

# Public Comment on draft Character Districts (12/5/11 - 1/6/12)

## 1: Town Square

Date	Name	Comment
1/3/2012	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I believe it is a mistake to allow condominium/penthouse type of residential or non-residential whether it is for tourists, second home or full time use in the town square area. I think it is more appropriate outside of the Town square district. At least, limit this to a small percentage of the building.</li> <li>• I agree with limiting the square to 2 stories above grade.</li> <li>• Please keep the western character theme of the town square. Departure from the “cowboy” theme for more of a western, mountain rustic theme may reflect more of what blends with the current age of the various buildings around the Town Square.</li> <li>• I hope that any redevelopment will encourage and hope to require back door deliveries in the design of the buildings. Large semi’s delivering products blocking traffic during busy times has been a problem.</li> <li>• Limiting the first floor throughout the Town Square area to only types of businesses that generate sales tax will limit a property owners rights and may be discriminatory.</li> </ul>
1/3/2012	Acari, Armond Save Historic JH	[actual comment could not be pasted]
12/9/2011	Geraci, Carrie Interested Public	Where quality public space has been identified as a core characteristic, LDR’s need to reinforce integration of design professionals at the earliest phase in the development process if we are to benefit from public art that have been thoughtfully integrated into the design and serves a function in the development.
12/9/2011	Geraci, Carrie Interested Public	Cache Street is a major artery anchored by the physical features of GTN Park and Snow King with the Elk Refuge in the middle. These natural wonders connect us directly to our lifestyle of recreation and environmental conservation. Our culture and heritage institutions exist along this artery, the NMWA, Historical Museum and the Center for the Arts. This artery also supports visitor services such as Home Ranch Welcome Center and the GY Visitor Center. Building added value into development along Cache Street will allow for a greater economic impact and connection to our commercial core, the town square. This artery should visually demonstrate, through well-designed public space and the inclusion of public art, the unique values we share as a community.
12/7/2011	Hazen, Diane Interested Public	1.1 Like 2 story limit on town square; interesting active pedestrian; regulate uses on the first floor--no banks/office; pocket parks and interesting; crabtree hotel location; pull people off square; gallery association; more events
12/7/2011	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	1.1 Like the 2 stories. Western/mountain rustic is the correct word. Pedestrian mall is good.
12/7/2011	Hazen, Diane Interested Public	Galleries are a good use in downtown bring in sales tax and attract people to the area, support the tourist economy.

Save Historic Jackson Hole Analysis

Re: Character Districts / Illustrating Our Vision, Dec 5, 2011 Draft

District 1: Town Square

**SHJH SUMMARY:** Buildout ranges for residential and commercial development should be provided. Protection of character in a district this small in scope will not be enough to protect overall community character. Refine language to acknowledge that this area is an important area to prioritize character preservation, but that the effort will be extended to other areas of town as well. Also, incorporate language that references a small town atmosphere.

BACKGROUND:			
<u>Existing Conditions</u>	<u>SHJH Summary of Proposed Key Changes in Plan</u>	<u>SHJH Comments/Concerns/Questions</u>	<u>SHJH General Recommendations</u>
District encompasses the area that is currently zoned as the Town Square Overlay (w/ Public and Urban Commercial Zoning).	<b><u>Overall Degree of Change:</u></b> <b>Minimal</b>	Diagram needs some clarification. ( Examples - the depiction of an automobile by-pass and the scope of 1.1 subarea )	<b>Refine map to clarify 1.1 subarea scope and by-pass.</b>
This is the historic center of Jackson Hole, with defined western character.	<b><u>Details:</u></b> stable district "retaining or replicating the existing built environment" 1.1 Town Square	Is this a large enough geographic area to protect the historical core of the community?	<b>Specify where the incorporation of condos or apartments would be encouraged on the second floor (specify directly on Square, off the Main Square, or all locations).</b>
This district includes a major highway intersection, with strong seasonal shifts in intensity of use.	Building heights should not exceed two stories.		<b>The language referencing the preservation of western character and heritage should not be limited to this district alone.</b>
	It encourages closure of some streets to the automobile.		<b>Reference this district's role in the protection of a <u>small town</u> atmosphere.</b>
	It encourage condos, lofts or apartments on second floor.		

**District 1: SHJH Detailed Recommendations for Improving Predictability and Consistency with Community Vision**

Plan Page	Plan Section	Recommended Changes
IV-10	Table of Existing and Future Characteristics	Further clarify what is meant by increasing "complete streets" within this small area.
IV-10	Table of Existing and Future Characteristics	Reconsider "absent" natural scenic vistas. The view from the Town Square into the surrounding landscape is an important part of the visitor experience and feeling of being in a small town. Restrictions on the adjacent built form is strongly linked to this protection of view of the natural landscape that defines Jackson Hole.
IV-10	Paragraph 1, Sentence 3 and 4	In general, protection of character in a district this small in scope will not be enough to protect overall community character. The plan needs to more clearly recognize the important issue of western heritage preservation and protection of a small town atmosphere. Refine language to acknowledge that this area is an important area to prioritize character preservation, but that the effort will be extended to other areas of town as well. Also, incorporate language that references a small town atmosphere.
IV-10	Paragraph 3, Sentence 1	Further clarify what is intended by reinvesting in the already-existing public space of the Town Square. More specificity is needed, such as preferences for vegetation as a dominant form.
IV-11	Neighborhood Form Diagrams	For consistency, the "neighborhood form" diagram should be moved to this page.
IV-12	Features Map	Further clarify the "automobile by-pass" map feature. Clarify if 1.1 encompasses the entire district or just the space immediately adjacent to the Town Square.
IV-13	1.1 Town Square	Clarify if "condominiums, lofts and apartments" will be encouraged in all areas of the district.
IV-13	1.1 Town Square, Sentence 5	Linked to the above point, clarify if parking requirements for this potential residential development will be waived, or directed to "public lots."

## 2: Town Commercial Core

Date	Name	Comment
1/5/2012	, Interested Public	Consider moving the old Sage Brush Motel site into District 2.3 to be included in the lodging overlay. This property would be a perfect gateway property into the Downtown district creating a distinctive western edge to the downtown. The site is approximately the same distance from the Town Square as the Rustic Inn anchoring the northern end of the district. The site would be excellent for a high end short term lodging facility taking advantage of its location along West Broadway for easy access for visitors with a development focused on Flat Creek and the views of Snow King Mountain, the Karns Meadow and Saddle Butte.
1/3/2012	Acari, Armond Save Historic JH	[actual comment could not be pasted]
1/3/2012	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The redevelopment into 2 to 3 story buildings where one story presently dominates has the potential of increasing the densities and driving growth over and above current entitled development. This will change the character, bulk and scale, of the district. Where is the tradeoff to neutralize in another district?</li> <li>•There is no mention of western character in this district, why not?</li> <li>•Preserving scenic and ecological values of Flat Creek and Cache Creek should be the #1 prioritized goal verses recreation.</li> </ul>
1/1/2012	Ewing, Patty Interested Public	Lodging overlay should NOT include narrow strip along Flat Creek. Too many issues. Not existing lodging. Too narrow. Threat to already threatened Flat creek, no parking, etc. Cowboy Village Resort SHOULD be in it's entirety
12/29/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	<p>a. Recommendation: In the diagram on the first page of this district, we should aim to make “viable wildlife habitat and connectivity” a “half circle” in the future column, and clarify that enhancements to Flat and Cache Creeks should be explicitly ecological</p> <p>b. It will be important to ensure that excessive lodging not overwhelm housing and other commercial development in this district</p> <p>c. Recommendation: Flat Creek corridor enhancements in this district should be focused primarily on ecological enhancements, and setbacks and other considerations should be explicitly mentioned in this chapter. Future enhancements should focus on the creek as a community amenity that prioritizes scenic and ecological values over recreational opportunities.</p> <p>d. Recommendation: Section 2.2 should include a commitment for new development in this area to take into account existing neighborhoods and work to integrate into them rather than overtake them with inappropriate bulk and scale.</p>
12/9/2011	Geraci, Carrie Interested Public	Cache Street is a major artery anchored by the physical features of GTN Park and Snow King with the Elk Refuge in the middle. These natural wonders connect us directly to our lifestyle of recreation and environmental conservation. Our culture and heritage institutions exist along this artery, the NMWA, Historical Museum and the Center for the Arts. This artery also supports visitor services such as Home Ranch Welcome Center and the GY Visitor Center. Building added value into development along Cache Street will allow for a greater economic impact and connection to our commercial core, the town square. This artery should visually demonstrate, through well-designed public space and the inclusion of public art, the unique values we share as a community.
12/9/2011	Geraci, Carrie Interested Public	Our culture and heritage are a core component of what makes Jackson Hole a quality place for people to live, work and visit. To encourage the future vitality of creativity in our community and to continue to benefit from the positive economic impact creative professionals have on our community, live-work spaces need to be planned for and even subsidized as part of our affordable housing pool. The cost of property is a key factor in young talented creative professionals moving to other communities. Live-work spaces also reduce traffic and add character to our neighborhoods. Developers in the Town Square and commercial core should be given incentives to include live-work spaces for creative professionals who may be producing visual arts (fun to watch artists working from ground-floor studios open to street/level), who are producing creative intellectual or digital capital or who work for arts and culture organizations.
12/9/2011	Geraci, Carrie Interested Public	Where quality public space has been identified as a core characteristic, LDR’s need to reinforce integration of design professionals at the earliest phase in the development process if we are to benefit from public art that have been thoughtfully integrated into the design and serves a function in the development.

## 2: Town Commercial Core

Date	Name	Comment
12/7/2011	Winder, Dan Interested Public	Districts 2 and 3: Include Cowboy Village completely in district 2. Make sure we have options--put into L.O. entirely. Maintain drive width along South Cache--don't narrow. Leave Pearl as it is. Elk Country Inn. Maintain and expand sales tax base. Need more people in 2 and 3.
12/7/2011	Varley, Jay Interested Public	Need to reduce size of lodging overlay to concentrate around the Town Square. Create a gateway to downtown at the Flat Creek bridge using the bridge and water as a theme. Utilize alleys to allow more density and reduce curb cuts on the street.
12/7/2011	Hazen, Diane Interested Public	Galleries are a good use in downtown bring in sales tax and attract people to the area, support the tourist economy.
12/7/2011	Dietz, Bruce Interested Public	Adjust the boundary between Districts 2 and 3; move District 2 boundary to Willow and enhance Willow in the same fashion as South Cache; new boundary should include both sides of Willow Street. 3.2 Allow office uses, especially when proximate to existing office uses.
12/7/2011	Wallace, Jim Interested Public	Move district 2 South Cache boundary up to and including both sides of Willow. Mixed use along Willow corridor. Need a sidewalk along the west side of Willow all the way to Snow King. Consider Willow and Cache as 1-way streets. 0' front yard setback.
12/7/2011	Waldrup, Jim Interested Public	Along Broadway to Glenwood/Milward north side consider 4-story stepped back
12/7/2011	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	2.3 Flat Creek concept makes sense.

Save Historic Jackson Hole Analysis  
Re: Character Districts / Illustrating Our Vision, Dec 5, 2011 Draft

District 2: Town Commercial Core

**SHJH SUMMARY:** Given the already existing 50-70 years of potential new growth (including the undeveloped, already-approved projects in Town) and the extent of commercial vacancies, it is not necessary to promote additional development potential during the life of this plan. In general, language is too vague and could apply to most communities. Buildout ranges for residential and commercial development should be provided for this very large "transitional" area. Other key suggestions include: 1) less density should be proposed for areas near Flat Creek, 2) the Lodging Overlay should not be expanded, and 3) parking issues must be addressed in greater detail.

BACKGROUND:			
Existing Conditions	SHJH Summary of Proposed Key Changes in Plan	SHJH Comments/Concerns/Questions	SHJH General Recommendations
This is a large geographic area that contains a "significant amount of the community's commercial uses, employment opportunities and lodging capacity."	<b>Overall Degree of Change:</b> Significant change	The table suggests that the area has no "defined character/high quality design."	Buildout ranges for the subareas (for both residential and nonresidential) should be provided. Only with these figures will the degree of "transition" be understandable.
It includes Downtown, Snow King Resort, and North Cache area.	<b>Details:</b> complete neighborhood with transitional and stable subareas 2.1-2.5 > identifies 2.1 Snow King Resort, 2.2 Snow King and South Cache Corridors, 2.3 Downtown, 2.4 Public/Civic, and 2.5 North Cache Gateway	Even though the plan states that 2-3 story buildings will be permitted, the sketch on p.19 of the plan depicts a 4 story building. (Perhaps this is not intended to be a potential new structure, but it should be clarified.)	Table should be refined to indicate that the area does have a degree of defined character.
	Area will see increased development potential, with buildings pulled to the street. (Parking will be underground or out of sight.)	This is a <b>very</b> large geographic area, all of which could see increased development potential.	Refine map to clarify by-pass designation.
	"Enhancement of public streetscape" is encouraged.	Snow King Resort is designated a transitional area. Why are resort areas not consistently designated as stable?	Resort designations should be consistent with the policy that resort areas are not permitted to expand.
	Lodging Overlay is proposed for expansion.	This district suggests a considerable increase in commercial development potential, which the public has generally not supported. Why are we expanding lodging when we do not have full occupancy with the current lodging?	Lodging overlay should not be expanded.
	Increased connectivity between Snow King Resort and Downtown is proposed.	The description does not adequately capture "existing character." No reference is made to the importance of this district continuing to help support the feel of a small town community.	Reference this district's role in the protection of a small town atmosphere.
		Scenic vista protection is an important part of the town experience, which is not recognized.	Impacts of taller buildings should be addressed in greater detail.
		Who is going to pay to provide parking for commercial development?	Given the important issue of parking capacity in this district, provide more specificity (amount and locations) regarding future parking policies.
		2-3 story lodging along Flat Creek does not respect this sensitive area. It is not consistent with the drawings that show development tapering off at the edge of town. What about requirements for setbacks from Flat Creek, and the highway?	Less density near Flat Creek should be encouraged.

**District 2: SHJH Detailed Recommendations for Improving Predictability and Consistency with Community Vision**

Plan Page	Plan Section	Recommended Changes
IV-14	Table of Existing and Future Characteristics	Reconsider/modify "absent" defined character, natural scenic vistas, and viable wildlife habitat and connectivity (given Flat Creek and adjacency to the National Elk Refuge). Characteristics need to be modified to demonstrate the uniqueness of different areas within the district.
IV-15	Paragraph 1, Sentence 3	Further refine the vision for this district based on unique characteristics within the Town. The goal "to create a vibrant pedestrian oriented mixed use district with a variety of non-residential and residential uses" is far too vague, and could apply anywhere.
IV-15	Paragraph 2, Sentence 2	Amend language. There is already considerable nonresidential and residential development in the pipeline. Further clarify the degree of increased "availability of lodging and residential units." (Buildout ranges would provide this information.)
IV-15	Paragraph 4, Sentence 3	Further specify general locations for "strategically located parking lots" that would be needed in addition to those that exist today.
IV-15	Paragraph 5, Sentence 1	Provide more specificity regarding phrases such as "enhancement of the public streetscape" to be consistent with climate and other factors unique to Jackson's unique characteristics. In general, descriptions should be more specific in defining desired character, as in our existing plan. Very little direction is given about the preferred types of development.
IV-15	Paragraph 6, Sentence 1	Clarify if the "Downtown" center encompasses all of the area north of Center for the Arts, including the former "NoBro" District.
IV-15	Addition to Existing Language	Language should be added that acknowledges the need for separate planning efforts (for individual areas) to provide increased levels of specificity.
IV-16	Features Map	Further clarify the "automobile by-pass" map feature.
IV-17	Neighborhood Forms	Clarify why the "mixed use" form is not proposed for this area given the narrative and designations such as "S. Cache Mixed Use Corridor".
IV-17	2.1 Snow King Resort, Sentence 1	Resort zoning classifications are inconsistent throughout the new plan. Clarify use of "transition" in this section. The plan should be clear that no additional density or intensity will be approved beyond what already is described in the Master Plan.
IV-18	2.2 Snow King and South Cache Corridors, Sentence 1	Further clarify the degree of appropriate "transition". (Buildout ranges would provide this information.) Also, increased commercial potential has been a consistent concern of many members of the public. It will be important to get a clear picture of the degree of change proposed for the area.
IV-19	2.3 Downtown, Paragraph 1, Sentence 1	As indicated, this is a "large" area, proposed for potentially significant change. (Buildout ranges are essential to determine the degree of potential change.) Also, more detail is needed about the preferred types of development. ( This draft, in comparison to the April 2009 Future Land Use Plan, provides far less specificity on the preferred development types.)

IV-19	2.3 Downtown, Paragraph 1, Sentence 3	Amend language to acknowledge generalized characteristics of this area instead of stating "the existing character and built form is varied and inconsistent." Implying that the area has no defined character suggests that there is no character to uphold in future land use decisions. In general, the areas are so large that it makes it challenging to summarize character. However, this certainly does not mean that subareas lack consistent character.
IV-19	2.3 Downtown, Paragraph 2, Sentence 1	Add language to complement general statements in the plan such as this sentence 1. This sentence could be in any comprehensive plan, anywhere. Language such as "consistent building size" does not provide a clear picture of what to expect. Clarify - Is the goal to trend towards a more intense character type or to protect and restore a pedestrian, smaller scale environment (as described in our existing plan)?
IV-19	2.3 Downtown, Paragraph 2, Sentence 7	The Lodging Overlay should not be expanded as proposed.
IV-19	2.3 Downtown, Paragraph 2, Sentence 8	Language needs to be refined and strengthened to provide more direction than the term "variety". Language needs to be incorporated that stresses the importance of maintaining a small town atmosphere.
IV-20	2.4 Public/Civic, Sentence 3	Language should be added to provide some direction that future development must be compatible with adjacent land uses.
IV-20	2.5 North Cache Gateway, Sentence 1	Further clarify the degree of appropriate "transition". (Buildout ranges would provide this information.)



### 3: Town Residential Core

Date	Name	Comment
1/3/2012	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The redevelopment into 2 to 3 story buildings where one story presently dominates has the potential of increasing the densities and driving growth over and above current entitled development. This will change the character, bulk and scale, of the district. Where is the tradeoff to neutralize in another district?</li> <li>•There is no mention of western character in this district, why not?</li> <li>•Preserving scenic and ecological values of Flat Creek and Cache Creek should be the #1 prioritized goal verses recreation.</li> </ul>
1/3/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	[actual comment could not be pasted]
12/29/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	<p>a. Recommendation: In section 3.5, the statement “parking should be minimized” should be replaced with “surface parking should be minimized.” This leaves more options for other approaches to dealing with parking.</p> <p>b. Recommendation: Also in section 3.5, the reference to “some limited local convenience commercial” should be more tightly defined. You may be referring to the often-discussed idea of a small grocery store, but “convenience commercial” could mean a wide range of other uses.</p>
12/13/2011	Adams, Justin Interested Public	The town still has a chance to redevelop along the lines of Anne Frame's example. Officials need to stop talking about upzones that encourage landowners to hang on for a higher selling price and let the town develop. End the affordable housing exaction and the energy exaction and give yourself a competitive advantage against the county. Also, the threat of an affordable housing ghetto going in next door diminishes the incentive to follow Anne Frame's example. The officials seem quite content to preside over a town of resort employees, affordable housing, and illegal workers. This does not build value for anyone.
12/13/2011	Wolf, Jim Interested Public	<p>The proposed character for the 3.2 district is very unfavorable to the existing neighborhood residents. It would basically open up the old AR-2 zone to wide 3-story multi-family development throughout, with fewer restrictions than the very undesirable PUDs</p> <p>The continued mixed-use content content is satisfactory</p> <p>However the plan does not recognize the several quite-different nieghborhood pockets within 3.2: Glenwood vs Historical vs Art Center periphery vs Karns, etc</p> <p>On the smaller lots, the principles are satisfactory: 3 units with alley, 2 without, 2 stories</p> <p>On the "larger residential lots and along mixed-use commercial corridors"...multi-family... "in order to replace existing commercial uses and to blend the borders of the Commercal Core with the Residential Core", you open Pandora's box. Probably 70%+ of the 3.2 lots could be argued to fall in this category. Recommendation: make the definition stick to "existing commercial uses" and to the "MHPs and Urs" and preclude the accumulated 3- and 2-lot current residentail uses. This will reduce some of the speculation in this zone and will offer mid-block protection for existing residents while permitting eventual conversion of the large nonconforming parcels.</p> <p>Second, completely avoid going to 3-story structures. These are totally incompatible with this area and do not exist elsewhere. Even the pre-1994 multifamilies went only to 2 stories. There is no way an existing 1-lot existing resident can abut comfortably with a new 3-story structure. This appears to be a naked sop to the developer/speculator group.</p> <p>Recommendation: apply the same guidelines to the new multi-families as to the mixed use office, e.g. "same bulk, scale and intensitiy". There is enough lateral flexibility to create multi-families at the existing density of about 17 units/acre.</p>

### 3: Town Residential Core

Date	Name	Comment
12/13/2011	Hagen, Audrey Interested Public	<p>First, thanks to all who have been tireless in their involvement in this public process. Wow!</p> <p>Whatever the zoning outcome, I hope we can have work, shop and living all together in the "greater" downtown area. I wish it could be flexible and encourage (instead of hinder) small scale projects that create more living/working/shopping spaces. I hope that the zoning changes allow our family the economic viability to continue to live on property that has been in the Hagen family for 80+ years. I want S. Cache to be busy and vibrant and livable for our family all at the same time.</p> <p>I must admit that sometimes this whole process has seemed so overwhelming and filled with such conflicting viewpoints that it is hard to see the end!</p> <p>Audrey</p> <p>P.S.</p> <p>I love everything about living downtown except the front end loaders and plow trucks at 3:30 AM!! -- I think the public works department does a great job, I just wish it wasn't so early in the morning!! I hope that part of this plan defines how town services (lighting, plowing, etc.) can coexist with residential as well as commercial.</p>
12/13/2011	Prugh, Greg Interested Public	<p>I echo Jim's [Wolf] conversation.</p> <p>However, there needs to be a reason to renew this category and for people to reinvest in town.</p> <p>What is the reason?</p>
12/9/2011	Geraci, Carrie Interested Public	<p>Our culture and heritage are a core component of what makes Jackson Hole a quality place for people to live, work and visit. To encourage the future vitality of creativity in our community and to continue to benefit from the positive economic impact creative professionals have on our community, live-work spaces need to be planned for and even subsidized as part of our affordable housing pool. The cost of property is a key factor in young talented creative professionals moving to other communities. Live-work spaces also reduce traffic and add character to our neighborhoods. Developers in the Town Square and commercial core should be given incentives to include live-work spaces for creative professionals who may be producing visual arts (fun to watch artists working from ground-floor studios open to street/level), who are producing creative intellectual or digital capital or who work for arts and culture organizations.</p>
12/7/2011	Hazen, Diane Interested Public	<p>3.1 and 3.2 Encourage owner occupied housing; "ownership and community;" corner lots could be multi family large house</p>
12/7/2011	Winder, Dan Interested Public	<p>Districts 2 and 3: Include Cowboy Village completely in district 2. Make sure we have options--put into L.O. entirely. Maintain drive width along South Cache--don't narrow. Leave Pearl as it is. Elk Country Inn. Maintain and expand sales tax base. Need more people in 2 and 3.</p>
12/7/2011	Dietz, Bruce Interested Public	<p>Adjust the boundary between Districts 2 and 3; move District 2 boundary to Willow and enhance Willow in the same fashion as South Cache; new boundary should include both sides of Willow Street. 3.2 Allow office uses, especially when proximate to existing office uses.</p>
12/7/2011	Wallace, Jim Interested Public	<p>Move district 2 South Cache boundary up to and including both sides of Willow. Mixed use along Willow corridor. Need a sidewalk along the west side of Willow all the way to Snow King. Consider Willow and Cache as 1-way streets. 0' front yard setback.</p>
12/7/2011	Horn, Scott Interested Public	<p>3.1 Should have Buds drawing and small commercial, bar, restaurant</p>
12/7/2011	Dietz, Bruce Interested Public	<p>Allow commercial uses along Willow Street. Traffic volume already to high to support residential uses.</p>

Save Historic Jackson Hole Analysis

Re: Character Districts / Illustrating Our Vision, Dec 5, 2011 Draft

District 3: Town Residential Core

**SHJH SUMMARY:** In general, language is very vague and could apply to most communities. Buildout ranges for residential and commercial development should be provided for this very large area. Language should be incorporated that explicitly states that stable areas should not promote a trend towards a more intense character type. Additional commercial development potential should not be encouraged.

<b>BACKGROUND:</b>			
<u>Existing Conditions</u>	<u>SHJH Summary of Proposed Key Changes in Plan</u>	<u>SHJH Comments/Concerns/Questions</u>	<u>SHJH General Recommendations</u>
Institutional Use is located in this area.	<b>Overall Degree of Change:</b> Significant change	The table suggests that the area has no "defined character/high quality design."	<b>Buildout ranges for the subareas (for both residential and nonresidential) should be provided. Only with these figures will the degree of "transition" be understandable.</b>
There is a mix of low to high density residential development.	<b>Details:</b> complete neighborhood with transitional and stable subareas 3.1-3.5 > identifies 3.1 East Jackson 3.2 Core Residential, 3.3 Institutional Area, 3.4 Multi-Family Area, and 3.5 East Broadway Mixed Use	3.1 - The narrative is vague regarding future preferences for development intensity. For example, it states that a variety exists today, and a variety will exist in the future, but does not provide detail about what the majority of future development should look like.	<b>Table should be refined to indicate that the area does have a degree of defined character.</b>
It includes a quiet area of town with little thru-traffic.	A "variety of building sizes will be encouraged."	3.2 encompasses a large area that is targeted for increased residential density.	<b>Transitional areas should be minimized.</b>
	It seeks to "reestablish a more neighborhood feel with a strong sense of ownership by all residents."	When it states that parking will be minimized, does this mean that parking requirements will decrease?	<b>Language should be incorporated that explicitly states that stable areas should not promote a trend towards a more intense character type.</b>
	3.2 will see increased density and larger buildings.	3 story buildings would represent a significant change for many places within the transitional area.	<b>The public has consistently not supported additional commercial development potential. Additive potential should not be encouraged.</b>
	3.5 proposes mixed use and local convenience commercial.	The required density to support additional local convenience commercial does not exist.	<b>Scenic vistas are an important part of living within many of these areas in Town, which the table should acknowledge.</b>

**District 3: SHJH Detailed Recommendations for Improving Predictability and Consistency with Community Vision**

Plan Page	Plan Section	Recommended Changes
IV-22	Table of Existing and Future Characteristics	Reconsider/modify "absent" defined character and natural scenic vistas.
IV-23	Paragraph 1, Sentence 3	Regarding references to "highly desirable residential neighborhood", the plan should be more specific about what types of features make neighborhoods desirable by residents. For example, many residents want quiet streets, dark skies, and walkable streets - not the urban-type infrastructure-based amenities suggested in this plan. If detail is not provided in the plan, debates about what is "desirable" will certainly be common in the future.
IV-23	Paragraph 2, Sentence 1	Describing future character using "variety" is too vague. Language should be added to provide specific guidance on where certain types will be encouraged.
IV-23	Paragraph 2, Sentence 3	Provide additional language to describe the intent of reestablishing "a more neighborhood feel."
IV-23	Paragraph 2, Sentence 6	Further define "improvements" to Snow King Avenue.
IV-23	Paragraph 2, Sentence 8	Clarify if the intent is to preserve existing local convenience commercial or to also add additional opportunities.
IV-24	Features Map	Clarify plans for "key transportation network project."
IV-25	3.1 East Jackson, Sentence 1 and 3	Given the geographic scope of the district, additional clarification is necessary to explain where the "variety of housing types" will be encouraged. Phrases such as "compatible with the existing character" when the character is highly variable do not provide clear direction.
IV-25	3.1 East Jackson, Sentence 6	Clarify "some areas" in this sentence. What are these areas?
IV-25	3.2 Core Residential, Paragraph 1	Further clarify the degree of appropriate "transition". (Buildout ranges would provide this information.)
IV-26	3.2 Core Residential, Paragraph 2, Sentence 4	Clarify the phrase "parking should be minimized" in terms of a potential decrease in parking requirements for new development.
IV-27	3.4 Multi-Family Area, Sentence 8	Language needs to be amended. The park is a great asset in the Town, but in general it is questionable to repeatedly describe a need to "increase the livability of the area." Have residents been voicing a need to increase "livability" of this area?
IV-27	3.5 East Broadway, Sentence 1 and 2	Further clarify the degree of appropriate "transition". (Buildout ranges would provide this information.) The area described does not include "multifamily residential" and could represent a significant change.
IV-27	3.5 East Broadway, Sentence 6	"Limited local convenience commercial" is too vague. The community has consistently voiced concerns about the degree of already existing commercial development potential. Given existing densities of the neighborhood and its relative periphery area of town, additional potential should not be encouraged.

## 4: Mid-Town

Date	Name	Comment
1/3/2012	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	•The Northern Broadway area should not allow greater density than is entitled. This is inconsistent with Comp Plan vision. The increase of development surrounding the Karns Meadow is not compatible with a wildlife crossing and wildlife movement corridor. Preservation of wildlife habitat, permeability, scenic and ecological values should be prioritized above recreation and development. There may be too much human activity to encourage wildlife to migrate through the Karns Meadow area. Fencing the hillside above North Broadway so that wildlife can not cross Broadway below, should be considered.
1/3/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	[actual comment could not be pasted]
1/2/2012	Acri, Armond Interested Public	-Higher density is not appropriate for steep hillsides at the Y. This area is isolated from the rest of the community by the Highway making access for vehicles and pedestrians difficult. Any solution that attempts to resolve the isolation will be very expensive and will require the community to pay to assist development. It also further encroaches on critical wildlife habitat. It is not consistent to allow dense development adjacent to an area in the County that is identified as an area to preserve. -Making this area “the local’s downtown” is not consistent with the vision that the downtown area be shopping for tourists and locals. If the goal is to make this the local’s downtown then take out statements that we want locals to go downtown. -High density around the perimeter of Karn’s Meadow diminishes its value for wildlife. Town should be permeable for wildlife, this point is especially important for Karn’s Meadow.
12/29/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	a. We are very supportive of the references to natural resource values in this district b. Recommendation: In section 4.2 it would be helpful to add a statement with regard to keeping bulk and scale down. We are also supportive of a wildlife crossing in this sub area. c. Recommendation: In section 4.5, the last sentence should be amended to read, “Moving forward, wildlife needs will be prioritized over recreational amenities in this sensitive location.”
12/7/2011	Horn, Scott Interested Public	4.1 Like START bus location. 4.4 Like description
12/7/2011	Johnson's, T. Interested Public	Continue sub-district 4.1 to the east to include all the AC zoned property fronting West Broadway. Add a stop light along West Broadway at Virg. to increase pedestrian connectivity between north and south sides. Slow the speed along West Broadway to 20 mph to address wildlife issues instead of an expensive over/under pass. The mule deer herd in this area is shrinking or gone no need for an overpass/under pass any longer. Deer cut outs and statues attract the deer should not be allowed. Address commercial uses in residential areas.

Save Historic Jackson Hole Analysis

Re: Character Districts / Illustrating Our Vision, Dec 5, 2011 Draft

District 4: MidTown

**SHJH SUMMARY:** Given the already existing 50-70 years of potential new growth (including the undeveloped, already-approved projects in Town) and the extent of commercial vacancies, it is not necessary to promote additional development potential during the life of this plan. In general, language is too vague and could apply to most communities. Buildout ranges for residential and commercial development should be provided for this large "transitional" area. Other key suggestions include: 1) increased development potential on the West side of Broadway should not be encouraged and 2) further refine the vision for this district as a "local's downtown" given the plan's goal to encourage local use in the existing Downtown.

BACKGROUND:			
Existing Conditions	SHJH Summary of Proposed Key Changes in Plan	SHJH Comments/Concerns/Questions	SHJH General Recommendations
It is "one of the most complete neighborhoods in the community."	<b>Overall Degree of Change:</b> Significant change	The table suggests that the area has no "defined character/high quality design."	Buildout ranges for the subareas (for both residential and nonresidential) should be provided. Only with these figures will the degree of "transition" be understandable.
It includes the major "Y" intersection.	<b>Details:</b> complete neighborhood with transitional, stable and preservation subareas (4.1-4.5) > identifies 4.1 Highway Corridor, 4.2 Northern Hillside, 4.3 Central, 4.4 Residential, 4.5 Karns Meadow	The new plan acknowledges that a key challenge "will be to identify a solution to accommodate a wildlife crossing along West Broadway Avenue." Adding density to this area, while calling for a such a mitigation, is questionable.	Table should be refined to be consistent and to indicate that the area does have a degree of defined character. (For example, "defined character" should not be absent given that it is "one of the most complete neighborhoods in the community. It also should not state that "walkable schools and recreation" are only partial.)
Flat Creek is a prominent feature, with extensive mule deer movement.	It promotes redevelopment of "underutilized properties with mixed use structures."	4.2 Northern Hillside subarea includes increased development potential on steep, south-facing hillsides, and along a major intersection. This is not consistent with a vision to taper density at the edge of Town, or to respect wildlife habitat.	In order for new development to be "sensitive to hillsides," increased development potential on the West side of Broadway, should not be encouraged. This area is very isolated from the rest of the community. It is not appropriate for high density as it will be very expensive (and maybe impractical) to develop pedestrian connectivity to the rest of the community.
	"Create a walkable mixed-use local's downtown" is a key focus.	Language underemphasizes the potential impacts of substantially increased density on planning issues such as parking, wildlife management, water quality of Flat Creek, and road capacity.	More explanation should be provided to describe the overall vision for this area to be the local's downtown, given the plan's goal to encourage local use in the existing downtown.
	It proposes an increase in residential population.	Recent proposals raise questions about the future designation of Karns Meadow as a "preservation" area. In order for the area to have value for wildlife, the borders must be permeable for wildlife.	There should not be high density on the perimeter of Karns Meadow.
		"Local's downtown" is not consistent with the goal to get locals downtown.	The specific boundaries of the transition area should be decreased to minimize the scope of increased development potential.
		What does "improve Snow King Transportation Corridor" mean?	Define Improvements.

**District 4: SHJH Detailed Recommendations for Improving Predictability and Consistency with Community Vision**

Plan Page	Plan Section	Recommended Changes
IV-28	Table of Existing and Future Characteristics	Reconsider/modify "absent" defined character and "partial" walkable commercial and recreation. Characteristics need to be modified to demonstrate the uniqueness of different areas within the district.
IV-29	Paragraph 2, Sentence 1	Further refine the vision for this district as a " local's downtown" given the plan's goal to encourage local use in the existing Downtown.
IV-29	Paragraph 2, Sentence 3	Further clarify what is intended in terms of improvements for Snow King Avenue.
IV-29	Paragraph 2, Sentence 4	Refine language to remove vagueness of terms such as "enhancing" and "underutilized properties."
IV-29	Neighborhood Forms	Further clarify characteristics unique to "village" versus "mixed use".
IV-30	Features Map	The transition area is too large and should be minimized significantly.
IV-31	Paragraph 3, Sentence 3	This district needs significant modifications to the transition area. The map, and accompanying narrative, appear inconsistent with the goal to "facilitate wildlife movement through the district."
IV-31	4.1 Highway Corridor, Sentence 1	Buildout ranges are essential to determine the degree of "transition". Also, more detail is needed about the preferred types of development. ( This draft, in comparison to the April 2009 Future Land Use Plan, provides far less specificity on the preferred development types.)
IV-31	4.1 Highway Corridor, Sentence 9	The challenge to accommodate wildlife movement within the development pattern and intensity proposed would be significant. Additional development potential should not be permitted until the issue of the wildlife crossing is first addressed.
IV-32	4.2 Northern Hillside, Sentence 1	Buildout ranges are essential to determine the degree of "transition". Also, more detail is needed about the preferred types of development. ( This draft, in comparison to the April 2009 Future Land Use Plan, provides far less specificity on the preferred development types.)
IV-32	4.2 Northern Hillside, Sentence 4, 5, and 6	An increase in development potential should not be permitted in this area given the unresolved wildlife-related and transportation access challenges.
IV-32	4.3 Central, Paragraph	Buildout ranges are essential to determine the degree of "transition". Also, more detail is needed about the preferred types of development. ( This draft, in comparison to the April 2009 Future Land Use Plan, provides far less specificity on the preferred development types.)
IV-32	4.3 Central, Sentence 5	Refine language to provide increased direction on preferences for 2 and 3 story buildings. In a number of locations in the plan, "a combination of two and three story structures" is outlined. The plan should provide some sort of guidance on criteria by which these different allowances would occur, or clarify if the intent is to incrementally shift to three-story structures. Existing language is too vague here, as in other similar areas in the plan.
IV-33	4.4 Residential, Sentence 1	Clarify if redevelopment would encourage single family or multi-family structures. Language is unclear.
IV-33	4.4 Residential, Sentence 5	Further clarify what is intended by "sensitive to hillsides" with specific reference to allowable development potential.
IV-33	4.5 Karns Meadow, Sentence 1	Further clarify the categorization "preservation" given proposed uses within the area.

## 5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
1/3/2012	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	<p>District 5: West Jackson 5.6 Northwest South Park area</p> <p>Positive language changes that should stay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•Density now to be similar to adjacent West Jackson neighborhoods</li><li>•Priority before considering this area is “infill and redevelop other existing complete neighborhoods”</li></ul> <p>Recommendation: We all understood that the intent of the development in section 5.6 was that this area will be developed more intensively in exchange for eliminating development rights on the open lands in the greater South Park area. This should be stated explicitly. Otherwise it implies a massive upzoning of this area while still permitting at least 1 unit per 35 acres in the rest of South Park. Our understanding is that the PRD or other transfer tool is envisioned to conserve the open space, and that the development in 5.6 is seen as the best place to concentrate development to achieve that goal. Please clarify this so that this can’t be read as an upzone in addition to already existing rights on the open space you’re hoping to preserve.</p> <p>Remember also that there are only five large land owners in South Park – dominated by the largest two of Robert Gill and Kelly Lockhart that own and control the entirety of area 5.6 – Northwest South Park. In addition to these 200 plus acres in area 5.6 each owner owns – they also each own another 350 acres in Central South Park (area 10.2) as well as over 600 acres each along the Snake River next to Shooting Iron (greater South Park now in district 9). In summary - area 5.6 could resolve some 2,200 plus acres in greater South Park owned and controlled by these two land owners alone.</p> <p>Corrections: the map on page IV-36 incorrectly locates the possible school zone expansion in on the southern boundary of the existing High School. Simply bring it up to match the boundary.</p> <p>Overarching Misses in Character Maps and in the Themes and Policies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1.The Character District Chapter needs to indicate potential build-out ranges for both residential and nonresidential development by district. Once released, the community needs to support the ranges in order for them to be approved. This was promised to the community when we got to this stage of the mapping and it is extremely disturbing that those ranges are not already included on these maps.</li><li>2.Both the Character District Chapter and Policies must state that a transfer method to enable permanent protection of open space must be in place before increased density in populated areas is allowed. Increasing development potential in certain areas should be a planning approach to uphold the priority of conservation, not for the sake of growth alone. The community firmly understood this is to be the core of the plan – and the electeds have generally agreed this is their intent. This statement of intent needs to be added to both the Themes and Policies as well as in the introduction to the character district maps.</li></ol>
1/3/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	[actual comment could not be pasted]



## 5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
1/3/2012	Aurelio, Linda Interested Public	<p>I would like to express additional comments on the Draft Comprehensive Plan Character Districts specific to Districts 5 &amp; 10, West Jackson and South Park respectively.</p> <p>One key point going forward is the definition of the Plan matrix which defines, in circle form, ( Existing Characteristics Chart IV-2) the weights of attributes of each district. I would contend that Both Districts 5 &amp; 10 receive a "full circle" on viable wildlife habitat connectivity and natural scenic vistas. If you do not live in this wonderful part of the community perhaps you would not see our abundance of wildlife each and every day, or appreciate our vistas as we go about our daily lives. This recognition alone provides the platform on which the residents of these districts have been working so hard to protect from build out and density earmarks. It is the cornerstone of our plea for the continuation of open space and what is left of the rural nature of these two districts.</p> <p>With that said, I do support the most recent Alliance letter to the above parties on recommendation #6 &amp; 7. "Recommendation #6: Execute a rapid assessment of wildlife impacts of the proposed development pattern, or authorize the NRTAB to do so. Recommendation #7: Insert more explicit considerations for wildlife permeability in the following districts: 2, 3, 4, 5, and 13 ( I would include district 10).</p> <p>Why have we not commissioned the expertise of the NRTAB to provide such an analysis so we may look at the issues for wildlife permeability ? Given the public outcry for wildlife preservation as priority number 1, I would think this study would have already been completed in conjunction with recommendations for future growth.</p> <p>Taking a look at District #5 in the Comprehensive Plan (5.3), it is recognized that this stable district already supports the majority "of community workforce housing and every effort should be made to ensure this neighborhood retain its vitality, cohesiveness.... An important goal is to maintain a strong sense of ownership and community in the area." Given these facts, it would be in everyone's best interest to continue to support safety and integrity of this vital area for both it's residents,school children, and wildlife. By the continuation of support for a connector road (Tribal Trail Connector) through the very heart of this district (pg. IV-35), we would destroy the very neighborhoods we are trying to envision and maintain. Currently, most traffic in this area is school demand at peak school hours. The best solution is to provide enhancements to High School Road for residential, pedestrian, and school access priorities. It is not in the best interest of our community to divert daily commuter traffic though and around town intersections into our neighborhoods as a connector road would certainly do.</p> <p>Last, attention to Comp Plan section 5.6 must be clarified. This section does not provide the necessary definition and direction for the future of Northwest South Park areas. Growth Management goals must be clear and concise and not determined at a later date"if necessary" . This area holds some of the best remaining parcels of open space which can define our valley for future generations. The Plan ( Existing &amp; Future desired Characteristics IV-35) talks about the "enhancement of the southern gateway into Town with improved visual appearance" as a key goal of importance. Now is the time to clearly define that gateway so that existing open space and scenic value remain permanent for all to share and enjoy.</p> <p>As always, thank you for your time and dedication to this process.</p>
1/2/2012	Aciri, Armond Interested Public	<p>-Given that current regulations allow sufficient growth for 50-75 years (much longer than the Plans expected life of 10-15 years) there is no reason to develop the Northern portion of South Park during the life of this Plan. It should be identified for the future, but we should be clear that it will not be developed until we have built out Town. That allows time to investigate methods to achieve the community goals of permanent protection of open spaces.</p> <p>-An East-West connector should be completed prior to any development in Northern South Park. Attempting to build it after development will be difficult.</p>

## 5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
12/29/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	<p>a. Recommendation: Section 5.2 should be amended to recognize that this area is already trending towards housing and complete neighborhood attributes, and should be encouraged to continue to do so, given the close proximity to schools, a grocery store, pathways, and Flat Creek. This is an ideal location for “complete neighborhood” attributes, but given recent developments, it is no longer a particularly good location for industrial uses. Industry should be focused into District 7.</p> <p>b. Recommendation: Section 5.4 should commit to repurposing High School Road primarily as a residential access road and not a highway.</p> <p>c. Recommendation: Section 5.6 needs to be clarified with regard to the lower priority of development in northwest South Park. We are supportive of efforts within the Growth Management Plan to proactively allocate development to certain areas of the County before others.</p> <p>D. Recommendation: In section 5.6 there is mention of a “neighborhood planning effort.” This term must be better defined to include plans for roadways, public areas, pathways, and other components of development in such a large area. The neighborhood planning should happen prior to accepting any development proposal, and should include a rigorous review of any major development application by the public and the elected officials, beyond that required by an ordinary development application. This is extremely important given the large scale of proposed development in this area.</p> <p>E. Recommendation: We believe that the intent of the development in section 5.6 is that this area will be developed more intensively in exchange for eliminating development rights on the open lands in the South Park area. This should be stated explicitly. Otherwise it implies a massive upzoning of this area while still permitting at least 1 unit per 35 acres in the rest of South Park. Our understanding is that the PRD or other transfer tool is envisioned to conserve the open space, and that the development in 5.6 is seen as the best place to concentrate development to achieve that goal. Please clarify this so that this can’t be read as an upzone in addition to already existing rights on the open space you’re hoping to preserve.</p>
12/12/2011	O'Brien, Kristine Interested Public	<p>Below are my written comments concerning the Planners' open house on Thursday. Thanks to the Elected officials and staff who dedicated so much time to explain the Plan and listen to community concerns.</p> <p>First, I appreciate the steps taken towards conservation in Middle and Southern South Park, the affirmation of its scenic, rural and wildlife connectivity values as well as its value as the gateway from the south. And I like the commitment not to develop the Northwest corner of South Park before infill in town is complete and also to require potential development in that section to match the character of the existing, adjacent neighborhood. The acknowledgment of a need to address the highway wildlife crossings is commendable (although I would like to see the widespread East-West wildlife connectivity drawn on the map as is the North-South corridor along Flat Creek). These kinds of positive steps towards conservation and preservation serve the community well now and for the future.</p> <p>Second, as a general principle, it is best to err on the side of too little development as opposed to putting as much as possible in targeted areas. Development does not need a head start. All development has social and environmental costs associated with it. The Comprehensive Plan should do as much as possible to ensure that the doubling of development now on the maps pays its own way as it is obviously unsustainable to use growth to solve growth related issues. Future generations will have to defend this ecosystem against the weight of an increasing wealthy global economy. The Plan must foster permanent preservation of open space, wildlife habitat and scenic vistas as large profit margins will always tempt us to overdevelop in a piecemeal fashion. In many parts of the world clean air and enjoyment of nature are already so rare they are available only to a privileged few. Let's not let that happen here.</p> <p>Finally, for the sake of clarity, predictability and transparency of government, please release the build-out numbers for each district. Ranges are fine. The community is smart enough to understand the difference between a worst-case, maximum build-out scenario and what is likely. People are aware that there is already a huge amount of development potential embodied in current property rights. That's why we've all agreed not to add new potential. People can't know what their neighborhoods will look like or what the overall impact and cost of growth could be, without knowing the amount and type of development possible in each district. In addition, business decisions are better made in a predictable environment. At a time when trust in government is at an all time low, it is important to be as transparent as possible in the process.</p>
12/7/2011	Hazen, Diane Interested Public	5.6 Like open space corridor as gateway; should be less dense than Cottonwood to transition into rural preservation; lower density on south edge and higher density to the north; road east-west is ok to get people to highway and reduce traffic on south park road to south; stream enhancement for wildlife

## 5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
12/7/2011	Baur, Donna Interested Public	5.2 Like the Gregory Lane concept. 5.6 Road makes sense. Should similar same as single family. Like range view which is more stable or affordable. No commercial.
12/7/2011	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	5.2 Makes sense to redevelop industrial buildings. Pedestrian amenities make sense. Restoration of Flat Creek makes sense. 5.6 Like east-west road
12/7/2011	, Interested Public	5.2 restore Creek - no trail, wildlife corridor 5.6 restore Creek - no trail, wildlife corridor 13.1 Drawing - remove soccer field, expand rec center
12/7/2011	Jesse, Dennis Interested Public	5.2 and 5.3 Redevelop to more intense uses with more stories; highway enhancements make sense; like Redmond; landscaping. 5.6 More residential single-family; allow affordable units for younger families; better as wildlife habitat and also has a view corridor but fences prevent wildlife; the road as proposed makes sense, critical; South Park Loop should not connect to 22; path along the creek should be public on either creek whether there is access by people or not.
12/6/2011	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Alex - Yup – saw it finally go live during the JIM. Thanks.  I will have some input, suggestions and corrections naturally.  With that aside - having skimmed all of it (all districts and introduction) – I do want to thank the planning team as this approach on finally putting lines on the ground – and the detail within the descriptions (at least verbally and visually – as we are still missing the extremely important “Appendix I”) - is the right direction forward.  We know the rub is how we actually move development from rural to existing or new expanded centers – while leaving the incentives in place to permanently reduce the development potential in those critical rural areas (via permanent open space easements) – all within our cumulative existing remaining development potential (approximately double our current built environment). But that has more to do with some stronger affirmations and commitments within the body of the themes and policies – so it is clear on where the LDRs changes should be focused - and what goals are to be achieved.  Kindly let me know when the one-page 60/40 spit build-out numbers summary (as Jeff explained to the electeds yesterday afternoon) is ready for public consumption - as I know you will have it for the open house.  Also please explain the timeline for an updated “Appendix I” with build-out ranges by district – and in aggregate. I would hope we have that well before the January joint meetings (electeds and planning commissions). We all expected that to be part of this phase of the maps.  Again – I want to acknowledge the amount, and quality, of work the planning staff has put in – and the responsiveness to public feedback that I do see in character districts 10 (South Park) and 5 (West Jackson) especially. It is appreciated and noted. Although I, along with my neighbors, continue to still have specific concerns – we have come a long way to improving the characterization for the future of the greater South Park region.  As your lead in sentences for the South Park district states so well:  “The South Park District is, and will continue to be, the agricultural southern gateway to Jackson. The existing agricultural open space that defines the character of the district provides a scenic foreground for Teton views, wildlife habitat connectivity, reference to heritage and stewardship ethic, and a quite rural setting for residents.”  You can pass my positive reception on to the planning team.

# Save Historic Jackson Hole Analysis

Re: Character Districts / Illustrating Our Vision, Dec 5, 2011 Draft

District 5: West Jackson

**SHJH SUMMARY:** To increase predictability, the new plan should include more detail to clearly distinguish future "neighborhood forms". Buildout ranges for residential and commercial development should be provided. Given the community's stated priority for infill development during the life of this plan and the already existing 50-70 years of development potential, 5.6 Northwest South Park, should be removed as a transitional area. Language should be included to ensure that development of such a large geographic area (5.6) would be a community-level, comprehensive planning effort, not just at the neighborhood level. How this area gets developed will have huge implications for the valley and Town of Jackson as a whole. This larger planning effort could then determine the basis for an amendment to the comprehensive plan (for this area to be a transitional area.)

BACKGROUND:			
Existing Conditions	SHJH Summary of Proposed Key Changes in Plan	SHJH Comments/Concerns/Questions	SHJH General Recommendations
The area includes a wide variety of land uses with a large undeveloped agricultural area in the southern portion of the district	<b>Overall Degree of Change:</b> Significant change	The table suggests that the area has no "defined character/high quality design."	<b>Buildout ranges for the subareas (for both residential and nonresidential) should be provided. Only with these figures will the degree of "transition" be understandable.</b>
The area includes numerous planned neighborhoods and an industrial area.	<b>Details:</b> complete neighborhood with stable and transitional subareas (5.1-5.6) - identifies 5.1 Highway Corridor, 5.2 Gregory Lane Area, 5.3 South Park Loop Road, 5.4 School Campuses, 5.5 West Jackson Residential, 5.6 Northwest South Park	Sketches do not appear consistent with corresponding 5.1 and 5.3 sections.	<b>Table should be refined to indicate that the area does have a degree of defined character. (For example, "defined character" should not be absent given that it is "one of the most complete neighborhoods in the community. It also should not state that "walkable schools and recreation" are only partial.)</b>
	5.1, 5.2, 5.3 and 5.6 are all transitional areas, with an unknown degree of change. Some of these areas could see significant change.	A wildlife overpass is depicted in section 5.6. Based on the existing east-west movement of wildlife, it will be important to use and compile the best available science to inform the optimal location.	<b>Given the geographic scope of transitional areas, additional policy objectives should be added to explain the proposed change.</b>
		This district lists only four policy objectives.	<b>The degree to which sketches will guide and influence specific sections of the land development regulations should be defined.</b>
		Northwest South Park has been incorporated within the district, rather than being part of District 10: South Park. This is a large transition area in the new plan, but its details are to be deferred to a future "neighborhood planning effort."	<b>The geographic scope of 5.6 should be considered rural, given that development is not desired here for the life of the plan. In the case that it remains transitional, the scope should be decreased. More information should be provided to describe what is meant by "if necessary" as a condition for future development of the subarea. What types of conditions would make it necessary? Existing language is far too vague, and contradictory given the "transitional" designation.</b>

		5.2 - Will the nonresidential potential be transferred from other locations or will the proposed increases represent additive commercial development?	<b>The plan should first concentrate on infill and redevelopment rather than promote 5.6 as transitional. Also, as in other districts, density increases in District 5 should be contingent upon permanent conservation elsewhere in the area. Also, the suggested increases in nonresidential development should be clarified.</b>
			<b>East/West connector from South Park Loop Road to Highway 89 should be built PRIOR to any development in NW South Park.</b>

**District 5: SHJH Detailed Recommendations for Improving Predictability and Consistency with Community Vision**

Plan Page	Plan Section	Recommended Changes
IV-34	Table of Existing and Future Characteristics	Reconsider "absent" defined character, natural scenic vistas, agricultural and undeveloped open space, and abundance of landscape over built form. Characteristics need to be modified to demonstrate the uniqueness of different areas within the district.
IV-35	Paragraph 2, Sentence 1	Further clarify the use of the term "more attractive." Does this mean more landscaping and increased architectural requirements? More specificity is needed.
IV-35	Paragraph 2, Sentence 5 and 6	Additional language about the challenge of transportation congestion, including the terms for which additional development potential is encouraged, is essential. Specifically, will roadway improvements be required prior to encouraging additional development? Cost-benefit analyses of additional growth in this area is essential given the costs of these "solutions" to the community.
IV-35	Neighborhood Form Diagrams	Further clarify characteristics unique to "mixed use" versus "village" for this district.
IV-36	Features Map	Minimize the "transition" area. The "transition" area is too large in the current agricultural area, particularly given the stated direction in 5.6.
IV-37	5.1 Highway Corridor, Sentence 3	Further clarify the degree of increased residential and commercial development potential. If nonresidential uses are intended to be catered to locals, will deed-restricted units be a priority for the area? (Buildout ranges would provide some of this information.)
IV-37	5.2 Gregory Lane Area, Sentence 2	Further clarify the degree of "transition" intended by "current development pattern will be intensified." (Buildout ranges would provide this information.)
IV-37	5.2 Gregory Lane Area, Sentence 6	Language should reference impervious surface coverage as it relates to "improvements to Flat Creek" and the accommodation of "larger structures."
IV-38	5.3 South Park Loop Road	Language should be incorporated that acknowledges wildlife movement in the area.
IV-38	5.4 School Campuses, Sentence 3 and 4	Further emphasize that transportation issues and challenges associated with the school district (including seasonal limitations) must be closely evaluated prior to improvements and adding additional development potential within the vicinity.
IV-39	5.6 Northwest South Park, Sentence 1	Buildout ranges for this large geographic must be provided to provide any level of predictability. (The various "West Jackson neighborhoods" have a range of densities.)
IV-39	5.6 Northwest South Park, Sentence 2	Stating the priority is good, but further clarify the intent of the policy in the case of future development decisions. Specifically, further describe the "if necessary" conditions that would merit the encouragement of intensely developing the area.
IV-39	5.6 Northwest South Park, Sentence 4	Language should be incorporated to reflect that development of such a large geographic area should be a community-level, comprehensive planning effort not just at the neighborhood level. How this area gets developed will have huge implications for the valley and Town of Jackson as a whole. (In general, this plan has delayed the difficult decisions.)

## 6: Town Periphery

Date	Name	Comment
1/3/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	[actual comment could not be pasted]
1/3/2012	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Further subdividing of this area should not be allowed unless the property is surrounded by similar density that is proposed.</li> <li>•Indian Trails Subdivision should not be dissected into 2 different districts. They are controlled by the same covenants, HOA, etc. The fact that the northern part is just outside the radius for schools should not be a determining factor. This makes no sense.</li> <li>•Policy 5.3.b. Preserve existing workforce housing stock. How does one control the sale and purchase of independently owned homes? Putting limits on the FAR allowed may keep the homes in a more affordable price range that appeal to a working class of people.</li> </ul>
12/29/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	a. We are supportive of the mentions of wildlife corridors and permeability in this district.
12/20/2011	Ewing, Patty Interested Public	<p>Thanks for the opportunity to spend a great deal of time chatting about the Town Periphery District #6 at the December 7th open house. I very much appreciate the courtesy and time accorded my questions and comments.</p> <p>One of the primary goals of land use planning is PREDICTABILITY, not vague language which allows flexibility. Use clear, unequivocal language which demands future land use be predictable.</p> <p>Following are additional comments based on the published (December 5, 2011) Existing @ Future Desired Characteristics of District 6, Town Periphery.</p> <p>1.IV-41 Eliminate: "Further subdivision of land should ("should" is an enabling verb – use "must") be in keeping with surrounding character but is appropriate in order to further the growth management tools of the plan". What does the verbiage in italics actually mean? I think it actually means that anything goes if it furthers the growth management tools of the plan, which are fuzzy at best. The plan must be absolutely clear that subdivision MUST be consistent with surrounding character and DENSITY, i.e. single family homes on large lots. Either eliminate the entire statement to be consistent with the statement which later appears in Upper Cache 6.2: "Future subdivision will be in keeping with the traditional development pattern with no increase in density than exists on the ground today. On each lot, only a single family dwelling will be allowed", or use the exact same verbiage both places, the second statement is clear and concise.</p> <p>2.IV-41 Eliminate: "Pedestrian/bike amenities such as pathways will be added to connect these areas to surrounding district with Compete neighborhood amenities and to connect the community to adjacent public lands." Where can pathways be added? Currently, there are three accesses to public lands up Cache Creek and this statement is redundant because of the following:</p> <p>3.IV-41 "Consideration of alternative mode improvements will be made on collector streets such as Cache Creek Drive. These improvements will serve to enhance safety and provide connectivity for cyclists and pedestrians to surrounding districts with Complete neighborhood amenities and to connect the community to the adjacent public lands." Simple suggestions for improving the shared use of Cache Creek Drive: #1- post speed limit of 20 miles per hour and enforce it; #2 - speed bumps which are effective for cars and bikers (both often come down Cache Creek Drive at high speeds) ; #3- trim the willows back on the corners to greatly increase visibility.</p> <p>4.IV-44 6.2 Upper Cache: Eliminate: "while other commercial uses producing large amounts of traffic and high impacts should be reduced." What commercial uses produce large amounts of traffic and high impact currently? There are none!</p>
12/7/2011	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	6.1 Combine with 5.5, development could occur in conservation easement beyond, wildlife crossing is a challenge 6.2 Agree with this description 6.3 Makes sense
12/7/2011	Ewing, Patty Interested Public	NO complete streets. Increase wildlife permeability in other areas, particularly Snow King Estates, east of Rancher

6: Town Periphery

Date	Name	Comment
12/7/2011	Winder, Dan Interested Public	Maintain equine use on Cache Creek neighborhood. No sidewalks necessary. No further improvements to Cache Creek Drive--keep as is.



# Save Historic Jackson Hole Analysis

## Re: Character Districts / Illustrating Our Vision, Dec 5, 2011 Draft

### District 6: Town Periphery

**SHJH SUMMARY:** Buildout ranges for residential and commercial development should be provided. The table's description of future characteristics does not appear consistent with the district's focus as a stable area. Also, characteristics need to be modified to demonstrate the uniqueness of different areas within the district. Language should be clear that further subdivision should not be encouraged. Reconcile "limited alternative mode improvements" with the proposed addition of pedestrian/bike amenities. Identify specific locations for these amenities.

BACKGROUND:			
<u>Existing Conditions</u>	<u>SHJH Summary of Proposed Key Changes in Plan</u>	<u>SHJH Comments/Concerns/Questions</u>	<u>SHJH General Recommendations</u>
The area is primarily low density single family development.	<b>Overall Degree of Change:</b> Minimal change	The map appears to include the USFS administrative site, which could be subdivided independently of the vision in this plan. (It may not be a "stable area.")	<b>Table and diagrams need refinement. The conclusions of the table appear inconsistent with the narrative in the remainder of the section.</b>
The area encompasses the interface between Town and rural or undevelopable lands.	<b>Details:</b> complete neighborhood with stable and preservation subareas (6.1-6.3) > identifies 6.1 Low to Medium Density Neighborhoods, 6.2 Upper Cache, and 6.3 Snow King Slope	The table suggests that the area has no "defined character/high quality design."	<b>Buildout ranges for the subareas should be provided. Only with these figures will the degree of change be understandable.</b>
	New buildings should match existing character in size and scale, even in the case of lot consolidation.	For some areas, it states that further subdivision is appropriate. It is unclear what will be allowed when existing lots are subdivided.	<b>Further subdivision should not be allowed in the periphery given the plan's goals.</b>
		The table states that "natural scenic vistas" are absent today, and will be partial in the future. At the same time, it states that it has a partial "abundance of landscape over built form" today, and that it will be absent in the future.	

**District 6: SHJH Detailed Recommendations for Improving Predictability and Consistency with Community Vision**

Plan Page	Plan Section	Recommended Changes
IV-40	Table of Existing and Future Characteristics	Reconsider "absent" defined character, natural scenic vistas, and walkable schools. Characteristics need to be modified to demonstrate the uniqueness of different areas within the district.
IV-40	Table of Existing and Future Characteristics	The table's description of future characteristics does not appear consistent with the district's focus as a stable area.
IV-41	Paragraph 2, Sentence 2	The sentence regarding "future subdivision of land" is confusing. Further subdivision should not be encouraged.
IV-41	Paragraph 2, Sentence 9	Further clarify the proposed addition of pathways given the statement to have limited alternative mode improvements.
IV-41	Neighborhood Form Diagrams	Further clarify characteristics unique to "residential" versus "village" for this district.
IV-42	Features Map	Further clarify the "pedestrian connection" map feature. Does the plan encourage separated pathways in some of these areas?
IV-42	Features Map	Further distinguish "wildlife corridor" versus "wildlife permeability" features on the map.
IV-43	6.1 Paragraph 1, Sentence 6	Further clarify what is intended by "sensitive to hillsides" with specific reference to allowable development potential.
IV-43	6.1 Paragraph 2, Sentence 3 & 4	Reconcile "limited alternative mode improvements" with the proposed addition of pedestrian/bike amenities. Identify specific locations for amenities.
IV-44	6.2 Upper Cache, Sentence 2	Clarify references to future subdivision in this area.
IV-44	6.2 Upper Cache, Sentence 9	"Consideration" of improvements is too vague. Does the community want improvements in this area? If not, the plan should not encourage them.
IV-44	6.3 Snow King Slope	Categorization of resorts should be consistent throughout the plan. Clarify use of the term "preservation" for this area.

## 7: South Highway 89

Date	Name	Comment
1/3/2012	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•Wildlife concerns should be the #1 priority.</li><li>•Visual screening to and from the Hwy should be a priority</li><li>•Workforce housing in the industrial area 7.1 has not been successful. Heavy business and Industrial use areas do not mix well with residential.</li></ul>
1/3/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	[actual comment could not be pasted]
12/29/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	<p>a. Recommendation: In section 7.1 we have to be sure to plan so that we can fit the light industry in this district and not focus excessively on this as a mixed-use area, in an effort to keep light industry from overlapping into other districts. Since we are recommending that the Gregory Lane area transition away from industrial use in the future, we would need to be certain that we can accommodate all future light industry needs for the county within district 7. This might mean less emphasis on residential use in 7.1.</p> <p>b. We are supportive of the wildlife considerations in section 7.2</p> <p>c. Recommendation: In section 7.2 it will be important to clarify that habitat concerns trump scenic concerns. That is, development in this area should be predicated on finding a place with less wildlife impacts not on finding a place with less scenic impacts.</p>

Save Historic Jackson Hole Analysis

Re: Character Districts / Illustrating Our Vision, Dec 5, 2011 Draft

District 7: South Highway 89

**SHJH SUMMARY:** Buildout ranges for residential and commercial development should be provided. It will be difficult to add additional development in this area without significant impacts to wildlife permeability.

BACKGROUND:			
<u>Existing Conditions</u>	<u>SHJH Summary of Proposed Key Changes in Plan</u>	<u>SHJH Comments/Concerns/Questions</u>	<u>SHJH General Recommendations</u>
This area is characterized by industrial character that decreases from north to south.	<b>Overall Degree of Change:</b> <b>Minimal/Moderate</b> change	It states " architectural enhancements and landscaping will be encouraged, but not at the expense of promoting light industrial uses." Does this mean that landscaping will not be required if it cuts into the business plans of potential commercial businesses?	<b>Clear buildout ranges for potential increases in permitted uses should be stated.</b>
It includes a southern gateway into Jackson with a strong sense of rural character.	<b>Details:</b> complete neighborhood with stable subareas > identifies 7.1 South Park Business Park and 7.2 Hog Island Home Business	The district proposes four wildlife crossing areas.	<b>Prioritizing locations for wildlife crossing would be helpful if all areas cannot be pursued.</b>
The area includes frequent wildlife movement.	There are no proposed decreases in development potential.	It is unclear if additional light industrial development will be promoted. If so, it is unclear how needs for wildlife movement will be addressed.	

**District 7: SHJH Detailed Recommendations for Improving Predictability and Consistency with Community Vision**

<b>Plan Page</b>	<b>Plan Section</b>	<b>Recommended Changes</b>
IV-46	Table of Existing and Future Characteristics	<b>Reconsider/clarify "absent" defined character.</b>
IV-47	Paragraph 1, Sentence 1	<b>Further clarify the degree to which additional light industrial uses will be promoted. (Buildout ranges would provide this information.)</b>
IV-47	Neighborhood Form Diagrams	<b>Further clarify characteristics unique to "habitat/scenic" versus "conservation".</b>
IV-48	Features Map	<b>Use of map features, such as workforce housing or "live/work area," should be consistent (as applicable) across districts.</b>
IV-48	Features Map	<b>"Scenic foreground" should be expanded to include additional sections along Highway 89.</b>
IV-49	7.1 South Park Business Park, Sentence 5	<b>Sentence should not include the language "but not at the expense of promoting light industrial uses."</b>
IV-49	7.1 South Park Business Park, Sentence 8	<b>Language should be added to clarify what is intended by the term "attention," and provide specific examples. It will be difficult to add additional development in this area without significant impacts to wildlife permeability.</b>

## 8: River Bottom

Date	Name	Comment
1/3/2012	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•Any structure to divert or direct the flow of any river or creek to enhance private property should not be allowed.</li><li>•Snake River Sporting Club should be restricted from expanding this resort.</li></ul>
1/3/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	[actual comment could not be pasted]
1/2/2012	Acri, Armond Interested Public	-Snake River Sporting Club should be discussed in this section. It should not be ignored because it failed.
12/29/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	a. District 8 is excellent overall. In particular, we support the emphasis within 8.3 on future redevelopment being designed to enhance scenic and wildlife values of the area.
12/7/2011	Stevens, Sally Interested Public	Need Snake River bridge redundancy
12/7/2011	Horn, Scott Interested Public	8.2 need bridge to cross river to get to Fall Creek Rd

District 8: River Bottom

**SHJH SUMMARY:** To increase predictability, the new plan should include more detail to clearly distinguish future "neighborhood forms". Buildout ranges for residential and commercial development should be provided. The failed Snake River Sporting Club should be noted, not ignored. Emphasis must be placed on permanent conservation, not conservation. (The hard linkage necessary to gain permanent conservation is missing; language committing to this linkage and the use of some form of transfer mechanism must be provided in this document.) Priority restoration areas should be identified.

**BACKGROUND:**

<u>Existing Conditions</u>	<u>SHJH Summary of Proposed Key Changes in Plan</u>	<u>SHJH Comments/Concerns/Questions</u>	<u>SHJH General Recommendations</u>
The area includes primarily low density residential character.	<b>Overall Degree of Change:</b> Minimal change & resort development.	There is <b>no mention of Snake River Sporting Club</b> .	<b>Snake River Sporting Club is a difficult planning issue that needs to be addressed.</b>
The area includes important riparian habitat and movement corridors for wildlife.	<b>Details:</b> rural area with conservation, preservation and stable areas > identifies 8.1 Solitude/John Dodge/Tucker/Linn, 8.2 Large Parcels, 8.3 Canyon Corridor, and 8.4 Hoback Junction	CCRs likely prohibit further subdivision within many areas referenced in 8.1. Does the plan propose to shift this density elsewhere, even though CCRs would have restricted it from happening in the first place?	<b>Key recommended changes are linked to the overall plan's need to clarify the difference between intentions for temporary zoning versus permanent conservation.</b>
	8.1 - New development and subdivision is not appropriate (reduction in number and size of buildings).	There is a focus on reducing the amount and impact of development, but the extent is unclear.	<b>Buildout ranges for the subareas (for both residential and nonresidential) should be provided. Only with these figures will the degree of reduction be understandable.</b>
	8.2 - Non-development conservation is the preferred land use.	Two workforce housing areas are designated. Does this suggest new development should be clustered into those areas?	<b>Clarification is needed regarding proposed workforce housing in 8.3 (based on diagram).</b>
	8.3 - It suggests "fewer and smaller buildings" with a focus on wildlife crossings.		
	8.4 - "Townsite density single family residential units" will continue.		

**District 8: SHJH Detailed Recommendations for Improving Predictability and Consistency with Community Vision**

Plan Page	Plan Section	Recommended Changes
IV-50	Table of Existing and Future Characteristics	Reconsider/clarify "absent" defined character and "partial" scenic vistas. In general, the geographic scope of this district is too large for the described characteristics to be fully representative of any
IV-51	Paragraph 1, Sentence 2	Refine language to clarify that many areas in the southern portion of the district are highly visible to the public.
IV-51	Paragraph 2, Sentence 2	To increase predictability, prioritized areas for restoration should be identified.
IV-51	Paragraph 2, Sentence 4 and 5	Clarify intent of the term "directed out" with regard to the use of a transfer mechanism. Incorporate additional text to clarify that permanent conservation is the priority for "redevelopment."
IV-51	Neighborhood Form Diagrams	Further clarify characteristics unique to "clustering" versus "habitat/scenic" versus "conservation" versus "agriculture".
IV-52	Features Map	Further clarify use of "improved permeability" and workforce housing features on the map (particularly given the inconsistency of use across districts).
IV-52	Features Map	Further clarify rationale for the boundary delineation of "rural preservation area" versus "rural neighborhood conservation" areas.
IV-53	8.1 Solitude/John Dodge/Tucker/Linn, Sentence 4	Further clarify intent and describe potential implementation strategies (such as purchase of development rights) to "reclaim" open space.
IV-53	8.2 Sentence 3	Clarify intent of the term "directed into Complete neighborhoods" with regard to the use of a transfer mechanism. Incorporate additional text to clarify that permanent conservation is the priority for "redevelopment."
IV-54	8.3 Canyon Corridor	For consistency in the plan, acknowledge the Snake River Sporting Club, and clarify the use of the category "conservation" in this area given this already approved resort master plan. Additional language should be added to acknowledge the pending, major highway expansion on South Highway 89.



## 9: County Valley

Date	Name	Comment
1/3/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	[actual comment could not be pasted]
1/3/2012	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•The reference to preserve workforce housing stock does not make sense.</li><li>•Wildlife crossings are critical for wildlife permeability.</li></ul>
1/1/2012	Cummings, Kathy Interested Public	The character district "County Valley" makes no mention of the airport and its impacts on the valley and the wildlife. The airport generates considerable noise and light pollution, plus ever increasing traffic on the roads. To ignore it in the Character District leaves the district description incomplete, and makes it difficult if not impossible to implement mitigation measures.
12/29/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	a. We are supportive of the mentions of both wildlife crossings and wildlife permeability in this district
12/7/2011	Winder, Dan Interested Public	Leave development incentive tools in place to protect Spring Gulch; otherwise we condemn it to 1 per 35 ranchettes if we strip PRD incentives

Save Historic Jackson Hole Analysis

Re: Character Districts / Illustrating Our Vision, Dec 5, 2011 Draft

District 9: County Valley

**SHJH SUMMARY:** To increase predictability, the new plan should include more detail to clearly distinguish future "neighborhood forms". Buildout ranges for residential and commercial development should be provided. Inconsistent direction to both restrict additional nonresidential development and add "convenience commercial" should be removed. In certain areas, increased emphasis should be placed on permanent conservation and non-development use of lands to truly protect crucial wildlife habitat and movement corridors. "Clustering" does not fix all wildlife-related and scenic preservation issues.

BACKGROUND:			
Existing Conditions	SHJH Summary of Proposed Key Changes in Plan	SHJH Comments/Concerns/Questions	SHJH General Recommendations
The area includes many of the community's iconic scenic vistas.	<b>Overall Degree of Change:</b> Minimal change	Greater clarity is needed regarding commercial development potential. Language suggests no additional nonresidential development but suggests the benefits of convenience commercial.	Clarify why South Park: District 10 was not included as part of District 9: County Valley (particularly given the inclusion of lower Melody Ranch)
The area includes many major transportation corridors.	<b>Details:</b> rural area with conservation and preservation areas > identifies 9.1 Jackson Hole Golf and Tennis, 9.2 Agricultural Foreground, 9.3 Nethercott/Wenzel/3 Creek/Lower Melody, and 9.4 Gros Ventre Buttes	If development is directed into other locations, to what extent will it be required to be a localized shift?	Clarify intentions for land development regulations. Will this district see a reduction in footprint, but not overall density?
	9.1 - overall development in the area should decrease but "provision of locally oriented services" would benefit residents of the area. Also suggests START service	Other districts of the plan refer to a reduced "building density and size". This district description refers to a reduced "building size and development footprint."	Buildout ranges for the subareas should be provided. Only with these figures will the degree of proposed change be understandable.
	9.2 - development "should be directed into or adjacent to complete neighborhoods that border this area."	This district depicts five wildlife crossings.	Prioritization for wildlife crossings, based on existing information, would be beneficial.
	9.3 - "workforce housing character of this area will be preserved."	Four areas are designated for workforce housing. Were studies conducted to show that these areas provide higher levels of workforce housing than other areas within the district? And, what type of workforce housing is planned for West Gros Ventre Butte?	Clarify if the areas designated for workforce housing are the areas targeted for clustered development within the district. In terms of providing direction for land development regulations, the intention of designating workforce housing areas on the map should be clarified.
		Will accessory residential units (ARUs) be allowed?	
		Is START service realistic for this district?	

**District 9: SHJH Detailed Recommendations for Improving Predictability and Consistency with Community Vision**

<b>Plan Page</b>	<b>Plan Section</b>	<b>Recommended Changes</b>
IV-56	Table of Existing and Future Characteristics	<b>Reconsider/clarify "absent" defined character.</b>
IV-57	Paragraph 2, Sentence 3	<b>Remove inconsistent direction regarding nonresidential development.</b>
IV-57	Paragraph 3, Sentence 4	<b>Clarify if intention is also to increase additional capacity for motorized vehicles.</b>
IV-57	Neighborhood Form Diagrams	<b>Further clarify characteristics unique to "clustering" versus "habitat/scenic" versus "conservation".</b>
IV-58	Features Map	<b>Further clarify use of workforce housing features on the map (particularly given the inconsistency of use across districts).</b>
IV-59	9.1 Jackson Hole Golf and Tennis, Sentence 1	<b>Resort zoning classifications are inconsistent throughout the new plan. Clarify use of "conservation" in this section.</b>
IV-59	9.1 Jackson Hole Golf and Tennis, Sentence 7	<b>Remove inconsistent direction regarding nonresidential development.</b>
IV-59	9.1 Jackson Hole Golf and Tennis, Sentence 8	<b>Rather than state that START "will" service the resort, include language that START will be explored. A cost-benefit analysis of service should be conducted.</b>
IV-60	9.2 Agricultural Foreground, Sentence 7	<b>Sentence should conclude with "highway wildlife crossings, clustering of development and permanent conservation."</b>
IV-60	9.3 Sentence 1	<b>The characterization of this large area as "workforce housing" (that includes 3 Creek) should be refined.</b>

## 10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
1/6/2012	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	<p>Paul – thanks for the talk this morning. On the corridor mapping – and misses – attached [see acutal comment] is a suggested marked-up map (similar to what was done for other districts) of two general wildlife movement corridors (east-west and north –south) that were missed. I did that with red penciling. There will be some slight language changes needed below also so the focus is not solely on Flat Creek. I have pasted some of my previous comments in again below.</p> <p>The attached again has in red some ideas of mapping that is consistent to other areas. I pasted to this PDF the area by Albertsons (the Y) in Town and also Teton Pines/Aspens maps - for similar examples of how mapping the wildlife corridors was done in other areas.</p> <p>Hope this clarifies what I am suggesting. I pasted the comments [1/3/12 comments] on the two topics we discussed this morning – missing corridors and shifting development to the north (not south) in area 10.2.</p> <p>I am copying Alex as I discussed this with him – along with my other suggestions - at the open house. I have also copied Ben since I reached out to him also.</p> <p>Rich</p> <p>PS I also attached two photos on elk moving through the Seherr-Thoss properties in area 10.2 – this is the movement “corridor” I described that occurs form the north, east and west –then heading south to, or north from, the winter feed grounds along the snake river.</p>
1/4/2012	Fuchs, Tim Wyoming Game and Fis	<p>The Wyoming Game and Fish Department (Department) has reviewed the document: Illustration of Our Vision- Teton County Comprehensive Plan and offer the following comments. Listed on page IV-47 is a Policy Objective (7.3.b) to “Reduce wildlife and natural and scenic resource transportation impacts”. While we applaud this policy as drafted and feel it has merit, the map on page IV-48 depicting locations of the 2 northern wildlife crossing structures across U.S Hwy 89, raises concerns for our Department. These proposed wildlife crossing structures could funnel elk onto private lands where cow/calf feeding operations take place during the winter months. These crossings could place elk in direct conflict with domestic cattle, greatly enhancing the possibility of elk/cattle commingling and raising concerns for disease transmission (i.e. brucellosis) and damage to privately owned stored hay crops. The Department is responsible for compensating landowners for wildlife damages to stored crops and the location of these crossing structures have the potential to create negative economic impacts to landowners and the Department by funneling wildlife onto private livestock feeding operations.</p> <p>An additional concern we have regarding the construction of wildlife crossing structures in this area is the construction of several miles of wildlife proof fencing in order to funnel wildlife to the crossing structures. We believe the construction of several miles of wildlife proof fencing may force animals into the Town of Jackson. The north terminus of the any wildlife proof fence, would likely end in the vicinity of Snow King Mountain and would undoubtedly funnel animals into more urban areas.</p> <p>The Department requests Teton County reconsider the location of the northern 2 crossing structures. If we can provide you with any additional information, please contact me at the Jackson Regional office, at 307-733-2323.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p>

## 10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
1/3/2012	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	<p>District 10: South Park Identifies 10.1 Southern South Park and 10.2 Central South Park</p> <p>South Park Neighbors is extremely supportive of the important recognition now included in the text and maps of this areas scenic, open space and wildlife values. All of that should remain as is.</p> <p>Improvements and Recommendations</p> <p>Missed Existing Wildlife Corridors:</p> <p>Recommendation: Identify the east-west wildlife corridor across 10.2 (Central South Park) associated with the already mapped wildlife crossing on HWY 89.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•Add the existing east-west wildlife corridor through the northern end of Central South Park (10.2). Also expand the language in the text to identify the more diffuse large wildlife movement corridors north-south in areas 10.1 and 10.2 that exists beyond just the Flat Creek corridor.</li></ul> <p>For the last thirty years of wildlife collision data the highest mortality on HWY 89 from Smiths to the Hoback Junction is the section from Smiths to Rafter J. The text recognizes this important wildlife crossing and partially the associated corridor - but has misstates some basic biology. The map of this district should also identify this important east-west wildlife corridor in area 10.2 (Central South Park) west of Flat Creek. Collisions in this area on HWY 89 include mule deer, moose and elk. A large percentage of the collision data show that elk use this area to cross. Clearly this species is not traveling down along the important Flat Creek riparian corridor but rather from the north through South Park and east across to the Snow King highlands - as well as back and forth between the Snake River and across the district (east- west) and HWY 89 to the Snow King highlands. Movement also clearly occurs diffusely north to south to their winter feed grounds. See attached photo to this email that documents one of these crossings last winter.</p> <p>In the existing general text you do note “the intensity of wildlife vehicle collisions on South HWY 89 shows the importance of the District’s open space for wildlife movement...” In the area 10.2 specific description you get the basic biology incorrect by stating “The most important of these open spaces is the area between Flat Creek and the highway. This are not only provides the scenic gateway in Town, but also provides an open area for a wildlife crossing of the highway that would feed wildlife into a preserved Flat Creek corridor.”</p> <p>Recommendation: This needs to be corrected to acknowledge the existing movement corridors that are actually east and west – and also occur much more diffusely through the open spaces in the entire district north-south (not solely along Flat Creek).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•The Flat Creek riparian strip is of critical ecological importance but the primary large ungulate movement corridors are actually the open spaces outside of this stream – again east to west and north to south beyond just Flat Creek.</li></ul> <p>Shifting Development in Section 10.2:</p> <p>In the 10.2 section, it states that "agricultural open spaces will be preserved by directing the development potential from the area into or adjacent to existing developed areas to the north or south." Why north and south?</p> <p>Recommendation: This should be stated simply “to the north”. Given the 200 plus acres identified in Northwest South Park (area 5.6) – now part of District 5 (West Jackson).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•This is especially true when the two primary land owners Robert Gill and Kelly Lockhart own and control both the lands in Central South Park (sending areas) as well as the receiving area next to Cottonwood Park in northwest South Park (area 5.6).</li></ul> <p>Interconnectivity of Subdivisions in Area 10.1 (Southern South Park):</p>

10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
		<p>Recommendation: This section should clarify that pathways are more suitable than roads to achieve interconnections between the various neighborhoods in Southern South Park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•Pathway easements already exist both north and south in Rafter J and Melody Ranch subdivisions. In Melody Ranch the HOA has opposed in the past any takings to achieve road connectivity. In reality that would require the use of eminent domain by the taking of dedicated open space, several home lots and homes - as well as the purchase and taking of the entirety of the private roads within the Melody subdivision. Not only is that financially unachievable – is it clearly legally challengeable. The cost of this action would be in the neighborhood of \$8-10 million dollars.</li></ul> <p>Over Reaching:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•START and a future potential new Elementary School are probably not realistic given the current and future density in this area.</li></ul> <p>Corrections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•The map on page IV-62 has left out the entirety of northern Flat Creek to HWY 89 portion of the Lockhart’s properties.</li></ul>
1/3/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	[actual comment could not be pasted]

## 10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
1/3/2012	Aurelio, Linda Interested Public	<p>I would like to express additional comments on the Draft Comprehensive Plan Character Districts specific to Districts 5 &amp; 10, West Jackson and South Park respectively.</p> <p>One key point going forward is the definition of the Plan matrix which defines, in circle form, ( Existing Characteristics Chart IV-2) the weights of attributes of each district. I would contend that Both Districts 5 &amp; 10 receive a "full circle" on viable wildlife habitat connectivity and natural scenic vistas. If you do not live in this wonderful part of the community perhaps you would not see our abundance of wildlife each and every day, or appreciate our vistas as we go about our daily lives. This recognition alone provides the platform on which the residents of these districts have been working so hard to protect from build out and density earmarks. It is the cornerstone of our plea for the continuation of open space and what is left of the rural nature of these two districts.</p> <p>With that said, I do support the most recent Alliance letter to the above parties on recommendation #6 &amp; 7. "Recommendation #6: Execute a rapid assessment of wildlife impacts of the proposed development pattern, or authorize the NRTAB to do so. Recommendation #7: Insert more explicit considerations for wildlife permeability in the following districts: 2, 3, 4, 5, and 13 ( I would include district 10).</p> <p>Why have we not commissioned the expertise of the NRTAB to provide such an analysis so we may look at the issues for wildlife permeability ? Given the public outcry for wildlife preservation as priority number 1, I would think this study would have already been completed in conjunction with recommendations for future growth.</p> <p>Taking a look at District #5 in the Comprehensive Plan (5.3), it is recognized that this stable district already supports the majority "of community workforce housing and every effort should be made to ensure this neighborhood retain its vitality, cohesiveness.... An important goal is to maintain a strong sense of ownership and community in the area." Given these facts, it would be in everyone's best interest to continue to support safety and integrity of this vital area for both it's residents,school children, and wildlife. By the continuation of support for a connector road (Tribal Trail Connector) through the very heart of this district (pg. IV-35), we would destroy the very neighborhoods we are trying to envision and maintain. Currently, most traffic in this area is school demand at peak school hours. The best solution is to provide enhancements to High School Road for residential, pedestrian, and school access priorities. It is not in the best interest of our community to divert daily commuter traffic though and around town intersections into our neighborhoods as a connector road would certainly do.</p> <p>Last, attention to Comp Plan section 5.6 must be clarified. This section does not provide the necessary definition and direction for the future of Northwest South Park areas. Growth Management goals must be clear and concise and not determined at a later date"if necessary" . This area holds some of the best remaining parcels of open space which can define our valley for future generations. The Plan ( Existing &amp; Future desired Characteristics IV-35) talks about the "enhancement of the southern gateway into Town with improved visual appearance" as a key goal of importance. Now is the time to clearly define that gateway so that existing open space and scenic value remain permanent for all to share and enjoy.</p> <p>As always, thank you for your time and dedication to this process.</p>
12/29/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	<p>a. We are supportive of the important recognition of scenic values as well as open space and wildlife values in this district b. Recommendation: The description of this district should also identify important East/West wildlife corridors as areas that should be protected c. We are supportive of the wildlife focus of Flat Creek, as it is not a suitable area to prioritize recreational amenities. D. Recommendation: This section should clarify that pathways are more suitable than roads to achieve interconnections between the various neighborhoods in South Park.</p>

## 10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
12/12/2011	O'Brien, Kristine Interested Public	<p>Below are my written comments concerning the Planners' open house on Thursday. Thanks to the Elected officials and staff who dedicated so much time to explain the Plan and listen to community concerns.</p> <p>First, I appreciate the steps taken towards conservation in Middle and Southern South Park, the affirmation of its scenic, rural and wildlife connectivity values as well as its value as the gateway from the south. And I like the commitment not to develop the Northwest corner of South Park before infill in town is complete and also to require potential development in that section to match the character of the existing, adjacent neighborhood. The acknowledgment of a need to address the highway wildlife crossings is commendable (although I would like to see the widespread East-West wildlife connectivity drawn on the map as is the North-South corridor along Flat Creek). These kinds of positive steps towards conservation and preservation serve the community well now and for the future.</p> <p>Second, as a general principle, it is best to err on the side of too little development as opposed to putting as much as possible in targeted areas. Development does not need a head start. All development has social and environmental costs associated with it. The Comprehensive Plan should do as much as possible to ensure that the doubling of development now on the maps pays its own way as it is obviously unsustainable to use growth to solve growth related issues. Future generations will have to defend this ecosystem against the weight of an increasing wealthy global economy. The Plan must foster permanent preservation of open space, wildlife habitat and scenic vistas as large profit margins will always tempt us to overdevelop in a piecemeal fashion. In many parts of the world clean air and enjoyment of nature are already so rare they are available only to a privileged few. Let's not let that happen here.</p> <p>Finally, for the sake of clarity, predictability and transparency of government, please release the build-out numbers for each district. Ranges are fine. The community is smart enough to understand the difference between a worst-case, maximum build-out scenario and what is likely. People are aware that there is already a huge amount of development potential embodied in current property rights. That's why we've all agreed not to add new potential. People can't know what their neighborhoods will look like or what the overall impact and cost of growth could be, without knowing the amount and type of development possible in each district. In addition, business decisions are better made in a predictable environment. At a time when trust in government is at an all time low, it is important to be as transparent as possible in the process.</p>
12/7/2011	Hazen, Diane Interested Public	<p>10.1 Some connectivity makes sense; some open space should continue (correct in document). 10.2 Like scenic corridor near 89 up to gateway; do not want South Park Rd to be widened; continue bike path on south park rd; like preservation designation because flood irrigation has positive impact on 3 creeks area for trout</p>



## 10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
12/6/2011	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	<p>Alex - Yup – saw it finally go live during the JIM. Thanks.</p> <p>I will have some input, suggestions and corrections naturally.</p> <p>With that aside - having skimmed all of it (all districts and introduction) – I do want to thank the planning team as this approach on finally putting lines on the ground – and the detail within the descriptions (at least verbally and visually – as we are still missing the extremely important “Appendix I”) - is the right direction forward.</p> <p>We know the rub is how we actually move development from rural to existing or new expanded centers – while leaving the incentives in place to permanently reduce the development potential in those critical rural areas (via permanent open space easements) – all within our cumulative existing remaining development potential (approximately double our current built environment). But that has more to do with some stronger affirmations and commitments within the body of the themes and policies – so it is clear on where the LDRs changes should be focused - and what goals are to be achieved.</p> <p>Kindly let me know when the one-page 60/40 spit build-out numbers summary (as Jeff explained to the electeds yesterday afternoon) is ready for public consumption - as I know you will have it for the open house.</p> <p>Also please explain the timeline for an updated “Appendix I” with build-out ranges by district – and in aggregate. I would hope we have that well before the January joint meetings (electeds and planning commissions). We all expected that to be part of this phase of the maps.</p> <p>Again – I want to acknowledge the amount, and quality, of work the planning staff has put in – and the responsiveness to public feedback that I do see in character districts 10 (South Park) and 5 (West Jackson) especially. It is appreciated and noted. Although I, along with my neighbors, continue to still have specific concerns – we have come a long way to improving the characterization for the future of the greater South Park region.</p> <p>As your lead in sentences for the South Park district states so well:</p> <p>“The South Park District is, and will continue to be, the agricultural southern gateway to Jackson. The existing agricultural open space that defines the character of the district provides a scenic foreground for Teton views, wildlife habitat connectivity, reference to heritage and stewardship ethic, and a quite rural setting for residents.”</p> <p>You can pass my positive reception on to the planning team.</p>

Save Historic Jackson Hole Analysis

Re: Character Districts / Illustrating Our Vision, Dec 5, 2011 Draft

District 10: South Park

**SHJH SUMMARY:** To increase predictability, the new plan should include more detail to clearly distinguish future "neighborhood forms". Buildout ranges for residential and commercial development should be provided. This district goals appear somewhat inconsistent by suggesting both START service and a school while at the same time recommending no additional development potential. Language should be adjusted to encourage development to the north of this district, closer to existing services - not north and south. The separation of the Melody Ranch development into two different districts should be explained.

<b>BACKGROUND:</b>			
<u>Existing Conditions</u>	<u>SHJH Summary of Proposed Key Changes in Plan</u>	<u>SHJH Comments/Concerns/Questions</u>	<u>SHJH General Recommendations</u>
It is identified as the "agricultural southern gateway into Jackson."	<b>Overall Degree of Change:</b> Minimal change	The diagram does not include "workforce housing", but the language refers to it frequently. Provide language to clarify the use of "workforce housing" in various district maps.	<b>Clarify why South Park: District 10 was not included as part of District 9: County Valley (particularly given the inclusion of lower Melody Ranch).</b>
It includes planned neighborhoods.	<b>Details:</b> rural area with conservation and preservation areas > identifies 10.1 Southern South Park and 10.2 Central South Park	Plan suggests potential addition of school.	<b>Plan appears inconsistent by suggesting both START service and a school while at the same time recommending no additional development potential. Given existing densities, there is no need to mention the need for a school or START bus service during the life of this plan.</b>
	It states that "any development that does occur will be directed into or adjacent to areas of existing development."	Plan states 10.1 area will be "regularly served by START." Is this realistic?	<b>Diagrams need additional explanation. Workforce housing depictions should be consistently applied throughout the districts.</b>
	It proposes increased connectivity among existing developments.	It states "In areas of non-workforce housing, lot consolidation to reduce density is encouraged." What are the areas of non-workforce housing?	<b>Development should be directed to the north only, close to existing services.</b>
	It will focus on preservation and conservation.	In the 10.2 section, it states that "agricultural open spaces will be preserved by directing the development potential from the area into or adjacent to existing developed areas to the north or south." Why north and south?	

**District 10: SHJH Detailed Recommendations for Improving Predictability and Consistency with Community Vision**

<b>Plan Page</b>	<b>Plan Section</b>	<b>Recommended Changes</b>
IV-62	Table of Existing and Future Characteristics	Reconsider/clarify "absent" defined character and variety of housing types
IV-63	Paragraph 2, Sentence 5	Add language that more clearly recognizes the challenges of providing START service to this area, particularly given existing densities of development.
IV-63	Paragraph 2, Sentence 6	Further clarify what is intended by "improved connectivity" in terms of auto travel versus alternate modes of travel. Given existing conditions, preferred connectivity should be via alternative modes of travel.
IV-63	Neighborhood Form Diagrams	Further clarify characteristics unique to "clustering" versus "habitat/scenic" versus "conservation".
IV-64	Features Map	Use of map features, such as workforce housing, should be consistent (as applicable) across districts.
IV-65	10.1 Southern South Park, Sentence 8	Rather than state that START "will" regularly service the area, include language that START will be explored. A cost-benefit analysis of service should be conducted.
IV-65	10.1 Southern South Park, Sentence 9	Further clarify why this area is an appropriate place for a new school.

## 11: Wilson

Date	Name	Comment
1/3/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	[actual comment could not be pasted]
12/29/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	a. We support the limited growth in this district, as well as the recognition of wetlands, wildlife values and community character.
12/8/2011	Hadden, Kenny Interested Public	Hi! I'm just writing to reiterate a couple points I've made in person. 1. I'd love a bus stop at the PO in Wilson that is for local travelers to and from town, not just folks commuting over the pass. 2. I think the bike path from Wilson to Jackson should be made a top priority. The section needed over fish creek would get used all the time by foot traffic in Wilson as well. 3. If there must be more development in wilson, I think the style/density of the attainables on 3rd street could be expanded to several more blocks headed north. 4. I love the idea of a median in downtown Wilson, as well as pulling buildings to toward the road so that parking is behind them, creating a little commercial plaza. Thanks for all your hard work!
12/7/2011	Baldauf, Jill Interested Public	Wilson character district is reflective of comment offered to date.
12/7/2011	Hadden, Kenny Interested Public	11.1 Like concept, workforce housing limited to 2 story, should be designed differently to avoid cookie cutter; too much industrial modern look; more in character with the area. Add text about bus stop and infill near general store. Bike path from Wilson to town. 11.3 Continue the small lots into 11.3. Wilson medical and associated park could be better used with smaller lots and affordable units. Walkway ends and should continue to town.

Save Historic Jackson Hole Analysis

Re: Character Districts / Illustrating Our Vision, Dec 5, 2011 Draft

District 11: Wilson

**SHJH SUMMARY:** To increase predictability, the new plan should include more detail to clearly distinguish future "neighborhood forms" (with particular regard to 11.1). More detail should be provided to describe future character in 11.1 (Even though the geographic scope for "transition" is small, it encompasses the majority of the area that upholds the existing character of Wilson, and could therefore strongly influence the future feel of the community.) Buildout ranges for residential and commercial development should be provided. The complete neighborhood boundary should be adjusted (remove 11.4 from "complete neighborhood" status) to emphasize the long-term goal to prevent incremental encroachment of development into this important area for wildlife.

<b>BACKGROUND:</b>			
<u>Existing Conditions</u>	<u>SHJH Summary of Proposed Key Changes in Plan</u>	<u>SHJH Comments/Concerns/Questions</u>	<u>SHJH General Recommendations</u>
It is a "western gateway into the community."	<b>Overall Degree of Change:</b> Minimal change (with the exception of 11.1)	It is somewhat unclear how 11.1, as a transitional subarea, is expected to change in the future.	<b>Buildout ranges for the subareas (for both residential and nonresidential) should be provided. Only with these figures will the degree of "transition" be understandable.</b>
It is a rural community with small scale structures.	<b>Details:</b> complete neighborhood with transitional and stable subareas (11.1-11.4) > identifies 11.1 Wilson Commercial Core, 11.2 Wilson Townsite, 11.3 Wilson Meadows, and 11.4 South Wilson	The boundary of the complete neighborhood is too large, and suggests the possibility for incremental expansion in the future.	<b>The stable subareas that are described as being important for wildlife should be removed from the "complete neighborhood" designation. For example, adjust boundary so that 11.4 South Wilson is part of District 9: County Valley.</b>
It is an important riparian area for wildlife.	The plan states that it will not rely on additional development potential.	The diagram's use of "pedestrian crossings" should be clarified, particularly for areas that are proposed to be lower density.	<b>The diagram needs refinement.</b>
	"START will become a more convenient and viable option for residents of Wilson..."	Given the scale of the Wilson community, it is unclear why START bus would be more viable.	<b>In general, more analysis should be done to test the density thresholds for effective START service.</b>
	11.1 - "Added will be a residential character..." in the Wilson Commercial Core.	Given the traffic problems (among other planning issues) in the county, it is questionable to add increased density beyond what is already allowed. By doing so, the plan is essentially promoting a system of scattered nodes along the West Bank, instead of truly confining the development footprint. Early in the process, the public did not support a "compact centers and housing" land use scenario, which is essentially what is proposed.	<b>Density increases in 11.1 should be contingent upon permanent conservation elsewhere in the area.</b>
		As in many sections of the plan, density increases are incompatible with the protection of wildlife habitat and movement. The plan appears to underestimate the challenge of truly protecting areas for wildlife use.	

**District 11: SHJH Detailed Recommendations for Improving Predictability and Consistency with Community Vision**

Plan Page	Plan Section	Recommended Changes
IV-66	Table of Existing and Future Characteristics	Reconsider/clarify "partial" defined character, viable wildlife habitat and "absent" scenic vistas.
IV-67	Paragraph 1, Sentence 8	Further clarify what is intended by "Protecting Wilson's existing character while enhancing the district." In general, the plan should provide greater definition about what is meant by enhancement, a term that can mean many different things to different people.
IV-67	Paragraph 2, Sentence 5	Add language that more clearly recognizes the challenges of providing START service to this area, particularly given existing and proposed densities of development.
IV-67	Neighborhood Form Diagrams	Further clarify characteristics unique to "village" versus "mixed use".
IV-68	Features Map	Further clarify the data sources for drafting the "wildlife corridor" feature. In general, clarify the link between map features and future regulatory tools such as the Natural Resources Overlay.
IV-69	11.1 Wilson Commercial Core, Sentence 1	Further clarify the degree of appropriate "transition". (Buildout ranges would provide this information.)
IV-69	11.1 Wilson Commercial Core, Sentence 3	Further clarify the degree of appropriate additional "residential character" in the area.
IV-69	11.1 Wilson Commercial Core, Sketch	Associated sketch appears inconsistent with direction provided in the 11.1 narrative. In general, sketches should be more realistic, particularly when depicting the degree of landscaping and the built form.
IV-70	11.2 Wilson townsite, Sentence 7	Further clarify potential locations of separated pathways in the area.
IV-70	11.3 Wilson Meadows, Sentence 5	Further clarify potential types of pathways in the area.
IV-71	11.4 South Wilson, Sentence 1	Remove area from the "complete neighborhood" designation given the stated role of the area for "wildlife movement." (It could be a part of "County Valley".) By inclusion within the boundary, it suggests potential transition for the area in the future. The plan should suggest that this area be protected from additional development potential in the long term.

## 12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
1/3/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	[actual comment could not be pasted]
1/3/2012	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The clear up-zoning and density increases for this area of significant to heavy wildlife use is not appropriate.</li> <li>•There appears to be an attempt to re-zone the “Rains Property” and the area purchased for investment by the TCHA to high density affordable housing by just this mapping.</li> <li>•Hwy 390, is not designed and cannot handle the level of development suggested in all of the sub areas. WYDOT has taken any timeframe for re-design and re-construction off the table.</li> <li>•The opportunity to create redundancy for road connections does not exist so the intersection of Hwy 390 and HWY 22 will degrade as more development occurs.</li> </ul>
1/2/2012	Acri, Armond Interested Public	<p>-Increased density at the Aspens is not appropriate. It is already very dense and increased development will make traffic problems on 22 and 390 worse.</p> <p>-Increasing density at the Aspens east of 390 is not appropriate. It will require expensive solutions to link the two areas for both vehicle and pedestrians. These solutions will require taxpayers to subsidize the cost of development.</p>
12/29/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	a. Recommendation: Please clarify that there should be no increased commercial development on the east side of highway.
12/7/2011	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	12.1 Not a problem except concerned about wildlife. 12.2 Still have a problem with that, there is a lot of wildlife there. 12.3 Concern about fencing; good about pedestrian connection across 390 but NOT necessarily within Pines and Aspens just an expense that isn't necessary
12/7/2011	Walker, Christine Interested Public	12.1 and 12.2 Like concept. 12.3 and 12.4 Like year round workforce concept
12/6/2011	Whetzel, Josh Interested Public	I do not think you have the wildlife corridors plotted correctly. You show them in Green running sort of North East to South to South West through the Aspens/Pines district. My place is in the Berry Patch and from what I have observed and seeing other areas directly North of the district, wildlife moves more East West through the area. I pointed this out to a planner this fall during an open house at the Art Center.

Save Historic Jackson Hole Analysis

Re: Character Districts / Illustrating Our Vision, Dec 5, 2011 Draft

District 12: Aspens/Pines

**SHJH SUMMARY:** To increase predictability, the new plan should include more detail to clearly distinguish future "neighborhood forms". Buildout ranges for residential and commercial development should be provided. This area is not an appropriate place for increased development potential given transportation and wildlife-related issues. Most important, the scope of development proposed within this area is inconsistent with plan's stated goal to design "for wildlife permeability." Proposing additional scattered development along a highway that lacks capacity for increased volume is not good planning. The complete neighborhood boundary should be significantly reduced.

BACKGROUND:			
Existing Conditions	SHJH Summary of Proposed Key Changes in Plan	SHJH Comments/Concerns/Questions	SHJH General Recommendations
The area includes a master planned community adjacent to 390.	<b>Overall Degree of Change:</b> Significant change	Given the traffic problems (among other planning issues) in the county, it is questionable to add increased density beyond what is already allowed. By doing so, the plan is essentially promoting a system of scattered nodes along the West Bank, instead of truly confining the development footprint. Early in the process, the public did not support a "compact centers and housing" land use scenario, which is essentially what is proposed.	<b>Buildout ranges for the subareas (for both residential and nonresidential) should be provided. Only with these figures will the degree of "transition" be understandable.</b>
It has low to moderate density residential development.	<b>Details:</b> complete neighborhood with transitional and stable subareas (12.1-12.4) > identifies 12.1 Aspens/Pines Commercial Core, 12.2 390 Residential Core, 12.3 Aspens/Pines Residential and 12.4 390 Residential South	The boundary of the complete neighborhood is too large, and suggests the possibility for incremental expansion in the future.	<b>The stable subareas that are described as being important for wildlife should be removed from the "complete neighborhood" designation and be included in District 9: County Valley.</b>
It includes commercial and resort type recreational amenities.	12.1 - It states "residential opportunities will be incorporated into the area without adding height..."	It is unclear how 12.1 and 12.2, as transitional subareas, are expected to change in the future.	<b>More detail regarding proposed future character is essential.</b>
	Increased START service and establishment of a complete "main street" parallel to the highway are proposed.	As in many sections of the plan, density increases are incompatible with the protection of wildlife habitat and movement. The plan appears to underestimate the challenge of truly protecting areas for wildlife use.	<b>Density increases in 12.1 and 12.2 should be contingent upon permanent conservation elsewhere in the area.</b>
	12.2 subarea "will become defined by housing variety."	The diagram's use of workforce housing is difficult to understand (in terms of future intentions for land development regulations.) What does the plan intend in terms of workforce housing?	<b>Any density increases, even as part of a transfer program, should be evaluated closely given the traffic-related problems of 390.</b>
	The transitional area expands east of the highway.	Is increased START service realistic?	



**District 12: SHJH Detailed Recommendations for Improving Predictability and Consistency with Community Vision**

Plan Page	Plan Section	Recommended Changes
IV-72	Table of Existing and Future Characteristics	Reconsider/clarify "absent" walkable commercial and recreation and scenic vistas and "partial" viable wildlife habitat.
IV-73	Paragraph 1, Sentence 4	Further clarify: Is the area east of the highway all "workforce housing" as stated?
IV-73	Paragraph 2, Sentence 1	Further clarify what is meant by the term "more cohesive character."
IV-73	Paragraph 2, Sentence 1	Further clarify the degree of appropriate "increased workforce housing opportunities" in the area. (Buildout ranges would provide this information.)
IV-73	Paragraph 2, Sentence 4	Further clarify the type of "pedestrian infrastructure" that is appropriate to cross this busy highway corridor. Given the location of the highway, and the volume of use, it does not make sense to encourage increased development potential on the east side of the highway. Further clarify "increased" START service.
IV-73	Paragraph 2, Sentence 5	The level of development proposed within this area is inconsistent with this statement to design "for wildlife permeability."
IV-73	Neighborhood Form Diagrams	Further clarify characteristics unique to "village" versus "mixed use".
IV-74	Features Map	Further clarify the data sources for drafting the "wildlife corridor" feature. In general, clarify the link between map features and future regulatory tools such as the Natural Resources Overlay.
IV-74	Features Map	"Transition" area should be greatly minimized. It makes no sense to suggest that this area is appropriate for increased development potential within the life of this plan, particularly given transportation capacity issues. If the goal of the plan is to compact the development footprint, the footprint should not be expanded, as proposed. Similarly, if the goal is to decrease the disparity between development potential in the county versus town, it doesn't make sense to proposed increased expansion in the county.
IV-74	Features Map	Further clarify use of workforce housing features on the map (particularly given the inconsistency of use across districts).
IV-75	12.1 Aspens/Pines Commercial Core, Sentence 1	Further clarify the degree of appropriate "transition" in the area, in terms of both residential and nonresidential development potential. (Buildout ranges would provide this information.)
IV-75	12.1 Aspens/Pines Commercial Core, Sentence 6	Further clarify the planning challenges associated with a "main street" parallel to the highway, and why this shift is proposed. This would represent a significant change for the area.
IV-75	12.2 390 Residential Core, Sentence 1	development potential in this area does not make planning sense, given the existence of the highway.

IV-75	12.2 390 Residential Core, Sentence 5 and Sketch	<b>The narrative and sketch appear to suggest development potential that would not be consistent with the goal to "allow wildlife movement through the area."</b>
IV-76	12.3 Aspens/Pines Residential, Sentence 2	<b>Further clarify what is intended by "workforce housing will be encouraged" in this stable area. Specify if this is intended to give direction for density or deed-restriction requirements.</b>
IV-76	12.3 Aspens/Pines Residential, Sentence 5	<b>Further clarify intent for additional "pedestrian amenities" in this area and acknowledge seasonal limitations.</b>
IV-76	12.4 390 Residential South, Sentence 1	<b>Further clarify what is meant by "year round pedestrian connections" (across the highway) given the proposed stability, and associated density, of the area.</b>

### 13: Teton Village

Date	Name	Comment
1/3/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	[actual comment could not be pasted]
12/29/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	a. This district description is particularly aspirational, specifically with relation to the needed amendments to the Resort Master Plan. How will this take place? b. Recommendation: This district should include explicit mention of the goal to ensure that future commercial development serves the resident population at the Village and does not generate additional vehicle trips. Without immense increases in the local convenience character of current and future commercial development in this district, the residential development will merely generate a significant number of trips on the already busy Highway 390.
12/7/2011	, Interested Public	1) ingress egress important 2) walkability focus - great 3) community convenience and visitor commercial should expand opportunities 4) make a more complete neighborhood, local convenience 5) transportation and walkable focus is good 6) mix use is good. Don't allow too much height.
12/7/2011	, Interested Public	5.2 restore Creek - no trail, wildlife corridor 5.6 restore Creek - no trail, wildlife corridor 13.1 Drawing - remove soccer field, expand rec center
12/7/2011	Horn, Scott Interested Public	13.1 Need to be clear that there is an expansion of commercial/residential; like description but needs to be its own community to decrease driving
12/7/2011	Blann, Jerry Interested Public	Character should be western, not Bavarian. Allow non-residential (non-profits) in Village Core. Future commercial buildout?

Save Historic Jackson Hole Analysis

Re: Character Districts / Illustrating Our Vision, Dec 5, 2011 Draft

District 13: Teton Village

**SHJH SUMMARY:** To increase predictability, the new plan should include more detail to clearly distinguish future "neighborhood forms." Buildout ranges for residential and commercial development should be provided. Categories and narrative regarding future resort development should be consistent across districts - resorts should not see an increase in intensity beyond what is already approved in the master plans. If changes are proposed, development potential could be reallocated. The periphery of this district in particular has viable wildlife habitat; the plan should not suggest that it is absent.

BACKGROUND:			
Existing Conditions	SHJH Summary of Proposed Key Changes in Plan	SHJH Comments/Concerns/Questions	SHJH General Recommendations
It is a "high intensity core, dominated by lodging and other nonresidential uses, surrounded by lower intensity residential area."	<b>Overall Degree of Change:</b> Moderate change and Resort development	It states "a reallocation or increase in amount of commercial allowed in the district may be appropriate..." Why include language that provides this choice?	Language should clearly state that a reallocation, and not an increase in amount of commercial development, is appropriate.
The area is a major resort community, particularly in the winter.	<b>Details:</b> complete neighborhood with transitional and stable subareas (13.1-13.3) > identifies 13.1Teton Village Commercial Core, 13.2 Teton Village Residential Core, 13.3 Teton Village Single Family	Is the proposed level of "multifamily workforce housing" consistent with what has already been approved in the resort master plans?	Potential range for increased development potential should be clearly stated.
	It "will become a year-round community that feels like a village. Additional employee and workforce housing will provide a base of full-time residents..."	13.3 -It suggests "increased pedestrian and shuttle connections into the Village commercial core." Who will fund these connections? Is this part of START?	Additional details on proposed shuttle services from the low density residential area should be clarified. Is this a county- sponsored service?
		Parts of Teton Village are designated as transitional areas. Why are resort areas not consistently designated as stable since they have a defined master plan?	
		Why is this one, of only two, districts with a "defined character/high quality design"?	

**District 13: SHJH Detailed Recommendations for Improving Predictability and Consistency with Community Vision**

Plan Page	Plan Section	Recommended Changes
IV-78	Table of Existing and Future Characteristics	Reconsider/clarify "absent" viable wildlife habitat and walkable commercial and recreation.
IV-79	Paragraph 2, Sentence 1 and 2	Further clarify the degree of appropriate "additional employee and workforce housing". (Buildout ranges would provide this information.)
IV-79	Paragraph 2, Sentence 2	Explain how the addition of density will result in a <u>net</u> reduction of peak traffic on 390.
IV-79	Paragraph 2, Sentence 5	Clarify if "enhanced public transit" is a START-based service to locations such as Grand Teton National Park.
IV-79	Paragraph 2, Sentence 6	This last sentence should refer to "reallocation" only, not a potential "increase in amount of commercial allowed in the district."
IV-79	Neighborhood Form Diagrams	Further clarify characteristics unique to "village" versus "mixed use" and "resort".
IV-80	Features Map	In general, clarify use of "transition" within resort areas, where predictable levels of development have already been approved.
IV-81	13.2 Sentence 7	Further clarify the degree of additional "workforce housing" and the type. Will additional development be deed-restricted? (Buildout ranges would provide some of this information.)
IV-82	13.3 Sentence 3	Language should be added to this section that references wildlife habitat within the area.
IV-82	13.3 Sentence 4	Clarify if proposed "shuttle connections" would be funded as part of the START program.

## 14: Alta

Date	Name	Comment
1/3/2012	Monroe, Allen Interested Public	<p>I wish to submit comments regarding the Draft Illustration of Our Vision [Character District Development Phase III], which I downloaded at: <a href="http://www.jacksontetonplan.com/files/2011/09/111205_District14.pdf">http://www.jacksontetonplan.com/files/2011/09/111205_District14.pdf</a>.</p> <p>I attended the workshop held at the Alta Library on October 27, and in Jackson this past September. Numerous Alta residents and many of my neighbors were present at the October 27 meeting. I understand each of the subgroups at the meeting mentioned a desire for State Line Road to be completed, across South Leigh Creek to its northern terminus, where it meets up with Beard Road, providing access to South Leigh Canyon trail heads and to various homes in the vicinity. I will elaborate on the specifics of that issue below. But first, I notice that there are three sub-sections of the Character District Development document which pertain to District 14, Alta:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•14.1: Alta Farmland</li><li>•14.2: Alta Core</li><li>•14.3: Grand Targhee Resort</li></ul> <p>A brief paragraph for each of the sub-districts summarizes key aspects of the vision of its citizens. The following statement is included in section 14.1: Alta Farmland:</p> <p>"A key transportation project for this area which will improve connectivity, reduce vehicle miles traveled, and improve the sense of community is completing the connection of State Line Road to South Leigh Creek Canyon."</p> <p>As chairman of the Roads Committee for our "Forest Edge" subdivision, I applaud Planning for its good job of synthesizing the many comments which have been made by Alta's residents, and including the above language in the draft document.</p> <p>There are some other matters which would be worthwhile to include in the final version of the document, which may warrant a fourth sub-section, 14.4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•The farmland to the north of South Leigh Creek and to the east of Forest Edge subdivision are within wildlife migration corridors, and may be worthy of consideration for conservation easements if the present owners are amenable. Any significant sub-dividing of said farmland would considerably increase the pressure on the Beard Road / South Leigh Road, and could degrade well water quality and availability in Forest Edge.</li><li>•Additionally, it would be in the community interest to improve the availability of water for fire suppression.</li><li>•Lastly, because of the high value of the low-gradient gravel road access to the South Leigh Creek trail heads and eastward to the Wilderness boundaries, consideration should be given to the development of pathways connecting the rest of Alta to the area.</li></ul> <p>The foregoing summarizes my comments, and the following provides further background and detail as to why completing the connection of State Line Road to South Leigh Creek Canyon is of great importance to Alta residents on both sides of South Leigh Creek.</p> <p>I am a resident of the Forest Edge subdivision, and am concerned that the bridge on State Line Road that used to cross South Leigh Creek has not been replaced. Since Teton County, Wyoming and Teton County, Idaho entered into an agreement whereby Teton County, Wyoming maintains the stretch of State Line Road which runs from Ski Hill road to the northern terminus of State Line Road, and whereby Teton County, Idaho agrees to maintain the stretch of State Line Road south of Ski Hill Road, the northern part of the section to be maintained by Teton County, Wyoming seems to have "fallen through the cracks."</p> <p>My neighbors who have been present for more years than myself indicate that Teton County, Idaho originally put in the bridge in, and that lack of regular maintenance caused extensive degradation. When a hay swather was attempting to cross the bridge, it got stuck in rotting timbers, according to Bill Beard, who owns property adjoining South Leigh Creek. The timbers on the bridge were removed by Teton County, Idaho, in 1979, and the rest of the structure was removed at a much later date. The frame of the bridge was still in place in 1993 according to Pete and Leslie Mead, who own an adjoining property.</p> <p>Some of my neighbors were informed several years ago that funds had been appropriated for improvements to State Line Road to its northern terminus, including a crossing over South Leigh Creek. But actual construction work stopped about a mile south of the crossing. Some of the residents 1/2 mile or more north of Hastings Lane, who had granted easements across their properties, were never officially informed as to why the work was not actually performed.</p>

## 14: Alta

Date	Name	Comment
		<p>From what I have garnered in discussing this with the County Commissioners, there were a couple of residents who were unwilling to grant easements. Many of those who are anxious that the bridge be replaced are willing to engage in discussions with these residents to see if common ground can be reached, and with the County Engineer to examine modest re-routing possibilities if other solutions cannot be found.</p> <p>My discussions with the County Commissioners indicate that maintenance of State Line Road north of South Leigh Creek is not performed by the County due in large part because it is not connected to the remainder of State Line Road across the creek. And that the road would be maintained properly if there were a crossing over South Leigh Creek.</p> <p>Currently, due to the lack of a crossing, there are numerous problems:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• "Official" maps, as picked up by such mapping sites as Google Maps, Mapquest, and Yahoo, show State Line Road as being continuous across South Leigh Creek. Therefore various people who use such maps try to take the route, and cross the creek. Some of them get stuck in the creek, and at high water, there are risks of being swept away.</li><li>• Possibly because of the problem with maps as referenced above, the local Fire Department has failed to respond to a fire in the subdivision in a timely manner. A crossing over the creek would improve the timeliness and reliability of emergency responders, and better-protect life and property in our part of Teton County.</li><li>• When the Forest Edge subdivision was first approved by Teton County, the assistant superintendent of schools testified that: "For purposes of our education impact analysis, we used an occupancy factor of .25 and a student population multiplier of .25. This analysis would indicate when the total development is achieved the student population generated would be 1.6875 students. It is important to note that this is the first subdivision development that has been located in such an area that these students generated from the development would be unable to attend the Alta Elementary School. In accordance with Wyoming statutes, we would therefore have to provide isolation payments to all students K-12. If our student analysis proves to be in error, the school district would have to request from Teton County a possibility of opening the road going north from the Alta Elementary School." [State Line Road] It should be noted that there currently are 4x as many K-12 students north of South Leigh Creek as had been projected using the formula described above.</li></ul> <p>o Vehicles crossing South Leigh Creek at State Line Road cause petrochemicals to enter the pristine trout stream. Discussions with Friends of the Teton River indicate support for removing this source of pollution to a key tributary of the Teton River.</p> <p>o Vehicles which try to take State Line Road but which don't cross South Leigh Creek due to high water or other perceived danger often cross Jim Price's adjoining property without permission, and cause damage to crops and potential damage to Jim Price's private bridge.</p> <p>o The lack of a crossing wastes a lot of fuel and time for residents who wish to go from places situated south of South Leigh Creek to places north of South Leigh Creek. For example, Google Maps shows that the "preferred route" from my house at 4240 Leigh Lane, Alta, WY to 1040 Alta North Road, is 4.9 miles long, takes 19 minutes, and crosses South Leigh Creek. The actual route out to Hwy. 33 is 16.3 miles long, and takes 35 minutes.</p> <p>o Bicyclists need to have safer routes. For those wishing to access South Leigh Canyon from parts of Alta south of South Leigh Creek, it is necessary to use Hwy. 33, if they don't wish to cross private property or go through the creek. There have been a number of recent fatalities on Hwy. 33 to bicyclists, and a safer route is needed.</p> <p>o Teton County, Wyoming recently improved the South Leigh Road, eliminating drainage problems which plagued local residents every spring and fall. But the section of State Line Road north of South Leigh Creek remains a morass during the rainy season. Photographs are available.</p> <p>We are most appreciative of your efforts in crafting a workable vision of the future for Teton County. We hope these details, though a bit lengthy, will be helpful in achieving that goal.</p> <p>I have volunteered my time and presently serve on the Teton County, Idaho "Teton 2020" transportation subcommittee. Idaho residents also have indicated a strong desire for completion of State Line Road and improved road maintenance, and we are hopeful that the two Teton Counties can begin a constructive dialogue in that regard.</p>

## 14: Alta

Date	Name	Comment
1/3/2012	Kosydar, Christine Interested Public	<p>My husband and I own a lot on South Leigh Road that we hope to build on in a few years. After reviewing the plan, we support it. In particular, we support the preservation of farmlands with development encouraged in the core area of Alta.</p> <p>We purchased our lot to avoid the developed areas of Driggs. We intend to preserve as much as possible of it in its natural state, and we hope and expect that our neighbors will do the same. Had we wanted to reside in a development, we would have purchased a home at a far lesser cost in a one of many existing neighborhoods with less expensive homes in the Driggs area.</p> <p>Driggs is an example of what we don't want. It has failed to develop an appropriate plan and as a result, it is a scattered hodgepodge of developments that have destroyed many beautiful and valuable acres of farmland.</p>
1/3/2012	Acari, Armond Save Historic JH	[actual comment could not be pasted]
1/3/2012	Gorney, Robert Interested Public	My reason for writing is for the completion of State Line Road from 5000 North to 6000 North. I have lived here in Forest Edge Leigh Canyon , Wyoming, just north of 6000 North State Line Road, since 1995. The residence in this area have been trying for over fifteen years to get the road completed. The original plat for Forest Edge was approved with certain provisions being met. One of those provisions was for the completion of State Line Road. Allen Monroe, a neighbor, has made a more detailed comment to Jeff Daugherty for the reason for completion which I have inserted below;
1/3/2012	Eliason, Bert Clair Interested Public	<p>We appreciate the opportunity to make a comment regarding planning for Teton County.</p> <p>We live in Alta, a part of the county that is somewhat removed from Jackson, and also removed from the town of Alta. It is in South Leigh Canyon, directly east of Teton, Idaho.</p> <p>We have 1 rather simple need. The need to complete state line road connection to our part of Alta to the main town of Alta Wy. The state line road now stops short of our subdivision. This requires a lot of extra travel for us to get to the main town of Alta. Children attending school in the town of Alta have to be transported to Driggs, Idaho and then back up to the town of Alta. This is an added expense and inconvenience.</p> <p>The completion of state line road would not be very difficult or expensive and would be a great service for those of us living in this part of Alta, Wy, Teton county.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>
1/2/2012	Koster, Ken Interested Public	<p>This is so typical. I made comments about ten days following the meeting held in Alta. Since then, nothing after having provided my name, address, telephone number and email address at the meeting. Now here is a last minute request for a response!</p> <p>I will make my comment very brief. State Line Road needs to be completed up to 6000 North. Reasons were presented at the Alta meeting and do not need to be rehashed here.</p>
12/29/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	a. This district description is good overall.
12/6/2011	Koster, Ken Interested Public	<p>Received notice in mail today (12/6) which certainly does not allow for planning to attend your 12/7 workshop.</p> <p>Please recall one of the primary topics discussed at the Alta meeting. Completion of State Line Road from 5000 North to 6000 North.</p>



Save Historic Jackson Hole Analysis

Re: Character Districts / Illustrating Our Vision, Dec 5, 2011 Draft

District 14: Alta

**SHJH SUMMARY:** To increase predictability, the new plan should include more detail to clearly distinguish future "neighborhood forms". Buildout ranges for residential and commercial development should be provided. Categories and narrative regarding future resort development should be consistent across districts - resorts should not see an increase in intensity beyond what is already approved in the master plans. To avoid confusion, whenever the term "stable" is used in the plan, there should be no increase in development potential.

BACKGROUND:			
<u>Existing Conditions</u>	<u>SHJH Summary of Proposed Key Changes in Plan</u>	<u>SHJH Comments/Concerns/Questions</u>	<u>SHJH General Recommendations</u>
The area has a strong agricultural character.	<b>Overall Degree of Change:</b> <b>Minimal Change and Resort Development</b>	Is the infill of 1/3 acre character lots consistent with the community's desired character?	<b>Specify a potential range of increased residential development potential within 14.2 Alta Core.</b>
The area has a heavy reliance on Driggs, ID for services.	<b>Details:</b> rural area with preservation, stable and transitional subareas (14.1-14.3) > identifies 14.1 Alta Farmland, 14.2 Alta Core, 14.3 Grand Targhee Resort	It states that the Grand Targhee "plan is intended to be dynamic and subject to some evolution in design but not density or intensity."	<b>The degree to which sketches will guide and influence specific sections of the land development regulations should be defined. (There are a lot of "neighborhood forms" in this district.)</b>
			<b>Ensure that the new plan is consistent in its language regarding resort development. All resorts (not just Grand Targhee) should be restricted from requesting additional intensity or density.</b>

**District 14: SHJH Detailed Recommendations for Improving Predictability and Consistency with Community Vision**

<b>Plan Page</b>	<b>Plan Section</b>	<b>Recommended Changes</b>
IV-84	Table of Existing and Future Characteristics	Reconsider/clarify "absent" defined character and walkable schools
IV-85	Paragraph 2, Sentence 2	Further clarify the degree of appropriate density as infill in the Alta core. (Buildout ranges would provide this information.)
IV-85	Neighborhood Form Diagrams	Further clarify characteristics unique to "clustering" versus "habitat/scenic".
IV-86	Features Map	Further clarify the data sources for drafting the "wildlife corridor" feature. In general, clarify the link between map features and future regulatory tools such as the Natural Resources Overlay.
IV-88	14.2 Alta Core, Sentence 1 and 3	Further clarify the categorization of "stable" with the encouragement of higher density infill in the core area.
IV-88	14.3 Grand Targhee Resort, Sentence 1	Resort zoning classifications are inconsistent throughout the new plan. Clarify use of "transition" in this section.
IV-88	14.3 Grand Targhee Resort, Sentence 3	Language regarding future resort development should be consistent across districts. The last sentence provides clear direction regarding future density of the resort, and should be replicated in other applicable places in the plan.

## 15: County Periphery

Date	Name	Comment
1/3/2012	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	[actual comment could not be pasted]
12/29/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	<p>a. Recommendation: In the diagram on the first page of this district, it seems that natural scenic vistas warrant a completely filled in circle in the existing and future columns</p> <p>b. We are supportive of the focus on scenic values in this district</p> <p>c. Recommendation: This description should clarify that the transportation goals are centered on improving existing roads and access points and not building new ones.</p> <p>d. We are supportive of and encourage environmentally sensitive roadway design.</p> <p>e. Section 15.2 says “future development will be clustered in and around existing neighborhoods.” Since we believe that the intention is not to expand the neighborhoods within each of the four areas identified as 15.2, some clarification is needed. Otherwise this could be read as creating new “nodes” within these rural areas, especially since the maps also show “Workforce Housing” as a goal within each area of 15.2. If possible, it is probably preferable to shift development totally away from District 15 and into Complete Neighborhoods and section 15.2 should probably say something to that effect. Of course, we would need some new regulatory tools to enable that sort of shift to take place, as we have said before.</p>
12/16/2011	NeVille, David Interested Public	<p>I was at this meeting and do agree with Paul [Cote] that this was the discussion and general consensus of the community in Moran.</p> <p>Please know that this is a voice embracing Paul's concerns for our community.</p>

## 15: County Periphery

Date	Name	Comment
12/14/2011	Cote, Paul Interested Public	<p>My concerns revolve around the lack of specific response to the concerns of the citizens of Moran as expressed at those earlier meetings.</p> <p>As I recall, the primary concern of the citizens was to maintain the viability of the community here in face of the changing demographics. Mainly, that we are losing our middle class families and being populated with older part time residents without children in this community, nor the same level of involvement in community affairs.</p> <p>Maintaining the viability of the community should be a specific goal for the Moran/Buffalo Valley area, but nowhere do I see that mentioned.</p> <p>An essential part of this goal would have to include affordable housing in the Moran area, since working class families with children are priced out of the housing market, even now, when prices are reduced. Where is the affordable housing plan for Moran?</p> <p>Having families with children is essential to the community since a certain school age population is required to keep the Moran Elementary School open. The MES provides a cultural core for the community, and also makes it viable for our largest employers (Grand Teton Lodge Company, Park Service, Forest Service, and Signal Mtn Lodge) to attract and retain employees. Representatives from both GTLC and NPS spoke directly to this issue at the last meeting.</p> <p>The other part of the families with children issue is that that demographic also provides the most volunteers for the Moran Fire Station, another important institution hovering on the edge of extinction. There are currently only about 10 members, barely enough to keep it going.</p> <p>I would like to see a plan by the County to identify and purchase properties to be used for affordable housing with some requirement that residents of such be involved with the MES and/or MFS. There are also partnering possibilities with the GTNP in the Moran area itself. This might include the Park providing the land and utilities for housing, and the County, using affordable housing funds, to build the structures. Of course, such units would be rentals, but even so, the goals of bringing in families and populating the school and fire department would be addressed.</p> <p>The other glaring problem of Moran is the lack of commercial zoning to provide basic services to both residents and visitors on a year-round basis. The only such existing area is the Grand Teton Park RV Campground. This property makes the most sense for this type of activity since it is more centrally located than other possible sites, and it is already a developed site. Oddly, it is partly zoned BC and partly rural, in a fashion inexplicable to me.</p> <p>I feel the zoning issue on that property should be clarified with the intent to encourage such uses. As an alternative, the County should identify what other areas of Moran it feels would be suitable, if not this one.</p> <p>The preservation/conservation goals, while having some merit, seem out of place to me since Moran is already 99.9% park, forest, and open space in conservation easements. How much more do you want? Can you point out any significant parcel that is wildlife impermeable? With the existing SRO and NRO overlays (which I presume are not going away), this goal has already been met, and should not override the goal of maintaining the viability of the community.</p> <p>Really, though, I don't see some small expansion of commercial activity and 6 to 8 units of affordable housing as being threats to the conservation and preservation goals. If properly done they will coexist quite well.</p> <p>So, to recap, this is my best recollection of the bulk of the discussion at that meeting, yet I see almost none of it reflected in the plan. If we were to have another meeting, it would be to find the black hole into which our input disappeared, and to reiterate our resolve to get the County to respond to our needs as we, the residents, have expressed them.</p> <p>I am cc'ing this to other folks who, as I recall, were at the public hearing referenced by Alex, so they might comment on line, since it appears we will not have the opportunity to do so in person. To those of you receiving this via cc, please feel free to add your comments or forward this note along to others who may be interested.</p>

15: County Periphery

Date	Name	Comment
12/7/2011	Washut, Harry Interested Public	15.3 Why has Buffalo Valley/Moran community been left out as its own district? Like Alta, it is its own unique community and should have a say in its own future. The local blend of resort, local commercial and dude ranches should be able to upgrade and offer the latest needs of the tourists winter and summer which helps preserve the local community. The existing commercial development associated with the resorts in the area should be given resort (small) designation with lodging overlay which would allow rebuilding of existing commercial to meet the current needs of the traveling public, helping out the foundations of our community.

Save Historic Jackson Hole Analysis

Re: Character Districts / Illustrating Our Vision, Dec 5, 2011 Draft

District 15: County Periphery

SHJH SUMMARY: To increase predictability, the new plan should include more detail to clearly distinguish future "neighborhood forms". In general, the geographic scope of this district is too large for the described characteristics to be fully representative of any given area. Buildout ranges for residential and commercial development should be provided. Emphasis must be placed on permanent conservation. (The hard linkage necessary to gain permanent conservation is missing; language committing to this linkage and the use of some form of transfer mechanism must be provided in this document.) To be effective, the plan must set realistic priorities for the life of the plan, and not suggest, for example, that START service be expanded to Kelly.

BACKGROUND:			
Existing Conditions	SHJH Summary of Proposed Key Changes in Plan	SHJH Comments/Concerns/Questions	SHJH General Recommendations
The area is primarily rural, with dispersed residential and nonresidential use.	<b>Overall Degree of Change:</b> No to Minimal change	Diagram needs some clarification. (workforce housing designations on map)	Refine map and table to clarify intentions for future workforce housing.
It encompasses communities of Buffalo Valley, Kelly and Red Top.	<b>Details:</b> rural area with conservation and preservation subareas (15.1-15.4) > identifies 15.1 Large Outlying Parcels, 15.2 Buffalo Valley Residential/Game Creek/South Fall Creek, 15.3 Buffalo Valley Highway Ranches, and 15.4 Kelly	There is a strong emphasis on conservation and preservation. Is the priority for temporary downzoning or for permanent conservation?	State the priority for permanent conservation.
Opportunities for open space protection are abundant.	15.2 - Future development will be clustered around existing neighborhoods, <b>redevelopment will result in a reduction of building density and size.</b>	The 15.2 associated sketch does not strongly depict clustered development, although the policy calls for clustering in the future.	The degree to which sketches will guide and influence specific sections of the land development regulations should be defined.
	15.3 Future development should be clustered out of the viewshed.	In 15.3, term descriptions could use additional refinement. (What is meant by <i>enhancing</i> existing commercial development in Buffalo Valley, particularly given the <b>use of the term "resorts"</b> ?)	Buildout ranges for the subareas (for both residential and nonresidential) should be provided. Only with these figures will the degree of change be understandable.
	15.4 suggests START bus service or hub in Kelly.	Is START service realistic in Kelly?	The reference to START bus service should be further clarified, or removed, given the degree of density that would appropriate for effective use of START in this subarea.
		Based on the diagram, what workforce housing is planned for the 15.2 subarea?	The basis for how workforce housing depictions in the maps will be interpreted in the future needs to be clarified.

**District 15: SHJH Detailed Recommendations for Improving Predictability and Consistency with Community Vision**

Plan Page	Plan Section	Recommended Changes
IV-90	Table of Existing and Future Characteristics	Reconsider/clarify "absent" defined character and "partial" scenic vistas and undeveloped open space.
IV-91	Paragraph 2, Sentence 5	Clarify "improvements" to "convenience commercial" in these remote areas. In general, these areas lack the density to support additional commercial development.
IV-91	Neighborhood Form Diagrams	Further clarify characteristics unique to "preservation" versus "clustering" versus "habitat/scenic" versus "conservation" versus "agriculture". It is sometimes unclear which "forms" will be encouraged in given areas.
IV-92	Features Map	Further clarify use of workforce housing features on the map (particularly given the inconsistency of use across districts).
IV-92	Features Map	Further clarify rationale for restricting "scenic foreground" to such a limited area.
IV-93	15.1 Large Outlying Parcels, Sentence 3	Incorporate language that emphasizes the importance of <u>permanent</u> conservation, not just "conservation."
IV-93	15.1 Large Outlying Parcels, Sentence 4	Clarify intent of the term "directed away from these critical areas" with regard to the use of a transfer mechanism.
IV-93	15.1 Large Outlying Parcels, Sentence 7	Given the geographic scope of the district, further specify locations where "improvements to the roadway system" will be prioritized.
IV-94	15.2 Buffalo Valley Residential/Game Creek/South Fall Creek, Sentence 1	To increase predictability regarding potential implementation strategies, further define "opportunities to enhance and restore wildlife permeability." Does this direction refer to already existing development?
IV-94	15.3 Buffalo Valley Highway Ranches, Sentence 2 and 6	To increase predictability, clarify intent of the term "resorts" in this area, given the regulatory meaning of "resort" in the existing plan.
IV-94	15.3 Buffalo Valley Highway Ranches, Sentence 6	Further clarify the intent of the phrase "possibly enhanced to include more basic amenities". This should be reconciled with the goal to limit development potential in the area.
IV-95	15.4 Kelly, Sentence 7	Amend language that suggests START bus service is appropriate (given the existing and proposed densities and distance from other "complete neighborhoods".) The plan needs to set realistic priorities.

## Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
1/3/2012	Jordan, Tom Interested Public	Having reviewed the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance Character District Comments (and recommendations), I support those recommendations. I agree with the need for more specificity and clarity regarding growth and growth caps. I am concerned that the cost of growth will be placed on existing tax payers. I am concerned that the Plan in defining Character Districts fails to adequately integrate those districts with adjoining districts and within the Town as a whole.
1/3/2012	Jensen, Gail Interested Public	<p>General comments that are consistent with all districts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•I support and agree with the overall comments made by the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance and Save Historic Jackson Hole.</li> <li>•Without a transfer mechanism or specific mapping of the districts where density will be decreased, there is no reason to map potential density increases over and above current entitled development to any district. Passing this part of the Comp Plan without at least an amending the themes and policies to clearly reflect the commitment to keep growth at the same level of 1994 entitlements.</li> <li>•Show us the numbers that reflect the decreases in the areas where a decrease in density can be accomplished and where the resultant increases should be made. How will this be implemented – on a case by case basis? A “score card” needs to be kept as a commitment to the community that this plan does not produce unwanted additive development.</li> <li>•The PRD tool is the elephant in the room and needs to be dealt with immediately.</li> <li>•Every district has lofty goals that will involve funding. Who will pay for these improvements? Will these costs be spread among all districts via property taxes? Will new or re-development pay excise and connection fees that represent the investment the community has to make?</li> <li>•An analysis of our roads and infrastructure must be done to see at what level of development unacceptable levels of service, county-wide and district wide, will occur.</li> <li>•The maps are too vague and without numbers no one can predict what will be in their back yard – predictability.</li> </ul>
1/3/2012	Acari, Armond Save Historic JH	<p>Attached are Save Historic Jackson Hole’s comments on the Character Districts/Illustrating our Vision December 5, 2011 Draft. The comments are organized in three categories. The first are General Comments and Recommendations that apply to multiple districts or the overall strategy of this chapter. The second category includes comments and analysis of each District with a summary of the proposed changes as we understand them, our concerns and questions, and our recommendations for improving the document. The third category is a detailed analysis of each District with our recommended changes. Feel free to contact me if you have any questions.</p> <p>[actual comment could not be pasted]</p>
1/3/2012	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	<p>[photo also attached]</p> <p>The two districts I will be commenting are in greater South Park. Clearly the community cares deeply for this region given that citizen input tallies are greater for the South Park district by a factor of two, or more, than any other district in the County. The character district descriptions for this region are now much more responsive to community input than the previous versions.</p> <p>I have some overarching concerns that remain in the plan but would like to offer some very specific corrections, clarifications and suggestions for improvement of Districts 10 and 5 – South Park and West Jackson.</p> <p>Overarching Misses in Character Maps and in the Themes and Policies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.The Character District Chapter needs to indicate potential build-out ranges for both residential and nonresidential development by district. Once released, the community needs to support the ranges in order for them to be approved. This was promised to the community when we got to this stage of the mapping and it is extremely disturbing that those ranges are not already included on these maps.</li> <li>2.Both the Character District Chapter and Policies must state that a transfer method to enable permanent protection of open space must be in place before increased density in populated areas is allowed. Increasing development potential in certain areas should be a planning approach to uphold the priority of conservation, not for the sake of growth alone. The community firmly understood this is to be the core of the plan – and the electeds have generally agreed this is their intent. This statement of intent needs to be added to both the Themes and Policies as well as in the introduction to the character district maps.</li> </ol>



## Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
1/2/2012	Miller, Lorna Interested Public	<p>I am writing to express concern about the overall treatment of wildlife in this plan. I'm having a difficult time trying to figure out how to make my comments relate to the way the concepts are organized because virtually the entire valley floor is wildlife habitat in one way or another. Just because you identify an area as a Complete Neighborhood doesn't mean the animals will stop trying to move through. We see this all the time right now with deer in town or various species of wildlife in Teton Village.</p> <p>I divide my time between Teton Village and Butler Creek. I must tell you that I see more varied wildlife, more frequently (Moose, deer, foxes, coyotes, porcupines, bears) in the residential area of the Village than I ever do at the Fall Creek Road location. I feel strongly that addressing "permeability" should be an overarching goal in all character districts. The ecosystem is interwoven through the entire valley not just in the areas that have been identified as Rural: to think otherwise is wishful thinking</p> <p>In the character defining features section, I find the "design for wildlife AND/OR scenery" to be problematic. Does this mean there are scenarios envisioned where scenery is given priority to the exclusion of wildlife? A great deal of public comment on the plan did, I thought, put wildlife at the top of the priority list. Why is it not "Design for wildlife AND scenery?"</p> <p>This section also refers to "Agricultural Exemptions" under Special Characteristics (IV-6). I sincerely hope you do not intend to enshrine the current agricultural exemption for "wildlife friendly fencing" in this new plan. It is a false notion that you cannot contain livestock with fencing that is "wildlife friendly". To retain this exemption means that the concept of permeability will not be effectively supported in this Plan. The most egregious wildlife Unfriendly fencing in the valley has been constructed under this exemption. A couple of examples in 2011 are: The Pinto Ranch in Buffalo Valley where a 52" height top rail, FOUR rail buck and rail fence with a minimum 42" spread was constructed between the Buffalo Fork and the Park Boundary; This fence is exclusionary not permeable.</p> <p>The Doshay Property between the Gros Ventre River and the Kings Highway /Queen's Lane area. Most of this property is now fenced with exclusionary style buck and rail fence. The newest construction this fall placed the 52" high buck and rail fence along the edge of a deep irrigation ditch. On the south side of King's Highway. In effect this is total exclusion. This property also has a conservation easement on it with the JHLT. So, at the moment, the current Teton County Ag exemption for fencing allows wildlife exclusionary fencing to be constructed on lands that have conservation easement for wildlife values!</p> <p>There are numerous other examples:</p> <p>Spring Gulch. The 4 rail 52" high buck and rail fence along the west side of Spring Gulch Road on JH Land and Cattle property, some of which is JHLT conservation easement. The 52" high Buck fence on the east side of the road is built of steep slopes making the effective height much higher.</p> <p>The 5 strand barbed wire fence with a top rail at 52"+ that runs east-west across Spring Gulch Between JH Land and Cattle and the Box L (Lucas) Note: This is also conservation easement on the JH Land and Cattle property but the easement is held by the Teton County Scenic Preserve Trust!!</p> <p>It is ironic that the image chosen to illustrate the "Rural Neighborhoods with Conservation Opportunities" on pg IV-4 features most prominently a buck and rail fence!</p> <p>I hope that permeability and connectivity will be given serious consideration as the Plan moves forward and not merely lip service. Wildlife cannot know where the boundaries between Rural and Complete Neighborhoods are. It is up to this community to figure out a design and a plan that allows us to live compatibly with wildlife.</p> <p>Thanks for the opportunity to comment</p>

## Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
1/2/2012	Acri, Armond Interested Public	<p>General comments on all Districts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Without estimated build out ranges by District the Plans and Character District Maps are worthless. If fails to meet the most basic requirements of planning. How can we Plan when we do not know where we will end up?</li> <li>-There is no need to upzone any areas during the life of this Plan. We have sufficient capacity under the current regulations to allow growth for the life of 3 to 5 Comp Plans. (At 10 years per plan and 5 years to update) During the life of the next Plan we can determine methods to achieve the Community Goal of permanent protection of open spaces. This protection should be linked so that any increase in density is offset with a permanent decrease in another location.</li> <li>-The Character District Maps should commit to protecting of historic western rural character and small town atmosphere in all Districts, not just the Town Square.</li> <li>-Lodging overlay should not expand. We only fill all the lodging in the Town and County a few weeks of the year during the summer. Adding more lodging will make it more difficult to achieve the goal of increasing tourism during shoulder seasons.</li> <li>-Higher densities are not appropriate along Flat Creek. The narrow strip of land does not allow enough room for setbacks from the Creek. Development close to the Creek will cause problems with runoff into the Creek.</li> <li>-It is a contradiction to say that several districts are complete neighborhoods, but have no defined character.</li> <li>-It is inconsistent with the Policies to state that Resort Districts will not increase in size or density, but say that they are "transition" areas.</li> <li>-It appears the Plan calls for the taxpayers to fund public parking so that developers do not have to provide parking. This is not consistent with the public's desire to have development pay its own way.</li> <li>-The diagram showing the transition of development from Town Center to Rural County in both Plan and Elevation views is very confusing and needs to be reworked.</li> </ul>
1/2/2012	Stone, Cindy Hill Interested Public	<p>After exploring your vision of the character districts of Teton County Wyoming, I encourage you to provide an appendix or glossary for the entire Comprehensive Plan. A layman, such as me, has a hard time understanding your meanings of the following terms in the context of this plan.</p> <p>Corrective actions Enhancement High quality Complete neighborhoods Predictability Community Character Explore Exemptions Encourage Vibrancy Compatible redevelopment (Is this not an oxymoron?) Local downtown Local convenience commercial Stable Transitional</p> <p>This document is at best vague without definitions. Does stable mean the same thing in Chapter 5 as it does in your Character district chapters, or does it mean, without change, as in the dictionary?</p> <p>I found that the Character Districts "Illustration of Our Vision" read nicely. It resembles a Hallmark card, "Wish You Well."</p> <p>Assuming that there are 20 thousand tax payers in the valley today and you have spent \$500,000 on this plan, that is 25 bucks a taxpayer. Who could complain about that? I would have probably taken that 25 bucks and thrown it away on groceries. Perhaps I would have bought open space, but I'm now in the hole.</p> <p>This comprehensive plan process has truly affirmed my understanding of politics.</p> <p>Thank goodness that most of the large land owners have been such stewards of the land and wildlife. I applaud their patience, the communities continued involvement, and of course your politics.</p>

## Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
12/29/2011	Stevenson, Trevor Conservation Alliance	<p>Thank you for the extraordinary amount of work that each of you has put into the Comprehensive Plan and Character District Mapping processes. As we near the conclusion of this public process, we are appreciative of your commitment to the community's goals and values. To assist in this process, we would like to provide you with some detailed feedback on the draft Character District Maps that were released in early December.</p> <p>Enclosed is a memo that highlights some of the principle concerns, questions, and recommendations that we have about the Character Districts maps overall, as well as some thoughts on many of the individual districts and subareas. Also highlighted are areas that we believe the Character District Maps cover quite well.</p> <p>We look forward to continuing to engage in the Comprehensive Plan process in the coming months and working towards a product that the community can embrace. Thank you for your work.</p> <p>Comprehensive Plan Character District Maps: Overall Comments</p> <p>There are several overarching questions we have about the Comprehensive Plan Character Districts, and we have identified some topics that could benefit from additional analysis and exploration. Broadly, our primary concerns are outlined here along with recommendations that we think will improve the final product. Many of these broad concerns and suggested actions also apply to many of the distinct character districts. More specific comments and recommendations about each of the districts that are not covered in the broader points are included in the next section of this report.</p> <p>Implementation Plan and Regulations:</p> <p>An Implementation Plan will be a critical component of the finished product, set for adoption in April. We have made several recommendations in our November 30th letter and report with regard to this Implementation Plan, and specifically with regard to the Character Districts. There are several additional issues that warrant consideration.</p> <p>There are many sections of the Illustration of Our Vision document that implicitly call for specific regulations to be developed. The forthcoming Implementation Plan should prioritize these regulations so that they are developed and implemented as soon as possible.</p> <p>Examples of such regulations include: agricultural exemptions, density transfers (some districts mention strategies that appear to be district specific, some county-wide), clustering tools, mitigations, building permit timing allocation systems, definition of local convenience commercial, lot consolidations and associated allowances, minimum and maximum lot and structure size, wildlife protection standards (fencing, ponds, etc), among many others.</p> <p>Second, as part of the Implementation Plan, a feasibility study for START should be executed. For example, the Character District descriptions mention bus service to Kelly, but without the relevant data we cannot be sure that that is a realistic goal given the small population and relatively remote location.</p> <p>Shifting Development Patterns:</p> <p>One of the primary tenants of the Comprehensive Plan is the goal of directing development potential from the rural areas in the County to the Complete Neighborhoods, identified in the Character District descriptions. The question remains, how will we achieve this shift? It is important to answer this question as soon as possible to let the community know what they can expect from future development and conservation efforts. Without knowing how this shift will take place, the goal is merely aspirational and leaves us without any answers. This fall, the Alliance brought Mark White to Jackson. Mr. White is an expert on regulatory tools to shift development patterns, and suggested several approaches that are suited to our particular community. The timeline for acting on regulatory tools should be outlined in detail in the implementation plan.</p> <p>That said, the Illustration of Our Vision section covers quite well the locations and types of development increases throughout the valley. However, the opposite side of the equation, the decreases, are not as well described. Often, they come couched in the goal that with redevelopment of certain areas, density and intensity of development will be decreased. This may discourage reinvestment and redevelopment, and is not satisfactory as the primary tool for decreasing development in undesirable areas. This decrease must be clarified and described such that the community can understand where development will not occur in addition to what the maps lay out as places suitable for growth.</p> <p>Recommendation #1: Within the implementation plan, create a clear timeline to explore and implement regulations that can meaningfully shift development patterns.</p> <p>Recommendation #2: In the Character District Maps, provide a better description of where decreases in development are most desirable, rather than focusing primarily on where increases in development are planned.</p> <p>Amount of Growth:</p> <p>Additionally, the community has asked repeatedly for numbers associated with the proposed development pattern in the Character Districts. In fact, the introduction to the Illustration of Our Vision section states "the community is committed to continually adapting our implementation strategies to ensure that preservation and development occurs in the desired amount, location and type." This is laudable goal, but without a more accurate</p>

## Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
		<p>estimate of the amount of development that is desired or expected, it may be an unachievable goal. The community was told that the numbers would fall out of the mapping process. The commitment to a rough doubling, the 60/40 split and the goal of housing 65% of our workforce locally are good starts, but are not sufficient. This section should also clarify what “rigorous analysis of our successes and failures” means with regard to implementation of our goals.</p> <p>Recommendation #3: Provide estimates, on a district level as well as a countywide level, of the approximate amount of residential and commercial development that can be expected from this Plan.</p> <p>Recommendation #4: Clarify that the overall amount of growth is not to exceed what is currently entitled, and demonstrate that the plan is working towards this goal by providing rough projections for each district.</p> <p>Recommendation #5: Clearly define the “rigorous analysis” that you anticipate doing.</p> <p>Wildlife Impacts and Considerations:</p> <p>A rapid assessment of the projected wildlife impacts of the development pattern illustrated in the Character District maps should be completed and incorporated into the maps section prior to adoption, and perhaps some changes should be made to the maps depending on the outcome of the assessment. With this, we can begin to understand the impacts of our desired development amount, type and location on our areas’ wildlife.</p> <p>Wildlife permeability in new and existing development needs to be an even stronger consideration throughout the Plan. Certain districts, like the Town Periphery, cover the idea quite well while other areas would benefit from more explicit commitments to wildlife permeability. Many areas in our community, even in Town, are within or adjacent to wildlife habitat and public lands. Buttes, riparian areas, and more broadly, open spaces, provide important wildlife habitat. Development that occurs in or near these amenities must account for wildlife movement and the resulting regulations for these areas, when they are written, must also respect wildlife permeability.</p> <p>Recommendation #6: Execute a rapid assessment of wildlife impacts of the proposed development pattern, or authorize the NRTAB to do so.</p> <p>Recommendation #7: Insert more explicit considerations for wildlife permeability in the following districts: 2, 3, 4, 5, and 13</p> <p>Predictability:</p> <p>The document as a whole needs an increased focus on actual predictability. For example, on the page “What Does the Illustration of the Vision Address”, point number 6 suggests a lack of predictability, whereas it is one of the central tenants of the Plan according to the introduction. Further exploration into this idea is warranted. Additionally, without estimates of the amount of development proposed, this plan lacks the predictability it aims to achieve.</p> <p>As we explained in Recommendation #3, we recommend that you provide estimates, on a district level as well as a countywide level, of the amount of residential and commercial development that can be expected from this Plan.</p> <p>Prioritization:</p> <p>The first page of the Illustration of Our Vision references ensuring “that all policies of this Plan are implemented in the context of our Vision and no policies are forgotten.” It is important at this point to clarify that the community values enumerated in the Vision are prioritized.</p> <p>Recommendation #8: Clarify the language to prioritize the community values as the policies do.</p> <p>Definitions:</p> <p>The definitions of areas of stability, transition, preservation and conservation are helpful and indicate a commitment to achieving community goals. The gradient on the page entitled “Character Defining Features” is a key component of the Plan, and needs to be improved upon somewhat. The “clustering” image should better illustrate allocation of open space, as the current image implies a landscape dominated by structures with very little open space. Also, it will be important to clarify whether clustering tools will be available on parcels smaller than 160 acres; a formal review of the PRD tool as well as other density shifting or allocating systems would help to answer this question.</p> <p>Recommendation #9: Correct the misleading graphic of “clustering” on the gradient map,</p> <p>Recommendation #10: Determine how to best review the results of the PRD tool, and include a timeline for this review in the implementation plan.</p> <p>Costs of Growth:</p> <p>Recommendation #11: The costs associated with the growth described in the Character District should be addressed in introduction to the Illustration of our Vision section. Growth must pay its own way, and the direct and indirect costs of development must be considered.</p> <p>Enforcement:</p> <p>Recommendation #12: The introduction to the Illustration of Our Vision section should mention the importance of enforcing as strict as possible adherence to the intent of the district maps.</p> <p>Recommendation #13: The introduction should clarify that the transition zones between character districts should not cause incremental encroachment of the character of one district into a neighboring district. In other words, character district descriptions should be closely adhered to,</p>

## Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
		regardless of the character of a neighboring district.
12/7/2011	Wang, Louis Interested Public	"Predictability" is not provided--implication that plan provides predictability is "dirty pool;" if it is more predictable say more predictable. "Stable" don't label something stable if its going to change--confusing to the layman. "Complete" neighborhood--complete implies continuous adding; remove complete
12/7/2011	, Interested Public	Keep incentive tools respenct property rights while achieving 60/40 goal.
12/6/2011	Hadden, Kenny Interested Public	Hello, I saw an ad in the paper (run by Save Historic JH) decrying the recent community meetings as "manipulative" and I just wanted to write to let you know that I found them to be exactly the opposite. The meeting I went to was open, informative, and extremely well run. The planners are doing everything they can to get people's feedback and interpret it in the context of what is possible. I felt my voice was heard, and I found it an interesting and engaging process to be involved in. I was honored how seriously they took my feedback, as a fairly recent transplant with no city planning experience. The planners are a tremendously thoughtful, positive, motivated bunch and they deserve a ton of credit for the work they are doing.

**Save Historic Jackson Hole Analysis**  
**Re: Character Districts / Illustrating Our Vision, Dec 5, 2011 Draft**

**GENERAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - In order for the plan to provide sufficient predictability and consistency with community vision, the following fundamental changes must be made to the Character District Chapter:**

**The Character District Chapter needs to indicate potential buildout ranges for both residential and nonresidential development by district. Once released, the community needs to support the ranges in order for them to be approved.**

**Both the Character District Chapter and Policies must state that a transfer method to enable permanent protection of open space must be in place before increased density in populated areas is allowed.** Increasing development potential in certain areas should be a planning approach to uphold the priority of conservation, not for the sake of growth alone.

**Without a commitment to this linkage in place, increased development potential in any locations should be off the table.** With 50-70 years of growth already in the pipeline, additional development potential is not needed for the life of this 10-15 year plan.

**Tied to the previous points, the Character District Chapter should not propose scattered nodes of expanding development, such as the Aspens/Pines area, throughout the county. Specifically, complete neighborhood "transition" boundaries need to be significantly reduced.**

**Nonresidential development potential should not be increased beyond what is permitted today.** In many districts, the Character District Chapter references the potential for more commercial development potential than what is currently allowed (in the form of increased mixed use, convenience commercial, expansion of the lodging overlay and additional light industry). This must be changed to reflect a commitment to not increase overall potential and instead encourage reallocation of potential.

**Terminology needs to be clear and leave no room for confusion and contradiction.** "Stable" areas should maintain their current density or the term "stable" should not be used.

**The protection of historic, western rural character cannot be limited to the Town Square District.** The protection of rural character and small town atmosphere is important in all planning districts; language must be incorporated to reflect this goal.

**The term "complete neighborhoods" is a jargon term more appropriate for urban areas. Many residents disagree with the plan's take on what communities need to be livable, desirable, or "complete". Simply use the "neighborhood" term instead.** The plan ignores the fact that most residents and visitors enjoy quiet streets, dark skies, and a small town community where you recognize your neighbors, or get away from the "amenities" that anytown USA has to offer. Many residents do not want the change that would be enabled by the plan.

**Fix the overly vague areas of the plan (as described in the individual district analyses) and stop delaying all the difficult decisions.** For the most part, the plan is a lofty vision document that promotes the "we can have it all" sentiment: we can hand out more development entitlements (beyond where we are already headed) and still successfully protect wildlife and the other assets unique to Jackson Hole. Wishful thinking isn't good planning. For example, the plan should not propose increased development potential on sensitive hillsides around Town. If we do so, we will harm wildlife habitat and scenic vistas, and exacerbate already problematic transportation issues. Another Pine Glades is not needed.

**Incorporate language that acknowledges that the plan's vision for development is unchecked by adequate technical analysis of existing conditions, such as parking and transportation issues and fiscal impacts.** Given that these studies were not part of the comprehensive planning effort, it will important to emphasize that these studies must be done before density increases are permitted in any given location.

**To avoid future confusion, the Character District Chapter needs some fine-tuning, particularly in the following areas: increased detail on various "neighborhood forms", consistent use of map features (such as workforce housing) on town and county district maps, increased detail for terminology such as stable, transition, preservation and conservation, clarification of data sources for map features (such as wildlife corridors and permeability), and the need for consistent direction for resort zoned areas.**

**The Character District Chapter narrative needs to provide better guidance for realistic, fiscally responsible choices.** For example, it is unclear why the plan mentions the possibility of providing START bus service to Kelly, given existing and proposed densities for the area. In general, the plan needs to be internally consistent and that consistency is more important than throwing bones to stakeholders.