



## JOINT PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA DOCUMENTATION

**PREPARATION DATE:** February 2, 2012  
**MEETING DATE:** February 8, 2012

**SUBMITTING DEPARTMENT:** Town & County Planning  
**DEPARTMENT DIRECTORS:** Tyler Sinclair & Jeff Daugherty  
**PRESENTER:** Tyler Sinclair & Jeff Daugherty

**SUBJECT:** Comprehensive Plan Character District Review

### STATEMENT/PURPOSE

The purpose of this item is to continue the review of the draft Illustration of Our Vision (Character Districts) chapter of the Comprehensive Plan that was continued from January 26, 2012. Specifically the hearing will be focused on consideration and final action on Resolution No. 12-001 that would certify the draft Character Districts, subject to a list of modifications, for inclusion in the Comprehensive Plan.

### BACKGROUND/ALTERNATIVES

At the July 11, 2011 JIM the Town and County entered into a contract with AECOM for development and adoption of the Illustration of Our Vision (Character Districts) chapter of the Comprehensive Plan.

On January 11, 2012, the Town Council and Planning Commission held a workshop. On January 12, 2012 the County Commission and Planning Commission held an identical workshop. At each of these workshops, direction was given on substantive (i.e. "red") changes that should be made to the draft Character Districts. In addition, a list of proposed changes that are clarifications and/or enhancements (i.e. "green" changes) were also compiled prior to the January 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> workshops. These proposed red and green changes were the basis for the list of modifications considered by the Joint Planning Commissions.

On January 26, 2012, the Joint Town and County Planning Commissions reviewed the draft list of modifications and identified additions, enhancements, and subtractions to the list. A summary of the January 26, 2012, meeting is attached.

### Resolution No. 12-001

Following the January 26, 2012, meeting, Staff made the additions, enhancements and subtractions to the list of modifications directed by the Joint Planning Commission and incorporated the final list of modifications in a resolution that, if approved, would certify the Character Districts, subject to the list of modifications, as part of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan.

The purpose of this meeting is to finalize the list of modifications in the proposed resolution before voting on the resolution to certify the Illustration of Our Vision (Character Districts) chapter of the Comprehensive Plan to the elected officials and conclude the Joint Planning Commissions review. Following public comment, staff will facilitate a discussion (if necessary) of any items Commissioners would like to add, enhance or subtract from the list of modifications prior to voting.

The Character Districts, as modified, will represent the consensus direction of the Joint Planning Commissions on how the approved policies of the Comprehensive Plan should be implemented on the ground. Undoubtedly each Planning Commissioner, like each community member, will have personal opinions that are not represented in the Certified Character Districts; however the goal is that the Certified Character Districts represent the consensus opinion. Through public workshops in September and October, an open house in December, Planning Commissioner/Elected Official workshops in January, and numerous additional public comments, a wide variety of potential approaches to implement the approved policies have been identified. Drawing from those various approaches, the Certified Character Districts should represent the best possible consensus the Joint Planning Commission can reach on how best to implement the community's approved vision and policies.

As was done following the Joint Planning Commission Certification of the Themes and Policies in July 2010, Staff will compile a list of any personal Planning Commissioner comments on the Certified Character Districts and present them to the elected officials along with the Certified Character Districts.

#### Public Comment

Public comment received since January 20, 2012 is attached. Public comment received prior to January 20, 2012 has been previously provided and is available online at [www.jacktontetonplan.com](http://www.jacktontetonplan.com). Please contact staff if you would like additional copies. Public comment on the proposed resolution and items not addressed at the January 26, 2012 meeting will also be taken at the meeting.

#### Certification

Once the list of modifications is finalized, each Planning Commission will vote to certify the Character Districts, subject to the modifications, as part of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan.

#### FISCAL IMPACT

N/A

#### STAFF IMPACT

Staff impact related to this item is ongoing with a considerable amount of time being spent by Town and County staff on the Comprehensive Plan.

#### RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that each Planning Commission certify the draft Illustration of Our Vision chapter of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan subject to the identified modifications.

#### ATTACHMENTS

1. Meeting Agenda

2. Resolution No. 12-001: A Resolution Certifying the Illustration of Our Vision Chapter of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan as Part of the Comprehensive Master Plan of the Town of Jackson, Wyoming and Teton County, Wyoming
3. Summary of the January 26, 2012 Planning Commission Hearing
4. Public Comment Received since January 6, 2012

## LEGAL REVIEW

Legal review of the draft Illustration of Our Vision (Character Districts) chapter, as well as the approved Vision, Common Value, and Achieving Our Vision chapters, is ongoing. Modifications to the draft Illustration of Our Vision necessary due to legal review will be incorporated as the Chapter is rewritten prior to the March 14, 2012 Character Districts Joint Information Meeting.

## SUGGESTED MOTIONS

### **Town**

I move to adopt and direct the Secretary of the Planning Commission to sign Resolution No. 12-001 Certifying the Illustration of Our Vision Chapter of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan as Part of the Comprehensive Master Plan for the Town of Jackson, Wyoming and Teton County, Wyoming.

### **County**

I move to adopt and direct the Chairman to sign Resolution No. 12-001 Certifying the Illustration of Our Vision Chapter of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan as Part of the Comprehensive Master Plan for the Town of Jackson, Wyoming and Teton County, Wyoming.

## **AGENDA**

### **Character Districts Joint Planning Commission Hearing**

February 8, 2012 - 5:00 pm to 9:00 pm

Snow King Resort, Grandview Lodge, Basement Meeting Room

### **Goal of the Meeting:**

*Certify the Illustration of Our Vision as portion of the Comprehensive Plan subject to a list of modifications*

### **Part I: Opening and Public Comment**

1. Welcome and Opening Remarks from the Planning Commission Chairs.
2. Staff Presentation: Staff will briefly outline the contents of the resolution, the process that informed the drafting of the resolution, and the final motions that will be required by each Planning Commission.
3. Public Comment Session (2 to 3 minutes per speaker): The public will be asked to provide:

*Enhancements to the Resolution that would better represent the consensus direction of the Joint Planning Commissions.*

### **Part II: Discussion (Facilitated by Staff)**

After public comment, the Planning Commissions will discuss items that should be added, modified, or subtracted from the list of modifications in the Resolution. Planning Commissioners will be asked to:

1. Identify any items to be added, enhanced or subtracted from the list of modifications in the Resolution
2. Discuss identified items that are important to the group and make changes to the list of modifications based on group consensus.

### **Part III: Certification**

With the list of modifications finalized, the Planning Commissioners will vote to adopt a Resolution Certifying the Illustration of Our Vision Chapter of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan as Part of the Comprehensive Master Plan for the Town of Jackson, Wyoming and Teton County, Wyoming.

## **RESOLUTION NO. 12-001**

### **A RESOLUTION CERTIFYING THE ILLUSTRATION OF OUR VISION CHAPTER OF THE JACKSON/TETON COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AS PART OF THE COMPREHENSIVE MASTER PLAN FOR THE TOWN OF JACKSON, WYOMING AND TETON COUNTY, WYOMING**

**WHEREAS**, on June 21<sup>st</sup>, 2007, the Mayor and Town Council of the Town of Jackson and the Teton County Board of Commissioners jointly agreed to update the 1994 Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan and entered into a contract for planning services outlining joint funding and support to develop an integrated plan for the future; and

**WHEREAS**, Wyoming Statutes §§ 15-1-503, 15-1-504, and 15-1-505 authorize the Town of Jackson Planning Commission to amend, adopt, and certify to the Mayor and Town Council a master plan for the physical development of the municipality; and Wyoming Statute § 18-5-202 authorizes the Teton County Planning and Zoning Commission to amend and certify to the Teton County Board of Commissioners a comprehensive plan for promoting the public health, safety, morals and general welfare of the incorporated area of Teton County; and

**WHEREAS**, on June 29<sup>th</sup>, 2011, the Mayor and Town Council of the Town of Jackson and the Teton County Board of Commissioners unanimously approved the Vision, Common Values and Achieving Our Vision Chapters of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan, dated June 2011, subject to legal review and subject to staff updating the appendices and references to the appendices; and

**WHEREAS**, the Mayor and Town Council of the Town of Jackson and the Teton County Board of Commissioners jointly agreed to consider adoption of the approved Vision, Common Values, and Achieving Our Vision Chapters of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan at such time as the Illustration of Our Vision Chapter of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan ("Illustration of Our Vision Chapter") was completed and approved; and

**WHEREAS**, on August 17<sup>th</sup>, 2011, the Mayor and Town Council of the Town of Jackson and the Teton County Board of Commissioners entered into a contract for planning services outlining joint funding and support to develop the Illustration of Our Vision Chapter; and

**WHEREAS**, pursuant to the authority set forth in Wyoming Statutes §§ 15-1-503, 15-1-504, 15-1-505, and 18-5-202, the Town of Jackson Planning Commission and the Teton County Planning and Zoning Commission have jointly prepared the Illustration of Our Vision Chapter; and

**WHEREAS**, the Illustration of Our Vision Chapter was prepared through a public process that included a kickoff public meeting, workshops throughout the community, a community open house, joint elected official and planning commission workshops, newspaper advertisements for all meetings, and an interactive website; and

**WHEREAS**, the joint meeting of the Town of Jackson Planning Commission and the Teton County Planning and Zoning Commission held on January 26, 2012 was advertised in the Jackson Hole

News and Guide on December 21, 2011 and this advertisement included the various means for citizens to review the plan and provide comments prior to the public hearing; and

**WHEREAS**, on January 26, 2012, the Town of Jackson Planning Commission and the Teton County Planning and Zoning Commission jointly conducted a public hearing pursuant to the Wyoming Statutes recited above, which hearing was continued to February 8, 2012;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Town of Jackson Planning Commission hereby amends the 1994 Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan and adopts and certifies to the Mayor and Town Council of the Town of Jackson the attached Illustration of Our Vision Chapter; and the Teton County Planning and Zoning Commission hereby amends the 1994 Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan and certifies to the Teton County Board of Commissioners said Illustration of Our Vision Chapter; which Illustration of Our Vision Chapter is comprised of the following components published December 5, 2011 subject to the following modifications and subject to legal review:

Illustration of Our Vision Component (Character District)		Modification
IV	Illustration of Our Vision	Edit to improve word choice and remove typos without changing the intent.
		Ensure concepts are referred to consistently throughout the Chapter (e.g. a “subarea” is always referred to as a “subarea”).
		Ensure Character Defining Features illustrations and pictures match text.
		Remove unnecessary phrases within sentences such as “in this area,” and “in this district.”
		Refine maps to be more legible and properly aligned.
		Clarify throughout Character Districts that realization of future character will respect private property rights.
		Provide greater continuity in Character Defining Features Maps by including features from adjacent Character Districts and consistently addressing features such as workforce housing.
		More directly link the description of future characteristics to achieving each Common Value.
		Ensure that a stated desire for workforce housing character does not imply a requirement for deed restriction upon resale.
		Ensure that yards, landscaping, and small footprints are encouraged for single-family, detached dwellings in Town.
		Focus Character District language on area specific goals; remove regulatory language and preference for certain implementation tools (e.g. house size limits).
I	Introduction	Reformat the introduction to more clearly state the function and interrelationship of the Character Districts, and their relationship to the Vision, Common Values, and Growth Management Plan.
I. Why	Why Illustrate the Vision	

Illustration of Our Vision Component (Character District)		Modification
I.How	How is the Vision Illustrated	Ensure the discussion of the focus of Rural Areas and Complete Neighborhoods in the opening paragraph is consistent with Principles 3.1 and 3.2 defining each classification.
		In the Complete Neighborhood + Rural Area Table: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indicate the classification of each district.</li> <li>• Add a legend explaining the full, half, and empty circles.</li> </ul>
		Ensure that the phrase, “most of the community would agree” in the Areas of Transition definition does not imply requirement of a referendum.
		Ensure that the definition of Areas of Conservation clearly conveys a goal of reducing development impacts to open space and wildlife habitat protection.
		Clarify the purpose of the transect as a continuum of neighborhood forms that depicts the relationship between the character defining patterns and intensities of the community.
		Revise the transect graphic to be more consistent with the Character Defining Features descriptions to ensure that the individual Neighborhood Forms add additional clarity to the description of each District’s character.
I.What	What Does the Illustration Address	In the table under the transect: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Label Size as “acres”</li> <li>• Include limited footprint of development along with limited house size under Special Considerations for Habitat/Scenic.</li> <li>• Remove implication that clustering incentives (e.g. PRD) would require a minimum site area of greater than 160 acres under Size for Clustering.</li> <li>• Ensure goal of improved wildlife habitat, open space and scenic protection is clear under Special Considerations for Clustering.</li> <li>• Include integrated transportation planning under Special Considerations for Clustering.</li> </ul>
		Under #2: Complete Neighborhood + Rural Table: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add the classification (Complete Neighborhood or Rural Area) as the table heading in each District.</li> <li>• Clarify the purpose of full, half, and empty circles as representing the presence, partial presence, or general absence of a characteristic in the District.</li> </ul>
		Delete the second “elements of” in #3: Existing + Future Characteristics text.
		Indicate the Common Value of each Policy Objective (#4) in each District.
		Associate Neighborhood Forms (#5) with individual subareas in each District and revise description to be consistent with transect description.
		Clarify the illustrative intent of the locations of the features shown on Character Defining Features (#6) maps.
		Add “is” between “map not” in #6: Character Defining Features Map text.

Illustration of Our Vision Component (Character District)		Modification
1	Town Square	Expand the Town Square Character District and the protected historic experience to the west one block with the northern extent of the expansion area being the buildings fronting Deloney Avenue.
		Limit buildings facing the Square to two stories; allow three stories elsewhere in the District.
		Add 4.2.f as a Policy Objective as it is specifically implemented within the District.
		Clarify the intent to consider temporary and permanent closure of streets for use by motorized vehicles.
		Clarify that closure of streets, parking lots, parks and other public spaces will be encouraged in order to promote community events.
1.1	Town Square	Clarify that underground parking is also an option in the District.
2	Town Commercial Core	Add a half-circle under Future Viable Wildlife Habitat + Connectivity to represent desired Flat Creek enhancement.
		Add 4.1.d as a Policy Objective as the District has four mixed-use subareas
		Add 6.2.b as a Policy Objective and discuss more explicitly in District text.
		Add 6.2.c as a Policy Objective and discuss more explicitly in District text.
		Add 6.3.a as a Policy Objective and discuss more explicitly in District text.
		Remove 6.3.e as a Policy Objective as it is a non-locational policy.
		Add 7.1.c as a Policy Objective as it is specifically implemented within the District.
		Remove 7.2.a as a Policy Objective as it is applicable communitywide.
		Add emphasis on reincorporating Flat Creek into the community.
		Clarify the role of Snow King Avenue as a major transportation corridor.
2.1	Snow King Resort	Clarify the size and scale of structures appropriate in the subarea instead of referring to them as, “much larger than those typically allowed in other areas of town.”
2.2	Snow King and South Cache Corridors	Replace “Center of the Arts” with “Center for the Arts.”
2.3	Downtown	Revise to reflect that this subarea should only be the starting point for a more detailed discussion of the Lodging Overlay boundary and the regulations on the type and size of lodging desired.
		Clarify that lodging is also allowed in the Town Square District.
		Elaborate on how development will be designed to enhance Flat Creek.
2.4	Public/Civic	Reword the last sentence to clarify the Character District would need to be amended.
2.5	North Cache Gateway	Add a desire for stepped-back design of three story structures to reduce the appearance of additional height.
		Ensure Flat Creek is identified as a recreational and public access amenity.



Illustration of Our Vision Component (Character District)		Modification
3	Town Residential Core	Remove 4.1.c as a Policy Objective as it is applicable Townwide.
		Add 4.3.a as a Policy Objective as the District has two stable neighborhoods.
		Add 4.3.b as a Policy Objective as the District has one transitional neighborhood.
		Remove 4.3.S.2 as a Policy Objective as it is a strategy not a policy.
		Add 7.1.c as a Policy Objective as it is specifically implemented within the District.
		Remove 7.2.a as a Policy Objective as it is applicable communitywide.
		Ensure the goal of quality connection of neighborhoods to parks is clear.
		Rewrite so that the end of the first paragraph and beginning of the second are not the same words.
3.1	East Jackson	Revise language from “pulling buildings to the street” to “pulling buildings toward the street.”
3.2	Core Residential	Revise to allow only 2 stories generally; and only allow 3 stories in specific cases with proper design.
		Revise to allow nonresidential use fronting Willow Street, similar to South Cache subarea.
		Ensure that the desire for reinvestment, redevelopment, and revitalization is clear.
3.3	Institutional Area	
3.4	Multi-family Area	
3.5	East Broadway Mixed Use	Move the subarea to District 2: Town Commercial Core as the subarea character is more consistent with the District 2 character.
		Clarify the desire for local convenience commercial in this subarea.

Illustration of Our Vision Component (Character District)		Modification
4	Mid Town	Clarify that the desire is to locate lodging downtown, but not restrict continuation of existing lodging in Mid-Town.
		Add 1.1.c as a Policy Objective as it is specifically implemented within the District.
		Add 4.1.d as a Policy Objective as the District has two mixed-use subareas.
		Add 4.3.a as a Policy Objective as the District has one stable neighborhood.
		Add 4.3.b as a Policy Objective as the District has one transitional neighborhood.
		Add 5.2.d as a Policy Objective and discuss more explicitly in District text.
		Add 5.3.b as a Policy Objective as it is specifically implemented within the District.
		Add 7.1.c as a Policy Objective as it is specifically implemented within the District.
		Remove 7.2.a as a Policy Objective as it is applicable communitywide.
		Add 7.2.d as a Policy Objective and ensure an upgrade to Snow King – Maple Way is addressed in the District text.
		Increase the emphasis on incorporating Flat Creek into the community.
		Clarify the desire for buildings to address the street without requiring all parking to be placed in the rear.
4.1	Highway Corridor	Revise the text and boundary of the subarea to allow four stories north of Broadway where it can be built into the hillside and encourage the design to be stepped-back.
		Clarify that office uses will also be allowed in the subarea.
		Address pedestrian crossing of Broadway where development exists, or will exist, on both side of the road.
		Clarify the desire for a transportation network that is convenient for locals, not auto-oriented.
		Clarify that setbacks and landscaping should be proportional to road width and provide screening; and that parking should be off-street in the rear.
		Emphasize the importance of wildlife issues on West Broadway.
4.2	Northern Hillside	Clarify that height should be limited to two stories.
4.3	Central	
4.4	Residential	
4.5	Karns Meadow	Include the connectivity goal of connecting Broadway to Snow King in the western portion of the subarea.

Illustration of Our Vision Component (Character District)		Modification
5	West Jackson	Add 4.1.b as a Policy Objective as it is specifically implemented within the District.
		Add 4.1.d as a Policy Objective as the District has two mixed-use subareas.
		Add 4.2.c as a Policy Objective as the District has two mixed-use subareas.
		Add 4.3.a as a Policy Objective as the District has one stable neighborhood.
		Add 4.3.b as a Policy Objective as the District has two transitional neighborhoods.
		Remove 5.2.b as a Policy Objective as it is applicable communitywide.
		Add 5.3.b as a Policy Objective as it is specifically implemented within the District.
		Add 6.2.b as a Policy Objective as it is specifically implemented within the District.
		Add 6.2.c as a Policy Objective as it is specifically implemented within the District.
		Add 7.1.c as a Policy Objective as it is specifically implemented within the District.
5.1	Highway Corridor	Add discussion of connectivity to the residential area as shown on map.
		Address the desire for consolidation of highway access points.
		Clarify the use of auto dealers as an example of a necessary single use.
5.2	Gregory Lane Area	Make language more consistent with subarea 7.1: South Park Business Park.
		Enhance livability language to discuss better integration of residents into the subarea through design.
		Clarify that only accessory residential use is desired as light industrial use is the priority.
5.3	South Park Loop Road	
5.4	School Campuses	Restate “improved alternative mode connectivity” in layman’s terms.
5.5	West Jackson Residential	Clarify the desire for a sense of ownership rather than ownership of units.
5.6	Northwest South Park	Revise to link the ability to develop the subarea to a Growth Management Program trigger, without precluding the opportunity for a project that provides meaningful permanent open space by clustering or transferring development into the subarea.
		Insert that if developed the subarea should include redundant streets (grid/alleys), small lots, and a small area of mixed-use; but that industrial is not appropriate.
		Clarify that a solution is needed to congestion on High School Road, but that a new East/West connector road is just one possible option.

Illustration of Our Vision Component (Character District)		Modification
6	Town Periphery	Remove 4.1.c as a Policy Objective as it is applicable Townwide.
		Remove 7.2.a as a Policy Objective as it is applicable communitywide.
		Remove the half-circle under Future Walkable Schools, Commercial + Recreation as no amenities are to be added.
		Add a half-circle under Future Abundance of Landscape Over Built Form as the current character is to be maintained.
		Clarify the desire for site design that increases wildlife permeability.
		Clarify that the District is a Complete Neighborhood and not a Rural Area because of its location in Town and relative density to other Rural Areas.
		Mention pathways where START and pedestrian travel are discussed in the introduction.
6.1	Low to Medium Density Neighborhoods	Address the steep slopes, avalanche terrain, and wildlife habitat that should influence design in the subarea.
		Focus on wildlife permeability as a goal rather than specific tools such as fence removal.
6.2	Upper Cache	Clarify wildlife permeability and character preservation purposes in relation to fencing and equestrian goals.
6.3	Snow King Slope	
7	South Highway 89	Replace 3.1.d with 3.2.b as a Policy Objective, as 3.2.b is more appropriate for an area suitable for nonresidential development.
		Remove 5.2.e as a Policy Objective as it is applicable communitywide.
		Remove 6.3.d as a Policy Objective as it is a non-locational policy.
		Remove half of the circle under Future Natural Scenic Vistas as scenic is not the priority of the entire District.
		Add a half-circle under Existing Limited, Detached Residential as it is true of one of the subareas.
		Clarify the desire for protection of wildlife habitat and permeability and open space within the context of the suitable development.
		Amend the second to last sentence to read, “Development and redevelopment will avoid crucial wildlife habitat and movement corridors on the hillsides as well as riparian areas.”
7.1	South Park Business Park	Revise the use discussion to remove reference to allowance for high-tech/R&D and prohibition of retail and office and focus only on the priority of light industrial use.
		Address the connection of Southern South Park (10.1) to the convenience commercial as discussed in the District 10: South Park.
		Address the implications of industrial mixed-use living for families.
		Clarify the desire for screening, but not at the detriment of the ability to develop light industrial use.
7.2	Hog Island Home Business	Clarify the intent to protect a scenic view along the highway through the subarea.

Illustration of Our Vision Component (Character District)		Modification
8	River Bottom	Remove 1.1.g as a Policy Objective as it is applicable communitywide.
		Add 3.1.c as a Policy Objective as the District is a Rural Area.
		Remove half of the circle under Future Natural Scenic Vistas as only part of the district meets the definition of scenic.
		Discuss “management” of river access in Existing + Future Desired Characteristics text similarly to how it is discussed in the subareas.
		Clarify that, “public and commercial access <u>to the levee</u> will be ...”
8.1	Solitude/John Dodge/ Tucker/Linn	Include consideration of incentives for reducing density and impacts to wildlife.
8.2	Large Parcels	
8.3	Canyon Corridor	Clarify the desire for conservation rather than subdivision. Ensure highway wildlife permeability and scenic goals are clear.
8.4	Hoback Junction	
9	County Valley	Add 3.1.c as a Policy Objective as the District is a Rural Area.
		Add Puzzle Face to the list of ranches in the District.
9.1	Jackson Hole Golf and Tennis	Clarify the desire for local convenience commercial within existing development if possible.
9.2	Agricultural Foreground	Address the desire to bury overhead power lines along Highway 22 if possible.
9.3	Nethercott/Wenzel/ 3 Creek/ Lower Melody	Clarify the desire for conservation rather than subdivision.
9.4	Gros Ventre Buttes	Clarify the desire for conservation rather than subdivision.
10	South Park	Add 3.1.c as a Policy Objective as the District is a Rural Area.
		Clarify the goal of directing development that does occur into a transition area or clustering it near existing development with the incorporation of permanent open space.
10.1	Southern South Park	
10.2	Central South Park	Clarify the goal of directing development that does occur into a transition area or clustering it near existing development with the incorporation of permanent open space.
11	Wilson	Remove 5.2.e as a Policy Objective as it is applicable communitywide.
		Remove 6.2.b as a Policy Objective as it is inconsistent with the District’s goals.
		Add 6.2.c as a Policy Objective as it is specifically implemented within the District.
		Clarify that Wilson should serve residents and people otherwise passing through Wilson, not attract trips as a destination commercial center.
11.1	Wilson Commercial Core	
11.2	Wilson Townsite	Clarify that accessory residential units are part of the allowable character.
11.3	Wilson Meadows	
11.4	South Wilson	Clarify that the desired density is one unit per three acres or less as is the case today.

Illustration of Our Vision Component (Character District)		Modification
12	Aspens/Pines	Add 5.2.d as a Policy Objective and discuss more explicitly in District text. Add 6.2.c as a Policy Objective and discuss more explicitly in District text.
12.1	Aspens/Pines Commercial Core	Clarify illustration to better indicate which direction is north.
12.2	390 Residential Core	Reclassify as a Stable area with a similar description to subarea 12.4, calling for preservation of the existing residential pattern.
12.3	Aspens/Pines Residential	
12.4	390 Residential South	Clarify that the stable character is that of 1 acre or greater lot size.
13	Teton Village	Revise to allow for more potential housing without increasing the Village footprint. Additional units should be designed with the goal of year-round residency, address transportation issues, and result in direction of development out of rural areas.
		Emphasize the desire for combination and coordination of the Master Plans into a comprehensive Village plan with the goal of creating a functioning, sustainable resort community.
		Acknowledge that Master Plan conversations will reopen discussion of commercial allowances.
		Include a general desire for wildlife permeability in the District.
		Add 5.2.d as a Policy Objective and discuss more explicitly in District text.
		Add 6.3.a as a Policy Objective as it is specifically implemented within the District.
		Add a half-circle under Existing Walkable Schools, Commercial + Recreation as some areas are within walking distance of amenities.
		Add additional discussion of the resort character of the District.
13.1	Teton Village Commercial Core	
13.2	Teton Village Residential Core	Include allowance for more potential housing consistent with the modified future desired character for the District.
13.3	Teton Village Single Family	Include allowance for more potential housing consistent with the modified future desired character for the District.
14	Alta	Add 1.1.b as a Policy Objective as it is specifically implemented within the District.
		Add 3.1.c as a Policy Objective as the District is a Rural Area.
		Add 5.3.b as a Policy Objective as it is specifically implemented within the District.
		Remove 6.3.d as a Policy Objective as it is a non-locational policy.
		Replace 7.2.c with 7.3.a as a Policy Objective as 7.3.a is more appropriate as a Policy Objective for a specific roadway connection project.
14.1	Alta Farmland	
14.2	Alta Core	In the third sentence change the second “character” to “lots.”
14.3	Grand Targhee Resort	Clarify that the Targhee Master Plan should not expand.

Illustration of Our Vision Component (Character District)		Modification
15	County Periphery	Focus character discussion on reducing impacts and maintaining outlying communities.
		Add 1.2.a as a Policy Objective as it is specifically implemented within the District.
		Add 3.1.c as a Policy Objective as the District is a Rural Area.
		Add 3.5.a as a Policy Objective and discuss more explicitly in District text.
		Add 5.3.b as a Policy Objective and discuss in new Buffalo Valley subarea text.
		Remove 6.3.e as a Policy Objective as it is a non-locational policy.
		Ensure the prioritization of conservation is clear.
		Address open space, scenic and habitat preservation as goals not negative impacts of development.
15.1	Large Outlying Parcels	Clarify the desire for on-site renewable energy.
15.2	Buffalo Valley Residential/ Game Creek/South Fall Creek	Clarify the desire for conservation rather than subdivision.
		Replace the desire to “restore” wildlife permeability with a desire to “enhance.”
15.3	Buffalo Valley Highway Ranches	Recognize Buffalo Valley as a separate subarea emphasizing gateway character and scenic value and encouraging convenience commercial and maintenance of existing character.
15.4	Kelly	Delete reference to START service to Kelly as a priority.
		Ensure it is clear that live/work is not discouraged.

THIS RESOLUTION BEING PRESENTED, READ, AND ADOPTED ON THIS 8<sup>th</sup> DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2012.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Tyler Sinclair, Secretary, Town of Jackson Planning Commission

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark Newcomb, Chairman, Teton County Planning and Zoning Commission



## Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan Character Districts Summary: January 26, 2012 Joint Planning Commission Hearing

### Goal of the Meeting:

Certify the Illustration of Our Vision Chapter to be included in the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan with a list of modifications made up of:

- Direction from the 1/11 and 1/12 workshops
- Green changes identified by the elected officials, planning commissioners, and staff
- Additional Changes necessary to certify the chapter

### Part I: Opening and Public Comment (Chairmen) 2 hours

1. Welcome and Opening Remarks from the Planning Commission Chairs.
2. Staff Presentation: Staff briefly outlined the approved Plan's direction, the character district process, and the contents of the draft Illustration of Our Vision. Staff presented the key direction from the Town Council/Town Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners/County Planning Commission workshops held January 11 and 12, 2012. Staff identified the items that needed further Planning Commission discussion.
3. Public Comment Session: The public was asked to provide enhancements to the Character Districts that would better meet the Common Values contained in the approved Plan; with all other comments to be provided in writing to staff. Twenty (20) members of the public provided comment.

### Part II: Discussion (Facilitator) 2.5 hours

Following public comment, the Planning Commissions discussed items that should be added or subtracted from the draft "Joint Planning Commission Certified Character District Modifications." Direction from the 1/11 and 1/12 workshops and green changes consistent with the intent of the draft were the starting point for the final list. Proposed red changes that were not discussed at either workshop, proposed green changes that are unnecessary or addressed in another way, and blue changes will not be a part of the final list unless they were added through this exercise. Planning Commissioners were asked to:

1. Identify any items to be added to or subtracted from the draft "Joint Planning Commission Certified Character District Modifications"
2. Discuss identified items individually and provide direction to add, subtract, or replace the direction on the draft "Joint Planning Commission Certified Character District Modifications" based on group consensus.

The below table illustrates the items identified and the consensus direction given by the Joint Planning Commissioners on each item. The identified items are organized in order of their priority to the Joint Planning Commissions and color coded to indicate how the item was addressed in the 1/11 and 1/12 workshops. The consensus direction is stated as direction toward the draft Illustration of Our Vision and where appropriate will replace the direction from the 1/11 and 1/12 workshops in the "Joint Planning Commission Certified Character District Modifications."

Items	Item identified for discussion by one or more Planning Commissioner
	Item revisits a discussion/direction from 1/11 and/or 1/12
	Item clarifies a discussion/direction from 1/11 and/or 1/12
	Item was not discussed on 1/11 or 1/12

Direction	Joint Planning Commission consensus direction
	Direction to modify the content of the draft Character Districts
	Direction to clarify or enhance the draft Character Districts within the original intent
	No direction given, or direction given to make no change



Identified Items		District	Consensus Direction
Aspens/Pines Transition Areas	12.1	Aspens/Pines Commercial Core	No change to draft Districts.
	12.2	390 Residential Core	Reclassify subarea as Stable with a similar description to subarea 12.4, calling for a preservation of the residential pattern allowed today.
Height in Town	1	Town Square	Limit buildings fronting the Square to two stories; allow three stories in remainder of the District.
	2.1	Snow King Resort	No change to draft Districts. Height governed by Master Plan.
	2.2	Snow King and South Cache Corridors	No change to draft Districts. Limit to two stories.
	2.3	Downtown	No change to draft Districts. Allow three stories.
	2.5	North Cache Gateway	Allow three stories and encourage a step back.
	4.1	Highway Corridor	Allow four stories north of Broadway where it can be built into the hillside and encourage the fourth story to be stepped back.
	4.2	Northern Hillside	Clarify that height should be limited to two stories in the area above the hillside area appropriate for four stories.
Remove discussion of number of stories		Overall	No change to draft Districts.
Tie the Common Values into to the Character Districts	What	What Does the Illustration Address	Classify Policy Objectives by Common Value in each District.
		Overall	More directly link the future characteristics to achieving each Common Value.
Set policy of striving to reduce buildout		Overall	No change to draft Districts. Leave policy as stated – a goal of not more than a rough doubling tied to preservation of our common values.
Town Square Boundary	1	Town Square	Expand the Town Square Character District to include the Wort and surrounding areas.
South Park	5.6	Northwest South Park	Link ability to develop subarea to a Growth Management Plan trigger, but do not preclude the opportunity for meaningful permanent conservation of open space through a clustered development. (Do not include workforce housing or “other community benefits” as exempt from the link to the GMP trigger.)
Encouragement of high-tech/R&D	7.1	South Park Business Park	Remove discussion of encouraging or allowing high-tech/R&D and prohibiting retail and office and focus discussion on light industrial as the primary use.
PRD/TDR reference in Districts	How	How is the Vision Illustrated	No change to draft Districts. Strike implication in chart that PRDs would only be applicable on properties greater than 160 acres – leave those specifics to LDRs.
Implied requirements from use of term “Workforce Housing”		Overall	No consensus reached on changing how “workforce housing” is used in the Character Districts.

Identified Items	District		Consensus Direction
Remove reference to northwest South Park E/W connector	5.6	Northwest South Park	No discussion occurred, two Planning Commissioners wanted to discuss.
Move the Rodeo Grounds to South Park	3.3	Institutional Area	No discussion occurred, two Planning Commissioners wanted to discuss.
Define Western Character		Overall	No discussion occurred, two Planning Commissioners wanted to discuss.
Downzoning		Overall	No discussion following staff clarification that the Plan doesn't call for downzoning, it aspires to reduce development in resource areas using a variety of tools.
Connecting the Town/County		Overall	No discussion following staff clarification that the Vision, Policies, and Growth Management Program link all Character Districts.
Infrastructure costs		Overall	No discussion following staff clarification that Section 8 of the Common Values addresses infrastructure.
Too much detail in Districts (ie house size, lot size)		Overall	No discussion following staff clarification of existing direction is to focus Character Districts on area specific goals rather than possible tools.
Implementation Plan		Overall	No discussion following staff clarification that an Implementation Plan will be developed and adopted coincident with adoption of the Plan.

### Part III: Certification (Chairmen)

Following their discussion and direction on the "Joint Planning Commission Certified Character District Modifications" each Planning Commission continued the meeting to 5:00pm, February 8, 2012 in the Grandview Lodge of Snow King Resort. At the continued meeting the Joint Planning Commissions will consider adoption of a Resolution Certifying the Illustration of Our Vision Chapter of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan as Part of the Comprehensive Master Plan for the Town of Jackson, Wyoming and Teton County, Wyoming subject to a final list of modifications.

# Public Comment on draft Character Districts (1/20/12 - 1:30 pm 2/3/12)

## 1: Town Square

Date	Name	Comment
1/24/2012	, Design Review Committ	How will the definition of “Western character’ be determined? As a committee we are concerned about the standards with which a regulation to commit to a western character will be identified. Is there the possibility to include a limited amount of residential, mixed use in this model as exemplified by Davies Reid? This will make the Town Square more vital to our community and more regularly occupied with amenities that support a neighborhood.

## 2: Town Commercial Core

Date	Name	Comment
2/1/2012	Sibson, Barry Interested Public	<p>After four years of participation in the Comprehensive Plan process, I was quite pleased with the "Character District" plan for South Park. The key aspect of the SP plan was the preservation of the current open space. I am concerned, however, about the type of development and added population in the Northwest corner of the area and the concept of new roads connecting Melody Ranch, Rafter J and South Park Ranches.</p> <p>With the change of direction for the "Pines/Aspens" district, I am very concerned that there might be some thoughts of change in the South Park district. I believe that if any additional development were inserted in the SP district that it would be very detrimental to the South Park community, to wildlife movement and to the visual aspects of the approach to town.</p> <p>Important to me are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The open space in SP being permanently preserved, not just a zoning issue that could be changed in the future. Any development in SP should be tied contactually to preservation of open space in SP.</li><li>A corridor for wildlife movement down the west side of SP. I live next to Bob Lucas's ranch and have frequently seen and heard elk migrating through his ranch. I believe that they come down through the Sherr Thoss property and not down Flat Creek.</li><li>Maintenance of the rural view across SP from South 89 to the western mountains.</li><li>Incentives for the SP ranchers to continue ranching.</li><li>No additive development rights to those already existing.</li><li>A decrease in allowable commercial development.</li><li>Maintenance of a walkable town with a human scale to all development. Too many of the already developed 3 story buildings in town do not have that scale and are overwhelming. A step back of the third story should be required.</li></ul> <p>I appreciate the fact that the proposed plan has been scaled down to be more in keeping with the desires of the community, but I DO NOT want South Park to become the default area for growth.</p>
1/24/2012	, Design Review Committ	<p>2.3 Downtown: The vision of this district is strong and appropriate, and the integration of lodging with residential uses is a very good objective that would boost town's vitality. Completing the strong link between Snow King, the Center for the Arts and Town Square is an important priority. Projects should be supported that add to the vitality of this linkage. A concern to be noted is the proposed expansion of the Lodging Overlay to the 5-way. We hear a lot of complaints at DRC meetings from lodging owners about the hardships of having hotel rooms next to busy roads - thus leading oftentimes to very non-urban proposals. The parking requirements also make this an additional challenge. We would like to avoid seeing suburban development patterns in this area.</p> <p>2.5 North Cache Gateway: The character of a 'key gateway' needs to be more precisely determined and explained in a manner that stresses the equality of importance to that of the Flat Creek redevelopment. It may need to be a more comprehensive description than "should take the form of 2/3 story buildings that address the North Cache and Flat Creek corridor."</p>

## 4: Mid-Town

Date	Name	Comment
2/1/2012	Sibson, Barry Interested Public	<p>After four years of participation in the Comprehensive Plan process, I was quite pleased with the "Character District" plan for South Park. The key aspect of the SP plan was the preservation of the current open space. I am concerned, however, about the type of development and added population in the Northwest corner of the area and the concept of new roads connecting Melody Ranch, Rafter J and South Park Ranches.</p> <p>With the change of direction for the "Pines/Aspens" district, I am very concerned that there might be some thoughts of change in the South Park district. I believe that if any additional development were inserted in the SP district that it would be very detrimental to the South Park community, to wildlife movement and to the visual aspects of the approach to town.</p> <p>Important to me are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The open space in SP being permanently preserved, not just a zoning issue that could be changed in the future. Any development in SP should be tied contactually to preservation of open space in SP.</li><li>A corridor for wildlife movement down the west side of SP. I live next to Bob Lucas's ranch and have frequently seen and heard elk migrating through his ranch. I believe that they come down through the Sherr Thoss property and not down Flat Creek.</li><li>Maintenance of the rural view across SP from South 89 to the western mountains.</li><li>Incentives for the SP ranchers to continue ranching.</li><li>No additive development rights to those already existing.</li><li>A decrease in allowable commercial development.</li><li>Maintenance of a walkable town with a human scale to all development. Too many of the already developed 3 story buildings in town do not have that scale and are overwhelming. A step back of the third story should be required.</li></ul> <p>I appreciate the fact that the proposed plan has been scaled down to be more in keeping with the desires of the community, but I DO NOT want South Park to become the default area for growth.</p>

## 5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
2/2/2012	Dunlap, Dave Interested Public	<p>I am opposed to using the South Park area as a dumping ground for the rest of the county. Adding anywhere near 1000 homes is shortsighted and voids any concern for wildlife and responsible growth.</p> <p>I have been participating for four plus years in this process – I expect you to UPHOLD the map descriptions that now affirm the scenic, wildlife, wildlife connectivity and ranching heritage values of ALL of South Park (called district 10).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• We do not want additive growth from anywhere in the valley when we already have 50-70 years of growth already entitled – a rough doubling of our built environment on the ground today!</li><li>• Any development in Northwest South Park needs to be firmly linked to the large rural land owner stewards in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands . We do not want unwanted density dumped into South Park from Alta, Buffalo Valley or anywhere else in the valley.</li></ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o The language in NW South Park (sub-area 5.6) needs to be STRICTLY TIED to the minimum amount of growth needed in order to help our rural land owners achieve permanent conservation of their other South Park lands.</li><li>o Without this linkage – we do not support any additional density anywhere in our region – as we do not need any more development, and the sole reason for consideration of the NW corner is to achieve permanent conservation of these land owners other lands that dominate South Park.</li><li>o The NW corner of South Park should NOT be developed before the substantial in-fill potential in Town is completed.</li><li>o If some development in this NW corner is needed to permanently conserve South Park - then it should REFLECT the mix and density of housing of Cottonwood Park and NOT have any commercial, mixed use or light industrial in NW South Park.</li></ul>

## 5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
2/2/2012	Campbell, Leon G. Interested Public	<p>For four long years, elected officials and the Jackson Community have been working on the draft Comprehensive Plan which, when completed, will establish the future character of the Jackson Hole Valley for generations. It has been a long and exhaustive process which remains unfinished yet is being scheduled for completion early this year.</p> <p>It is ironic, despite the long hours devoted to such an important document, that the draft today is hardly comprehensive in the sense that maximum densities are still not established and thus, residential areas including Jackson, the Aspens, South Park and Teton Village fear that additional density from the more remote reaches of the County will be visited upon them in the new Plan, robbing them of their cohesion and unique character. These neighborhoods are in competition with each other to remain relatively rural and open.</p> <p>The Plan must mandate that infill development first be approved in Jackson, but only to a point where the town is able to preserve its Western frontier character as the "Last Best Place" in a rapidly urbanizing nation. However, if growth limits are established for Jackson, it is also necessary to limit the growth in the above neighborhoods at the amount entitled in 1994 which presently allows doubling of the built environment! For elected officials to permit additive growth in these several residential areas in the new Plan is madness. Additional densities can be left to future generations if the situation so dictates well into the future.</p> <p>In the South Park neighborhood, as an example, good planning would dictate that High School Road, which bisects the Northwest corridor of this neighborhood, remain rural to encourage walking and bicycling and minimizing automobile traffic. If development of the northwest quadrant of South Park results in residential growth in view of 1,000 homes it would exceed the size of Cottonwood Park, Rafter J and Melody Ranch neighborhoods combined!</p> <p>Moreover, any density approvals in northwest South Park must be linked to and contingent upon large landowners and the Jackson Hole Land Trust securing permanent conservation easements on the southerly part of South Park which not only functions as a scenic gateway to Jackson but an important wildlife corridor as well.</p> <p>A truly Comprehensive Plan, which has the primary objective of keeping rural, more distant and detached parts of the County, hardly is intended to accept growth from other parts of the Valley such as Alta and Buffalo Valley, at Jackson's expense nor to encourage additional commercial, industrial or mixed-use projects which additive density would demand.</p> <p>Density maximums must be established in the Plan so that growth is sequentially established in Jackson and its several residential communities consistent with their historical character. This is the key component of the Plan that the public has demanded of elected officials for four years and which is still not clarified in the latest draft. The community has spoken plainly that it does not wish additive growth. Nor does it have the funds or inclination to pay infrastructural costs of such growth. If elected officials recognize this fact and institutionalize it with growth limits and density maximums it will become abundantly clear that Jackson has 'men who match our mountains' who have served this community faithfully and well.</p>

## 5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
2/2/2012	Harvey, Ann Interested Public	<p>I am writing once again to comment on the seemingly endless comprehensive plan process. The bottom line, I think, is that you need to ensure that the plan lives up to its lofty ideals of protecting wildlife, habitat, scenery, and the other values that define Jackson Hole. You do not do this by adding more growth, whether it's in Wilson, the Aspens, South Park, or anywhere else in the valley. The more growth the plan allows, the more fragmented and degraded wildlife habitat becomes, and the more Jackson Hole resembles all the other places where humans dominate the landscape. Please stop thinking in terms of nodes, or spots, or whatever other cancerous terms describe additive growth in Jackson Hole. We do not want or need a plan that calls for more growth. It's hard to imagine what Jackson Hole will be like with the doubling in growth that's already allowed--how can you possibly think that it's your duty to encourage even more?</p> <p>When will specific mechanisms for decreasing development in rural areas, and permanently preserving open space, be revealed to the public? Learning from the newspaper that there's a lot of "flexibility" in how 2000 potential units will be shifted from rural areas to denser areas does little to inspire confidence that this is anything more than fantasy. It's a laudable ideal to concentrate growth in the town of Jackson and decrease it in the rural parts of the valley, but until the second part of the equation is dealt with, you shouldn't be even considering additive growth anywhere in the County. After 4 years of planning, shouldn't the means of decreasing density be figured out? It's easy to allow more growth and hard to preserve open space, but taking the path of least resistance is not exactly good planning.</p> <p>I'm glad to see that the current version of the plan calls for preserving much of South Park instead of making the whole thing a density dumping ground. Please stick to this. And if any increase in density is approved for the Northwest corner, it must be clearly tied to decreasing density and permanent open space protection throughout the rural areas of South Park. The map descriptions should affirm this and be consistent with the plan language. No density increase should be directed to South Park until the Town has reached its infill potential. And no commercial development should be allowed in South Park.</p> <p>I am also entirely supportive of the Village Road residents who object to adding growth to the Aspens area. It just doesn't make sense to do that, given transportation and infrastructure issues, as well as wildlife values in that part of the valley.</p>
2/2/2012	Vito, Kristin Interested Public	<p>For four years, community members have consistently asked for one thing in the comprehensive plan--keep the character of South Park rural. The sole reason for any density increase in NW South Park should be for permanently protecting open space in the remainder of South Park. Please note this community request in the appropriate map descriptions.</p>
2/1/2012	Coelho, Katherine and Interested Public	<p>In regards to the growth plan, we need to permanently conserve the large rural ranches in the NW area of South Park. These ranches help make Jackson Hole one of the most beautiful areas in the U.S. Since the majority of our economy is tourism, it is of them up most importance to preserve the beauty of the area. If it becomes necessary for some small development of this area to help the ranchers conserve the rest of their property then the development should be only in the NW corner and in the same density and character as its neighbor Cottonwood Park. As to any other increase in density in South Park it is totally unnecessary as we have 50-70 years of lands of entitled growth all ready planned for. No leep froging - in fill must be done first.</p> <p>We also must preserve the linkage for the wild life. In all the meetings I have attended the audience has said that the wild life of Jackson Hole is one of its most important attributes for residents and visitor alike.</p> <p>Lets keep Jackson as what it is know for; wilderness, wild life and the old West.</p>



## 5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
2/1/2012	Dawson, Ted Interested Public	<p>Please protect the south corridor and entrance into our Valley!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• We do not want additive growth from anywhere in the valley when we already have 50-70 years of growth already entitled – a rough doubling of our built environment on the ground today!</li><li>• Any development in Northwest South Park needs to be firmly linked to the large rural land owner stewards in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands – period. We do not want unwanted density dumped into South Park from Alta, Buffalo Valley or anywhere else in the valley.<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o The language in NW South Park (sub-area 5.6) needs to be STRICTLY TIED to the minimum amount of growth needed in order to help our rural land owners achieve permanent conservation of their other South Park lands.</li><li>o Without this linkage – we do not support any additional density anywhere in our region – as we do not need any more development, and the sole reason for consideration of the NW corner is to achieve permanent conservation of these land owners other lands that dominate South Park.</li><li>o The NW corner of South Park should NOT be developed before the substantial in-fill potential in Town is completed.</li><li>o If some development in this NW corner is needed to permanently conserve South Park - then it should REFLECT the mix and density of housing of Cottonwood Park and NOT have any commercial, mixed use or light industrial in NW South Park.</li></ul></li></ul> <p>The guests to southern entrance of our Valley should not be met with a whole lot of development and really impacting our animal corridors!</p>
1/31/2012	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	<p>When residents of the Aspens, Westbank and other areas say they don't want to be targeted for growth, I support their concerns for sprawl and over development 100%. Being from Cottonwood Park we too have the same concerns about green field development and traffic congestion, especially on High School Road. Throughout the Comprehensive plan process, residents of Cottonwood Park have demanded that there should be no dumping of additive growth anywhere in the valley. The focus for preserving open space should come first. Then town infill should come next.</p> <p>Northwest South Park should not be the dumping ground for the valley's growth problems. The only clustered development that should be transferred to NW South Park is the minimal development rights from the South Park area itself by working with South Park's large land owners and the Land Trust using the proper incentive tools, to permanently retire the desired open space there.</p> <p>To think that dumping town density growth into the North West corner of South Park will protect other areas like the Aspens and the Westbank from growth is a fantasy. We can't afford additive growth anywhere in the valley when we have 50-70 years of growth already entitled. We must not rely on up zoning NW South Park and down zoning other areas. All it takes is a simple vote in the future to change it. We will only end up with additive growth on top of the already entitled growth without solving the problem the Aspens and other areas are worried about. It will be too late then. South Park will become a sprawling unwelcome place to live.</p> <p>We will lose the great middle class family neighborhoods to industrial traffic and unsafe streets around the schools. Then, after South Park is ruined, the Aspens and other areas of the valley will be once again, targeted, because we didn't have permanent protection of sensitive areas, we didn't have a plan with real numbers, we didn't have a plan that stated any density increase should be balanced with density decrease, we didn't have a plan that followed through with town infill first, we didn't have a plan that said no to zoning changes that can be easily reversed at the whim of whoever is in office.</p> <p>I know there will be a neighborhood across from us someday. It should be complimentary to Cottonwood Park at a similar density to Rangeview Park with open space along High School Road. High School Road should be a residential road to encourage walking and biking. There should be no industrial or commercial development along High School Road or in the NW corner. It will end up a failing; congested road that not even a connector road will help unless we only allow a small residential neighborhood in the NW corner. Being from Cottonwood Park I could easily say no growth in NW South Park. Put it in the Aspens, put in the Westbank. I won't, because they too are great neighborhoods that deserve protection of their rural character and small neighborhood atmosphere. Cottonwood Park and the neighborhoods around High School Road should not be excluded from that same protection.</p>

## 5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
1/30/2012	Rhea, Rebecca Interested Public	<p>I have owned a home in Single Tree Ranch Subdivision for the past 7 years and lived in many different places in Jackson Hole since 1978. For more than 3 decades I have witnessed many failed planning efforts in Jackson Hole. It seems like the developers always win. I think it is finally time to set reasonable growth limits and once and for all to protect neighborhoods so the quality of life, social, scenic and wildlife values that make Jackson Hole a desirable place to live, work, and vacation are not sacrificed. I believe it is important to keep population growth and development at reasonable levels so there is adequate infrastructure. Infrastructure needs must be able to be met within the current and projected tax revenues.</p> <p>I have a particular interest in District 10 (South Park) where I live. This district is significant habitat for wildlife and is particularly important for migrating elk and wintering moose. I have personally observed more than 100 elk at a time spend several weeks in the ranch land adjacent to my house, observed elk in my backyard and migrating through my neighborhood. I frequently see moose, coyotes, fox, bald eagles, and osprey from my house. Trumpeter swans, Canada geese, Great Blue Herons, numerous other birds and mammals live in or pass through South Park.</p> <p>I have been participating in the latest comprehensive plan effort for the past four years. I strongly believe that it is not appropriate to increase the density of South Park is a trade off for reducing density elsewhere. South Park has already been developed to a level that should not be exceeded after buildout of existing lots is complete.</p> <p>Sub-area 5.6 should be strictly tied to the minimum amount of growth so there can be permanent conservation of the large rural landowners other South Park Lands. Development of this area should complement the existing development there, particularly the three school campuses.</p> <p>The South Park Loop road cannot handle increased traffic without being widened which would destroy its rural character and recreational values.</p> <p>This planning effort needs to be finally completed so that the time and energy of elected officials and landowners can be better spent on preserving what is best about Jackson Hole and meeting the other challenges of the future.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of my position on this matter.</p>
1/30/2012	Salter, Andy Interested Public	<p>I am a resident of South Park, I have been closely following your efforts over the past four years to revise the Comprehensive Plan and I have written you previously to express my views.</p> <p>PLEASE UPHOLD the map descriptions that now affirm the scenic, wildlife, wildlife connectivity and ranching heritage values of ALL of South Park (district 10).</p> <p>Please do not saddle South Park with additive growth from anywhere in the valley when we already have 50-70 years of growth already entitled – a rough doubling of our built environment on the ground today!</p> <p>Any development in Northwest South Park needs to be firmly linked to the large rural land owner stewards in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands – period. Unwanted density should NOT be dumped into South Park from Alta, Buffalo Valley or anywhere else in the valley.</p> <p>The language in NW South Park (sub-area 5.6) needs to be STRICTLY TIED to the minimum amount of growth needed in order to help our rural land owners achieve permanent conservation of their other South Park lands.</p> <p>oWithout this linkage – I do not support any additional density anywhere in our region – as we do not need any more development in South Park, and the sole reason for consideration of development in the NW corner is to achieve permanent conservation of the balance of the lands in South Park.</p> <p>oThe NW corner of South Park should NOT be developed before the substantial in-fill potential in Town is completed.</p> <p>oIf some development in this NW corner is needed to permanently conserve South Park - then it should REFLECT the mix and density of housing of Cottonwood Park and NOT have any commercial, mixed use or light industrial in NW South Park.</p> <p>Much progress has been made during the course of your deliberations to protect South Park, its vistas and its wildlife migration routes and I sincerely appreciate your efforts in that regard. Please remain steadfast in your commitment to protect our beautiful portion of the valley.</p>

## 5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
1/30/2012	Van Gelder, Bill Interested Public	<p>With much frustration it has been brought to my attention that South Park is again back on the table for additional unrestricted density.</p> <p>I feel frustrated as over the course of this very long, drawn out process, it has been made consistently clear by the community by that south park should not be the place for unrestricted development in the new comprehensive plan. Now it appears, at the very last minute, the language previously agreed to preserving the rural nature and scenic value of South Park is going to be significantly weakened.</p> <p>I am not opposed to developing of South Park, and feel that north western south park is appropriate for higher density, however I STRONGLY urge this upzoning of northwest south park needs to be tied to the minimum amount of growth needed in order to help the rural land owners of south park achieve permanent conservation of their lands. Without this linkage I do not support any additional density in South Park, and I do not support this upzoning of North West South Park until ALL of the in Town potential infill is created. Furthermore if the development of NW south park is needed, it should be residential in nature (similar to Cottonwood Park), not commercial or industrial. We don't need town and south park to morph into a mini metropolis of urban sprawl seen from Colorado Springs to Fort Collins.</p>
1/30/2012	Balogh, Holly Interested Public	<p>I am a resident of Melody Ranch where my family has lived for the past 11(!) years. As a concerned citizen about growth and most importantly about the wildlife and wild lands in this region, I wanted to provide some comments about the planning process.</p> <p>I took time out of my schedule to attend one of the mapping and planning workshops in Rafter J back in October. Prior to that, I had participated in other planning discussions over the past several years. From these discussions, I expect that the commission will uphold the descriptions that were discussed and commented on for all of South Park – district 10. It was very clear that the majority of residents at the mapping discussion holds scenic, wildlife, and wildlife connectivity as sacred and fully expects that these values will be addressed and not compromised in the final plans.</p> <p>It is extremely important to me that there is no additional growth placed in the valley when we already have 50 plus year of growth already entitled. It is also extremely important to me that development in Northwest South Park be linked to the large rural land owner steward in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands. Without this linkage the entirety of South Park could be developed – completely destroying the values we all hold so dear.</p> <p>Moreover, I think it extremely important that development be completed in town and any potential development be finished their before expansion into other rural Teton county areas. If we do develop part of the NW corner of South Park, let's be smart. Let's develop it like Cottonwood or Indian Trails and not destroy the residential areas with commercial or other mixed use that makes parts of Town, and areas behind Smiths look like a total junk show from any outsider's observations.</p> <p>I'd like to remind you about our wildlife. We must make these steps to protect our animals who share our space. We choose to live here and want to keep our wildlife alive. Providing them room to roam is critical to their long term survival. This month alone I have had two different mom and baby moose sets, bald eagle, fox, and trumpeter swans in my back yard. Help me help them by protecting this crucial.</p> <p>Thank you very much for listening. Please feel free to contact me for further discussion.</p>

## 5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
1/30/2012	Gammer, Michele Interested Public	<p>I write to you as a resident of South Park. I have been attending meetings and following developments on the Comprehensive Plan over the past four years. I have written to you previously to share my viewpoint.</p> <p>I respectfully urge that you UPHOLD the map descriptions that now affirm the scenic, wildlife, wildlife connectivity and ranching heritage values of ALL of South Park (district 10).</p> <p>Please do not burden South Park with additive growth from anywhere in the valley when we already have 50-70 years of growth already entitled – a rough doubling of our built environment on the ground today!</p> <p>In addition, I request that any development in Northwest South Park be firmly linked to the large rural land owner stewards in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands – period. Unwanted density should NOT be dumped into South Park from Alta, Buffalo Valley or anywhere else in the valley.</p> <p>The language in NW South Park (sub-area 5.6) needs to be STRICTLY TIED to the minimum amount of growth needed in order to help our rural land owners achieve permanent conservation of their other South Park lands.</p> <p>oWithout this linkage – I do not support any additional density anywhere in our region – as we do not need any more development in South Park, and the sole reason for consideration of development in the NW corner is to achieve permanent conservation of the balance of the lands in South Park.</p> <p>oThe NW corner of South Park should NOT be developed before the substantial in-fill potential in Town is completed.</p> <p>oIf some development in this NW corner is needed to permanently conserve South Park - then it should REFLECT the mix and density of housing of Cottonwood Park and NOT have any commercial, mixed use or light industrial in NW South Park.</p> <p>To date, much progress has been made during the course of your deliberations to protect South Park, its vistas and its wildlife migration routes and I sincerely appreciate your efforts in that regard. Please remain steadfast in your commitment to protect our beautiful portion of the valley.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my input.</p>

## 5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
1/28/2012	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	<p>Outcomes related to PRD, District's 5.6 and 10 from Thursday's meeting.</p> <p>I hope to see some clarification on several of these decisions before the staff report - not only by the joint planning commission meeting on Thursday but also the County meeting on January 12 - as I do not believe you have captured the strong intent on some of these decisions – especially on the intent of 5.6 and its linkage to 10.1 and 10.2.</p> <p>So here is what I heard from the joint planning commission meeting (plus some additional notes in a few areas from the joint electeds/planning commissions meetings of the County on January 12 and Town on January 11):</p> <p>PRD and clustering tools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•PRD and clustering options were re-affirmed Thursday as critical to large land owner options. That will be incorporated into the plan body more clearly.</li><li>•The direct reference in the tables of clustering – thus PRD option on properties only at 160 acres and above – was removed Thursday. Everything from 35 acres up should have clustering incentives.</li></ul> <p>Area 5.6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•Area 5.6 — now a clear direct link to these two owner's other properties in 10.2 and also district 9 (Snake River bottom properties below Shooting Iron).</li><li>•Clarifying the intent of 5.6 is to use the PRD and non-contiguous PRD (with these land owners disconnected other properties along the Snake River) to achieve permanent open space throughout South Park - and other rural areas if a TDR tool is ever successful.</li><li>oThis is the key point also confirmed by the County Commissioners – which has yet to be made clear. I expect language that shows the clear linkage here as both bodies where clear in their direction. You can leave an opening to transfer from other rural lands outside of South Park – but we know there are significant barriers to that being realized.</li><li>•In-fill priority to town remains first – but should not preclude a meaningful proposal from the families (Gill and Lockhart) that protects important scenic, wildlife and wildlife connectivity - as well as agricultural heritage - parcels in South Park – especially as controlled by these same owners.</li><li>oThe County also took this position but, like the above, you have not captured their clear intent. I expect to see that clearly stated.</li><li>•On cutting the reason for “before in-fill” – the planning commissions clearly cut “workforce housing” and “other community benefits” – not because those do not have value – but they should not be reasons to move forward on 5.6 before Town, and other complete neighborhoods, achieve in-fill.</li><li>oThe joint County meeting January 12 – again it was not discussed about other community benefits period, meanwhile Hank Phibbs got no other elected support on adding workforce housing as a reason to proceed on 5.6 before in-fill in Town. In fact Paul V. opposed that idea.</li><li>oMeanwhile the Town joint meeting from January 11 clearly stated in-fill first period – tied to the growth management plan – with no other conditions or triggers.</li></ul> <p>District 10, sub-area 10.1 and 10.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•10.1 language will stay the same on the intent is to preserve these critical open space areas – clarification will be added that if clustering development is needed to do that – that it should be directed to the north into area 5.6. This is an aspirational goal that does not preclude Seherr-Thoss by clustering adjacent to either South Park Ranches or Melody Ranch – but the big idea of the plan is to see if there is a way to transfer development potential to the north into area 5.6</li><li>•10.2 – again both the joint planning commissions and the County meeting from January 12 clearly responded to the obvious link since 80% of 10.2 are the same land owners that own 100% of area 5.6. I expect to see clear language and direction recognizing that both groups affirmed this. So very clear language on preserving the area is the intent – and if some development is necessary to achieve that due to clustering incentives – then to the north into area 5.6. Again this is aspirational so does not preclude Lucas from doing an independent PRD and have that clustered potential move next to South Park Ranches in the southern portion of his parcel. But the big idea of course in the plan is to see if that potential can be moved to the north</li></ul>

## 5: West Jackson

Date      Name

### Comment

into area 5.6.

- The focus is on achieving permanent protection through the PRD and possible TDR – and not through zoning alone in 10 and 5.6. District 5.6 is truly unique in its potential to use existing tools on the books to achieve the plan’s goals. I would remind you also that there are 35 acres zoned Suburban in the NW corner of 5.6.

- 10.2 – Both language and mapping on wildlife movement throughout the district that matches the description in the general introduction mentioned in 10. Both groups by default affirmed that – and staff has said they already intend to correct those biological mistakes that claim the only wildlife movement of large mammals is along Flat Creek. Alex has assured me these green changes have been captured (E-W and N-S) - and will be made - but I have yet to see them listed in a list of proposed changes.

oNOTE: when I drove home late Thursday evening another elk had just been killed on the Lockhart side of HWY 89 just ¼ mile south of Smith’s. This is the same area between Smiths and Rafter J that has been shown for thirty years to have the highest wildlife collision rate between Smiths and Hoback junction on HWY 89. The group of elk had traversed from west to the east across sub-area 10.2 to reach the Snow King highlands – and one member was killed as they crossed Thursday evening.

I also felt the discussion well after the 9pm cut-off perhaps did not allow the joint planning commissions time to address the issue on “mixed use” in area 5.6. If they do not revisit that – then it will be raised again with the electeds in March as I see mixed use not only not compatible in this residential area – but also a clear threat to redevelopment and reinvestment in the Town by bringing those uses so far out to the peripheries of Town. Clearly the public has said if 5.6 becomes necessary to achieve open space protection in South Park – that they expect 5.6 to be residential, with a mix of housing types and a density that reflects the Cottonwood Park neighborhood across the street. Staffs’ addition of “gridded streets and alleys” – which has not been brought up by any electeds or planning commissioners – could be misinterpreted that you are suggesting a character different from what the citizens have clearly articulated.

I appreciate staff’s work on the plan – but I am also frustrated that staff seems to not be fully recognizing both public input and electeds/planning commission directives without adding their own personal bias. Perhaps that is unavoidable - so I hope you take my perspectives and comments in the spirit they are offered. If need be I would be happy to have a few score of residents at the February 8 and/or March 12 meetings to reinforce their passion for these changes - at the same level you have recently heard from other areas in the valley.

## 5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	<p>I am hopeful that you will do right by the people of Jackson Hole who have worked hard to make this plan fair to all.</p> <p>Under Illustrating our Vision it states that "Realizing our vision means proactively planning for what we want – rural open spaces and high quality complete neighborhoods – and identifying where we want them. Our Vision and Common Values describe how we will direct development toward suitable areas in order to preserve and protect the ecosystem and design development to enhance our quality of life. The Illustration of Our Vision identifies where those suitable areas are located. As important as location, is the type of preservation or development desired. Unlike the past, a principle of growth management in this Plan is predictable implementation. By defining the desired character for each area of the community, all community members know what to expect as a result of preservation and development regulations and incentives. In areas suitable for development, the Illustration of Our Vision describes how we will protect the character we love while ensuring that the development contributes to the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. The Illustration of Our Vision also describes how we will preserve and enhance all other areas to provide wildlife habitat, wildlife connectivity, scenery, and open space. The community is committed to continually adapting our implementation strategies to ensure preservation and development occurs in the desired amount, location, and type. This can only be realized if we define desired location and character for the preservation and development. Adapting our implementation also requires rigorous analysis of our successes and failures. The Illustration of Our Vision defines existing, baseline character in addition to desired future character; allowing implementation strategies to be adapted based on analysis rather than theory. Our community's many districts share common values, but also have unique identities. While each of our community's policies is important to achieving our Vision, not all policies apply community wide. Each individual preservation and development project should be a contributing piece in the community wide plan for achieving our Vision. The Illustration of Our Vision is the community wide picture of where we will place all the pieces – ensuring that all policies of this Plan are implemented in the context of our Vision and no policies are forgotten."</p> <p>We can improve the district maps by including what our community has always called for and has stated so in OUR vision above. If we don't, the latter part of the above which states that "allowing implementation strategies to be adapted based on analysis rather than theory" will be in fact the opposite. Without the projected growth numbers for each district and over all for town and county, we will be theorizing our way into a quagmire that only developers could love.</p> <p>Please focus on decreasing development in desirable areas rather than focusing on where growth should go. Focusing on just growth areas will lead to careless development planning and cost overruns that will hurt everyone. Also work with the Land Trust and large land owners by providing incentives to permanently retire development rights. The Land Trust is very important to the success of the comprehensive plan.</p> <p>Being from Cottonwood Park I would like to repeat the some of the recommendations that JHCA has submitted to the process.</p> <p>District 5: West Jackson</p> <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.</p> <p>You can either ruin High School road with theories or go by the numbers. You can't have industrial growth and have a safe environment for school zones and the neighborhoods around them. Hopefully you read my letters in the past pushing for a campus road that promotes safety and less traffic on High School Road. It is so important now that the district map is calling for expansion of the school zone on High School Road. Please respect our wishes as property owners with rights too. We are not looking to make money off of it. We are just looking to preserve our land and it's value as a</p>

5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
1/24/2012	, Design Review Committ	great family neighborhood.  5.1 Highway Corridor: Encourage measures to marry curb cuts and create stronger street walls with landscaping. Broadway continues to be a true eyesore for most of its length; only by creating an environment that is more comfortable for pedestrians with better street walls, proportions, safety and landscaping, will it become a vital street. 5.6 Northwest South Park: A traffic study to identifying the impact of an additional connector between HWY 89 and South Park Loop would be helpful in understanding the appearance and character of such a road.



## 7: South Highway 89

Date	Name	Comment
1/30/2012	Ross, Dianna Interested Public	<p>I HAVE ATTENDED A LOT OF THE PLANNING MEETINGS AND STILL DO NOT KNOW WHAT ALL OF THIS MEANS FOR OUR PROPERTY. WE STILL HAVE PEOPLE INTERESTED IN BUYING TO ESTABLISH CONSTRUCTION YARDS. IS THIS SOMETHING THAT CAN BE DONE ON OUR PROPERTY UNDER THE NEW DISTRICTS?</p> <p>I REALLY WOULD LIKE TO BE ABLE TO SELL SOMETHING AS LANE AND I HAVE BOTH HAD MAJOR HEALTH PROBLEMS IN THE LAST FEW YEARS. I MYSELF HAVE HAD 5 MAJOR SURGERIES IN THE LAST 18 MONTHS. IF YOU CAN HELP PLEASE LET ME KNOW.</p>

## 9: County Valley

Date	Name	Comment
1/31/2012	Scott, Mary Gibson Grand Teton National P	<p>In June 2011, the Teton County Board of Commissioners and the Jackson Town Council formally adopted the Jackson - Teton County Comprehensive Plan. This action was the result of years of hard work by you, your staff, and many others, and we appreciated the opportunity to provide our own comments on issues relevant to Grand Teton National Park. We commend you on this important achievement and are pleased that the Plan includes numerous references to the importance of coordinating with local federal land managers.</p> <p>While the Comprehensive Plan identified common values, principles, policies, and strategies for achieving the communities' goals, the next step is to identify more specifically how development will be directed in particular areas. The Illustration of Our Vision phase that is currently underway therefore seeks to define the character of 15 individual districts within the Town of Jackson and Teton County. We have reviewed the draft Illustration of Our Vision document and found that it is consistent with and respectful of the resources and values of Grand Teton National Park. We are particularly appreciative of efforts to maintain wildlife movement corridors in areas where it is appropriate to do so.</p> <p>As you continue moving forward with the planning effort, and in other related efforts such as revising the Natural Resources Overlay and the land development regulations, we ask that you continue to be mindful of the potential effects of decisions on Grand Teton National Park. Development on the west side of the Snake River along the Wyoming 390 corridor (Teton Village, Aspens, and Wilson) is of particular importance because of the potential to adversely affect the Moose - Wilson Road corridor within the park. This corridor contains some of the most rich and sensitive wildlife habitat within Grand Teton National Park, and is highly valued for its primitive values, opportunities for wildlife viewing, and access to the Laurance S. Rockefeller Preserve. The rustic, narrow, and winding character of the Moose - Wilson Road, and the relatively slow travel speeds are key to enjoyment of this area. Traffic volumes, however, are rapidly approaching levels that will diminish the quality of visitors' experience, and are likely not sustainable. Future growth on the Wyoming 390 corridor, as well as transportation-related actions may significantly impact the park and should be carefully considered by planners and decision makers.</p> <p>We also note that Character District 15, the County Periphery, includes agricultural lands and open space that are adjacent to or within the boundaries of Grand Teton National Park. We appreciate that the draft Illustration of Our Vision document states that the areas within the County periphery will remain rural in character, that open space will be preserved, and wildlife habitat and movement corridors will be protected and enhanced. These policies, along with the criteria describing development in the Buffalo Valley and Kelly areas are consistent with NPS goals for management of adjacent park lands. As the planning process continues to move forward, we would appreciate the opportunity to provide input on how the land development regulations and Natural Resource Overlay can be used as tools for protecting park resources and values where development on inholdings or adjacent lands is a concern.</p> <p>We appreciate the opportunity to provide these comments and look forward to continued coordination on planning and development decisions that have cross-boundary implications. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please feel free to contact me or Management Assistant Gary Pollock at (307) 739-3411 or 739-3428.</p>

## 10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
2/2/2012	Harvey, Ann Interested Public	<p>I am writing once again to comment on the seemingly endless comprehensive plan process. The bottom line, I think, is that you need to ensure that the plan lives up to its lofty ideals of protecting wildlife, habitat, scenery, and the other values that define Jackson Hole. You do not do this by adding more growth, whether it's in Wilson, the Aspens, South Park, or anywhere else in the valley. The more growth the plan allows, the more fragmented and degraded wildlife habitat becomes, and the more Jackson Hole resembles all the other places where humans dominate the landscape. Please stop thinking in terms of nodes, or spots, or whatever other cancerous terms describe additive growth in Jackson Hole. We do not want or need a plan that calls for more growth. It's hard to imagine what Jackson Hole will be like with the doubling in growth that's already allowed--how can you possibly think that it's your duty to encourage even more?</p> <p>When will specific mechanisms for decreasing development in rural areas, and permanently preserving open space, be revealed to the public? Learning from the newspaper that there's a lot of "flexibility" in how 2000 potential units will be shifted from rural areas to denser areas does little to inspire confidence that this is anything more than fantasy. It's a laudable ideal to concentrate growth in the town of Jackson and decrease it in the rural parts of the valley, but until the second part of the equation is dealt with, you shouldn't be even considering additive growth anywhere in the County. After 4 years of planning, shouldn't the means of decreasing density be figured out? It's easy to allow more growth and hard to preserve open space, but taking the path of least resistance is not exactly good planning.</p> <p>I'm glad to see that the current version of the plan calls for preserving much of South Park instead of making the whole thing a density dumping ground. Please stick to this. And if any increase in density is approved for the Northwest corner, it must be clearly tied to decreasing density and permanent open space protection throughout the rural areas of South Park. The map descriptions should affirm this and be consistent with the plan language. No density increase should be directed to South Park until the Town has reached its infill potential. And no commercial development should be allowed in South Park.</p> <p>I am also entirely supportive of the Village Road residents who object to adding growth to the Aspens area. It just doesn't make sense to do that, given transportation and infrastructure issues, as well as wildlife values in that part of the valley.</p>

## 10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
2/2/2012	Dunlap, Dave Interested Public	<p>I am opposed to using the South Park area as a dumping ground for the rest of the county. Adding anywhere near 1000 homes is shortsighted and voids any concern for wildlife and responsible growth.</p> <p>I have been participating for four plus years in this process – I expect you to UPHOLD the map descriptions that now affirm the scenic, wildlife, wildlife connectivity and ranching heritage values of ALL of South Park (called district 10).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We do not want additive growth from anywhere in the valley when we already have 50-70 years of growth already entitled – a rough doubling of our built environment on the ground today!</li> <li>Any development in Northwest South Park needs to be firmly linked to the large rural land owner stewards in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands . We do not want unwanted density dumped into South Park from Alta, Buffalo Valley or anywhere else in the valley.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The language in NW South Park (sub-area 5.6) needs to be STRICTLY TIED to the minimum amount of growth needed in order to help our rural land owners achieve permanent conservation of their other South Park lands.</li> <li>Without this linkage – we do not support any additional density anywhere in our region – as we do not need any more development, and the sole reason for consideration of the NW corner is to achieve permanent conservation of these land owners other lands that dominate South Park.</li> <li>The NW corner of South Park should NOT be developed before the substantial in-fill potential in Town is completed.</li> <li>If some development in this NW corner is needed to permanently conserve South Park - then it should REFLECT the mix and density of housing of Cottonwood Park and NOT have any commercial, mixed use or light industrial in NW South Park.</li> </ul>
2/1/2012	Coelho, Katherine and Interested Public	<p>In regards to the growth plan, we need to permanently conserve the large rural ranches in the NW area of South Park. These ranches help make Jackson Hole one of the most beautiful areas in the U.S. Since the majority of our economy is tourism, it is of them up most importance to preserve the beauty of the area. If it becomes necessary for some small development of this area to help the ranchers conserve the rest of their property then the development should be only in the NW corner and in the same density and character as its neighbor Cottonwood Park. As to any other increase in density in South Park it is totally unnecessary as we have 50-70 years of lands of entitled growth all ready planned for. No leep frogging - in fill must be done first.</p> <p>We also must preserve the linkage for the wild life. In all the meetings I have attended the audience has said that the wild life of Jackson Hole is one of its most important attributes for residents and visitor alike.</p> <p>Lets keep Jackson as what it is know for; wilderness, wild life and the old West.</p>

## 10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
2/1/2012	Stone, Cindy Hill Interested Public	<p>Whoa there pard,</p> <p>After four grueling years of dealing with planners, and elected officials I think the valley is tired of your rhetoric and BS.</p> <p>DENSITY? "Where are we going to put it?" ---- Really Paul? Every iota of this valley has been platted and planned for. Right now in South Park if all the large rural land owners decided to cash in there would be another 500 homes. Along with those 500 homes would come a lot of permanent open space. ---Permanent----. And there is nothing you could do about it.</p> <p>Not to forget the 73 homes in Melody Ranch 2 that are still on a piece of paper in someone's file cabinet, or the 32 vacant lots in Melody 1. Is Shooting Iron built out? Three Creeks?</p> <p>You are not the density commissioners. You are the elected officials and planning commissioners. Yup,----- that's we the people you hear hollering boys. "We The People" are herding up and we don't like the color of that horse you're riding.</p>
2/1/2012	Sibson, Barry Interested Public	<p>After four years of participation in the Comprehensive Plan process, I was quite pleased with the "Character District" plan for South Park. The key aspect of the SP plan was the preservation of the current open space. I am concerned, however, about the type of development and added population in the Northwest corner of the area and the concept of new roads connecting Melody Ranch, Rafter J and South Park Ranches.</p> <p>With the change of direction for the "Pines/Aspens" district, I am very concerned that there might be some thoughts of change in the South Park district. I believe that if any additional development were inserted in the SP district that it would be very detrimental to the South Park community, to wildlife movement and to the visual aspects of the approach to town.</p> <p>Important to me are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The open space in SP being permanently preserved, not just a zoning issue that could be changed in the future. Any development in SP should be tied contactually to preservation of open space in SP.</li><li>A corridor for wildlife movement down the west side of SP. I live next to Bob Lucas's ranch and have frequently seen and heard elk migrating through his ranch. I believe that they come down through the Sherr Thoss property and not down Flat Creek.</li><li>Maintenance of the rural view across SP from South 89 to the western mountains.</li><li>Incentives for the SP ranchers to continue ranching.</li><li>No additive development rights to those already existing.</li><li>A decrease in allowable commercial development.</li><li>Maintenance of a walkable town with a human scale to all development. Too many of the already developed 3 story buildings in town do not have that scale and are overwhelming. A step back of the third story should be required.</li></ul> <p>I appreciate the fact that the proposed plan has been scaled down to be more in keeping with the desires of the community, but I DO NOT want South Park to become the default area for growth.</p>

## 10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
1/30/2012	Rhea, Rebecca Interested Public	<p>I have owned a home in Single Tree Ranch Subdivision for the past 7 years and lived in many different places in Jackson Hole since 1978. For more than 3 decades I have witnessed many failed planning efforts in Jackson Hole. It seems like the developers always win. I think it is finally time to set reasonable growth limits and once and for all to protect neighborhoods so the quality of life, social, scenic and wildlife values that make Jackson Hole a desirable place to live, work, and vacation are not sacrificed. I believe it is important to keep population growth and development at reasonable levels so there is adequate infrastructure. Infrastructure needs must be able to be met within the current and projected tax revenues.</p> <p>I have a particular interest in District 10 (South Park) where I live. This district is significant habitat for wildlife and is particularly important for migrating elk and wintering moose. I have personally observed more than 100 elk at a time spend several weeks in the ranch land adjacent to my house, observed elk in my backyard and migrating through my neighborhood. I frequently see moose, coyotes, fox, bald eagles, and osprey from my house. Trumpeter swans, Canada geese, Great Blue Herons, numerous other birds and mammals live in or pass through South Park.</p> <p>I have been participating in the latest comprehensive plan effort for the past four years. I strongly believe that it is not appropriate to increase the density of South Park is a trade off for reducing density elsewhere. South Park has already been developed to a level that should not be exceeded after buildout of existing lots is complete.</p> <p>Sub-area 5.6 should be strictly tied to the minimum amount of growth so there can be permanent conservation of the large rural landowners other South Park Lands. Development of this area should complement the existing development there, particularly the three school campuses.</p> <p>The South Park Loop road cannot handle increased traffic without being widened which would destroy its rural character and recreational values.</p> <p>This planning effort needs to be finally completed so that the time and energy of elected officials and landowners can be better spent on preserving what is best about Jackson Hole and meeting the other challenges of the future.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of my position on this matter.</p>

## 10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
1/30/2012	Gammer, Michele Interested Public	<p>I write to you as a resident of South Park. I have been attending meetings and following developments on the Comprehensive Plan over the past four years. I have written to you previously to share my viewpoint.</p> <p>I respectfully urge that you UPHOLD the map descriptions that now affirm the scenic, wildlife, wildlife connectivity and ranching heritage values of ALL of South Park (district 10).</p> <p>Please do not burden South Park with additive growth from anywhere in the valley when we already have 50-70 years of growth already entitled – a rough doubling of our built environment on the ground today!</p> <p>In addition, I request that any development in Northwest South Park be firmly linked to the large rural land owner stewards in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands – period. Unwanted density should NOT be dumped into South Park from Alta, Buffalo Valley or anywhere else in the valley.</p> <p>The language in NW South Park (sub-area 5.6) needs to be STRICTLY TIED to the minimum amount of growth needed in order to help our rural land owners achieve permanent conservation of their other South Park lands.</p> <p>oWithout this linkage – I do not support any additional density anywhere in our region – as we do not need any more development in South Park, and the sole reason for consideration of development in the NW corner is to achieve permanent conservation of the balance of the lands in South Park.</p> <p>oThe NW corner of South Park should NOT be developed before the substantial in-fill potential in Town is completed.</p> <p>oIf some development in this NW corner is needed to permanently conserve South Park - then it should REFLECT the mix and density of housing of Cottonwood Park and NOT have any commercial, mixed use or light industrial in NW South Park.</p> <p>To date, much progress has been made during the course of your deliberations to protect South Park, its vistas and its wildlife migration routes and I sincerely appreciate your efforts in that regard. Please remain steadfast in your commitment to protect our beautiful portion of the valley.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my input.</p>
1/30/2012	Muschaweck, Erika and Interested Public	<p>we congratulate you all for the conscientious and diligent work you have done for such a long time in planning the future for Jackson Hole. In a few weeks the new comprehensive plan will be decided and we hope you will consider these last points in your decision.</p> <p>We have been participating from the beginning in this process and want you to uphold the map descriptions that now affirm the scenic, wildlife, wildlife connectivity and ranching heritage values of the whole of Jackson Hole, and especially all of South Park without raising the possibility of development to more than is already allowed in the existing comprehensive plan.</p> <p>We do not want additive growth in the valley when we already have 50-70 years of growth already entitled.</p> <p>Observing the wild animals in Jackson Hole is the most important and talked about happening. We live on the North end of Indian Trails. There are still several moose visiting our neighborhood, there is still the bald eagle's nest on high school butte, but the elk herd which was also coming through every winter does not appear anymore since the Teton Science School built their buildings in the canyon North of 22.</p> <p>Please cast your votes confirming the voluminous specific and consistent comments from this community and you will be forever gratefully remembered.</p>

## 10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
1/30/2012	Salter, Andy Interested Public	<p>I am a resident of South Park, I have been closely following your efforts over the past four years to revise the Comprehensive Plan and I have written you previously to express my views.</p> <p>PLEASE UPHOLD the map descriptions that now affirm the scenic, wildlife, wildlife connectivity and ranching heritage values of ALL of South Park (district 10).</p> <p>Please do not saddle South Park with additive growth from anywhere in the valley when we already have 50-70 years of growth already entitled – a rough doubling of our built environment on the ground today!</p> <p>Any development in Northwest South Park needs to be firmly linked to the large rural land owner stewards in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands – period. Unwanted density should NOT be dumped into South Park from Alta, Buffalo Valley or anywhere else in the valley.</p> <p>The language in NW South Park (sub-area 5.6) needs to be STRICTLY TIED to the minimum amount of growth needed in order to help our rural land owners achieve permanent conservation of their other South Park lands.</p> <p>oWithout this linkage – I do not support any additional density anywhere in our region – as we do not need any more development in South Park, and the sole reason for consideration of development in the NW corner is to achieve permanent conservation of the balance of the lands in South Park.</p> <p>oThe NW corner of South Park should NOT be developed before the substantial in-fill potential in Town is completed.</p> <p>oIf some development in this NW corner is needed to permanently conserve South Park - then it should REFLECT the mix and density of housing of Cottonwood Park and NOT have any commercial, mixed use or light industrial in NW South Park.</p> <p>Much progress has been made during the course of your deliberations to protect South Park, its vistas and its wildlife migration routes and I sincerely appreciate your efforts in that regard. Please remain steadfast in your commitment to protect our beautiful portion of the valley.</p>
1/30/2012	Balogh, Holly Interested Public	<p>I am a resident of Melody Ranch where my family has lived for the past 11(!) years. As a concerned citizen about growth and most importantly about the wildlife and wild lands in this region, I wanted to provide some comments about the planning process.</p> <p>I took time out of my schedule to attend one of the mapping and planning workshops in Rafter J back in October. Prior to that, I had participated in other planning discussions over the past several years. From these discussions, I expect that the commission will uphold the descriptions that were discussed and commented on for all of South Park – district 10. It was very clear that the majority of residents at the mapping discussion holds scenic, wildlife, and wildlife connectivity as sacred and fully expects that these values will be addressed and not compromised in the final plans.</p> <p>It is extremely important to me that there is no additional growth placed in the valley when we already have 50 plus year of growth already entitled. It is also extremely important to me that development in Northwest South Park be linked to the large rural land owner steward in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands. Without this linkage the entirety of South Park could be developed – completely destroying the values we all hold so dear.</p> <p>Moreover, I think it extremely important that development be completed in town and any potential development be finished their before expansion into other rural Teton county areas. If we do develop part of the NW corner of South Park, let's be smart. Let's develop it like Cottonwood or Indian Trails and not destroy the residential areas with commercial or other mixed use that makes parts of Town, and areas behind Smiths look like a total junk show from any outsider's observations.</p> <p>I'd like to remind you about our wildlife. We must make these steps to protect our animals who share our space. We choose to live here and want to keep our wildlife alive. Providing them room to roam is critical to their long term survival. This month alone I have had two different mom and baby moose sets, bald eagle, fox, and trumpeter swans in my back yard. Help me help them by protecting this crucial.</p> <p>Thank you very much for listening. Please feel free to contact me for further discussion.</p>



## 10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
1/28/2012	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	<p>Outcomes related to PRD, District's 5.6 and 10 from Thursday's meeting.</p> <p>I hope to see some clarification on several of these decisions before the staff report - not only by the joint planning commission meeting on Thursday but also the County meeting on January 12 - as I do not believe you have captured the strong intent on some of these decisions – especially on the intent of 5.6 and its linkage to 10.1 and 10.2.</p> <p>So here is what I heard from the joint planning commission meeting (plus some additional notes in a few areas from the joint electeds/planning commissions meetings of the County on January 12 and Town on January 11):</p> <p>PRD and clustering tools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•PRD and clustering options were re-affirmed Thursday as critical to large land owner options. That will be incorporated into the plan body more clearly.</li><li>•The direct reference in the tables of clustering – thus PRD option on properties only at 160 acres and above – was removed Thursday. Everything from 35 acres up should have clustering incentives.</li></ul> <p>Area 5.6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•Area 5.6 — now a clear direct link to these two owner's other properties in 10.2 and also district 9 (Snake River bottom properties below Shooting Iron).</li><li>•Clarifying the intent of 5.6 is to use the PRD and non-contiguous PRD (with these land owners disconnected other properties along the Snake River) to achieve permanent open space throughout South Park - and other rural areas if a TDR tool is ever successful.</li><li>oThis is the key point also confirmed by the County Commissioners – which has yet to be made clear. I expect language that shows the clear linkage here as both bodies where clear in their direction. You can leave an opening to transfer from other rural lands outside of South Park – but we know there are significant barriers to that being realized.</li><li>•In-fill priority to town remains first – but should not preclude a meaningful proposal from the families (Gill and Lockhart) that protects important scenic, wildlife and wildlife connectivity - as well as agricultural heritage - parcels in South Park – especially as controlled by these same owners.</li><li>oThe County also took this position but, like the above, you have not captured their clear intent. I expect to see that clearly stated.</li><li>•On cutting the reason for “before in-fill” – the planning commissions clearly cut “workforce housing” and “other community benefits” – not because those do not have value – but they should not be reasons to move forward on 5.6 before Town, and other complete neighborhoods, achieve in-fill.</li><li>oThe joint County meeting January 12 – again it was not discussed about other community benefits period, meanwhile Hank Phibbs got no other elected support on adding workforce housing as a reason to proceed on 5.6 before in-fill in Town. In fact Paul V. opposed that idea.</li><li>oMeanwhile the Town joint meeting from January 11 clearly stated in-fill first period – tied to the growth management plan – with no other conditions or triggers.</li></ul> <p>District 10, sub-area 10.1 and 10.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•10.1 language will stay the same on the intent is to preserve these critical open space areas – clarification will be added that if clustering development is needed to do that – that it should be directed to the north into area 5.6. This is an aspirational goal that does not preclude Seherr-Thoss by clustering adjacent to either South Park Ranches or Melody Ranch – but the big idea of the plan is to see if there is a way to transfer development potential to the north into area 5.6</li><li>•10.2 – again both the joint planning commissions and the County meeting from January 12 clearly responded to the obvious link since 80% of 10.2 are the same land owners that own 100% of area 5.6. I expect to see clear language and direction recognizing that both groups affirmed this. So very clear language on preserving the area is the intent – and if some development is necessary to achieve that due to clustering incentives – then to the north into area 5.6. Again this is aspirational so does not preclude Lucas from doing an independent PRD and have that clustered potential move next to South Park Ranches in the southern portion of his parcel. But the big idea of course in the plan is to see if that potential can be moved to the north</li></ul>

## 10: South Park

Date Name

### Comment

into area 5.6.

- The focus is on achieving permanent protection through the PRD and possible TDR – and not through zoning alone in 10 and 5.6. District 5.6 is truly unique in its potential to use existing tools on the books to achieve the plan’s goals. I would remind you also that there are 35 acres zoned Suburban in the NW corner of 5.6.

- 10.2 – Both language and mapping on wildlife movement throughout the district that matches the description in the general introduction mentioned in 10. Both groups by default affirmed that – and staff has said they already intend to correct those biological mistakes that claim the only wildlife movement of large mammals is along Flat Creek. Alex has assured me these green changes have been captured (E-W and N-S) - and will be made - but I have yet to see them listed in a list of proposed changes.

oNOTE: when I drove home late Thursday evening another elk had just been killed on the Lockhart side of HWY 89 just ¼ mile south of Smith’s. This is the same area between Smiths and Rafter J that has been shown for thirty years to have the highest wildlife collision rate between Smiths and Hoback junction on HWY 89. The group of elk had traversed from west to the east across sub-area 10.2 to reach the Snow King highlands – and one member was killed as they crossed Thursday evening.

I also felt the discussion well after the 9pm cut-off perhaps did not allow the joint planning commissions time to address the issue on “mixed use” in area 5.6. If they do not revisit that – then it will be raised again with the electeds in March as I see mixed use not only not compatible in this residential area – but also a clear threat to redevelopment and reinvestment in the Town by bringing those uses so far out to the peripheries of Town. Clearly the public has said if 5.6 becomes necessary to achieve open space protection in South Park – that they expect 5.6 to be residential, with a mix of housing types and a density that reflects the Cottonwood Park neighborhood across the street. Staffs’ addition of “gridded streets and alleys” – which has not been brought up by any electeds or planning commissioners – could be misinterpreted that you are suggesting a character different from what the citizens have clearly articulated.

I appreciate staff’s work on the plan – but I am also frustrated that staff seems to not be fully recognizing both public input and electeds/planning commission directives without adding their own personal bias. Perhaps that is unavoidable - so I hope you take my perspectives and comments in the spirit they are offered. If need be I would be happy to have a few score of residents at the February 8 and/or March 12 meetings to reinforce their passion for these changes - at the same level you have recently heard from other areas in the valley.

## 10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
1/25/2012	Quinn, David Interested Public	<p>First and foremost, I would like to thank you for your efforts over the past several years of working with the community and all interested parties on trying to accomplish the goal of making Teton County a place with the highest wildlife and scenic values of any place in our Country.</p> <p>In regards to the current Comprehensive Plan draft; I would like to make the following suggestions for the South Park area:</p> <p>First, the goal of wide open spaces and abundant wildlife can be achieved with the right efforts from our community. As the Land Trust stated in a recent letter to the county, it is critical to keep as many tools available for large land owners in order to preserve the character that everyone has been accustomed to. If tools such as the PRD are eliminated, many of the remaining ranches will be divided into the minimum 35 acre parcels that are allowed by State laws, and eventually the wide open spaces that everyone has been accustomed to will slowly vanish and we will be left with views of ranchettes or large second homes, with no community benefit.</p> <p>Over the past two years, various conservation groups have continued to recommend keeping as many tools available for conservation of large open spaces. Recently, it seems, with the advent of the mapping of Teton County; that many of these important thoughts have been displaced or forgotten about. It seems, as there has been strong pressure from a few minority residents in the community to put a layer of green (conservation) and blue (preservation) over any remaining rural lands in the community, disregarding that these large green areas have a base development right of one house, guest house and barn per 35 acre parcel. These same people are pressuring the county staff and elected officials to have landowners conserve their remaining lands by moving their development rights to town or a small node next to the High School Road. I am not sure if a suitable tradeoff is being suggested. In reality, and financially there are many problems with this concept. The value of the density of large tracts of rural land in the middle of South Park has a lot more value as 35 acre pieces than multiple small town sized lots next to the High School Road.</p> <p>Allowing landowners to cluster development on their own lands may be a better alternative. There are many areas throughout the County, within or next to existing development, where non-contiguous PRD's could be successful without limiting land owners to town or a node in Northern South Park. No one knows if the town or landowners in these nodes will accommodate additional density. All landowners have to be given the same opportunity to preserve their lands and cannot be confined to moving their rights to specific areas.</p> <p>In the last public comment period, 37 residents of Teton County; many that live in South Park, commented that that they would like to see additional development in Southern South Park. Many people commented that it would be a good area for equestrian use possibly with riding areas to accommodate the equestrian community that exists in South Park and the rest of the community. These residents have also expressed having a small grocery store, or amenities that would be advantageous to eliminating additional traffic to Town and beneficial to the residents of Southern South Park. It is important to provide landowners with different preservation options to choose from. Again, this is what the Land Trust has stated in their recent letter.</p> <p>My final point is that we have all been working on a character driven Comp Plan. Many people are trying to blend a number driven plan into the character plan. Please keep on track with defining the character of each district and do not fall into past mistakes of trying to add numbers to the plan. Numbers will only confuse and complicate the process beyond what people can comprehend. I have been told that a numbers plan was unsuccessfully tried in 2009.</p> <p>In closing, I appreciate your efforts and hope you can stay on track with your goals. Please see the attached copies of the comments that 37 individuals made in the last comment period. There are many concerned citizens in Teton County that believe that proper planning is the key to the livelihood of our community. Please do not let a few people pressure you into making the wrong decisions.</p>

## 11: Wilson

Date	Name	Comment
2/2/2012	Mortensen, John and P Interested Public	<p>We wanted to communicate our support for the views expressed in the advertisement in today's paper run by all the community and neighborhood groups here in our valley.</p> <p>We have lived here over twenty years, and have constantly expressed the save views of open space and wildlife resources protection. Each new plan promises to embrace these values and then ignores them. We have enclosed a photo [see email for photos of moose/deer] of some our favorite neighbors and residents where we live in downtown Wilson.</p> <p>At the last town meeting in Wilson planners promised we would remain the same, and wildlife and current open space would be protected. But now it sounds like adverse pressure in other areas and the planning department may change that here, and the entire west side where we have limited infrastructure (roads, water, sewer, schools, etc).</p> <p>Please listen to us and fellow residents who value our historic Jackson Hole character, wildlife and open space resources. We do not want to risk what we all have expressed we hold most dear.</p>

## 11: Wilson

Date	Name	Comment
1/20/2012	Moyer, Peter, F. Interested Public	<p>There is a basic concept which has some surface appeal, and is being pushed very aggressively by some people: move un-built density away from scenic/wildlife areas, into developed areas of Jackson Hole. Yet even an appealing theoretical concept has no mettle, until it is fully examined in its practical application, in detail, by our community. Those trying to sell the deal have been painfully short on detail. It is high time to take a common sense, informed look at the concept.</p> <p>This program would be based upon two highly sensitive matters: down-zoning in many areas, which obviously sticks in the craw of some landowners while actually limiting permanent conservation measures as well, and up-zoning in old-time Jackson Hole neighborhoods like Wilson and the Aspens, plus Teton Village, which is extremely controversial as well. You had best get it right, because you are playing with fire on all sides.</p> <p>I. Down-zoning. Most of the density transfer down-zoning would come from the elimination or reduction of the clustering/permancmt open space provisions which have been in our Comprehensive Plan for decades. Landowners receive limited density bonuses if they cluster development with permanent protected open space. Is it really such a good idea to eliminate or drastically reduce this provision? The simple answer is NO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The SRA project ended up using this concept, and the result was well over 1,000 acres of permanently protected open space. Many other landowners have done so as well. That is permanent protection which is not subject to future political change. Unlike the pending proposal.</li><li>• The clustering rights are the basis for Federal tax benefits favoring local conservation easements. Reducing or eliminating the clustering provisions of our Plan could have a very adverse impact on the incentive to donate future conservation easements with permanently protected, critical open space - all or part of the Federal tax benefits could disappear for potential conservation easement donors.</li><li>• The existing clustering provisions can be beneficial for open space and wildlife. Moreover, the benefits and burdens are adjacent - it is not one area getting open space benefits as a result of up-zonings far away.</li></ul> <p>Bottom line, you would be playing with fire on the landowner rights side AND on the conservation side. Sure, there could be improvements in the existing clustering provisions of the Plan: (a) the clustering provisions should be fairer to small landowners and (b) undevelopable land (streams, wetlands, hillsides, setback areas) should not count in the density bonus formula. But minor tweaking, not wholesale change. Certainly not an excuse to up-zone elsewhere!!!</p> <p>II. Up-Zoning. Your "node" up-zoning proposals have been met with fierce resistance for over 4 years, and due to tin ears of some politicians and bureaucrats the resistance will increase, for many reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The impacted neighborhoods in Wilson, South Park, Village Road area, etc. do not want the up-zoning.</li><li>• Many people throughout Jackson Hole, and many visitors to Jackson Hole, DO NOT WANT JACKSON HOLE URBANIZED. More traffic, more wildlife kills and other adverse impacts, more loss of our friendly small town community character.</li><li>• Most of the clustering density you would transfer through up-zonings elsewhere is phantom density which would otherwise never be used. Essentially phony benefits.</li></ul> <p>• The groups fighting this idea are not trying to take away landowner rights: there is no right to up-zoning.</p> <p>••••</p> <p>The bottom line is simple. You would eliminate or reduce beneficial existing clustering rules, in a manner adverse to landowners and conservationists. Although much of the current potential clustering density would never be used, you would treat it as real build-out density and transfer it to highly developable places where it will indeed be developed. The opposite of genuine conservation because you will effectively create a lot more development! And make many people very concerned: landowners, conservationists, neighborhoods, visitors.</p> <p>The concept sounds okay on the surface, but it is fundamentally flawed when one takes a realistic, hard look. A classic lose, lose.</p>

## 12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
2/2/2012	Harvey, Ann Interested Public	<p>I am writing once again to comment on the seemingly endless comprehensive plan process. The bottom line, I think, is that you need to ensure that the plan lives up to its lofty ideals of protecting wildlife, habitat, scenery, and the other values that define Jackson Hole. You do not do this by adding more growth, whether it's in Wilson, the Aspens, South Park, or anywhere else in the valley. The more growth the plan allows, the more fragmented and degraded wildlife habitat becomes, and the more Jackson Hole resembles all the other places where humans dominate the landscape. Please stop thinking in terms of nodes, or spots, or whatever other cancerous terms describe additive growth in Jackson Hole. We do not want or need a plan that calls for more growth. It's hard to imagine what Jackson Hole will be like with the doubling in growth that's already allowed--how can you possibly think that it's your duty to encourage even more?</p> <p>When will specific mechanisms for decreasing development in rural areas, and permanently preserving open space, be revealed to the public? Learning from the newspaper that there's a lot of "flexibility" in how 2000 potential units will be shifted from rural areas to denser areas does little to inspire confidence that this is anything more than fantasy. It's a laudable ideal to concentrate growth in the town of Jackson and decrease it in the rural parts of the valley, but until the second part of the equation is dealt with, you shouldn't be even considering additive growth anywhere in the County. After 4 years of planning, shouldn't the means of decreasing density be figured out? It's easy to allow more growth and hard to preserve open space, but taking the path of least resistance is not exactly good planning.</p> <p>I'm glad to see that the current version of the plan calls for preserving much of South Park instead of making the whole thing a density dumping ground. Please stick to this. And if any increase in density is approved for the Northwest corner, it must be clearly tied to decreasing density and permanent open space protection throughout the rural areas of South Park. The map descriptions should affirm this and be consistent with the plan language. No density increase should be directed to South Park until the Town has reached its infill potential. And no commercial development should be allowed in South Park.</p> <p>I am also entirely supportive of the Village Road residents who object to adding growth to the Aspens area. It just doesn't make sense to do that, given transportation and infrastructure issues, as well as wildlife values in that part of the valley.</p>
2/2/2012	Robinson, Sami Interested Public	<p>I am writing again as a very concerned citizen about the Comp. Plan. I know this is a critical time and many important decisions will be made very soon. The decisions will effect our lives for many years to come. I am asking you to not upzone the village road/aspens area. Living here for 35 years I know the wildlife that resides here. This is not a place that should be considered for increased density. The Aspens are should remain STABLE.</p>
2/2/2012	Sandvig, Louisa Interested Public	<p>My name is Louisa Sandvig, I live in Tucker Ranch off the Village Rd.</p> <p>I am very concerned about your desire to increase the density around the Aspens for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1.If you increase density, you will have to enlarge the Village Rd., which is already very difficult to cross during "rush hours" around 8:00am &amp; 4:30pm.</li><li>2.More wildlife will be killed with a wider road to cross.</li><li>3.More wildlife will be disturbed with more traffic &amp; people.</li><li>4.More retail development on the Westside would decrease Jackson's &amp; Teton Village's retail business revenue.</li></ol> <p>If you think you need more density, I suggest keeping it in Jackson.</p> <p>Why do we need more density? Real estate sales are down, there's a lot of vacant rental space in town. What are you all thinking?</p> <p>Please pay heed to those of us who live on the Village Rd. We DON'T NEED OR WANT MORE DENSITY in the Aspens or around the Village Rd.</p>
2/2/2012	Karahadian, Kathy Interested Public	<p>Please do not upzone these neighborhoods in order to create more density. I moved here 23 years ago from California to escape the onslaught of development.</p> <p>The village road cannot support any more traffic than is already there. The wildlife will never survive it and neither will the character of our neighborhoods!</p>

## 12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
2/2/2012	Whitmire, Bob Interested Public	<p>As I understand the goals of the community, preservation of wildlife is #1.</p> <p>We already have a significant problem with the slaughter of large and small animals, particularly moose, on the Village Road. The road bisects moose habitat and water sources, so movement of wildlife across the road is inevitable.</p> <p>No one seems to understand why the moose population seems to be declining severely.</p> <p>It's hard to see how the addition of 300 or 400 families in the vicinity of the Aspens and the consequent increase in traffic on the Village Road will help to preserve wildlife in general or our apparently endangered moose population in particular.</p> <p>I'm sure you are familiar with all of the preceding points.</p> <p>How do you justify the proposed build-up around the Aspens?</p>
2/1/2012	Fossel, Scott Interested Public	<p>Unless you can First show what the huge increase in the Aspens will look like AND address current traffic congestion on the Moose Wilson Road, I strongly strongly urge you to STOP further development. With development already underway at Teton Village, we do not have the capacity to add to the Aspens.</p>
2/1/2012	Winder, Philip Interested Public	<p>Please keep the Aspens and the West Bank open and do not allow the natural beauty of our valley to be overdeveloped. Listen to the voice of the people who elected you. No new housing in the Aspens and do not allow more density and development in the neighborhood.</p>
2/1/2012	Huff, Mercedes Interested Public	<p>Thank you for taking the time to read this letter and listen to my comments. I know this has been an arduous process and it's close to the end – which is why it is SO critical to get it right and not ruin our precious valley.</p> <p>I am writing to you today because there is a strong inclination on the part of some of you to increase the density in the area of the Aspens by 300+ residential units. That is not to say that I'm not enormously concerned about the Valley as a whole. This same thinking will be replicated in other areas of the Valley. The product of four years of planning was given to you last March and you overturned what the public had so strongly asked for. Through many public hearings and letters written to planning commissioners it was agreed that the idea of upzoned "nodes" was not the direction the people of Teton County wanted to go. But lo and behold, you decided to do that anyway. Under the guise of preserving wildlife, you're proposing to remove people's property rights in the more rural areas by downzoning them and transferring those development rights to these "nodes" or "character districts" which will become very dense towns of their own. I can't think of anything less in keeping with the character of the valley. How can you take away someone's property rights (without guaranteeing any permanent protection of those areas for open space) and then shove them into another area where they aren't wanted?</p> <p>The basic problem here is that too much density is being created. The 1994 Comprehensive Plan had a population cap which most people have expressed they would like to see DECREASED. What this New Plan proposes to do will actually INCREASE development.</p> <p>Much of the vitality of our community comes from the protective feelings so many of us share for this very special place. We didn't choose to live in a place that could become like Park City, Vail or the like. I strongly encourage you to keep Jackson Hole STABLE, to resist the urge of some planners to transition this Valley into a more urban community. This is an absolutely critical time, because this kind of error and bad planning will have disastrous results that can't be undone.</p> <p>Some might ask why, as a real estate broker, I am opposing this dense development. THE ANSWER IS SIMPLE – IT'S THE RIGHT THING TO DO. LESS IS MORE!</p>

## 12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
2/1/2012	Leet, Melissa and Ken Interested Public	I am writing to say that I strongly oppose any increase in the Aspens area. We are new to Jackson. We chose it as our community because we appreciated that it wasn't overly built-out in the way that most mountain communities have become. Significantly increasing development would erode its character and its beauty.
2/1/2012	Gilmore, John Interested Public	Simply, be careful! I live in John Dodge, and drive 389 daily, and wouldn't look forward to more traffic and/or a 4-lane road. I have always thought (a 22-year resident) that the density should be mostly in town, with high-rises if necessary. Save the views for rural areas. A hard job - good luck.
1/31/2012	Scott, Mary Gibson Grand Teton National P	<p>In June 2011, the Teton County Board of Commissioners and the Jackson Town Council formally adopted the Jackson - Teton County Comprehensive Plan. This action was the result of years of hard work by you, your staff, and many others, and we appreciated the opportunity to provide our own comments on issues relevant to Grand Teton National Park. We commend you on this important achievement and are pleased that the Plan includes numerous references to the importance of coordinating with local federal land managers.</p> <p>While the Comprehensive Plan identified common values, principles, policies, and strategies for achieving the communities' goals, the next step is to identify more specifically how development will be directed in particular areas. The Illustration of Our Vision phase that is currently underway therefore seeks to define the character of 15 individual districts within the Town of Jackson and Teton County. We have reviewed the draft Illustration of Our Vision document and found that it is consistent with and respectful of the resources and values of Grand Teton National Park. We are particularly appreciative of efforts to maintain wildlife movement corridors in areas where it is appropriate to do so.</p> <p>As you continue moving forward with the planning effort, and in other related efforts such as revising the Natural Resources Overlay and the land development regulations, we ask that you continue to be mindful of the potential effects of decisions on Grand Teton National Park. Development on the west side of the Snake River along the Wyoming 390 corridor (Teton Village, Aspens, and Wilson) is of particular importance because of the potential to adversely affect the Moose - Wilson Road corridor within the park. This corridor contains some of the most rich and sensitive wildlife habitat within Grand Teton National Park, and is highly valued for its primitive values, opportunities for wildlife viewing, and access to the Laurance S. Rockefeller Preserve. The rustic, narrow, and winding character of the Moose - Wilson Road, and the relatively slow travel speeds are key to enjoyment of this area. Traffic volumes, however, are rapidly approaching levels that will diminish the quality of visitors' experience, and are likely not sustainable. Future growth on the Wyoming 390 corridor, as well as transportation-related actions may significantly impact the park and should be carefully considered by planners and decision makers.</p> <p>We also note that Character District 15, the County Periphery, includes agricultural lands and open space that are adjacent to or within the boundaries of Grand Teton National Park. We appreciate that the draft Illustration of Our Vision document states that the areas within the County periphery will remain rural in character, that open space will be preserved, and wildlife habitat and movement corridors will be protected and enhanced. These policies, along with the criteria describing development in the Buffalo Valley and Kelly areas are consistent with NPS goals for management of adjacent park lands. As the planning process continues to move forward, we would appreciate the opportunity to provide input on how the land development regulations and Natural Resource Overlay can be used as tools for protecting park resources and values where development on inholdings or adjacent lands is a concern.</p> <p>We appreciate the opportunity to provide these comments and look forward to continued coordination on planning and development decisions that have cross-boundary implications. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please feel free to contact me or Management Assistant Gary Pollock at (307) 739-3411 or 739-3428.</p>
1/30/2012	Moyer, Peter, F. Interested Public	<p>A nice result Thursday and a nice article today (attached).</p> <p>But we are just getting started. Semper vigilis, or whatever the proper spelling should be.</p> <p>Peter</p>



## 12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
1/27/2012	Moyer, Peter, F. Interested Public	<p>Thanks to all of you who showed up at the County/Town meeting last night. Very productive and most appreciated!</p> <p>There were many who spoke for the public. The only speaker who strongly supported the Staff and "nodes" was Bill Collins, the private planner who had been the County planning director.</p> <p>There is something very important to remember there, particularly for people in South Park and the Village Road area, relating to Teton County government ownership when combined with its up-zoning power, and the inherent conflict of interest. That is the current situation with the 5 acre Rains parcel next to the Aspens, which is owned by the County Housing Authority. The Rains parcel has one unit of density and the recorded plat prohibits subdivision. Yet County Staff would ignore that restriction, with a vast up-zoning.</p> <p>When Bill Collins was planning director, the County Housing Authority contracted to buy South Park acreage from Roger Seherr-Thoss. The County's initial plan was to up-zone for commercial plus 350 to 400 residences, even though the Plan's normal clustering rules only permitted a small fraction of that residential density with no commercial. The County kept trying to justify the very high land cost of this "New Neighborhood" project so the up-zoning target kept going up and up, eventually to 1,100 residential units plus commercial. County consultants even pushed for 1,400 units to justify costs. The deal later cratered, and the County forfeited its \$350,000 earnest money deposit. South Park -- and Jackson Hole -- could have become far more urban with that up-zoning.</p> <p>Anyway, just by way of perspective. Not too different than what some County people want on the Rains property. A terrible precedent for all of us, due to the inherent, extreme conflict of interest which can exist when ownership and zoning power are both in government hands.</p> <p>If an individual County Commissioner used his or her power in government to up-zone their own land, that would be an egregious conflict of interest. Is it really okay for the County government to do the same thing on the Rains parcel? I do not think so, and hopefully we can all be united on this point.</p>
1/26/2012	Parker, Lizbeth, and Sea Interested Public	<p>Our family has been visiting Jackson Hole regularly for over twenty years. We have made good friends with Ken &amp; Sherrie Jern, and stay with them at the Wildflower Inn whenever we come to visit. When we come to Jackson, we love to observe the abundant wildlife (often from the deck of our room at the Wildflower Inn!), spend time on the Snake River with one of the excellent Westbank Angler guides, hike and bike in the national park, and dine at the Snake River Grill as well as Jackson's other fabulous restaurants. Together, we have climbed the Grand Teton, and Sean has summited other peaks in the Teton Range with Ken. But most importantly, we enjoy spending time in Jackson to get away from the increasingly crowded front range of Colorado. While the front range continues to experience unfettered growth, with the increasing traffic, density, infrastructure, strip malls, noise and crowds that go along with it, we appreciate each time we visit the quieter, more spacious environs of Jackson. We enjoy spending time not only with our friends Ken &amp; Sherrie, but also enjoy experiencing the wonder of the Tetons and Jackson in a less crowded, less congested, and less hurried environment.</p> <p>We wanted to write to let you know that in our opinion, any additional building, beyond what is envisioned by the 1994 Comprehensive Plan would have a very negative impact on our perception of Jackson Hole as a place we love to spend time. Adding 500 more homesites along the Village Road, above and beyond the 7,000 still available in the County, seems excessive, and would almost certainly negatively impact the fabric of the community we have come to know and love. Unlike in Colorado, we feel that Jackson planners have done an excellent job of keeping unnecessary growth at bay over the past twenty years. The additional growth would certainly impact wildlife and the already-congested Moose-Wilson Road, and would undoubtedly bring the general noise level up considerably. These negative effects would certainly make us think twice about continuing to consider Jackson our second home, and we would be less likely to plan regular vacations there from our home in Colorado. In short, we love to come to Jackson precisely because it is not the front range of Colorado, and doesn't have Colorado's increasing traffic, density and sprawl; we would hate to see what we love and appreciate about Jackson coming to an end.</p> <p>Thank you for considering our thoughts on the proposal for additional growth beyond the 1994 Comprehensive Plan, and please feel free to contact either of us if you would like to discuss our thoughts further.</p>

## 12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Boll, George, A. Interested Public	<p>My wife and I have been coming to Jackson and Grand Teton National Park almost every year since approximately 1994 when we first came and fell in love with the area. We have on occasion brought family and friends and now also bring the newest addition to our little family, our daughter Gabi. We have also talked up the area and know for a fact that many of our friends have taken our advice and took an initial trip, also fell in love, and have since often returned with their families and friends. Unfortunately, our disclosure to others of our love for such a beautiful area, blessed with comparably wonderful people, may also have contributed to the beginning of its undoing. Specifically, we have noticed over the past years what seems to us to be a tremendous increase in traffic along the Teton Village road and along the Moose-Wilson road into the park with commensurate road kill and other deleterious effects as a result. Some of this is likely due to close access the roads present to the newly opened Laurance Rockefeller Preserve Center. However, we have also seen significant development along the Teton Village road since our first exposure to the area which must also be significantly contributing to the increase traffic. We were therefore very concerned to read of the proposal to open up the area to even more development. Certainly, there must be long term plans already in place that when originally drawn up were forward looking with regard to future development yet balanced with restrictions to achieve the laudable goal of protecting what makes the area so special. If so, my family, friends and I would ask that due weight be given thereto so as to not further destroy the beauty, serenity and habitat for wildlife this area has historically provided. Progress coupled with development can be a good thing for business and community. However, depending upon location and scale, and if left unchecked, it can also be terribly destructive with diminishing returns to all but those who profit thereby. In this case, my family, friends and I fear allowing up to 500 additional homes is more the latter than the former and, if allowed, would truly benefit only a privileged few to the detriment of the many. I hope that you will listen to this learned voice from Texas who lives in a vast sea of homes and businesses. There is a reason we come to places like Jackson. Reasons that make it special. The more it grows to look like where we live, crowded and full of rooftops blocking the view and access to the mountains, the less likely we are all to return. Memories are usually more clear closer in time to the events to be recollected. Deference should be given to the planning visionaries who initially must have sought reasonable restrictions upon development along the Teton Village road undiluted by the following years of change. We pray you will keep the area special for yourselves and your out of state friends and restrict such further development accordingly.</p>

## 12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Jern, Sherrie and Ken Interested Public	<p>I would like to specifically address the upzoning issue in Raintree.</p> <p>Ken and I moved from Vail, Colorado because we could not afford to own a home in Vail on our ski instructor and Outward Bound wages. (We lived and worked there for 10 years.) But we saved enough money to relocate to Jackson in 1976. We bought a lot in the Aspens for \$17,000. We designed our own house, cut down the logs, hauled them out of the woods. We built this house by hand and by ourselves. We had one daughter, born and raised in Jackson. She now lives in Corvallis, Oregon where she is a teacher and has saved her money and last summer bought a house...on her own.</p> <p>In 1988, we sold our home in the Aspens and bought Lot 13 in the Raintree Subdivision, where the zoning was one home per 3 acres. We again built and designed a log house. We have invested all of our money and ourselves into this land and house.</p> <p>We purchased this lot because of the rural lifestyle and the wonderful neighbors up and down the village road. This is home. We love the abundant wildlife, the trees, the water, the quiet. This area is a special spot with horses, sheep, goats, chickens, barns and buckrail fences in addition to moose, both mule and white tail deer, fox and coyotes. The great horned owls, eagles and birds are numerous.</p> <p>When the new Sally Rains Subdivision was finalized, it stated on the Plat Map that "This Subdivision Shall Not Be Subject To Further Subdivisions"</p> <p>This was stated on the Map even with all of the principals knowing that the County would purchase 5 acres in this subdivision through the Housing Authority in a two week time period for the very purpose of up zoning it for affordable housing in the future. Not only did the County pay far more than the appraised value of this land, but they stated that it was for "Land Banking" Although records clearly show much discussion by Christine Walker in regards to future affordable housing on this land. (Staff Report February 13, 2007-)</p> <p>County buys the Land and then later the County upzones it to suit their vision.</p> <p>Not our vision. Not the vision of the majority of nearby residents. When we retire, we will not be able to afford our home. And we probably will not be able to own a home in Jackson again. That is our problem, not our neighbors, not yours....but ours.</p> <p>We believe that there is enough growth built into the 1994 Comp Plan. We do not need more. We do not need to ruin our neighborhoods anywhere in the Valley. We do not need to change the lifestyle of families who have lived here for 30 years or more. We do not need or want the change. We have something that the rest of the world envies. We do not need to become them.</p> <p>Planners want to plan....you went to school for this. But sometimes, things are best left alone.</p>
1/25/2012	Rogers, Marcia & Beryl Interested Public	<p>We are visitors to your wonderful area and it has been brought to our attention that you have plans for more homes in the area of the Moose Wilson Road. We have been coming to Jackson and the Tetons for over fourteen years. We come to get away from congestion and the city atmosphere. We have loved the Moose Wilson Road area and the thoughts of more over priced homes does nothing for us. The wildlife will suffer and the God given beauty of the area will be gone overnight. Please I beg you to leave the area as it is...you have plenty of homes and entertainment already there. Let us enjoy the peace and beauty that you have without more clutter. When we this country ever learn that some things simply need to be left alone!!!!</p>
1/24/2012	Robinson, Sami Interested Public	<p>I am writing for myself and my neighbors in the Aspens first filling. We re absolutely opposed and appalled by the recent information on up zoning the village road near the Aspens. We have been attending meetings and plan to speak on Thursday evening. This is a very inappropriate place for up zoning. It is obvious this is where the wild life habitat is. Many animals have been killed this winter already without the up zoning. We urge you to not proceed and listen to the residents. This should not even be considered as an area for more development.</p>

## 12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
1/24/2012	Swift, Phelps Interested Public	<p>Dear Ben,</p> <p>Your inflammatory remarks in last week's newspaper deserve a response. Peter Moyer was speaking on behalf of himself and other Village Road residents ... the stakeholders who have lived, worked, and raised their families in the Aspens/Teton Pines district. Peter's comments are not "from afar;" rather, his comments are from the ground and have widespread support from his Village Road neighbors.</p> <p>To the contrary, you are attempting to engineer our neighborhood "from afar" by imposing your ivory tower, closed door planning ideas on us and our neighborhood. Our neighborhood works and we wish to preserve its character.</p> <p>The Village Road residents have dutifully followed your process by attending numerous public meetings and writing comments over the past four years. I personally attended at least five (5) public hearings, three (3) workshops, and wrote a letter dated June 8, 2009 which is attached. Nothing has changed and my comments, questions, and suggestions are still applicable today.</p> <p>The "node" up-zone was soundly rejected and has now been revived by the release of the character maps. Its new name is "transition area". No matter what the label, it still spells TURMOIL.</p> <p>During the overheated real estate bubble, the Housing Authority panicked and recklessly speculated on land. Its purchase of the Rain's parcel, at twice its appraised value in 2006, once only looked foolish ... but now appears to have been illegal. Those bad land deals have costs the tax payers millions and violated the public trust. It is not reasonable to try to vindicate bad investments by dumping density with the stroke of a pen.</p> <p>For obvious reasons, I have not been invited to your private planning meetings. Your grand experiment to dump density into a single-family platted subdivision is ill founded, unfair, and destructive. See you at the public hearings.</p> <p>Thanks for your consideration.</p>
1/23/2012	Springer, Kim Interested Public	<p>I'm writing you to protest new plans for growth and development along and at the end of Highway 390. I understand several of you are in favor of growth in these areas which seems astonishing. As residents of Jackson Hole we have a unique opportunity and responsibility to help protect the National Lands at our County boundaries. Wilson and the West Bank also happen to be below the level of the Snake River. From a safety standpoint, it makes no sense to add development in just the place scientists predict to be "ground zero" if the river floods. This is not to mention grim predictions of earthquakes and floods from world renowned geologists, hydrologists and other scientists.</p> <p>Mary Gibson Scott, Superintendent of Grand Teton National Park has communicated the Park's resource concerns to the County Planners. She says "Development on the west side of the Snake River along the Wyoming 390 corridor (Teton Village, Aspens, and Wilson development nodes) is of particular importance because of the potential to adversely affect a portion of the Moose-Wilson Road within the Park as well as important wildlife habitat and movement corridors." She further points out the Moose-Wilson portion of the Park contains some of the most rich and sensitive wildlife habitat within Grand Teton National Park. Therefore she asks that transportation strategies and development decisions be sensitive to the needs of surrounding jurisdictions, including Grand Teton National Park. A wildlife rich dead-end road should be an immediate red flag for future development. As residents of Teton County we have more influence on decisions in Grand Teton than most other tax payers, even though the Park belongs to all of us. We need to help influence wise decisions for every American.</p> <p>The current Comprehensive Plan allows for plenty of new growth, 7000 units I'm told. Who can justify the need for more? It's clearly poor planning to suggest such a need without looking at the impacts and providing justification and extensive new plan and all these comments have been ignored. Who's driving this process and why? Where are all the people who want to scrap the old plan and add to growth?</p> <p>It's very hard to be supportive of a new plan while knowing the old plan's zoning and LDR's haven't held up, certainly not in our neighborhood. We need to know buildout numbers and how development in rural areas will be decreased. If this information isn't available we'll be worse off with a new plan than with the existing plan. Planning means making decisions and commitments and producing documents people can actually understand.</p>

## 12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
1/20/2012	Moyer, Peter, F. Interested Public	<p>There is a basic concept which has some surface appeal, and is being pushed very aggressively by some people: move un-built density away from scenic/wildlife areas, into developed areas of Jackson Hole. Yet even an appealing theoretical concept has no mettle, until it is fully examined in its practical application, in detail, by our community. Those trying to sell the deal have been painfully short on detail. It is high time to take a common sense, informed look at the concept.</p> <p>This program would be based upon two highly sensitive matters: down-zoning in many areas, which obviously sticks in the craw of some landowners while actually limiting permanent conservation measures as well, and up-zoning in old-time Jackson Hole neighborhoods like Wilson and the Aspens, plus Teton Village, which is extremely controversial as well. You had best get it right, because you are playing with fire on all sides.</p> <p>I. Down-zoning. Most of the density transfer down-zoning would come from the elimination or reduction of the clustering/permancmt open space provisions which have been in our Comprehensive Plan for decades. Landowners receive limited density bonuses if they cluster development with permanent protected open space. Is it really such a good idea to eliminate or drastically reduce this provision? The simple answer is NO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The SRA project ended up using this concept, and the result was well over 1,000 acres of permanently protected open space. Many other landowners have done so as well. That is permanent protection which is not subject to future political change. Unlike the pending proposal.</li><li>• The clustering rights are the basis for Federal tax benefits favoring local conservation easements. Reducing or eliminating the clustering provisions of our Plan could have a very adverse impact on the incentive to donate future conservation easements with permanently protected, critical open space - all or part of the Federal tax benefits could disappear for potential conservation easement donors.</li><li>• The existing clustering provisions can be beneficial for open space and wildlife. Moreover, the benefits and burdens are adjacent - it is not one area getting open space benefits as a result of up-zonings far away.</li></ul> <p>Bottom line, you would be playing with fire on the landowner rights side AND on the conservation side. Sure, there could be improvements in the existing clustering provisions of the Plan: (a) the clustering provisions should be fairer to small landowners and (b) undevelopable land (streams, wetlands, hillsides, setback areas) should not count in the density bonus formula. But minor tweaking, not wholesale change. Certainly not an excuse to up-zone elsewhere!!!</p> <p>II. Up-Zoning. Your "node" up-zoning proposals have been met with fierce resistance for over 4 years, and due to tin ears of some politicians and bureaucrats the resistance will increase, for many reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The impacted neighborhoods in Wilson, South Park, Village Road area, etc. do not want the up-zoning.</li><li>• Many people throughout Jackson Hole, and many visitors to Jackson Hole, DO NOT WANT JACKSON HOLE URBANIZED. More traffic, more wildlife kills and other adverse impacts, more loss of our friendly small town community character.</li><li>• Most of the clustering density you would transfer through up-zonings elsewhere is phantom density which would otherwise never be used. Essentially phony benefits.</li></ul> <p>• The groups fighting this idea are not trying to take away landowner rights: there is no right to up-zoning. ••••</p> <p>The bottom line is simple. You would eliminate or reduce beneficial existing clustering rules, in a manner adverse to landowners and conservationists. Although much of the current potential clustering density would never be used, you would treat it as real build-out density and transfer it to highly developable places where it will indeed be developed. The opposite of genuine conservation because you will effectively create a lot more development! And make many people very concerned: landowners, conservationists, neighborhoods, visitors.</p> <p>The concept sounds okay on the surface, but it is fundamentally flawed when one takes a realistic, hard look. A classic lose, lose.</p>

### 13: Teton Village

Date	Name	Comment
1/31/2012	Scott, Mary Gibson Grand Teton National P	<p>In June 2011, the Teton County Board of Commissioners and the Jackson Town Council formally adopted the Jackson - Teton County Comprehensive Plan. This action was the result of years of hard work by you, your staff, and many others, and we appreciated the opportunity to provide our own comments on issues relevant to Grand Teton National Park. We commend you on this important achievement and are pleased that the Plan includes numerous references to the importance of coordinating with local federal land managers.</p> <p>While the Comprehensive Plan identified common values, principles, policies, and strategies for achieving the communities' goals, the next step is to identify more specifically how development will be directed in particular areas. The Illustration of Our Vision phase that is currently underway therefore seeks to define the character of 15 individual districts within the Town of Jackson and Teton County. We have reviewed the draft Illustration of Our Vision document and found that it is consistent with and respectful of the resources and values of Grand Teton National Park. We are particularly appreciative of efforts to maintain wildlife movement corridors in areas where it is appropriate to do so.</p> <p>As you continue moving forward with the planning effort, and in other related efforts such as revising the Natural Resources Overlay and the land development regulations, we ask that you continue to be mindful of the potential effects of decisions on Grand Teton National Park. Development on the west side of the Snake River along the Wyoming 390 corridor (Teton Village, Aspens, and Wilson) is of particular importance because of the potential to adversely affect the Moose - Wilson Road corridor within the park. This corridor contains some of the most rich and sensitive wildlife habitat within Grand Teton National Park, and is highly valued for its primitive values, opportunities for wildlife viewing, and access to the Laurance S. Rockefeller Preserve. The rustic, narrow, and winding character of the Moose - Wilson Road, and the relatively slow travel speeds are key to enjoyment of this area. Traffic volumes, however, are rapidly approaching levels that will diminish the quality of visitors' experience, and are likely not sustainable. Future growth on the Wyoming 390 corridor, as well as transportation-related actions may significantly impact the park and should be carefully considered by planners and decision makers.</p> <p>We also note that Character District 15, the County Periphery, includes agricultural lands and open space that are adjacent to or within the boundaries of Grand Teton National Park. We appreciate that the draft Illustration of Our Vision document states that the areas within the County periphery will remain rural in character, that open space will be preserved, and wildlife habitat and movement corridors will be protected and enhanced. These policies, along with the criteria describing development in the Buffalo Valley and Kelly areas are consistent with NPS goals for management of adjacent park lands. As the planning process continues to move forward, we would appreciate the opportunity to provide input on how the land development regulations and Natural Resource Overlay can be used as tools for protecting park resources and values where development on inholdings or adjacent lands is a concern.</p> <p>We appreciate the opportunity to provide these comments and look forward to continued coordination on planning and development decisions that have cross-boundary implications. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please feel free to contact me or Management Assistant Gary Pollock at (307) 739-3411 or 739-3428.</p>

### 13: Teton Village

Date	Name	Comment
1/20/2012	Moyer, Peter, F. Interested Public	<p>There is a basic concept which has some surface appeal, and is being pushed very aggressively by some people: move un-built density away from scenic/wildlife areas, into developed areas of Jackson Hole. Yet even an appealing theoretical concept has no mettle, until it is fully examined in its practical application, in detail, by our community. Those trying to sell the deal have been painfully short on detail. It is high time to take a common sense, informed look at the concept.</p> <p>This program would be based upon two highly sensitive matters: down-zoning in many areas, which obviously sticks in the craw of some landowners while actually limiting permanent conservation measures as well, and up-zoning in old-time Jackson Hole neighborhoods like Wilson and the Aspens, plus Teton Village, which is extremely controversial as well. You had best get it right, because you are playing with fire on all sides.</p> <p>I. Down-zoning. Most of the density transfer down-zoning would come from the elimination or reduction of the clustering/permancmt open space provisions which have been in our Comprehensive Plan for decades. Landowners receive limited density bonuses if they cluster development with permanent protected open space. Is it really such a good idea to eliminate or drastically reduce this provision? The simple answer is NO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The SRA project ended up using this concept, and the result was well over 1,000 acres of permanently protected open space. Many other landowners have done so as well. That is permanent protection which is not subject to future political change. Unlike the pending proposal.</li><li>• The clustering rights are the basis for Federal tax benefits favoring local conservation easements. Reducing or eliminating the clustering provisions of our Plan could have a very adverse impact on the incentive to donate future conservation easements with permanently protected, critical open space - all or part of the Federal tax benefits could disappear for potential conservation easement donors.</li><li>• The existing clustering provisions can be beneficial for open space and wildlife. Moreover, the benefits and burdens are adjacent - it is not one area getting open space benefits as a result of up-zonings far away.</li></ul> <p>Bottom line, you would be playing with fire on the landowner rights side AND on the conservation side. Sure, there could be improvements in the existing clustering provisions of the Plan: (a) the clustering provisions should be fairer to small landowners and (b) undevelopable land (streams, wetlands, hillsides, setback areas) should not count in the density bonus formula. But minor tweaking, not wholesale change. Certainly not an excuse to up-zone elsewhere!!!</p> <p>II. Up-Zoning. Your "node" up-zoning proposals have been met with fierce resistance for over 4 years, and due to tin ears of some politicians and bureaucrats the resistance will increase, for many reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The impacted neighborhoods in Wilson, South Park, Village Road area, etc. do not want the up-zoning.</li><li>• Many people throughout Jackson Hole, and many visitors to Jackson Hole, DO NOT WANT JACKSON HOLE URBANIZED. More traffic, more wildlife kills and other adverse impacts, more loss of our friendly small town community character.</li><li>• Most of the clustering density you would transfer through up-zonings elsewhere is phantom density which would otherwise never be used. Essentially phony benefits.</li></ul> <p>• The groups fighting this idea are not trying to take away landowner rights: there is no right to up-zoning.</p> <p>••••</p> <p>The bottom line is simple. You would eliminate or reduce beneficial existing clustering rules, in a manner adverse to landowners and conservationists. Although much of the current potential clustering density would never be used, you would treat it as real build-out density and transfer it to highly developable places where it will indeed be developed. The opposite of genuine conservation because you will effectively create a lot more development! And make many people very concerned: landowners, conservationists, neighborhoods, visitors.</p> <p>The concept sounds okay on the surface, but it is fundamentally flawed when one takes a realistic, hard look. A classic lose, lose.</p>

## 14: Alta

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Kane, Raye and Jim Interested Public	As ten-year residents of Forest Edge and taxpayers of Teton County, Wy we strongly support language in the Character District Maps connecting State Line Road across South Leigh Creek. We drive an additional 20 miles a day to get to Targhee. Same with our school children attending Alta School. Services are not available to us simply because we are not connected; such as, dust coating our roads and regular road maintenance. We oppose any change in the language that might prevent these improvements to State Line Road. We have been waiting a long time. Please do not sidetrack this plan. Thank you.
1/26/2012	Fuller, Lee and Jim Wov Interested Public	<p>We live in the Forest Edge subdivision in Alta and are for the proposed extension of State Line Road for the following reasons: 1) We have 7 children who need to ride a school bus to the Alta School.</p> <p>2) Fire protection and other emergency vehicles</p> <p>3)Utility vehicles</p> <p>These are all ESSENTIAL reasons, not frivolous nor indulgent reasons.</p> <p>Thank you for all your hard work and devoted time on behlf of the citizens of Teton County, Wyoming.</p>
1/26/2012	Moore, Steve, R Interested Public	<p>In 2003 I purchased property in Forest Edge Subdivision north of Alta. At the time, I was informed improvements were being done on Stateline Road, and within two years the South Leigh Creek crossing would be re-established. Since that time I have built an affordable and highly efficient home there, and now commute to my job at Grand Teton N.P.</p> <p>Co-workers live in the Alta and Ski Hill Road area, and should Stateline connect, the opportunity to carpool would be significantly enhanced. The current situation leaves me feeling somewhat disconnected from my community in that what would be a short bicycle ride or walk to visit friends and neighbors, or join up to commute, is now a lengthy and hazardous trip involving travel to and down Highway 33. It seems these issues would be resolved if the following Policies of the Comprehensive Plan were to be fully implemented. I would like to be on record as being strongly opposed to any alteration or interpretation of the plan that would not include a timely completion of Stateline Road connecting the South Leigh Area with the rest of the Alta community. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.</p> <p>Policy 7.2.a: Create a transportation network based on “complete streets” and “context sensitive” solutions</p> <p>The Town and County will adopt and implement “complete street” and “context sensitive” roadway design standards. The construction of complete streets and context sensitive roadways will serve as the backbone for a community wide transportation network that supports a significant mode shift to alternative transportation. To achieve the community’s transportation vision, improvements should safely accommodate all users of the public right-of-way, including: pedestrians, bicyclists, automobile drivers, trucks and transit riders. Public safety and reduction of crashes and fatalities (motor vehicle, bike, pedestrian, and wildlife) is a core transportation goal to be considered in the application of all strategies.</p> <p>Policy 7.2.b: Interconnect all modes of transportation</p> <p>Our alternative transportation system will provide a means to connect all alternative modes of travel. Park ‘n’ Rides, bicycle parking, complete streets, transit, and pathways will be incorporated into an integrated alternative transportation system. A system of trails to connect our parklands and trailheads should be considered as part of the transportation system. The Town and County will work jointly to identify opportunities for connections between various alternative transportation modes.</p> <p>Policy 7.2.c: Maximize interconnection, redundancy and hierarchy in the transportation network</p> <p>The development of an interconnected and redundant network is critical to the assurance of a safe, efficient and complete transportation system. In the event that a road or bridge is closed due to a natural hazard or other event, interconnection and redundancy will ensure continued access between and within locations in the community. It will be important to strike a balance between adding new roads and widening existing roads to provide for this community need. The Town and County will consider the need for interconnection, redundancy, and hierarchy when planning for an integrated transportation network.</p> <p>Policy 7.3.a: Develop a land use pattern based on transportation connectivity</p> <p>A goal of this plan is to interconnect existing County neighborhoods and the Town of Jackson with a multimodal transportation system. Within existing County and Town complete neighborhoods, alternative modes of transportation are viable for daily trips year-round, and these opportunities should be maintained and enhanced. Outside of complete neighborhoods the Town and County will promote a land use pattern that supports alternative transportation by requiring interconnectivity of future developments and existing development to the best extent possible.</p>



## 14: Alta

Date	Name	Comment
1/25/2012	Koster, Ken Interested Public	<p>Just received an email from Alan Monroe with the information about tomorrow evening's meeting. Really short notice and I find myself at St. John's tomorrow morning for a 10:00 a.m. procedure. I am sure I will not feel like staying around for this meeting and will return home here in Alta.</p> <p>Briefly, my concern and real interest is that the State Line Road project be completed to 6000 North. You have been provided ample reasons for such completion and I will not repeat them.</p>
1/25/2012	Monroe, Allen Interested Public	<p>I have had an opportunity to review briefly the January 26 Joint Planning Commission Meeting Agenda Documentation at <a href="http://www.jacksonstetontetonplan.com/files/2011/09/120126-Packet.pdf">http://www.jacksonstetontetonplan.com/files/2011/09/120126-Packet.pdf</a> on the County's Comprehensive Plan web site. It is indicated that public comment will be invited at the workshop. However, with the forecast for another 1 1/2 feet of snow and the recent closures of Teton Pass due to Avalanche control, I anticipate it will be difficult to attend the meeting.</p> <p>I wish to comment on the changes to the draft wording of the Character District Maps / Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>To provide some background information relevant to my comments, the packet for the January 11-12 planning workshop describes the following transportation-related objectives under the heading "Implementation of the Approved Policies in the Character Districts:"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•7.2.c Maximize interconnection, redundancy and hierarchy in the transportation network</li><li>•7.2.d Complete key Transportation Network Projects to improve connectivity</li><li>•7.3.a Develop a land use pattern based on transportation connectivity</li></ul> <p>I see from the packet of information provided prior to the 1/26 workshop/meeting that it has been proposed to make a clarifying (coded color green) change to the draft plan wording:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•Remove 7.2.c as an objective, and to Add 7.3.a as an objective.</li></ul> <p>In view of the considerable public comment which has been offered, it is unclear as to why this is being proposed, as existing transportation "connectivity" is a bit of a hodgepodge. Objective 7.2.c would appear to make it a goal to rationalize the roads and trails network, and therefore would be worth keeping in the Plan. It also would be worthy of consideration to add:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•7.2.d Complete key Transportation Network Projects to improve connectivity</li></ul> <p>to the Objectives for Alta, as that would relate directly to an objective of completing State Line Road, as originally planned and funded several years ago.</p>

## 15: County Periphery

Date	Name	Comment
1/31/2012	Scott, Mary Gibson Grand Teton National P	<p>In June 2011, the Teton County Board of Commissioners and the Jackson Town Council formally adopted the Jackson - Teton County Comprehensive Plan. This action was the result of years of hard work by you, your staff, and many others, and we appreciated the opportunity to provide our own comments on issues relevant to Grand Teton National Park. We commend you on this important achievement and are pleased that the Plan includes numerous references to the importance of coordinating with local federal land managers.</p> <p>While the Comprehensive Plan identified common values, principles, policies, and strategies for achieving the communities' goals, the next step is to identify more specifically how development will be directed in particular areas. The Illustration of Our Vision phase that is currently underway therefore seeks to define the character of 15 individual districts within the Town of Jackson and Teton County. We have reviewed the draft Illustration of Our Vision document and found that it is consistent with and respectful of the resources and values of Grand Teton National Park. We are particularly appreciative of efforts to maintain wildlife movement corridors in areas where it is appropriate to do so.</p> <p>As you continue moving forward with the planning effort, and in other related efforts such as revising the Natural Resources Overlay and the land development regulations, we ask that you continue to be mindful of the potential effects of decisions on Grand Teton National Park. Development on the west side of the Snake River along the Wyoming 390 corridor (Teton Village, Aspens, and Wilson) is of particular importance because of the potential to adversely affect the Moose - Wilson Road corridor within the park. This corridor contains some of the most rich and sensitive wildlife habitat within Grand Teton National Park, and is highly valued for its primitive values, opportunities for wildlife viewing, and access to the Laurance S. Rockefeller Preserve. The rustic, narrow, and winding character of the Moose - Wilson Road, and the relatively slow travel speeds are key to enjoyment of this area. Traffic volumes, however, are rapidly approaching levels that will diminish the quality of visitors' experience, and are likely not sustainable. Future growth on the Wyoming 390 corridor, as well as transportation-related actions may significantly impact the park and should be carefully considered by planners and decision makers.</p> <p>We also note that Character District 15, the County Periphery, includes agricultural lands and open space that are adjacent to or within the boundaries of Grand Teton National Park. We appreciate that the draft Illustration of Our Vision document states that the areas within the County periphery will remain rural in character, that open space will be preserved, and wildlife habitat and movement corridors will be protected and enhanced. These policies, along with the criteria describing development in the Buffalo Valley and Kelly areas are consistent with NPS goals for management of adjacent park lands. As the planning process continues to move forward, we would appreciate the opportunity to provide input on how the land development regulations and Natural Resource Overlay can be used as tools for protecting park resources and values where development on inholdings or adjacent lands is a concern.</p> <p>We appreciate the opportunity to provide these comments and look forward to continued coordination on planning and development decisions that have cross-boundary implications. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please feel free to contact me or Management Assistant Gary Pollock at (307) 739-3411 or 739-3428.</p>
1/25/2012	Bowditch, Fred Interested Public	<p>I wish to comment on the current Master Plan and suggested revisions, in particular to the Re-zoning of Rural Properties and Planned Unit Developments. I am very concerned that Teton County residents will not be able to subdivide or create a PUD on acreage that is less than 35 acres in the future. There are areas in this County where many residents have subdivided larger properties into 10 or 12 acre parcels, leaving a larger (35 or 40 acre parcel) literally "land-locked" by these smaller parcels. In the case of some of these parcels, the owners may have intentions to subdivide or create a PUD in the future, for investment purposes or future (retirement) income. To maintain continuity in a Homeowners Association, it would be odd and not in keeping with area character to have one single parcel of 40 acres surrounded by smaller 10 acre parcels. To eliminate the possibility of future PUD's would be to disregard a Homeowners Association's character, as well as the owner's future intentions.</p> <p>I respectfully request that you review your possible elimination of future PUD's on acreage of less than 35 acres. One extreme zoning regulation does not necessarily work for all of Teton County, and would be unfair to many land owners. I am asking in particular to review the zoning requirements of the Horse Creek Mesa plateau [see attached map], and leave the zoning as is, with the possibility of future PUD's. I appreciate your attention to this matter and look forward to your response.</p>

## Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
2/3/2012	Zardus, Heidi Interested Public	Please don't ruin Jackson Hole! Please protect wildlife and open space in the new comprehensive Plan. I don't want more urbanization of Jackson Hole. There is only one Jackson Hole. It's special. It needs to be protected. It can't accommodate huge urban development, and there is not reason it should. There are many other places that are not national treasures, where development is appropriate. Not here. Please protect the qualities of this valley that most people come her for.
2/3/2012	Jennings, Marc Interested Public	Have you not learnt the message about greed and stupidity yet ...Nature is the only thing left to create any sense of well being , to think and to put some perspective to our existence....More houses means more people which dilutes any chances for nature ...Visiting Nature is one thing and yes should be accessible for all to behold ,but to build is just plain dumb ..I now we will be told Jobs Jobs Jobs well create them out of preserving and visiting this place and not enriching a few to build yet more hideous and polluting dwellings forever spoiling the views and beauty for everybody.....
2/3/2012	O'Brien, Paul F. Interested Public	<p>As we near the end of the long Plan process I want to re-emphasize a point I have made over the past few years, and raise a new concern.</p> <p>First, the primary goal of this Plan should be to play defense, to control, limit, regulate, and indeed discourage development. This is not because development is bad. It is not. It is because intense pressures to develop Teton County are inevitable. Current development rights are large; the County is uniquely attractive for lifestyles, recreation, and scenery; and growing global growth will fuel demand. Combine that thought with the expressed will of the residents and you have a clear objective.</p> <p>Second, I have been disappointed to see signs that the Plan process may be trying to drive wedges among neighborhoods and communities by looking for “someplace” to put density. The character district approach has value in allowing the Plan to consider local issues and concerns. But it must not be used as a tool to divide. So far, community groups have recognized this risk and reinforced their solidarity. But I would welcome clear and emphatic statements from planners and elected officials that they understand this danger and will oppose any efforts to set district against district.</p> <p>Finally, I want to thank all of you for the work you have done. It has been a long process, but much has been and can be accomplished from it.</p>
2/2/2012	Muromcew, Alexander Interested Public	I wish to support the message in the ad in today's JH Daily by the Village Road Coalition and the Wilson Advisory Committee: Please keep our neighborhoods stable. I am against the urbanization of Jackson Hole.
2/2/2012	Hocking, Scott Interested Public	Please stop adding density to Teton County.We need a stable community of a small size to not further impact or destroy the wildlife that lives in Teton County. High density housing belongs next to cities,not in this remote corner of our state. Please include buildout population numbers in your forecasts.These allow for rational discussion about future population,and allows residents to envision what size this county can or should become. If we are at 20,000 residents today,we need to take a long look at our waste transfer station,associated costs,and what will be done with that trash as more housing and people are encouraged to reside here. The road system and trash system should be at the front of these discussions,not after they are impacted and turn out to be insufficient.

## Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
2/2/2012	Campbell, Leon G. Interested Public	<p>For four long years, elected officials and the Jackson Community have been working on the draft Comprehensive Plan which, when completed, will establish the future character of the Jackson Hole Valley for generations. It has been a long and exhaustive process which remains unfinished yet is being scheduled for completion early this year.</p> <p>It is ironic, despite the long hours devoted to such an important document, that the draft today is hardly comprehensive in the sense that maximum densities are still not established and thus, residential areas including Jackson, the Aspens, South Park and Teton Village fear that additional density from the more remote reaches of the County will be visited upon them in the new Plan, robbing them of their cohesion and unique character. These neighborhoods are in competition with each other to remain relatively rural and open.</p> <p>The Plan must mandate that infill development first be approved in Jackson, but only to a point where the town is able to preserve its Western frontier character as the "Last Best Place" in a rapidly urbanizing nation. However, if growth limits are established for Jackson, it is also necessary to limit the growth in the above neighborhoods at the amount entitled in 1994 which presently allows doubling of the built environment! For elected officials to permit additive growth in these several residential areas in the new Plan is madness. Additional densities can be left to future generations if the situation so dictates well into the future.</p> <p>In the South Park neighborhood, as an example, good planning would dictate that High School Road, which bisects the Northwest corridor of this neighborhood, remain rural to encourage walking and bicycling and minimizing automobile traffic. If development of the northwest quadrant of South Park results in residential growth in view of 1,000 homes it would exceed the size of Cottonwood Park, Rafter J and Melody Ranch neighborhoods combined!</p> <p>Moreover, any density approvals in northwest South Park must be linked to and contingent upon large landowners and the Jackson Hole Land Trust securing permanent conservation easements on the southerly part of South Park which not only functions as a scenic gateway to Jackson but an important wildlife corridor as well.</p> <p>A truly Comprehensive Plan, which has the primary objective of keeping rural, more distant and detached parts of the County, hardly is intended to accept growth from other parts of the Valley such as Alta and Buffalo Valley, at Jackson's expense nor to encourage additional commercial, industrial or mixed-use projects which additive density would demand.</p> <p>Density maximums must be established in the Plan so that growth is sequentially established in Jackson and its several residential communities consistent with their historical character. This is the key component of the Plan that the public has demanded of elected officials for four years and which is still not clarified in the latest draft. The community has spoken plainly that it does not wish additive growth. Nor does it have the funds or inclination to pay infrastructural costs of such growth. If elected officials recognize this fact and institutionalize it with growth limits and density maximums it will become abundantly clear that Jackson has 'men who match our mountains' who have served this community faithfully and well.</p>

## Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
2/2/2012	Harvey, Ann Interested Public	<p>I am writing once again to comment on the seemingly endless comprehensive plan process. The bottom line, I think, is that you need to ensure that the plan lives up to its lofty ideals of protecting wildlife, habitat, scenery, and the other values that define Jackson Hole. You do not do this by adding more growth, whether it's in Wilson, the Aspens, South Park, or anywhere else in the valley. The more growth the plan allows, the more fragmented and degraded wildlife habitat becomes, and the more Jackson Hole resembles all the other places where humans dominate the landscape. Please stop thinking in terms of nodes, or spots, or whatever other cancerous terms describe additive growth in Jackson Hole. We do not want or need a plan that calls for more growth. It's hard to imagine what Jackson Hole will be like with the doubling in growth that's already allowed--how can you possibly think that it's your duty to encourage even more?</p> <p>When will specific mechanisms for decreasing development in rural areas, and permanently preserving open space, be revealed to the public? Learning from the newspaper that there's a lot of "flexibility" in how 2000 potential units will be shifted from rural areas to denser areas does little to inspire confidence that this is anything more than fantasy. It's a laudable ideal to concentrate growth in the town of Jackson and decrease it in the rural parts of the valley, but until the second part of the equation is dealt with, you shouldn't be even considering additive growth anywhere in the County. After 4 years of planning, shouldn't the means of decreasing density be figured out? It's easy to allow more growth and hard to preserve open space, but taking the path of least resistance is not exactly good planning.</p> <p>I'm glad to see that the current version of the plan calls for preserving much of South Park instead of making the whole thing a density dumping ground. Please stick to this. And if any increase in density is approved for the Northwest corner, it must be clearly tied to decreasing density and permanent open space protection throughout the rural areas of South Park. The map descriptions should affirm this and be consistent with the plan language. No density increase should be directed to South Park until the Town has reached its infill potential. And no commercial development should be allowed in South Park.</p> <p>I am also entirely supportive of the Village Road residents who object to adding growth to the Aspens area. It just doesn't make sense to do that, given transportation and infrastructure issues, as well as wildlife values in that part of the valley.</p>
2/2/2012	Close, Tina Interested Public	<p>I have lived here 30 years and seen the wildlife go down in population. Please, please; please NO MORE Density anywhere! We have enough human population in the valley. Add more and takes away our good life here.</p> <p>Have some guts to say NO to more development and more density.</p>
2/2/2012	Boynton, Bryan Interested Public	<p>Please keep Jackson Stable.</p> <p>My wife and I live here for the small town character, wildlife/open space and community.</p> <p>Lets not change it since a few greedy developers want to get richer.</p>
2/1/2012	Costello, M. E. Interested Public	<p>I have a home at 2665 Tucker Ranch Road on the West Bank</p> <p>This is email is urge you not to allow our wonderful community to become pockets of high density development. Jackson is the most wonderful community in the west and to change its character in this manner would be disastrous.</p>

## Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
2/1/2012	Huff, Mercedes Interested Public	<p>Thank you for taking the time to read this letter and listen to my comments. I know this has been an arduous process and it's close to the end – which is why it is SO critical to get it right and not ruin our precious valley.</p> <p>I am writing to you today because there is a strong inclination on the part of some of you to increase the density in the area of the Aspens by 300+ residential units. That is not to say that I'm not enormously concerned about the Valley as a whole. This same thinking will be replicated in other areas of the Valley. The product of four years of planning was given to you last March and you overturned what the public had so strongly asked for. Through many public hearings and letters written to planning commissioners it was agreed that the idea of upzoned "nodes" was not the direction the people of Teton County wanted to go. But lo and behold, you decided to do that anyway. Under the guise of preserving wildlife, you're proposing to remove people's property rights in the more rural areas by downzoning them and transferring those development rights to these "nodes" or "character districts" which will become very dense towns of their own. I can't think of anything less in keeping with the character of the valley. How can you take away someone's property rights (without guaranteeing any permanent protection of those areas for open space) and then shove them into another area where they aren't wanted?</p> <p>The basic problem here is that too much density is being created. The 1994 Comprehensive Plan had a population cap which most people have expressed they would like to see DECREASED. What this New Plan proposes to do will actually INCREASE development.</p> <p>Much of the vitality of our community comes from the protective feelings so many of us share for this very special place. We didn't choose to live in a place that could become like Park City, Vail or the like. I strongly encourage you to keep Jackson Hole STABLE, to resist the urge of some planners to transition this Valley into a more urban community. This is an absolutely critical time, because this kind of error and bad planning will have disastrous results that can't be undone.</p> <p>Some might ask why, as a real estate broker, I am opposing this dense development. THE ANSWER IS SIMPLE – IT'S THE RIGHT THING TO DO. LESS IS MORE!</p>
2/1/2012	Rogers, Nancy and John Interested Public	<p>Please, please, please, keep Jackson Hole Stable. We do not want a more urban community!!!</p>
2/1/2012	Jern, Sherrie Interested Public	<p>When I attended the meeting on January 26, I heard one of the county planning commissioners say "no one wants density in their back yard and the growth at Teton Village will break 390's back anyway, so why not break it now."</p> <p>I disagree on many levels. Increased density in Teton County, for me is not relative to just my personal backyard.</p> <p>I consider all residents of Teton County to be my neighbors and all of Teton County to be my back yard. I (and many others) also believe that the thousands of homes allowed to yet be built under the 1994 Comprehensive Plan is all that our "neighborhood" can physically support.</p> <p>To use the term "NIMBY" promotes division and prejudice when you are assuming to know the beliefs of residents working to protect this Valley for all of their neighbors now and into the future. Increased density in any area affects us all.</p>

## Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
2/1/2012	Moyer, Peter, F. Interested Public	<p>RE:The Basic Problem and Issue -- Social Engineering</p> <p>It was interesting to read the Ben Ellis quotes in today's front page article. The Jackson Hole community has said over and over again, that we want STABILITY in our neighborhoods, and permanent protection of wildlife/open space resources.</p> <p>Yet Ben and some others have taken that clear message and turned it on its head. Fictional and temporary down-zoning would be used as an excuse to up-zone immediately for "work force housing" levels advocated by the Housing Authority. That would be pure social engineering by some politicians and government planners. Coupled with Ben's threat to dump up-zoning density in other neighborhoods, if removed from the Aspens! To me that is a bullying "divide and conquer" tactic by Ben, and it is dead wrong.</p> <p>We already have a Valley where 68% of the people who live here, work here. The remaining second home people are an important part of our history and our economy, not the enemy. Do we really need to up-zone and urbanize Jackson in order to ward off second home owners and to bring in more people from Driggs and Alpine? I think not.</p> <p>I have enclosed the 2010 Housing Authority "Blue Ribbon Panel" findings which are the basis for Ben's current up-zoning and subsidized housing campaign.</p> <p>P.S. -- Great Letters to the Editor today. Thank you Kristine, Justin and Kathy.</p> <p>Teton County and Jackson planners have been pushing a basic re-do of Comprehensive Plan provisions which have been in effect for 18 years. Neighborhoods would be targeted for commercial and residential up-zonings. The only additional protection of open space and wildlife resources would come from selected down-zoning-- with no permanent protection of these valuable open space and wildlife resources. Unlike the existing clustering/open space provisions in our Plan.</p> <p>We believe that this approach is unwise, and would lead to increased urbanization of Jackson Hole with an adverse impact on wildlife, on open space, and on the great community character which attracts so many residents and visitors to our Valley.</p> <p>Much of the vitality of our community comes from the intense protective feelings so many of us share, for this very special place. Please contact our Teton County Commissioners at <a href="mailto:commissioners@tetonwyo.org">commissioners@tetonwyo.org</a> and the Jackson Town Council at <a href="mailto:electedofficials@ci.jacksonwy.us">electedofficials@ci.jacksonwy.us</a> and urge them to keep Jackson Hole and its neighborhoods STABLE, to resist the urge of some planners to transition this Valley into a more urban community.</p> <p>This is an absolutely critical time, because errors of this kind really cannot be undone. Please take some time to comment. It is very, very important.</p> <p>We hope that you join all of us in caring deeply about our community, our wildlife/open space resources, and our friendly small town character.</p> <p>Village Road Coalition Wilson Advisory Committee South Park Neighbors North of Town Neighbors Cottonwood Park Neighbors East Jackson Neighbors</p>
2/1/2012	McIntyre, Julie Interested Public	<p>Most residents in Teton County made a personal choice, really, a commitment to live in this splendid place. We could have stayed in cities or the 'burbs and perhaps enjoyed greater monetary reward, but we made the choice to be near nature and live here. I am concerned that density "spots" continue to be a moving target in our Comprehensive Plan. If one targeted zone has the good fortune to be "saved" because of its perceived intrinsic value, then the thinking seems to be that another area must open up. Why? As far as the wildlife are concerned, this is one ecosystem that they live in and travel through all year. Maybe it's time to stop aspiring to be Boulder/Austin/etc., and appreciate where we are: living in a relatively unwrecked ecosystem with healthy wildlife yet abiding.</p> <p>In short: please uphold our rural values with the highest priority to protect wildlife. Teton County residents have strongly expressed and supported this throughout the CP process. ALL neighborhoods are valuable, we don't want more density, we are asking for predictability and conservation. When can enough be enough?</p>

## Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
1/31/2012	Moyer, Peter, F. Interested Public	<p>The attached policy ad will be running in the Daily this week, and the two weeklies on Wednesday, February 8 next week.</p> <p>Peter</p> <p>Teton County planners have been pushing a basic re-do of Comprehensive Plan provisions which have been in effect for 18 years. Selected neighborhoods would be targeted for commercial and residential up-zonings. The only additional protection of open space and wildlife resources would come from selected down-zoning- with no permanent protection of these valuable open space and wildlife resources.</p> <p>Unlike the existing clustering/open space provisions in our Plan.</p> <p>We believe that this approach is unwise, and would lead to increased urbanization of Jackson Hole with an adverse impact on wildlife, on open space, and on the great community character which attracts so many residents and visitors to our Valley.</p> <p>Much of the vitality of our community comes from the intense protective feelings so many of us share, for this very special place. Please contact our Teton County Commissioners at <a href="mailto:commissioners@tetonwyo.org">commissioners@tetonwyo.org</a> and urge them to keep Jackson Hole and its neighborhoods STABLE, to resist the urge of some planners to transition this Valley into a more urban community.</p> <p>This is an absolutely critical time, because errors of this kind really cannot be undone. Please take some time to comment. It is very, very important.</p> <p>We hope that you join all of us in caring deeply about our community, our wildlife/open space resources, and our friendly small town character.</p> <p>Village Road Coalition South Park Neighbors Wilson Advisory Committee North of Town Neighbors</p>
1/30/2012	Delorme, Carrie Interested Public	<p>i would like to comment on the article in the jackson hole news &amp; guide today about commissioners removing the Aspens from the "high-density" area of growth. they are wondering now where to put the additional housing they approved in the plan. i say NOWHERE.</p> <p>reduce it and remove it from the plan. who says you need growth and development? development should be capped almost completely. the town of jackson and the surrounding areas are congested and over-developed to begin with. ever try driving through town???</p> <p>growth inevitably means higher property taxes, higher cost of living, and lower standard of living. it's not necessarily a good thing.</p> <p>continued growth leads eventually to places like chicago, new york, los angeles. i know nobody wants to say it but everyone is thinking it - NO MORE GROWTH!</p>



## Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
1/26/2012	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	<p>I am hopeful that you will do right by the people of Jackson Hole who have worked hard to make this plan fair to all.</p> <p>Under Illustrating our Vision it states that "Realizing our vision means proactively planning for what we want – rural open spaces and high quality complete neighborhoods – and identifying where we want them. Our Vision and Common Values describe how we will direct development toward suitable areas in order to preserve and protect the ecosystem and design development to enhance our quality of life. The Illustration of Our Vision identifies where those suitable areas are located. As important as location, is the type of preservation or development desired. Unlike the past, a principle of growth management in this Plan is predictable implementation. By defining the desired character for each area of the community, all community members know what to expect as a result of preservation and development regulations and incentives. In areas suitable for development, the Illustration of Our Vision describes how we will protect the character we love while ensuring that the development contributes to the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. The Illustration of Our Vision also describes how we will preserve and enhance all other areas to provide wildlife habitat, wildlife connectivity, scenery, and open space. The community is committed to continually adapting our implementation strategies to ensure preservation and development occurs in the desired amount, location, and type. This can only be realized if we define desired location and character for the preservation and development. Adapting our implementation also requires rigorous analysis of our successes and failures. The Illustration of Our Vision defines existing, baseline character in addition to desired future character; allowing implementation strategies to be adapted based on analysis rather than theory. Our community's many districts share common values, but also have unique identities. While each of our community's policies is important to achieving our Vision, not all policies apply community wide. Each individual preservation and development project should be a contributing piece in the community wide plan for achieving our Vision. The Illustration of Our Vision is the community wide picture of where we will place all the pieces – ensuring that all policies of this Plan are implemented in the context of our Vision and no policies are forgotten."</p> <p>We can improve the district maps by including what our community has always called for and has stated so in OUR vision above. If we don't, the latter part of the above which states that "allowing implementation strategies to be adapted based on analysis rather than theory" will be in fact the opposite. Without the projected growth numbers for each district and over all for town and county, we will be theorizing our way into a quagmire that only developers could love.</p> <p>Please focus on decreasing development in desirable areas rather than focusing on where growth should go. Focusing on just growth areas will lead to careless development planning and cost overruns that will hurt everyone. Also work with the Land Trust and large land owners by providing incentives to permanently retire development rights. The Land Trust is very important to the success of the comprehensive plan.</p> <p>Being from Cottonwood Park I would like to repeat the some of the recommendations that JHCA has submitted to the process.</p> <p>District 5: West Jackson</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>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.</li><li>b. Recommendation: Section 5.4 should commit to repurposing High School Road primarily as a residential access road and not a highway.</li><li>c. Recommendation: Section 5.6 needs to be clarified with regard to the lower priority of development in northwest South Park.</li></ul> <p>You can either ruin High School road with theories or go by the numbers. You can't have industrial growth and have a safe environment for school zones and the neighborhoods around them. Hopefully you read my letters in the past pushing for a campus road that promotes safety and less traffic on High School Road. It is so important now that the district map is calling for expansion of the school zone on High School Road. Please respect our wishes as property owners with rights too. We are not looking to make money off of it. We are just looking to preserve our land and it's value as a</p>

## Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment														
		great family neighborhood.														
1/26/2012	Coon, Dave Interested Public	<p>Over the last four years a tremendous amount of effort, thought and expense has gone into the re-write of the Comprehensive Plan that will be the guide our future growth, development and preservation of this great place I am privileged to call home. The whole process has been long, involved and tenuous. The results are good and I applaud all the participants, but some “tweaking” is still required.</p> <p>Let’s look at the key words and some definitions:</p> <p>Comprehensive: Wide in scope; inclusive.</p> <p>Plan: A scheme for making, doing, or arranging something.</p> <p>For most of the current re-write, the intentions and wording reflect what the desires of the community were in terms of scope and inclusion, but some areas are not specific enough, too general or simply too vague to meet the true definition of a complete Plan. Before you recommend or approve this document, please consider the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•The current proposed language doesn’t address the fiscal impacts (costs) of growth. Even with the entitled development already on the books, realistic infrastructure improvements could be astronomical. Here are some very basic estimates:</li></ul> <table><tr><td>-Roads/Highways/Wildlife mitigation</td><td>\$200 million</td></tr><tr><td>-Public Transportation</td><td>\$150 million</td></tr><tr><td>-Schools (6 more @ 30m)</td><td>\$180 million</td></tr><tr><td>-Sewer/Water Improvements</td><td>\$200 million</td></tr><tr><td>-Power Grid Improvements</td><td>\$200 million</td></tr><tr><td>-Public Buildings (hospital, airport, administrative, trash, etc.)</td><td>\$100 million</td></tr><tr><td>-Public Services (Fire, Police, Administrative, etc.)</td><td>\$150 million</td></tr></table> <p>As you can see, we will be looking at some serious future costs to provide basic services for anticipated growth during the next 40 to 50 years. Additional language pertaining to fiscal review, an implementation plan/schedule, etc., is warranted in this document. Don’t expect people to keep voting for the SPET!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•Current language doesn’t adequately address the costs and impacts of additive growth to select character districts. Please allow only “already entitled” infill development in all character districts. Remember the pleas for predictability, preserving rural/neighborhood character and NO additive growth!</li></ul> <p> </p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•Current language doesn’t clearly address an incentive mechanism for preserving wildlife/open space by transferring development to more appropriate areas.</li></ul> <p>Please keep in mind that anything you/we do regarding our human needs has a greater effect on the natural environment than one can imagine. The Rockefeller’s were looking forward into perpetuity with their vision; our Plan has an intended lifespan of only 10 to 15 years. Let’s make John D extremely proud by approving the best plan possible. Thanks for all the great work!</p>	-Roads/Highways/Wildlife mitigation	\$200 million	-Public Transportation	\$150 million	-Schools (6 more @ 30m)	\$180 million	-Sewer/Water Improvements	\$200 million	-Power Grid Improvements	\$200 million	-Public Buildings (hospital, airport, administrative, trash, etc.)	\$100 million	-Public Services (Fire, Police, Administrative, etc.)	\$150 million
-Roads/Highways/Wildlife mitigation	\$200 million															
-Public Transportation	\$150 million															
-Schools (6 more @ 30m)	\$180 million															
-Sewer/Water Improvements	\$200 million															
-Power Grid Improvements	\$200 million															
-Public Buildings (hospital, airport, administrative, trash, etc.)	\$100 million															
-Public Services (Fire, Police, Administrative, etc.)	\$150 million															