



## Community Open House & Workshop Summary

---

Wednesday, November 7, 2007 – 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.  
St. John's Episcopal Church, Fellowship Hall, Jackson

### Format/Agenda:

- **Presentation** about "Working Vision" and its role, mapped areas of change and stability, land use capacity and build out information, community character concepts, and balance and trade-offs within the Vision's elements. The presentation also discussed the mapping exercise.
- **Table Mapping Exercise.** Participants reviewed and worked on two maps focused on: (1) countywide mapping and (2) Town of Jackson.
- **Wrap-up**
- **Individual "Working Vision" and Goals comments** - Individual participants commented on posters.

### Participation:

Over 120 people attended the meeting.

Staff: Jeff Daugherty, Blair Leist, Amy Kuszak, Alex Norton, Susan Johnson, Maggie Schilling, Mary Shouf, (County), Jeff Noffsinger, Abbie Bilotta, and Shawn Hill (Town), Ben Herman and Lesli Ellis (Clarion), and Bill Collins (Collins Planning).

### Meeting Summary:

#### Objectives:

---

- 1 Share ideas about the "Working Vision" and goals,
- 2 Define "community character" and preferences, and
- 3 Develop preliminary ideas for land use concepts (countywide and for the Town of Jackson) to assist the team with preparing a range of land use alternatives.

## **Comments on the Community “Working Vision” and Themes and Guiding Principles (organized by theme)**

---

### **Stewardship of Natural, Scenic, and Environmentally Sensitive Areas:**

- We are too quick to throw out NRO protection
- No development in existing NRO or sensitive designated lands.
- Wildlife is what make this a special, unique place. Every effort to protect, preserve, enhance wildlife habitat, migration routes, and sustainability is essential.
- Protect wildlife habitat. Please don't compromise effectiveness of conservation easements with density in adjoining areas.

### **Meet Our Community's Diverse Housing Needs:**

- Unless commercial development is limited, employee housing will never be totally satisfied. Limit the number of jobs in Teton County by restrictive zoning and enforcing it and an adequate amount of attainable employment housing can be achieved. Teton county may not need the same percent of worker housing as other counties.
- Community needs to be protected. There are too many second homes and a shift to fractional ownership condos.
- Specify affordable housing qualification beyond income.
- Integrate affordable housing in town neighborhoods.
- Maximize Town of Jackson development and redevelopment possibilities that include workforce ownership and rental housing – no less than 60% mitigation rates.
- How about affordable rentals for our workers?
- Provide affordable housing with space. Do not cram on top of each other. Give kids room to play.
- Concentrate development (housing) in Town of Jackson near transportation, services, and schools.

### **Comprehensive, Integrated Transportation Strategy:**

- Get good baseline data for non-motorized travel so we can measure changes (in addition to monitoring afterwards)
- Roundabouts work well and are great for slowing down traffic.
- Add grocery stores/ services to areas that are lacking to decrease motor traffic to reach services.
- Funding mechanisms for alternate transportation. Link to growth development. (transfer tax?)
- Increase transportation and increase walking areas with closure to traffic so people have to ride the bus.

### **Manage Growth Responsibly:**

- I see no data to support the statement that we “accommodate necessary changes while preserving the defined build out” All developers expect up-zoning.
- Set a cap on building for the county. No up-zones.
- Preserving open lands and natural resources” should be the paramount theme to Teton County's comprehensive plan. If this is truly adhered to, all other community

values will follow. Otherwise, what is unique about this place will be sacrificed to greed and growth.

### **Jackson as “Heart of the Region”:**

- Town as “Heart of Region” is going too far when zoning regulations allow excessive building height to squeeze more people in—increase density.
- Restore essential services (grocery store) to downtown / core area (within pedestrian and biking distance).
- Agree—more pedestrian-friendly throughout. Significant problems with cross- walks.
- Yes on concentration of development in town where the services are.
- Add: Pedestrian system, complete streets, reduce free parking to encourage modal shifts.

### **A Diverse and Balanced Community:**

- Outdoor-based recreation and tourism are no longer the economic backbone. Real estate and development are.
- Guiding principles should incorporate “wildlife” values. Not simply commercial and recreational.
- Last sentence of Guiding Principle is ill-defined catch-all. Delete!
- Remember that a balanced community is made up of people of all ages. Where do seniors fit in?
- Affordable/attainable housing; that allows home owners a small business downstairs and reside upstairs (i.e., Wilson Plan already allows this. New affordable – could incorporate this.)
- We are losing our working class. Need more affordable rental properties.

## ***Mapping Exercise***

---

This section summarizes the work done by the groups at the meeting (for County and Town and for the subareas within them). The more detailed notes from each table are attached separately. The summary below presents the general range of ideas from all the tables.

### **County Planning Areas – Range of Alternatives to Explore**

#### ***General Comments:***

- Need to show wildlife habitat on maps, especially critical winter range and migration corridors.
- Most groups agreed that South Park is an appropriate place for some neighborhood growth, but it needs to be balanced with conservation.
- Some groups would like to see little to no growth overall.
- A lot of conversation about the need for pedestrian-friendly development.
- Many, but not all, viewed clustered development as a decent option.
- Some suggested eliminating resort zoning as a future option.
- Many discussed whether there should be an end point to expanding roads? Roads affect community character.

The results below reflect the range of ideas discussed for each county planning area:

#### ***Alta***

- Current zoning: Rural.
- More focus on agriculture conservation (TDRs).
- More focus on clustering
- Small convenience commercial potential (if local residents need).
- Targhee – address separately (small ski area versus 450 units).

#### ***Buffalo Valley***

- Current zoning: Rural.
- Convenience commercial potential (if local residents need).
- Clustering, but less excited about it.

#### ***Kelly***

- Residential on smaller lots on former town site (NPS housing)
- Current zoning: Rural
- Small convenience commercial potential.

### *Airport/Golf and Tennis*

- Potential node for mixed-use core area.
- Convenience commercial potential.
- Current zoning: Suburban Residential and pockets of rural clustered.

### *Aspens/Teton Pines*

- Seen as a good model for other areas – with Village center, bike and pedestrian-friendly , and accessible by transit.
- West side of 390 with Village Center (as is) with east side low density clustered with some agriculture.

### *Spring Gulch*

- Current zoning: Mostly rural
- More aggressive conservation.

### *South Park*

- Conservation (especially around river and in scenic area near road).
- Current zoning: Very low density rural.
- Neighborhood residential, just near town on Herford Ranch – near town.
- Neighborhood residential, spread further to South Park Loop Road with Convenience or local Mixed-Use Village Commercial (no big box).
- Blend of all of above, matching density to surrounding neighborhoods.
- Appropriate location for receiving site for TDRs.

### *Moose-Wilson Road*

- Plan for Teton Village as a node. It could be an appropriate receiving area for TDR and more density (especially from Moose-Wilson Road).
- The Village has reached its peak for allowable density. Strong conservation emphasis (downzoning?).
- Current zoning.

### *Wilson*

- Defer to Wilson plan – not much if any increased density except for some housing.
- A few groups suggested some density increase.
- Fish Creek and wildlife protection important.

### *Fall Creek Road (South)*

- Conservation west of road (wetlands, wildlife, riparian areas around Fish Creek).

- Current zoning: Single family and rural.
- Some groups discussed the golf resort concept, but none advocated for it.

#### *Hog Island*

- Area south of Evans could be neighborhood development.
- Current zoning: Rural.

#### *Hoback*

- Current zoning: Rural.
- Conservation for wildlife is important.
- Some increased convenience services. Small node/core at the Junction? Doesn't seem to have much potential to expand though.

### **Town of Jackson – Range of Alternatives to Explore**

#### *General:*

- Most groups would like to see growth occur in and around the town rather than dispersed. Sequential development instead of leap-frog was a common theme.
- A number of tables discuss the mix of affordable housing in new development mix (ranging from 0% to 60%).
- A number of groups mentioned "Green areas" integrated with density as being important.
- Gateways and appearance important.
- There are natural resources and wildlife habitat areas even in town (e.g., Mule Deer, Cache Creek corridor, hillsides). Make sure alternatives address conservation and open space in town too.
- Enough commercial in town, but need more residential.
- Enough high-end lodging; perhaps a need for family-friendly lodging.
- Western character important to a lot of the participants.
- Add Flat Creek Corridor as a planning area.
- Some concern about four stories. Many tables seemed to be more comfortable with three stories.

#### *Downtown*

- Town square – historic overlay
- Range of density options from no increases (2 story) to 3 to 4 stories near Town Square and just beyond.
- Housing is a recurring theme – mix of more housing.

- Pearl is locals district with strong desire to keep some separation between locals and tourists.
- Expand to include Cache

### *Commercial Corridor*

- Current auto-oriented zoning
- Area for increased mixed use and more housing with some more intense nodes for local commercial services. Needs to be more pedestrian-and bike friendly with increased transit. Improve appearance.

### *Downtown Residential "East Jackson"*

- Current zoning.
- Protected primarily single family (with some single-family, townhome, and condominium dwellings.
- More mixed-use and higher density housing between downtown and Snow King.
- Incorporate grocery store, small commercial.
- Auxiliary units.
- No lodging.

### *Snow King*

- Address as separate area with potential for housing.

### ***Build out***

---

Some groups were concerned that the number seem high and that a TDR or stronger focus on conservation approach or down zoning might make sense.

## ***Comment Forms (11 received at the meeting)***

---

### **1. Comments about the draft “Community Vision”**

- Limit growth to 1.5% per year. This will be sustainable.
- I think this process is extremely important and essential to keeping our community as a wonderful place to live.
- I like it, but I have some problems with the last sentence.
- Provide planned growth and development for working class concentrated in South Park area.
- Very concerned about Wilson Mix-use Village. The density in Wilson is fine. Wilson character is great! Don't place restrictions on building styles. That is what makes Wilson unique. We bought into Wilson because of this, not to have planners essentially place CC&R's on our property. Is the mix-use plan a part of the comprehensive plan? If it is, separate it out and work on separately.
- Means think small and inexpensive; means community not grandiose development; means small, with town of western character and wildlife. Do not want a large over developed town.
- I would like to see defined “affordable housing” category. These developments should be clustered, and dispersed around the county and town.
- Fine.
- Continue to up-zone in 1,3, and 4. If it means taller buildings, then so be it. City condos (like across from the Police Station) should continue with businesses downstairs and condo's upstairs.

### **2. Comments about the draft Themes and Guiding Principles**

- Do not simply create an open door for developers, who are transient and profit-oriented by nature. Make a plan that is beneficial for families and permanent residents.
- Very comprehensive and yet requires more detail.
- Ok.
- Affordable housing.
- Add: conservation, western character, wildlife. We don't need to fill everyone's needs—the rich or the transient.
- Sustainability—balance of energy/environmental concerns, and affordability (to create a viable community).
- Pathways through town are important. Parks where possible and then up-zone areas around the Virginian and Snow King.

### **3. Comments about a definition of “Community Character” (for the County, for the Town)**

- Most important driving force for future planning. Keys words: Rural, western (as in cowboy \_\_ (word?)), friendly, personal, and low density. Note: Modern, Denver-style, urban architecture is not appropriate.
- We need some strict design guidelines so Jackson/Teton County does not become like Vail or some other non-unique place. Limit the number of Avante Garde-style structures.

- It is very hard to define, but I know that the bigger we get, the more we lose. The enemy of preservation is people.
- Western/contemporary mix is welcome!
- Western, small, homely, fun not looming 2-3 story buildings from Aspen or Vail.
- Local, western-themed identity. Preserve sense of history and dedication to wildlife preservation.
- Workforce and volunteer housing
- Why do visitors come here? They want to see open spaces preserved as much as possible because that is too why we came.

#### 4. Comments about locations for growth or conservation

- If we up zone South Park and Sherr-Thoss, we must create a new Town Center to serve the thousands of suburbanites south of town. This means a town square, post office, grocery store, etc. Also, Teton Village must be treated like a new town, and given the approved new construction under SRA. Do not include Wilson for a commercial “node.” It will be ruined.
- We need much more conservation from Wilson along Fall Creek Road. Jackson (the town) has more space for growth, especially Northwest Broadway.
- Allow high density rental housing in area 4 (See Attached letter.)
- If you truly believe in (the community vision and the themes and principles), the current build-out projection is unacceptable. I feel that we need to determine the county’s “carrying capacity”. Pick that number, and then back into everything else. The population of the valley should be determined by tallying the number of residences, plus all the condos, time-shares, and motel rooms to determine the total number of people who can be here on any given day. That’s the number of people that will affect community character.
- Growth potential: Teton Meadows, Hog Island, Hoback must incorporate infrastructure; transportation, pathways, and sidewalks. Affordable housing for working class.
- Always need conservation everywhere. For growth: Melody Ranch – its already altered. Put caps on buildings regardless of developer’s applications. Just say “no” and don’t let them cry “loss of revenue, etc.”
- Preserve open land and ranches along Hwy 89/191 south of town. Reject building Teton Meadows Ranch’s – much too high density. Instead, change zoning laws in downtown and East Jackson to allow greater density development. East residential Jackson is incredibly strange versus most other communities. Instead of sprawling out south of town, we should build up East Jackson and allow greater density. Teton Meadows Ranch will ruin the beautiful scenic corridor south of town. A much larger highway will be required as well as commercial development to support that development if you let them build it. Do not chip seal any more roads! Do no chip seal Ski Hill Road next spring. Use asphalt! Follow the Complete Streets Plan, and Safe Routes to School. Put multi-use pathways all the way through town.

#### Other Miscellaneous Comments

- Transportation traffic not showed.
- Wildlife corridors.
- Park - How much does county drive?

- What does “very low density” mean? Definitions of “type”
- NRO- conservation/ no build → 1/35 acre
- Boundaries - can’t lump all together (Wilson, Mark “3Sts”.)
- Mixed-use leads to huge up up-zones, no expanded commercial.
- Conservation in all.
- South Park – low density – no village center equates less traffic. Traffic concern huge.
- Make sure we include: Pathways all the way through town; complete streets. Safe routes to school.
- No large hotels in down town.
- No buildings taller than current zoning laws permit.
- Keep/ maintain small town, small building unique western character in zones 1 and 2. No strip malls. No commercial/ industrial parks alone Hwy 89/191- keep them behind a more pleasant streetscape.
- Essential to educate new home buyers and other newcomers about the comp plan.

## Notes for Group Mapping Work and Discussions

---

### Table 1

#### County

---

##### General Themes:

- Preservation of key wildlife crucial winter range and migration corridors was very important to this group. We had Rich with the Teton Science School at our table who had knowledge about the major wildlife migration corridors (this was mapped with red arrows).
- Preserving Teton County's night sky was also a dominant theme.
- Enforcing strict skylining regulations was also important to this group.
- Conservation of land within the County seemed to be a key theme. Members of this group primarily wanted to see density increases within the Town to deal with population increases and to place needed affordable housing.
- The only area identified as a good place for affordable housing within the County by this group was within the South Park Loop.
- This group did not like the "leap frog" like developments of Rafter J and Melody Ranch. They believed that development should be sequential and should start close to Town and then move out within the County.

#### Town

---

- Affordable housing was a key discussion for this group when reviewing the Town map. The Town was identified as a good place to locate affordable housing since it is close to services, transportation, etc.
- This group believed that at least 60% of the housing approved within the Town should be housing that is affordable, but not necessarily affordable housing. They made this distinction because they believe that our current affordable housing excludes segments of the population that cannot get into affordable housing, but also cannot afford market rate homes.
- This group identified areas 1 and 2 as good places for mixed-used development (commercial on the bottom floors and residential on 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> floor). While they liked the idea of mixed-use development in these areas, they wanted to make a point that they did not like the architecture depicted in the example pictures. They felt like those pictures did not fit within Jackson or the western architectural character they would like to see.
- Did not want to see buildings getting over 3 stories. They also wanted to see green areas within densely packed developments.
- This group focused a lot on the "gateway" areas located on Highway 22 as you are entering Town from Wilson and on Highway 89 as you are entering Town from the

National Park. This group believed that the industrial uses at the gateway on Highway 22 should be eliminated over time and replaced with more attractive development. Overall, this group wanted to see development in these areas that would be architecturally sensitive to the “gateway” status.

- Area 4 was identified as another important area for wildlife.
- A fifth area was identified by this group on the map. This area is depicted as just north of the “Y” junction in Town. This group was concerned about the development occurring in this area. Specifically, they were worried about how landowners were obtaining access to these areas (ugly access roads scarring up the side of the butte). They were also worried about skylining within this general area and thought it should not occur.

## Table 2

### **General comments:**

---

- Integrate affordable housing in all areas; do not segregate.

### **County**

---

#### **Alta**

- No commercial seems necessary given Alta’s proximity to Driggs, but need input from residents.
- Need to preserve public access
- Need to incorporate Grand Targhee

Development patterns: E and possibly F (Alta core/ church and school), A (outside Alta Core), no pattern - Grand Targhee Resort

#### **Buffalo Valley**

- Recommend no additional commercial, but need input from residents.

Development patterns: A (Highway 26 – 287)

#### **Kelly**

- Kelly needs a store. Recommend local convenience store (zoning to accommodate) where uses are restricted to neighborhood needs.

Development patterns: A and F but not mixed-use.

#### **Airport**

- Needs a general store near Golf and Tennis, again recommending Local Convenience Commercial Zoning, not Mixed-Use.

Development patterns: D (assumed to be Rafter J density, clustered development) Golf and Tennis, A and B (Solitude, East Zenith/Prince Place).

### **South Park**

- Need another connecting road between highway 89 and South Park Loop Road paralleling High School Road; Like Eagle Village for mixed-use character; pedestrian-friendly with pathways and local convenience uses.
- Need small node of Local Convenience Commercial

Development Patterns: F and D (assumed to be Rafter J density, clustered development) for area south of Highway School Road; no specific boundary depth, C for inner portion of south end of South Park Loop Road, A and B for west side and south side (riparian areas) of South Park Loop Road.

### **Moose-Wilson Road, north of Nethercott**

- Need to better integrate Teton Pines and the Aspens as a common neighborhood; promote pedestrian access between two developments.
- Remaining portion: Maintain character of current NC zoning (NC densities)

Development Patterns: E and F for Teton Pines/Aspens.

### **Wilson**

- Maintain Wilson character, no large scale commercial, no mixed-use

Development patterns: E in Wilson Core, A in riparian areas, and B south of Highway 22

### **Fall Creek**

- Maintain and/or increase public access to river.

Development patterns: A

### **Hoback**

Development patterns: F in Hoback Junction

### **Teton Village**

Need Teton Village Area

## **Town**

---

### **General**

Require underground parking for commercial uses; encourage connectivity between neighborhoods, grid streets, sidewalks.

### **Town Square**

- Maintain reasonably priced lodging for tourists; don't allow redevelopment of lodging in the form of time share condos and townhouses; redevelopment of area should be transitioned to neighborhoods. West boundary should start at Flat Creek Bridge.

- Encourage Mixed use with residential to re-vitalize Town Square and encourage local residents to use Town Square in evenings; more park benches; close Center Street and Deloney Avenue/Town Square to vehicular traffic.

Development patterns: G, C, and B; No to C (north and north west of Town Square). F (Town Square)

### **South Highway 89**

More landscaping; parking to the rear or landscaping to screen parking from Highway; make more friendly by creating two road corridors, one for heavy traffic, separated by trees from a more local road.

Development patterns: E, strip allow south Highway 89

### **South Highway**

Development patterns: D

### **East Jackson**

Integrate affordable housing; need small grocery store, Local Convenience Commercial, not a Commercial Mixed-Use area

Development patterns: A and B

### **South Jackson/Snow King**

Development patterns: A and B

### **Snow King Resort**

Needs its own area.

## **Table 3**

### **County**

---

#### **Development Pattern Types**

- A. Conservation use was defined as a meaningful amount of land that either: (the group didn't feel that the three definitions were necessarily exclusive of each other but thought they were different)
  - 1 Has < 1 du/35ac
  - 2 Is completely void of development
  - 3 Creates connectivity
- B. Very Low Density use was defined as 1 or 2 dus/35ac
- C. Low Density Clustered was defined as a development with at least 70% land meeting the conservation definition and greater total density than the "very low density" category, but also having clustering with a minimum cluster density that went undefined at anywhere from town size lots to 3 acres

- G. Low Density Neighborhood was added to define development of 2-10 acre lots of uniform size.
- D. Neighborhood Residential was defined as Rafter J or Wilson Meadows density/feel
- E. Village Center was defined as town sized lots
- F. Village Center Mixed Use was defined as commercial in the vicinity of Village Center or Neighborhood Residential. Vertical mixing of uses was not embraced, but never explicitly left out of the definition, it seemed like they meant it to be purely commercial surrounded by residential.

### **General Comments:**

The conversation started with a statement that all increases in density in the County should happen in South Park defined as shown on the map. The group generally agreed with or at least didn't speak against this comment. They talked about sewer being appropriate and they talked about the importance of protecting scenic views from the highway and natural resources along the Snake and Flat Creek. That opening statement drove the conversation.

### **Alta**

A and B appropriate excited about some C

### **Buffalo Valley (Kelly not included)**

A and B appropriate less excited about C

### **South Park**

They all thought that A and D were appropriate. About 2/3s felt F was appropriate but only to the north near the existing commercial and should not be big box, should be local service commercial. They all thought a lot of D exists and should be replicated. One thought that G would be appropriate and some thought C and E would be appropriate as well. Toward the end there was a discussion and general consensus that the build out numbers were scary and through a TDR, or buying conservation easements, or down zoning potential units should be moved from most other places in the County into South Park. This was a strong feeling by some with others sort of silent and not arguing, but not everyone was as excited about this idea as a few.

### **Wilson**

In Wilson downtown they felt that D and F were appropriate, and to be honest our definition of F may have been influenced by Wilson voices, but Hoback was also discussed. Some felt that additional density would be appropriate but only for affordable housing. Some felt that no additional density should be added to Wilson. All felt that the town shouldn't be allowed to grow. We never got to the areas surrounding Wilson.

### **Fall Creek Road**

Only A and B were deemed appropriate on Fall Cr. Rd. with no dissent

### **Hog Island**

In Hog Island C and G were wanted to continue with what exists. In Hoback they felt residential should exist as it is platted but that the remaining commercial should be forced to remain commercial to avoid complete conversion to residential.

### **New Area: Spring Gulch**

They talked about creating a new area for spring gulch road and discussing what would be appropriate there, but got side tracked and never came back.

### **Not Discussed**

390 never came up.

North of Town was never addressed

## **Town**

---

### **Development Pattern Types:**

- A. Single-family = 50x150 lot with a detached single family home
- B. Residential Infill = 50x150 lot with one or two ARUs plus a single family home
- C. Townhomes was not further defined
- D. Lower density, larger unit, smaller building apartments/condos
- E. Stripmall purely commercial development
- F. Retail or Office with residential development in the building as well
- G. Lodging was not further defined
- H. Mixed Use, but entirely non residential
- I. Higher density, smaller units, bigger building apartments/condos
- J. Lodging with residential (employee housing but other long term residential was also mentioned after the definitions were done)
- K. Light industrial

### **General:**

After we got done with the County a number of the people at the table became disinterested and sort of drifted away or got quiet.

### **Downtown**

Downtown they felt that F, H, I, and J were appropriate. They also felt that D should be an option for flexibility sake but were not enthused about seeing that development type. They didn't want to see any more G unless it was associated with employee housing ie no G all J.

### **Corridor Commercial**

In the corridor commercial area they felt that F and H were appropriate but didn't like the idea of any more E. They seemed to distinguish between E and H vertically and by site design favoring a non-residential complex that did not involve a "sea of asphalt" but looked more like a smaller individual building (this is my interpretation, no one actually put a finger on the difference).

### **Downtown Residential**

In the downtown residential they felt A, B, C, and D were appropriate, although there was some, but strong, dissent against C. They felt that C and D were only appropriate in the transition from the Downtown or around Snow King. They did not feel that any commercial was appropriate, in one case in order to keep the neighborhood quiet.

### **Town Residential**

Town residential was again no commercial with A and B appropriate and some C and D near current density and current commercial. People had enough and wanted to go home at the question of creep.

## **Table 4**

### **General consensus:**

---

- No growth, but all realize that is not reasonable/possible – growth is necessary. Most would prefer things to stay the same. Some would like more non-single family development in town.
- Everybody would like more pedestrian friendly neighborhoods and valley in general. Safe pedestrian access in town.
- Most people are in favor of affordable housing but a few don't like it at all. Those in favor think it should be distributed equally throughout the County.
- When discussing the County they felt high density should be mainly in town but believe that traffic in town is already unbearable.
- Entire Valley is viewed as a wildlife corridor and important to provide protection.
- More growth will not solve housing problem
- Designated protection areas like the NRO should not be compromised for housing / development.
- If we are not careful, we will loose community to resort.
- Clustered Development is good.
- Green development.
- "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." Most of what we have is good.
- Diversity of people and housing.

### **County**

---

#### **Airport/Golf and Tennis**

Most would like to see **Airport/Golf and Tennis** as a node/core area and more density. They would like to have some local convenience – grocery store, restaurants, etc. Some thought that if density is increased, then half of it should be affordable.

#### **Alta**

Consensus – a little more development – a little more density. No more commercial in Alta. Alta is more connected to ID then Teton County, WY.

#### **Buffalo Valley/Kelly**

No commercial

Local commercial – grocery store

### **South Park**

No consensus. Range from total conservation to mixed use village center

### **Aspens/Teton Pines**

Great model for other areas – pathways, live, work, shop in one place -- can bike to Wilson and TV – can catch the bus too. Leave as is.

### **Greater Wilson Area**

Most would like to see a Village Center. Node/core area. More density near downtown. One person would like to see it stay as it is – no density, conservation wildlife protection, Fish Creek protection.

### **Fall Creek Road**

Consensus – not a place to solve housing issues, low density – conservation and very low density. Would like density to stay the same as it is.

### **Hog Island/Hoback**

Area south of Evans could be neighborhood development. Smaller lots ok. Small node/core.

## ***Town***

---

### **Downtown Commercial/Mixed**

- Some thought this area should be expanded a couple blocks to the south and a couple to the east.
- Some thought the area should shrink to the area around Town Square.
- Mixed-use
- Most, not all thought more density. Those that did not want density said so because of traffic and parking issues
- Locals avoid this area. Would like more local convenience in this area.
- Safe pedestrian access.
- Phase out traffic, pedestrian only area.
- Split on multi-story buildings
- Would like pedestrian friendly – eat, live, drink, shop, work in same place
- Those who want more density want more housing options not just SFD – like apts, condos, townhouse, etc. They want to live downtown.

### **Corridor Commercial**

Consensus – don't like this area – its ugly – ugly entrance to town – not pedestrian friendly.

### **Town Residential**

Needs more local convenience

Higher density would be good.

## **Table 5**

### **General**

---

As there was significant consensus of what the geographical distinctions should be within the group, the following are comments for the geographical areas redefined by the group.

### **County**

---

#### **I. Teton Village**

Although the group felt that the Village was, for the most part, built-out, there was widespread support for the current "F" type development that currently characterizes the area. The group also felt that Teton Village was an appropriate receiving area for the transfer of development rights, particularly if said rights came from Moose-Wilson Road. In the event of a TDR scenario, the group felt that the Village should continue to be developed as a high-density, mixed-use center with the intensity of development dissipating from the village core, providing a scaled transition to the permanent open space surrounding the Village.

#### **Alta**

Development in Alta should retain the agricultural character that currently exists but actual agricultural operations are not likely to continue long-term, the group felt. As such, the development scenario "C," along with realistic conservation efforts, was the preferred development pattern in Alta.

#### **Kelly/Buffalo Valley**

The group felt that there were key differences between Kelly and Buffalo Valley. Kelly is a former townsite with small, single-family lots within reasonable commuting distance of Jackson (although it was acknowledged that there are some commuters from Moran and Buffalo Valley). Furthermore, the Park Service owns a significant amount of property in Kelly and may seek to develop employee housing there. The group felt that neighborhood residential development exhibited by scenario "D" was appropriate in Kelly, as it represents the existing level of entitlement. Buffalo Valley, the group felt, should keep a low-density character envisioned in scenario "B" while taking advantage of any conservation opportunities.

### **Airport/Golf & Tennis**

The group felt that this area was built out and that the existing character, which was deemed to be scenarios “C” and “D,” should be preserved. When asked if this area was a possible receiving area for a transfer of development rights, it was widely felt that more density was not appropriate and thus, no density should be transferred here.

### **South Park**

South Park presented the most variation of preferred development scenarios among the group. Some felt that the “A” and “B” scenarios were appropriate as South Park was deemed to be at its development peak, whereas others who felt that more density was appropriate leaned towards the “E” and “F” scenarios. “D” was excluded because those that felt that more density was appropriate also felt that the maximum amount of open space possible should be preserved. There was also some sentiment expressed that density should be related to its proximity to the Town.

### **Moose-Wilson Road**

The vast majority of the group felt that Moose-Wilson Road (or the “Village Road”) had reached its peak for allowable density and that minor, incremental increases could occur in redevelopment scenarios. It was felt that what exists in this area should be preserved. As such, Scenarios “A,” “B,” “C,” “D,” and “E” were appropriate to the extent that were existing development patterns.

## **Town**

---

### **Downtown**

Scenarios “J,” and “D” were recommended by the group as they were understood to be the most dense development patterns presented. There was much emphasis on increasing the population in the Town Square area and providing services to support such a population. The group also felt that more housing Downtown was essential to address projected population growth.

### **Corridor Commercial**

The group felt that there was a significant amount of potential in this area for more housing. As such, Scenarios “J” and “D” were recommended. The density represented in these development patterns also, the group felt, were likely to bring about attractive redevelopment of existing commercial areas. Architectural design quality and pedestrian connectivity were stressed as important factors in the future development of this area.

### **Downtown Residential**

The group felt that this area (which was referred to as “East Jackson”) is currently a mix of single-family, townhouse, and condominium dwelling units. This mix of uses was generally found to be acceptable because there was adequate greenspace, sunlight, and clear expectation of development potential. The group felt that a “C” level of density may be appropriate but should emulate the character found in “B” and “A.”

## **Town Residential**

Due to time constraints, the group was not able to comment on this area.

## **Table 6**

### **County**

---

#### **General**

After a lengthy preliminary discussion regarding the definitions of character types, the table began to talk about designated areas. The following brief summary of the evening's discussion is broken up as such- zone by zone:

#### **Alta**

- A strong conscientious to keep Alta a rural place governed this discussion. By having Victor/Driggs the main commercial area, Alta has the ability to remain rural.
- One point brought up was the elementary school and it's luring charm. By keeping Alta a rural community, the school will continue to have such charm.
- There was not much knowledge on the proposed Targhee development and not much concern. One member of the table stated that Targhee should be kept as low density development.

#### **Buffalo Valley and Kelly**

- A quick agreement at the table to preserve the rural character of Buffalo Valley and Kelly. All agreed it was important for the wildlife in the area that the area is conserved.
- This should be the last place to develop in the county, one member stated.

#### **Airport/Tennis and Golf Area**

- There was a lengthy discussion on this area's definition. Most people felt that the boundary of the area was too large and/or not well defined. Some time was spent defining what the area currently is- residential.
- Getting beyond that, a Town Councilor, ceased all discussion on this area as he stated "it is neighborhood residential and will always be neighborhood residential". End.

#### **South Park**

- This area sparked the most controversy at the table and the lengthiest discussion.
- Part of the table thought it best to match development patterns with what is currently surrounding it- neighborhood residential. This would increase traffic only during commuter hours, for all around traffic increase would occur if there were a village, mixed-use center. This would also allow for neighborhood members to join other parts of the town and not just be "stuck" in the South Park area.

- In opposition, the other members thought it best to have a village center, mixed use area (or multiple). This would increase pedestrian and bicycle use, providing for a more community feel. This would also allow for local to have a local center and not have to go shop with tourists. Also, an increase in neighborhoods, as is inevitably going to happen, will necessitate a village center.
- Why not have bus stops down in Rafter J/Melody Ranch? It only makes sense for the neighborhoods to promote and increase bus service. START has tried many times to have bus stops in those respective neighborhoods, but no one rode the bus so service ceased.

### Aspens/Teton Pines

This area yielded little to no discussion. Keep as is- a neighborhood residential area with a village center. Also, keep bus stop running and regularly available.

### Greater Wilson Area

- Focusing mostly on downtown Wilson (section of town along Highway 22 which includes Prime Properties/Pearl Street, Hungry Jakes west to Stagecoach Bar). Most members of the table wanted no development in Wilson. Strong desire to keep Wilson development free. Want to keep rural, small town, USA.
- No more village centers (discussion split because half the table thought there to be an existing village center while the other half thought there not to be an existing village center).
- An increase in a village center, whether a new one or an additional, would only increase traffic. This would produce more of a traffic problem. Conscientious of the table was no increase in automobiles. No one could think of alternatives to transportation.

### Fall Creek Road (South of Wilson)

- Emphasized the importance of keeping this area of the county under conservation for the wetlands, wildlife and Fish Creek. Keep as very low density, as low as possible.

### Hog Island and Hoback

- Not much discussion regarding Hog Island except that some members of the table thought it was a “weird place” and should remain isolated.
- Increase in development should occur as is, low density residential along the highway. An increase at the already existing village center should occur. Hard to imagine more village center mixed use, opposed to just village center, as the village center is located right on the highway and the residences are so spread out. Doesn’t seem to have pedestrian/bicycle increase possibilities.

### Extra Notes on the County:

- Why isn’t Teton Village a part of the county plan?
- Most members of the table thought a road from the Airport to Teton Village is most optimal, however all stated it “will never happen” because of who owns homes along

the Snake west of the airport. One member liked the current roadway as it forces visitors to Teton Village to drive through town, perhaps seeing some shops, restaurants that sparked their tourist desires.

- Desire by all members of the table to continue to develop within the Town boundaries and outward from there. (“Why develop Wilson when there are empty lots in town?” a couple of members vocalized. Should be town development first so the surrounding area can stay rural and be a healthy habitat for wildlife.

### ***Town of Jackson***

---

#### **General**

With hopes to improve the discussion and create a broader sweep of ideas, we disregarded the photos of character types. These were brining confusion to the table as all members were highly concerned with doing the project “right”. We simply looked at the map provided for the town and discussed geographic zone by zone.

#### **Downtown Commercial/Mixed**

- Promote mixed use, allowing for more residential. Suggested allowing developers to build more than two stories within the downtown commercial area. Members of the table were tentative to agree with this, but did say downtown should constantly be reviewed and discussed by the planning commission and council. Downtown should never get stale nor should it have all the same shops and restaurants. Variety is the key to keeping downtown a desirable place to go.
- Someone raised the question of making the downtown area like Pearl Ave. This was quickly opposed, reasoning being Pearl is the place locals go and the downtown commercial area is the place tourists go. Seemed to be strong desire amongst members of the table for keeping locals and tourists separated.
- Comments were made regarding the downtown commercial area and it’s extension. When the table discussed the “Downtown Commercial” area, they wanted to be certain it meant the block (or two) surrounding the Town Square, not the area within the boundary North/Northwest of Town Square. This area should contain more residential units to shops.

#### **Corridor Commercial**

All are in fear of this zone becoming primarily auto zone. There is a strong need for pedestrians, the table agreed. No strip malls, no duplicate businesses (ex: same banks), with huge parking lots that have no landscaping. There is a need for more lofts/apartments in this zone to mix the use. Bike paths should be added throughout this area and public transportation should be enhanced.

#### **Downtown Residential**

- This zone is most viable for housing opportunities. A dense residential could be very feasible here. In order to provide for more housing and draw in more housing, more

commercial services and local conveniences should be added, such as a village mixed use center.

- The idea of keeping a “locals only area” was brought up again at the table. Create a place where locals can live, walk, bike, shop which would eliminate the need to go into the Downtown Commercial/Mixed area. (By “shop”, members of the table were referring to shopping for groceries).
- Auxiliary units should be used in this area.

### **Town Residential**

- Build only residences in this area- single family, residential infill, town homes. Members of the table commented on the picture of the town home used on the worksheet and how disliked it was. Jokingly, a member of the table reached over to cross-out the picture, displaying how aesthetically displeasing this town home is.
- Bike lanes on the existing roads are very necessary, as are sidewalks. The town should not have five feet be the standard for sidewalks. In addition, the placement of sidewalks should not be so fragmented. One member said that “it is such a waste” to have wide sidewalks that are not connected to another sidewalk.
- Omit lodging units from being built in this area, keeping this area a place for locals.

## **Table 7**

### **County**

---

#### **Missing Planning Areas**

*The following were identified as missing Planning Areas:*

- Teton Village
- Spring Gulch
- The Wilson area should be expanded north to include all of Fish Creek Road.

#### **Alta**

Area for possible Village Center (E) to provide local convenience commercial in future, if Targhee expands.

#### **Buffalo Valley**

Desired development patterns were Conservation (A) and Very Low Density (B).

#### **Kelly**

Desired development patterns were Conservation (A) and Very Low Density (B) for undeveloped larger parcels, with Low Density Clustered (C) or Neighborhood Residential (D) for areas near existing development.

### Airport area

Desired development patterns were Conservation (A) and Very Low Density (B).

### South Park

Desired development patterns were Conservation (A) by the Snake River. Suggested a gradient of little to no development along rivers and creeks to the west, with increasing density as you approach the highway (from A by the river to C by highway). Village Center (E) and Village Center/Mixed Use (F), including workforce housing, acceptable for Porter Estate. Neighborhood Residential (D), Village Center (E) and Village Center/Mixed Use (F), including workforce housing, acceptable for Scherr-Thoss/Lower South Park Loop Road. Mix of density and open space desired. Have to keep summer pasture to keep agriculture in the valley.

### Teton Village Road

Desired development patterns were Conservation (A) and Very Low Density (B). Preference is for it to be a three-lane road.

### Wilson

Comment: "it's cool." Desired development patterns were Conservation (A), Very Low Density (B), and Low Density Clustered (C). Local commercial was acceptable in core of Wilson. Height limit in core desired. Desire expressed to continue planning efforts for Wilson separate from Comp Plan process.

### Fall Creek Road

Desired development patterns were Conservation (A) and Very Low Density (B). No Resort designation for remaining ranch lands (such as for a golf course).

### Hoback

Desired development patterns were Conservation (A) and Very Low Density (B), with a strong emphasis on (A) along the Hoback River due to wildlife concerns. Identified Hoback Junction itself as location for Village Center/Mixed Use (F).

### General county comments:

- include a time limit on applications (too much negotiation, takes too long)
- consider eliminating resort zoning as a future option
- traffic is part of community character
- how much further are we going to expand our roads? What is the end point?  
Consider capping road growth.

## Town

---

### Missing Character Types

*The following were identified as missing Character Types:*

- Conservation. There are natural resources worth protecting even in town.

- Not all residential options for higher density have been included in the choices; (D) and (I) were too modern and tall; possible to build Lofts/Apartments in different styles that would be more appealing

### Missing Planning Areas

*The following were identified as missing Planning Areas:*

- Need to add the Flat Creek Corridor as a Planning Area

### Town Square

Commercial/Mixed Use (F) acceptable but not if three to four stories; (I) and (J) were not acceptable character types for this area. Residential Infill (B), including Lofts/Apartments acceptable for east edge but not if look like (D) or (I); no three to four story buildings. Overall objection to heights greater than 32'-35'.

### Corridor Commercial

Need to identify and protect mule deer migration corridor across here; consider overpass. Desired development patterns were Conservation and Single Family (A) along Flat Creek. Higher density affordable housing should go where it was originally proposed bordering Karns Meadow, so people in denser situation can take advantage of proximity to open space of park.

### East Jackson

Desired development patterns were Single Family (A) and Residential Infill (B).

### Residential South East

Conservation desired along Cache Creek corridor.

### Hillside Residential

Desired development patterns was Single Family (A). Need to include conservation of wildlife corridor through this area up to US Forest Service lands to the south.

### General Town Comments:

- We have enough commercial. Need more residential. No one has trouble finding a job, but no one can find a place to live.
- We need to ask, do we have enough lodging? Some say yes; we don't need any more. Some say no, we need more family-friendly lodging, but agree we have enough high-end.
- Do not build any more high-end townhomes (C) anywhere in town. We need to look at the income data of our workforce and build for it.

### Definition/elements of western character:

- Covered sidewalks.
- Building height of two stories max.

- Less glass. All glass buildings are not characteristic of the Old West.
- Use colors and materials (wood) of Old West.

Need to include conservation of Flat Creek corridor from the Elk Refuge, through town, to the US Forest Service lands on Snow King.

## Table 8

### General Comments

- South Park is primary area for increased development.
- Downtown Commercial/Mixed-Use Core should be expanded to include Cache – Snow King to Willow.
- Cottonwood area (far west town boundary) should be included in #3 Town Residential Zone.
- Community Character should define our capacity. Capacity should not be determined by maximum physical infrastructure potential.
- Need for affordable rental housing.

## Table 9

### County

---

#### Adjust Planning Areas

- Separate Kelly from Buffalo Valley
- Make Red Top area part of Area 7 instead of part of Area 8

#### Other County Features

##### a) Significant Corridors:

- Wildlife Corridors: Spring Gulch Rd (from Golf Course to Gros Ventre River), South Hwy 89 (Rafter J to Horse Creek), Hwy 22 (east and west of Snake River), Fall Creek Road (Wilson south to USFS boundary), entirety of Hwy 390, along Snake River from Wilson Bridge to South Park Feed Grounds, and all existing NRO areas
- Scenic Corridors: East and West Gros Ventre Buttes and all existing identified SRO areas
- Transportation Corridors: Build a second bridge across Snake at Hwy 22 that would serve vehicles (existing bridge should remain to serve bikes and peds and to serve as an emergency access when accidents happen on vehicular bridge)

##### b) Important Neighborhoods:

- Teton Village should be identified as a neighborhood because of the transportation implications with no redundancy for access
- Hwy 390 “Established Neighborhoods” should be protected from upzoning

- South Park need further consideration for meeting housing needs—should be mix of protection of open space, views, wildlife corridors, and a mix of housing types and densities, including a small local convenience commercial node

c) Important Conservation Areas:

- Existing NRO, SRO, and any new areas identified as critical to wildlife should be conserved

**Preferred Character Types and Growth Patterns:**

**Alta**

Low Density Clustered (State Line Road Area) & Neighborhood Residential with the opportunity for some minimal Local Convenience Commercial (Ski Hill Road Area)

**Buffalo Valley and Kelly**

Conservation and Very Low Density

**Airport/Tennis and Golf Area**

Low Density Clustered

**South Park**

Mix of Low Density Residential, Neighborhood Residential, Village Center, and Mixed Use (mixed use should only include limited local convenience commercial should high-density development occur)

**Aspens/Teton Pines**

West Side Hwy 390 should continue to provide Village Center/Mixed Use, but East side of Hwy 390 should be Low Density Clustered with some Agriculture and existing Neighborhood Residential should be preserved

**Wilson**

Village Center/Mixed Use

**Fall Creek**

Very Low Density

**Hog Island**

Low Density Clustered & Hoback: Neighborhood Residential

***Town (ran out of time)***

---

**Downtown Commercial/Mixed**

Commercial Mixed Use & Lodging

Comments: Square should have a 2-story limit with mixed residential and commercial; off square should be 3-stories mixed use; lodging OK, but fractional timeshare ownership not OK; North entry into town (great redevelopment opportunity to do it right) should be commercial/mixed use with 2-story along Hwy and 3 stories behind (buffered by butte)

### **Corridor Commercial**

Development types: E, F, G

### **Downtown Residential:**

Single family and townhomes with more affordable rental units (we are losing a lot of those to redevelopment), but protect Gill Addition as a single family neighborhood

### **Town Residential**

Single Family and Townhomes

Comments: Tourists should be concentrated near Town Square and Snow King (although locals use ski hill and ice rink). Protect open space in town (Karns Meadow)

## **Table 10**

### **County**

---

#### **Alta**

- Need to define and maintain character
- Preserve small ski area character...not 450 units

Character Types

- A. Conservation
- B. Very Low Density
- C. Low Density Clustered

#### **Buffalo Valley and Kelly**

- BV and Kelly should be considered separately
- Annex by national park

Character Types:

- A. Conservation
- B. Very Low Density
- C. Low Density Clustered (for Kelly only)

#### **Airport, Tennis and Golf Area**

Character Types:

- A. Conservation
- C. Low Density Clustered
- D. Neighborhood Residential

### **South Park**

- North end of Porter Estate has important role for scenic character
- Should be focus area for conservation
- Teton Meadows Ranch is a great area for a neighborhood
- No! TMR is not a great area for a neighborhood
- -Add density in town
- Teton Meadows Ranch should be more than 50 less than 500; in favor of lower cap
- Need to be other areas beside town for high density housing

Character Types:

- A. Conservation
- C. Low Density Clustered
- D. Neighborhood Residential

### **Aspens/Teton Pines**

- Don't add more density
- No more commercial around Aspens
- Great corridor to get people using transit

Character Types:

- A. Conservation
- B. Very Low Density
- E. Village Center

### **Greater Wilson Area**

- -Connect pathway...maintain character
- -Maintain conservation; river corridor and west side of town
- -Protect winter range
- -Density should be in Jackson

Character Types:

- A. Conservation
- C. Low Density Clustered
- E. Village Center
- F. Village Center/Mixed Use

### **Fall Creek Road**

- Protect wildlife areas
- No more chipseal

Character Types:

- A. Conservation
- B. Very Low Density
- C. Low Density Clustered

### **Hog Island and Hoback**

- Don't change Astoria and Snake River Sporting Club to dense housing

- Put in pathway from Hoback to Jackson
- Protect Snake River Corridor in all zones
- More housing at Junction area, but no upzone
- Wildlife concerns

Character Types:

- A. Conservation
- F. Village Center/Mixed Use

## **Town**

---

### **Downtown Commercial/Mixed**

- Pathways/Pedestrian safety and connections
- Complete streets and safe routes to school
- Concern about Pearl and Broadway intersection
- Keep good looking and funky

Character Types:

- A. Single Family
- F. Commercial Mixed Use
- G. Lodging
- H. Commercial Mixed Use

### **Corridor Commercial**

- Keep local businesses
- -No box stores/sprawl

Character Types:

- E. Corridor Commercial
- F. Commercial/Mixed Use
- G. Lodging
- H. Commercial/Mixed Use

### **Downtown Residential**

- Single Family/Residential Infill
- Pedestrian Friendly
- Keep funky
- More affordable housing and density

Character Types:

- A. Single Family
- B. Residential Infill
- C. Townhomes
- F. Commercial/Mixed Use

### **Town Residential**

- Conserve open space (Karns, Flat Creek, etc.)

- Don't remove southeast Jackson from zone 3...currently in 4.

Character Types

- A. Single Family
- B. Residential Infill
- D. Lofts/Apartments
- F. Commercial/Mixed Use
- I. Lofts/Apartments