



## Joint Planning Commission Meeting – Summary

Thursday, November 8, 2007

County Commission Chambers

Time: 6:00 – 8:00 PM

### Attendance

Four town planning commissioners attended. No county planning commissioners were present.

### Agenda

1. Reports from Public Event and STAG Meeting
2. Present Working Vision, land use capacity and build out, and balance and tradeoffs
3. Vision and Goals Discussion
4. Map Exercise to define preliminary Land Use Concepts – Countywide and for Town
5. Wrap-up

### Discussion

#### Summary of Vision and Goals and General Discussion

- Prioritized goals will be necessary and provide predictability in development approval process. Within the vision, which aims are first, second, etc.?
- Transportation is a big nightmare; tourism swells traffic. Traffic growth is local.
- Provide mixed-use within town (e.g., neighborhood grocery).
- "Wildlife" needs to be added to the vision and goals, as well as "stewardship."
- Targeting specific areas for housing and funding important (which leads to more civic and community involvement). Rental housing an important niche to address.
- "pattern" of development is important to mention (balancing needs with patterns).
- #5 – Transportation – Pedestrian network and transit system needs to be expanded.
- #6 Diverse and Balanced - is not true (See Schechter's articles for good explanation of that and good tools.)
- Tourism is important but not the "backbone" any longer.
- Check *Atlantic Monthly* article on "a Tale of Two Condos" (Malibu versus Dallas). for a good explanation of how zoning makes prices exorbitant.

#### Existing Conditions Report / Buildout Discussion

- P. 21. Combined total – Assumption about most new mixed-use development is non-residential in town. (This assumption could be changed, but that is how this first set of buildout calculations has been addressed.)
- Need to include policy language to not allow surprise changes and provide predictability. The perception is that approvals are inconsistent.
- An audience member suggested that buildout should be presented as a range and the numbers may be low.
- Consider a "point" system for essential workers for housing.
- See Aspen Background Study regarding mixed-use and costs.



- The Town appears to be over-zoned for commercial. But, if you restrict commercial space then rents go even higher. They are already very high.
- Should we look at a ratio of commercial and residential? (What has been the historical split? – Reconsider that).
- Targhee should not get too big – no greater than 450 units.

## Summary of Mapping Exercise

### Town Preferred Development Character

#### Downtown Core

- Define fairly tight Town Square “Historic District” (see map); for this area. The purpose would be to replicate early architecture in terms of pattern and form, using the old photographic record. It isn’t really a “historic” district as much as a character district, because very few historic structures remain.
- It would support residential above commercial.
- Steer development toward traditional Jackson character. (Group had some discussion that it is eclectic)
- Area 1 could support higher density (4 story buildings).

#### Corridor Commercial

- Area out towards “Y” intersection should be targeted as a new “town center” for locals. This is a good spot for increased density and more housing...
- Look at the possibility of high-density housing on the mesa area, across from/to west of “Y” intersection, but consider wildlife habitat needs there too.

#### Downtown Residential

- Extend Downtown Core to the south to include Snow King commercial area. New large hotels are pushing the “commercial” boundary should. There is underutilized residential there. This good area for more mixed-use and some lodging.
- Look at role of Kelly Street and Snow King. These are arterials that locals use for commuting.
- Focus denser housing to the south of Simpson. This area could accommodate higher density residential, so that adjoining downtown residential areas can retain their integrity and character.
- Consider a non-residential “small node” concept

#### Town Residential

No comments.

### County Preferred Development Character

#### General Comments:

Show winter range habitat and wildlife corridors on the maps.



Affordable housing does not all need to be single family. Consider some rentals, some mixed-use, and multi-family. Locations: The Village also, and town.

### 1. Alta

No comments

### 2. Buffalo Valley and Kelly

Comment by one planning commissioner: area up north should be designated as its own resort zone.

### 3. Airport/Golf and Tennis

No comments – mostly rural pattern to remain

### 4. South Park

- More density/mixed use here.
- Hereford Ranch (adjacent to town) should develop before Meadows because it is adjacent to town.
- The Meadows project is too big and away from town and should not develop until Hereford develops.
- May be some options for nodes of mixed-use on east edge and in limited nodes.

### 5. Aspens/Teton Pines

- Nodes of Mixed-use.
- Density node around Calico.

### 6. Greater Wilson Area

- Mixed-use with more residential density

### 7. Fall Creek Road

No comments

### 8. Hog Island and Hoback

No comments