



Stakeholders Advisory Group Meeting #4 - Summary

Thursday, May 15, 2008

4H Building

Time: 1:00 PM – 3:00 PM

Agenda

1. Reports and update on public input
2. Present Preferred Plan and policy outline, and town subarea materials with results from town meeting
3. Discussion
4. Wrap-up (future events, next meeting dates, etc.)

Attendance

STAG: Jerry Blann, Lorin Wilson, Bland Hoke, Rob Cheek, Franz Camenzind, Darrel Hoffman, Laurie Andrews, Sean O'Malley, Kelly Lockhart, Anne Hayden, Deb Sprague, Jake Ankeny, Aaron Pruzan, Brad Mead.

Staff: Jeff Daugherty and Alex Norton (County), Jeff Noffsinger and Tyler Sinclair (Town), Ben Herman and Lesli Ellis (Clarion), and Bill Collins (Collins Planning).

City Council/BOCC: none signed in

Guests (signed in): Larry Kummer and James Auge

Meeting Summary

Preferred Plan and Big Ideas

The planning team provided a brief overview of the planning process to-date and materials for review, including:

- Survey materials (on-line),
- Future Land Use Plan maps (county),
- "Preferred Plan (Future Land Uses) and Categories" paper,
- "Town Subarea Issues and Opportunities – Worksheets" paper and maps, and
- "Themes and Policies outline."

Committee discussion was as follows:

Buildout and Growth Concepts:

- Density in town – Will it be neutral? What does this mean? Response: We have not calculated know town density yet and won't until we determine land uses, but we think it will be in the range of 1,600 new residential units and 710,000 sf of commercial to 5,000 new residential units and 2.3 million sf of commercial (the range between the current allowable units and the possible units with bonuses). The public is not interested in increasing density and is interested in providing more predictability.
- Setbacks in the "Y" should be zero.
- Teton Village:

- Teton Village is an approved Master Plan only (the Master Plan is incomplete because it doesn't include commercial).
- Teton Village Road can't handle any more density because of traffic. Just approve platted areas only.
- TDMs – Make them stick. Teton Village will lead to a 10-15% increase in transit each year.
- 390 doesn't want to be dumping grounds.
- Teton County in the past has tried to do TDRs. They were a waste of time and a red herring.
- South Park.
 - Will the feathering include civic uses and parks? Response: Yes, that is the intent.
 - Supporting density in South Park makes infinite sense.
 - Listen to what neighborhood people say.
 - Densities south of South Park road – what is proposed? What are uses? Reply: Current draft suggests tiered residential density with a mix of residential types that starts with levels comparable to what is around the high school and terminating at the south end at 1 unit per acre. Some business, local commercial could occur at the north, just south of the High School. Neighborhoods would have parks, open space, and other amenities.
 - Mixed-use would not be appropriate in South Park because it would yield too much commercial and would be too unpredictable.
 - South Park is one location with the ability to make arterials (redundancy). Traffic plan for 25 years is to connect South Park to Hwy. 22. South Park can accomplish redundant transportation system – maybe community that makes sense.
 - Fear that South Park may be other side of tracks (integration of housing types in neighborhoods).
 - South Park is a clean slate. Think about before we discard agriculture uses – to help allow to maintain open space.

Transportation and Coordination with Land Use

- What is the transportation component in South Park? Reply: A parallel transportation component is occurring for South Park and the whole county. The county and town are coordinating with WYDOT on modeling and strategies and vision. That hasn't historically happened.
- Pathways and multi-modal are important, but we can't wish traffic away. Improved intersections and behavioral changes will be necessary too.
- Should we provide lanes for transit?
- Traffic in summer should be there.
- Lodging is a common use, not that different from apartments. Correlate with traffic. If lodging gets more dispersed it will cause traffic problems.
- Traffic – needs redundancy to make the system work.
- People don't want wider roads in the survey.

Density in town/housing:

- Neighborhoods – see how they are being used right now for multi-housing.
- People don't like change. South of Snow King (bulk and scale) in "Y" area there is some other single family. Be careful to not replace housing with other commercial.
- Town growth and density:
 - "Sending density to town" makes a lot of sense. Town is changing because we are looking at underground parking. It can't be density neutral. Need density to make the market work.
 - Housing Trust – The economic piece seems to be what's left out. Land in town costs 2 to 2.5x more expensive than in the county to develop. If you lower density in town, there won't be opportunities for workforce housing. Where does the funding come from? Housing Trust can't raise funding. Nervous about bringing down the density.

- Traffic/bike – More density in town should occur with transportation improvements – Level of Service (LOS) transportation E or F. More density outside (to keep it out of downtown). Mixed-use areas outside of downtown a good idea. Self-sustaining mixed-use makes sense.
- East of Cache and South of Redmond in town – Question if mixed-use is appropriate in that location.

Removal or Modification of Zoning Options:

- Regarding the “Options” (removal or modification)
 - Some discussion about changing zoning in some places is a good idea, but be careful of unintended consequences of removing all the options (e.g., PRDs, ARUs). Some landowners have the incentive to donate land, if the value of the donation helps them from a tax perspective.
 - Retain the option. It doesn’t mean you have to grant it.
 - If the options are too helter skelter, then rewrite them with stronger criteria, but keep some flexibility. Give some incentive (helps sustain agricultural land).
 - If landowners can only do 1 unit/35 acres, there is no option for them to get value out and they will sell and leave. We would lose what little bit of agriculture remaining.
 - P. 4 – modify or prohibit PRDs – could tighten up criteria. 9 units per 35 destroys agriculture if spread out, but don’t take away the option. Define it so a cluster is really a cluster (e.g., keep all the units on 50 acres). Current design doesn’t accomplish objectives.
 - You’d lose some agricultural families without the options.
- Disappointed that TDRs hasn’t gained traction. Maybe another idea – real estate transfer tax with money to buy open space?
- Non-contiguous PRD may be an option that already exists and could use a bit of modification.
- Have door open to landowners who want to work with themselves or other partners.
- PRD program is huge to land trusts. To remove it would take county further from its goals.
- Existing regulations need some flexibility to remove to another piece density (planning for agricultural owners).
- Ask people in town if they want density, they say “no” unless it is attached to saving land outside.
- “Process” re: subdivision favors developers (e.g., 1 year process of development happens before a lot of the public knows what to expect). Developers need to have communication up front. Response: This process will set up predictability.
- From business perspective, we need workforce housing and additional units to avoid transporting the problem to neighboring counties. The last project in line isn’t the solution.
- Denser development along High School road is a good idea.
- How about direct mail? To reduce trips. Have we considered relocation of hospital?
- Town residents don’t want all the density – unless they are getting more open space. In town, it is easier to swallow if it is getting scraped off in the county.
- If we remove PRD, we are expecting to get open space for free.
- Define “open space” and scenic resources (e.g., a lot of debate on the Scherr-Toss project). What do we want to preserve? Provide criteria with metrics.

Themes and Policies outline:

The planning team explained that the outline is a preview of the full set of policies to be issued at the end of the month. The team urged STAG to provide comments on organization and topics in the next week.

Discussion regarding policies included

- Themes and policies, by definition, are in conflict with one another. The last plan was missing a capstone chapter. This plan needs one.
- Theme 7 – Add use of energy recycling materials for redevelopment.

- Terminology about “redevelopment” is a negative term because of structures built down. Demolished (i.e., Pioneer Buildings were more sustainable). Urge reuse of structures and deconstruction programs that save materials.