



Stakeholders Advisory Group Meeting #2 - Summary

Thursday, November 8, 2007

4H Building, Miller Park

Time: 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Present Working Vision, land use capacity and build out, and balance and tradeoffs
3. Workshop to define preliminary Land Use Concepts – Countywide and for Town
4. Working Vision and Draft Goals
5. Wrap-up

Attendance

CAC: Deb Sprague, Franz Camenzind, Darrel Hoffman, Rob Cheek, Kelly Lockhart, Bland Hoke, Anne Hayden, Scott Pierson, Sean O'Malley, Kniffy Hamilton, Lorin Wilson.

Staff: Blair Leist and Jeff Daugherty (County), Jeff Noffsinger (Town), Ben Herman and Lesli Ellis (Clarion), and Bill Collins (Collins Planning).

City Council/BOCC: Bob Lenz, Leland Christensen

Guests (signed in): Stacy Stoker, Janine Teske, Brian Grubb

Meeting Summary

General Discussion

Buildout Calculations: It seems low in the county according to one committee member. Teton Meadows – How was it counted?

Vision and Goals Discussion

STAG did not spend time discussing Vision and Goals. They will be reviewing the draft and sending comments to the planning team.

Mapping Exercise

The committee divided into three groups to complete the mapping exercise addressing preferred development patterns for the county and development character for different parts of town. The results are summarized on the following pages for each group.

Group 1 (Jeff Daugherty and Blair Leist, facilitators)

Teton County – Planning Areas

1. Alta

- Continuation of agriculture-conservation easements; need focus for Alta.
- Real Estate Transfer Tax (RETT) for acquisition of development rights.

2. Buffalo Valley and Kelly

- These areas fit RETT also.
- Use a TDR for agricultural rights—needs to be banked—good tool but not sure how to make it really work.
- Clustering—need large contiguous areas.
- Conservation easements need to be publicly funded.
- RETT for open space, not for housing; applies to Buffalo Valley and Gros Ventre also. Market will help there.
- No development types selected.

3. Airport/Tennis

- Only redevelop in existing character – single family; preserve neighborhoods
- No development types selected.

4. South Park

- Certain portion should be annexed.
- Transitional levels of density from most to least moving away from Town.
- North area of South Park contiguous to current development.
- Development types: A

5. Aspens/Teton Pines

- Hate affordable housing because traffic can't handle it; change to 5 lanes on Village Road.
- Keep existing character, easements, big lot subdivisions – 35 acres and bigger.
- Existing 35s – Allow 3 units maximum; “by right incentive to donate” will result in greater number of conservation easements.
- 3 units per 35 acres will give more than PRD easements.
- In rural zone, promote outright use of 3 units per 35 acres.
- Develop agriculture overlay.
- Don't need clustering for wildlife.
- Incentivize open space through the 3 units per 35 acres program.
- Everything is regulatory; no incentives.
- Need less subjective resort zoning.
- All open space requirements must be in county.
- Development Types: A,B

6. Greater Wilson

- No additional density—put all density in Town.
- If put in Wilson, it will result in transportation problems and school problems.

7. Fall Creek

No comments

8. Hog Island

- Leave grandfathered commercial and existing pattern of residential character in redevelopment; incentivize for non-conforming to “go away.”
- No development types apply.

Town of Jackson – Character Areas

Downtown Commercial/Mixed

- Town needs to accept more growth; more residential and commercial; best area to accept additional growth.
- Emphasis on residential, not commercial.
- “Aspen model is broken.”
- Hate commercial/mixed-use; kill FAR in District 1.
- To drive projects, need to provide parking; good for all character types.
- 46’ height in Town will work.
- Want to see town square stay at 35’; square should get rid of 22’ alley setback; eliminate FAR of 2 on square.
- No sense to park on square; parking needs to be “fee in lieu” or underground.
- Development Types: B, D, G, and H.

Town Residential

- Snow King needs to be its own zoning district; year round residents; concentrated residential with commercial on fringes.
- No development types selected.

Group 2 (Lesli Ellis, facilitator)

Teton County – Planning Areas

1. Alta

- Maybe a village center (not all in agreement about this), but Driggs is close with small commercial.
- Ski resort has a different character (more like “E”).
- Development types: A, B, and C

2. Buffalo Valley and Kelly

- Divide into two planning areas: 2A – Buffalo Valley and 2B – Kelly
- **2A. Buffalo Valley:**
 - The area is important to tourists traveling through. It has some low density rural cluster development but that isn’t preferred (also KOA, Hatchet is there).
 - What’s there now may suffice for services. Not enough demand for more.
 - Development types: A and B.
- **2B. Kelly:**
 - It is ranch land, highlands, active store and gas station. Some commercial services might be appropriate, but the concept of a village center (choice E) is too much intensity for the area.
 - Continue to reflect its “Northern Exposure” character.
 - Keep the center, but conserve land around it.
 - Will growth in Golf and Tennis affect this area because kids go to school in Kelly? If bridge fills in then growth might occur in Kelly.
 - Development types: Should be based on existing development patterns and platting.

3. *Airport / Tennis and Golf Area*

- A lot of the area is platted with larger acreages. The resort is pretty high density with some services.
- Important wildlife habitat is in this area, so it shouldn't be higher density subdivision.
- No more commercial.
- Development types: A, B, and C

4. *South Park*

- Between Flat Creek and highway conserve agriculture and open space.
- South Park is important wildlife area. Some agriculture should be conserved.
- Type D – Housing that is a mix of free market and employee and workforce could also be a part of this area.
- Development types: some A, some D (Flat Creek to S. Park Loop)

5. *Aspens/Teton Pines*

- A lot is platted (denser on one side) Ranch housing is closer to river. A lot of conservation potential on east side of road near river (John Dodge).
- No bridge.
- Development types: A

6. *Greater Wilson Area*

- Concern about expansion of Wilson's footprint. Downtown versus outside are different characters.
- Development types: B to the north, E downtown (without intensifying).

7. *Fall Creek Road (S. of Wilson)*

- This area borders National Forest. Wildlife is important.
- Large acreages okay (Fall Creek road area is important for conservation).
- Development types: A

8. *Hog Island and Hoback*

- Hog Island and Hoback need to be addressed separately (Other areas: Hog Island, Canyon Club, And Gail Porter Elk Creek)
- Development types: E and F for Village Junction.
- Development types: A, B, and C outside the Junction.

Low Density Clustered Type

Could include some smaller lots, "workforce" housing. (S. Park) integrated.

Other topics and Question of Buildout

Areas 8 and 3 stick out as remote outlying areas. What is the expectation for services (e.g., safety)? People are saying they do not want much more growth, but the community has a housing need, so any growth should focus on that need. With current zoning, we are falling behind in housing. This has ramifications on ability to provide services (i.e., essential workers – see Schechter articles).

- Mixed use density. South Park, Hoback?
- Can't talk about density without the town's participation.
- County "Futures Map" from 1994 Plan was a good starting point.
- How much growth? Is it based on what is projected?

Wildlife

The group was concerned about higher rates of wildlife road kill. Are we making sure we don't encroach in wildlife habitat too much and increase safety concerns on highways? Highway 22 is a concern and a hot spot for wildlife conflicts.

Housing

The group debated whether concentrating affordable housing in certain locations creates neighborhoods of "haves and have nots," but was also concerned that dispersed housing creates traffic problems. They would like to see "integrated" affordable housing that is part of the community—not dispersed. Different types of housing are necessary. They noted that a lot of employees would like to be part of town. They also recognize that housing in town might not always be single family and might be on smaller lots or could be apartments. But balance preservation of single family within Town of Jackson.

Town of Jackson – Character Areas

General Map

- Add four gateways. These should address the adjacent properties that develop.
 - Provide a transition in height, with lower heights at the north entrance of town (i.e., from one story to intensification of density). The group didn't want to see an abrupt town entrance of 3 or 4 stories. Provide transitions from the refuge sign to the next intersection, as a "gateway zone". It is also part of the scenic byway.
 - For the southern gateway, use the same strategy of transitions. Encourage a design that reflects the western heritage and western culture. Avoid generic architecture.
 - For the 3rd and 4th gateways. Limit commercial encroachment.
- Add hospital/civic commercial services district in "East Jackson."
- Snow King area – call the roads "pedestrian-roadways," where it is understood people will be on the roads.
- Workforce housing is a huge concern for the town. Integrate social services.
- The Chamber's perspective is the region needs housing where there's density (i.e., in town or immediately adjacent). The plan should say something about mitigation in town or just outside. Build affordable housing in town first, then county.
- Don't want to be a resort only.
- Affordable rental housing is also important for filling professional services jobs.

1. Downtown Commercial/Mixed-Use

- Add workforce housing

2. Corridor Commercial

- Workforce housing could be a focus in Area 2.

3. Downtown Residential

- Employee housing shouldn't be on slopes – put on flatter areas. It affects viewsheds.
- Critical winter range is on slopes even in town. Plan for it.
- Development types: A, B

4. Town Residential

- Development types: A, B

Group 3 (Bill Collins and Ben Herman, facilitators)

Teton County – Planning Areas

1. *Alta*

- Recognize that this is a stand alone area.
- Needs small commercial node (if viable) but may be too close to Driggs.
- Preferred patterns are conservation, B and C.

2. *Buffalo Valley and Kelly*

- Options include conservation, but include some areas of community services and possibly more employee housing in Moran (NPS employees).
- Kelly seen as mostly built out.
- Primary use is A.

3. *Airport/Golf and Tennis*

- Mostly status quo-type development.
- Some possibility for clustered
- Density increase may trigger need for highway widening.

4. *South Park*

- Look at options for all.
- Seen as key area that determines how much growth occurs in town vs. county.
- Could look at F as a part of a scenario that is density-neutral for the region.

5. *Aspens/Teton Pines*

- Possibilities for more infill development in limited nodes (Aspens), but will be difficult to achieve with existing residents.
- Density increase may trigger need for highway widening.

6. *Greater Wilson Area*

- Issue discussed was more about amount of new development, rather than pattern or type.
- Several options – status quo, status quo/limited, or enhanced area with E and F.

7. *Fall Creek Road (S. of Wilson)*

No comments, don't see much change

8. *Hog Island and Hoback*

- Limited opportunities for any development due to road, infrastructure limitations

Town of Jackson – Character Areas

Downtown Core

- Should have a small core area that is lower-intensity “Old Jackson”, more traditional character
- Outside of core area, more urban character is okay.
- Particular interest in tying density to preservation of areas elsewhere in the county (i.e., buy it and bring it into town).

Corridor Commercial

- Area out towards “Y” intersection should be targeted as a new “town center” for locals:
 - More office uses, redevelopment of suburban-scale development.
 - Transition plan for underutilized sites.
 - Need to define street grid to get away from parking lot patterns, so that over time the area can develop its own circulation network, reducing density on the highway.
 - Need to transition from superblocks to gridded pattern.

Downtown Residential

- Need to draw some hard lines in some locations to avoid “bleedover” from core area.
- Look at possibility of labeling Redmond as a local’s “Main Street”.
- Cache corridor as connector from south side neighborhoods to core area.
- Need to look at Snow King commercial area (existing UC2 zoning) as potential town center for south side area.

Town Residential

No comments.

Wrap Up

The planning team will notify the community when the next meeting date is set. It is likely to be the last week of January 2008.