

Stakeholders Advisory Group - Comp Plan Update

10.30.08 Meeting Agenda

1. Welcome

Jeff Daughtery opened the meeting and reviewed to the role and responsibility of the STAG. In attendance were STAG members Scott Pierson, Kniffy Hamilton, Brad Mead, Tim O'Donoghue, Laurie Andrews, Aaron Pruzan, Janine Teske, Franz Camenzind, Darrell Hoffman, Sean O'Malley, Jerry Blann, and Anne Hayden-Cresswell; Staff members Jeff Daugherty, Tyler Sinclair, Jeff Noffsinger, and Alex Norton; and Cody Lockhart, Kristy Bruner, Larry Kummer, Dave Coon, Gail Jensen, Rich Bloom, and other members of the public

2. Approval of Agenda

Tyler Sinclair gave a quick review of the agenda and the current status of the comprehensive planning process. Franz Camenzind expressed concern over the length of the agenda. Tyler reassured the group that we could take as long as we needed to get through the issues and schedule future meetings if necessary.

3. Discussion of Issues

Each issue discussion will begin with a presentation of public comment and elected and appointed official direction. Please see the attached 8/11/08 memo summarizing public comment on these issues and visit <http://www.jacksontetonplan.com/surveys/> for complete records of public comment.

a. Buildout/Land Use Pattern

- **Public Comment** – Buildout should be lower than current projections and be clearly stated. Rural County areas should stay rural.
- **Officials' Direction** – County buildout should be lowered by reducing the allowable density bonuses in exchange for open space. Development footprint should be tightened. Development in the northern portion of South Park is appropriate to meet workforce housing demands if infrastructure issues are addressed.

- **Possible Questions for Discussion**

- Should buildout be reduced?
 - Are transfers of development rights a solution?
 - Where is residential growth appropriate in the County? Town?

- **Discussion Notes**

Scott Pierson stated that he supports density bonuses as part of some type of Transfer of Development Rights program. Brad Mead commented that the Plan should nurture scenic easements and the PRD tool is effective in incentivizing those easements. Laurie Andrews confirmed that the PRD has been an effective tool in the preservation of open space through the Land Trust. Franz reminded the group the PRD protects existing habitat, not create new habitat. Further, he stated that the Plan should clearly articulate community's desire to secure conservation easements. Darrell Hoffman stated that the PRD works better on larger parcels. Sean O'Malley cautioned the group about a "one size fits all approach" as a solution. Jerry Blann stated that the elimination of 60,000 square feet of commercial development in the SRA project has hampered the ability of

the Village node to be sustainable. Scott discussed his concern for the appropriate mix local business opportunities in the Lodging Overlay. Janine Teske suggested hiring a consultant to help identify the businesses needed for a vital downtown. Aaron Pruzan disagreed with the suggestion and commented that community has many of the needed establishments scattered about the town. Anne Hayden expressed concern that the build out number should be discussed after the other ideals are reviewed. She indicated discussing the growth rate, affordable housing, etc., would assist in determining the appropriate build out number.

b. Growth Rate

- **Public Comment** – Growth rate regulations should be implemented to allow for study of the impacts of growth.
- **Officials' Direction** – Growth rate regulation in other communities should be studied and possible legal nexuses should be examined.
- **Possible Questions for Discussion**
 - Should there be a growth rate cap?
 - What should be the basis for the growth rate cap?
- **Discussion Notes**

The Planning Team asked the question, “should there be a growth rate and how is that determined.” Jerry stated that infrastructure should support the location of development. Darrell indicated that it should be predictable and measured by the number of housing units and commercial square footage approved with the issuance of a building permit. Jerry cautioned that implementing a growth rate cap could be difficult and costly to implement. Franz asked if a desired growth management strategy could be reached without a specific formula. Sean asked if a growth rate cap would create a vibrant community. Franz stated, that the organization he represents is fairly comfortable with the current build out based on current zoning (but reserves the right change opinion upon confirmation). There was consensus in the group that the growth rate concept could be achieved without a detailed formula. Janine cited a conversation with local law enforcement about crime rates increasing when population reaches 20,000 because the increased population decreases communication in the community.

c. Workforce Housing

- **Public Comment** – Workforce housing requirements for residential and nonresidential development should be based on employee generation. Market rental housing is an important piece of the workforce housing stock.
- **Officials' Direction** – Housing 65% of the workforce locally is a good goal. Officials believe employee generation based requirements are appropriate, as is the provision of market rentals; and stress the need to identify areas for housing production if the 65% goal is to be met.
- **Possible Questions for Discussion**
 - Is housing 65% of the work force locally an appropriate goal?
 - How should the goal be achieved?

- Is it appropriate to allow bonuses for restricted housing development? Where is it appropriate to allow bonuses for restricted housing development in the County? Town?

- **Discussion Notes**

The Planning Team asked if the goal to house 65% of the workforce locally was attainable. Scott thought the goal was not realistic and that it is easy for the general community to set a goal if the ownership of its implementation is placed on a few. Jerry stated that critical mass of affordable/employee housing is important versus distribution throughout the county. Anne agreed with the goal, but asked how we get there. Brad restated the need to set realistic goals. He also stated that he could support a local tax when asked by Anne. Jerry suggested that new large home construction should build affordable units rather than pay a fee in-lieu to offset their impacts. Aaron cited Wilson as a good example with affordable housing constructed near the school. Darrell suggested that we trade commercial square footage for employee housing. Anne asked if we could capture density through conservation easements and transfer as an affordable housing unit to a designated sending area. Franz supports these two reallocation concepts and further stated that we needed to find a fair financial solution. Laurie stated that it is equally important for conservation organization to know where development is to occur. Anne used the “ships” and “chairs” analogy. She added that we needed to determine where the ship is going and how to arrange the chairs on the ship and do we need more than one ship.

d. Next meeting

The group agreed to meet again in two weeks to finish the agenda. The meeting summary and a date certain will be emailed to the group.