

**July 10, 2008**

**South Park Comp Plan Update Meeting**

**Guest:**

1. Forrest McCarthy 3745 Esther Way Teton Village, WY
2. Claire Fuller 5595 W. HWY 22
3. Cody Lockhart P.O Box 5000
4. Mike May P.O Box 13136 Jackson,
5. Deb VanDerVelde
6. Brian Remlinger 1915 Cinnamon Teal Jackson,
7. Matt Daly 1955 Bunk House Dr Jackson,
8. Margaret Creel 1680 Quarter horse Dr
9. Wayne Plithner 3180 Beaver Slide
10. Kristy Bruner
11. Mike Welch P.O Box 8091
12. Karen Jerger 1190 Haysled Dr Jackson,
13. Carol Colglazier 1890 Cinnamon Teal
14. Armond Acri 2001 Corner Ck Ln #5
15. Gail A Fustos P.O Box 9755 Jackson, WY 83002
16. Mike Emmer P.O Box 8131 Jackson, WY 83002
17. Kent Hobson P.O Box 7378 Jackson, WY 83002
18. Jan Momchilovich P.O Box 2092 Jackson, WY 83001
19. Karen K. 3430 Arabian Dr
20. Cindy Harger 1055 Brahma Jackson, WY 83001

21. Diane H	P.O Box 1299 Jackson, WY 83001
22. Ben Cannon	
23. John Hindman	P.O Box 9517 Jackson, WY 83001
24. Barbara V. Simms	5205 S. Canadian Springs Dr. Jackson, 01
25. John Simms	5205 S. Canadian Springs Dr. Jackson, 01
26. Jo Ann Grant	P.O Box 1516 Jackson, WY 83001
27. William Bradley	P.O Box 8655 Jackson, WY 83001
28. Roberta Harding	P.O Box 8655 Jackson, WY 83001
29. Luke Bruner	P.O Box 3351 Jackson, WY 83001
30. Tony Wall	P.O Box 1269 Wilson, WY
31. Julie McIntyre	P.O Box 2017 Jackson, WY 83001
32. Julie and Larry Kummer	
33. Kirk Stone	P.O Box 1280 Jackson, WY 83001
34. Shelly Elser	P.O Box 11214 Jackson, WY 83002
35. Pam Weiss	P.O Box 1938 Jackson, WY 83001
36. Nancy Wonacott	2085 So. Park Ranch Rd Jackson, WY 83001
37. Hope Sueller Moore	1924 So. Fork Rd Jackson, WY 83001
38. Hamish Tear	2087 So. Park Ranch Rd Jackson, WY 83001
39. Art Greger	
40. Tim Gray	3201 W. Big Trail Dr Jackson, WY 83001
41. Marg McIntyre	P.O Box 65
42. Sonja Shakey	P.O Box 326 Jackson, WY 83001
43. Ted Dawson	P.O Box 6339 Jackson, WY 83002

44. Kristine O'Brian 1227 Melody Creek  
45. Rich Bloom  
46. Becky Woods  
47. Mike Whitcomb  
48. Linda & Jim Goralsla 4415 Melody Ranch Rd Dr.  
49. Marv Heileson Melody Ranch  
50. Julia Weston Melody Ranch  
51. Fred & Barbara Whissel 1700 Quarter horse  
52. Cara Froedge  
53. Floyd Cooley 1245 Hereford  
54. Pamela Zernis 1705 Quarter horse  
55. Karen Langenberg 1216 Melody Creek Ln  
56. Ben Ellis  
57. Nancy& Dave Dunlap P.O Box 6765 Jackson, WY 83002  
58. Tom V. P.O Box 2017  
59. Cindy Stone P.O Box 1865 Jackson, WY  
60. Teri McCarthy P.O Box 4459 Jackson, WY 83001  
61. David & Marie Suhre 33855 Appaloosa Dr  
62. Brian Grubb  
63. Gail Jensen P.O Box 3932  
64. Steve Tipler 4550 Runway Rd Jackson, WY 83001  
65. Carol Peck 4355 Hufsmith Hill

**Theme 1: Promote Stewardship of Wildlife Habitat and other Environmental Sensitive Areas and Resources**

- The number of “units” proposed is too many to maintain wildlife area. Please decrease the build out numbers.
- Change “ideal” to begin , “Maintain population of native wildlife” and not native species.
- Re-write Theme 1 to say: Stewardship of Jackson Hole as a uniquely special destination and place to live.
- 1.1-8: The wildlife should include all flora and fauna not just “game and fish”. The south park open areas under the current zoning keeps a link from the Snake River at the south park bridge to and through the edges of town and on to the parks. It must be maintained as much as possible.
- If we are a “community first, resort second” why do we always get the resorts, gulf courses and lodging first and we are still waiting on the affordable housing.
- Wildlife first and foremost –keep density low in lower South Park important bird population for nesting ducks birds etc. more population of people will mean scarce nesting.
- Additional wildlife data needs to be gathered before density locations and conservation areas are decided. This is especially true along Hwy. 390.
- 1.1a- YES! Protect wildlife habitat etc.
- Use a public funding mechanism to acquire identified wildlife habitat of value. Use this identified habitat areas for “open space banking.”
- 1.1-I hear wildlife in the goals, but I’m not seeing it played out in specifics to date. Please recognize our phenomenal natural resources and protect them! We can always grow more (and will have the demand to do so) we can’t go back if we ruin it.
- “it is difficult for conservation to keep pace with development, where are the mechanism to change this dynamic PRD, TDR open space purchased in property.
- Beef up wildlife protection theme. Add principle that any and all development applications must be evaluated in light of impact in wildlife and wildlife habitat.
- 1.4: So this is throughout the county not just in outlaying regions? Respect migration corridors and scenic beauty as well.
- Preserve Rural character of South Park- Do not up zone to meet housing needs
- 1.4: Reduce use of flood lights at high school grounds.

- If we keep the stewardship of our wildlife as our priority then we need to reconsider the total build-out numbers. Keep our wildlife protected avoid South Park increases.
- Preserve scenic vistas and wildlife in South Park.
- Don't just try to fit in wildlife- wildlife is first then the rest can fit in what's left!
- Plan should recognize that there will be more wildlife-vehicle conflicts collisions with increase density in South Park.
- Wildlife habitat includes more than just critical movement corridor. It includes lesser and small species habitat as well. Includes birds and others as well as ungulates
- 1.4: Ban permanent yard lights. Can we require that 50% of the big lots' (K-Mart, Smith's) parking lots lights be off at non-commercial times?
- Freedom to roam Y to Y incorporated into data. Check Patagonia website.
- The change- what's special about JH? Wildlife, scenic, open space, uniqueness of Yellowstone, ecosystem, cowboy culture more than just wildlife
- 1.9: Access is good but the current plan to change drastically the South Park bridge access to the Snake River and the Evans expansion negatively affect/effect the community of the Snake River wildlife corridors to its source and outlet at the palisades for the benefit of commercial interest.
- Reduce road kill by installing under passes on all relevant roads. Also reduce speed probably use a camera box.
- We've got to protect the remaining wildlife movement in South Park.
- 1.1.d: Residents who live here average 11.4 daily trips, as opposed to a commuter's one trip. Be careful of assumptions mass transit to and from Alpine and Driggs may be most efficient.
- How and why do we go from 35-acre parcels in South Park to 1-acre parcels only? We need mixed land use not just 1-acre plots. We need some 20, 35, 100-acres. Wildlife does exist in southern South Park. This year I've seen elk, moose, fox, cougars, eagles, osprey, deer, coyote and hawks in the southern South Park area.
- According to numerous public meetings wildlife is the top priority of valley residents. The current proposal for South Park proposes densities that will impact wildlife, water quality, air quality and traffic. It is ineffective to reduce growth density in places like Buffalo Valley and then saturate other important areas like South Park.
- Farming at the north end of the valley can be preserved without sacrificing other important areas such as South Park. This will require growth limits.

- Preserving open space in Kelly, Buffalo Valley, Alta and moving it is wrong! No growth of significance is going on anyway.
- Page 8 states “indicators should be based on reading available data” How can we comment intelligently on almost zero data? Or is that the plan?
- Page 6 of the draft states “contains measures and indicators.” Where? They are not quantified. We the public can’t comment on that which we can’t see
- Ultimate growth cap to preserve the natural attributes of our valley.

### **Theme 2: Manage Growth Responsibility**

- 2.1: Traffic this summer is out of control. What will doubling population do? What will summer traffic be like In the future?
- 2.1: Traffic is unbearable at times now. How can we take more vehicles with more schools and workers then are already driving now?
- 2.1: Growth should be managed by a percentage each year so we don’t have the big bang.
- 2.1: Adding predictability great! (less conflict) However seems like undoing some of the past predictability added density via and TDR’S e.g. South Park.
- 2.1: At my work place (the hospital) a patient asked how we can take all this traffic.
- 2.1: As long as predictable development doesn’t mean the sacrifice of South Park. Mixed use centers and commercial is not appropriate for South Park.
- 2.1: This draft plan seems to “manage” growth less effectively then the existing. TOO VAGUE-no meat.
- 2.2d: We need a mechanism to guarantee conservation focus area will be implemented as planned.
- 2.2: Fewer commercial buildings will bring fewer workers which will bring fewer people who need homes.
- 2.3: Who determines appropriate physical design of scale? South Park is not an appropriate place for high impact, high density development.
- 2.3: Yes, but size and scale matter, eliminate PMUD.
- 2.5.d: Existing structure owners put rent too high so they stay empty for a long time. Need to implement rules to be rented out.

- 2.3: South Park needs to remain rural. If we cut off wildlife movement it will be gone forever.
- Any growth in South Park (So. High school Rd) should be homes unless there allowed a few small businesses (i.e. cleaning laundry mat) which might need for autos on the road.
- South Park needs to remain rural. It is one of the most beautiful areas of the whole area. South Park Loop Rd should not be widened.
- Keep South Park as rural as possible for the sake of the wildlife and transportation gridlock!
- Very difficult to comment on managing growth when there have not been decent estimates of forecasted growth.
- Increase size of NRO to adequately reflect where wildlife actually are in valley especially Wilson/West bank area.
- Town doesn't need more new development until it is figured out how town should grow by numbers (people).
- In managing growth not much mention of wild life issues –very disappointed.
- Roadway analysis – referring to travel demand modeling document please do it in an integrated fashion –looking at systems –wide impacts and scenarios, not one offs.
- It doesn't do any good to have a new Comp Plan or an old Comp Plan when it can be changed by 3 votes on a whim what's the point!
- But that didn't mean all of South Park- lets keep it rural or at least with the existing density.
- Predictability is a good idea. PUD-AH results in arbitrary up zones – the opposite of predictability get rid of them and all arbitrary up zone.
- County/Town cooperation= Enhanced (not just maintained).
- I hear County and Town are working together – and no doubt you are. However right now this process seems flawed as the town plan won't be reveled much less incorporated until the end of summer. It's hard to comment as we don't know what some parts of the county will look like until we see what the town will support of that makes sense. First step town must increase affordable housing % to be in line with county % so county doesn't have to house the majority of work force.
- Businesses should have responsibility in being able to house their workers.
- Residents of South Park bought homes in an area zoned Rural for the sake of predictability. Any new plan should be zoned close to that.
- When we were asked about growth in South Park we were told up zoning would be within  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile of the high school road. When did that change?

- Concept of build out is elusive, not without up zones or density bonuses nor is hard ranges and carrying capacity quotas.
- Road kill on highways threaten mega fauna, air quality and should not be expanded simply to justify high density and higher profits In South Park.
- I think you pulled the wool over most of the people's eyes when you asked the question about growth on your surveys. It asked whether we wanted growth in South Park. We questioned the wording and were assured that it just meant around High School Road. Most of us said OK.
- Transportation limitations must be considered to the optimum degree when considering appropriateness and density of developments.
- Replace "manage growth responsibility" or expand on it by saying "permit additional growth only to the extent it doesn't negatively impact special environment of Jackson Hole".

### **Theme 3: Develop a Comprehensive, Integrated Transportation Strategy**

- 3.2: People do not want connectivity of area if traffic volume increases. Highways should handle high volumes, not subdivision streets.
- In South Park businesses or service centers (i.e. daycares) should be kept at a size which would bring no more than 30 cars at a given time period (i.e. 8-9am/4-6pm)
- 3.1: How do we get kids onto school busses and stop the "Mommy 500"?
- 3.2: The transportation element totally ignores wildlife issues and wildlife mortality is largely a result of car conflict. Remember wildlife is the highest priority in the Plan.
- 3.1.a: No more hotels in town. Instead build apartments for service people so they can walk to work.
- 3.1: Recognize people aren't going to ride the bus very often. Aim for people walking to work and commerce.
- 3.2: Provide underpasses or overpasses and reduce speed to protect wildlife.
- Wildlife enhancements to roads (underpasses) crossing can be higher priority
- Maintain scenic roadways such as SP Loop, Spring Gulch they are important. Insanity of traffic on Broadway and HWY 22.
- Need a stop light at the intersection of highway and Rafter J before any more growth south of Rafter J.

- 3.1: Put high density in Town close to services.
- 3.1: Our existing transportation is at a critical point already. We need to fix existing systems before any new growth. Keep new growth close to Town.
- 3.2.e: We need public busses coming to Melody Ranch and Rafter J, long overdue.
- 3.4.b: More bicycle pathways widening it only encourages faster speed.
- 3.4.a: No need to widen highways if there is a stop on growth, less traffic we would have or existing one has to be decreased.

### **Travel Demand Modeling**

- All 3 new roadway network scenarios, Indian trail, Spring Gulch, and North Bridge, intersect or are within the NRO, WYGFD crucial winter habitats or big game migration corridors. How will we mitigate for this?
- The modeling results suggest that the WY 22 monitoring location will have 47% more traffic, the WY 390 location will have 22% more, and the Broadway Avenue location will have 12% more traffic than the threshold established in the current transportation chapter of the plan. The scenario also suggests that with no changes to current land use and a lower than average annual traffic growth rate (2% per year), the current Plan's objective will be difficult to achieve

### **Theme 4: Uphold Jackson as “Heart of the Region”**

- “Region” is too vague- I don’t know if you are talking Wyoming, Idaho, Montana etc. clarify.
- Resorts or business that create new jobs need to create housing on site.
- Town is totally blowing any maintenance of “small town” character with 4 story buildings. You are turning it into “any town USA” Huge new motel/hotel dwarfing those existing motels and diminishing those people who have supported Jackson for years!
- Less commercial % more housing % = better balance fewer employee problems, less emergency for affordable housing.
- I think there are differing visions of “Town as Heart” Town square as center! I’m not sure sprawling growth to and beyond “Y” meets original goal of this concept.
- Do concurrent Comp Plan, Town plan and LDR drafts.
- Provide affordable rental for seasonal workers.
- Rentals for workers should be a priority in Town.

- Living where you work is a good idea. Walk to work is sound planning.
- Maintaining Jackson as heart doesn't mean making South Park Town.
- 4.1: Affordable rentals should be encouraged and perhaps subsidized for first responders.
- I support 4.1 but do not believe that town as heart justifies 4 story buildings in Jackson.
- 4.5: Town is about as "vibrant" as any I've seen (including towns 3 times the size) what does this mean?

### **Theme 5: Meet our Community's Diverse Housing Needs**

- I think our affordable housing problems are best addressed by more rentals near town of at least 75%.
- Mandatory requirement of new commercial developments to house their employees on site as the cost of doing business with high returns. Do not believe housing in each and every development on site. The poor way that these development battles have been handled by the planning department.
- Diverse housing need. Make developers pay their own way. Don't make the community subsidize commercial development by subsidizing their workers.
- Don't be afraid to propose property right "build outs" to preserve wild life and open space.
- The statement ideal I think is unrealistic and based on what? Very vague.
- Recognizing that since many jobs are low wage serving positions, focus should shift away from ownership towards permanent renting (on site) by the businesses generating the jobs.
- Is it possible to focus on building rental units for some of our workers instead of just affordable purchase options? People need to earn the right to live in a resort we cannot just hand it to them.
- Not everyone who wants to live in Jackson can afford to live in Jackson it is not my responsibility to provide that want. I lived in Jackson 29 years before I could afford to purchase my first house. Nobody helped me buy it. I saved and made sacrifices to do it myself. As a community we should expect more personal responsibility from everyone who wants to live here. Also I did it as a single mother I had no money no family I just work for what I have.
- We allow this need to flourish as we continue to add commercial and residential growth in excess of what is zoned in the Comp plan. STOP IT AND THE INCREASED NEED WILL GO AWAY!
- No new resort zones.

- 5.2: Yes but free market incentives will never accomplish this in a resort town. Need less commercial growth (better balance with residential) and more seasonal rental housing.
- Every other place is “conservation” or “existing” zoning except South Park spread the pain around.
- Housing Developments (with no development on mountain or canyon) is preferable to spaced out 1-acre development, Wasteful.
- I have no problem with affordable housing spread throughout the county in fact it’s desirable to me. We just have to create it within established densities.
- 5.3,d: Workforce housing could be built indeed. So we have to cap development (hotels, new ones etc.) or we have to supply housing indeed.
- 5.4: Get rid of rodeo grounds put high density housing there.
- Widely spaced housing is like well placement in the Jonah field small as a % footprint, but it kills views, wildlife and service provisions.
- Is it fair to ask tax payers to shoulder load for housing for resorts etc? Prop tax is becoming overwhelming for current working Teton County homeowners. How do we keep housing affordable?
- Since we have identified the need for affordable workforce housing have the courtesy to spread it evenly between Jackson, South Park, Wilson and West Bank. DO NOT continue to unfairly target the South Park area.
- Eliminate PUD-AH and work on mitigation rates, balance of commercial/residential etc.
- If we have a crisis we need to only house emergency workers. Rental units make the only sense.
- Where applicable require new free market residential developments to construct their affordable attainable units on that development or at least contiguous to it e.g. 3-Creek.
- 5.1: I paid a fee in lieu of affordable housing when we built in 1995, at that time it was topped out at 3500 sq ft (ours was 2000) we need that fee in lieu to have no ceiling considering the trophy homes that are here and ultimately driving our prices rising.
- Affordable housing needs to be affordable for the people subsidizing these units.
- Emphasize rental units- rental first then work up to owning. Increase density in town build on top of stores look at the European model.
- Affordable housing needs to emphasize “Essential Workers” 1. Give them selection priority. 2. Require emergency service workers to live in Jackson Hole Valley.
- Increase affordable housing rates for dense up zones.

- We need small pods of affordable housing! The area new to Cottonwood (South park and Elk Spring Rd) is too congested, cars are already poring over to side streets! Wait till winter snow removal storage, not enough street parking. All dense housing areas need a storage area also like Rafter J parking area up Adams Canyon.
- 65% workforce housing is the only solid number in the draft. It should not be included unless other goals are also as specific e.g. % of open space % of rental housing, park space/residents etc.
- Plan assumes higher densities are only way to get affordable housing. This is old think and counterproductive add a policy adopt alternative measures other then increased densities to retain and develop affordable housing.
- 5.6.c: As long as no new services and amenities are built so that it will attract new development.

#### **Theme 6: Provided for a Diverse and Balanced Community and Economy**

- It seems that the inability to do this starts with “growth”. No “growth” eliminates the need for services and infrastructure and housing for the growth. We can’t handle what we have now.
- Limit commercial development as there is no way to balance workforce housing with the already deficient housing.
- Goals, ideals- plans should be more specific less generalized.
- Move responsibility, should be placed on employers for employee housing. i.e. 60-100% for new developments (commercial) for existing commercial have a program for existing to provide employee housing.
- Attached as its root 6.3.b “green” business is not necessarily without adverse environmental impacts.
- 6.2: Economic development is driving and exacerbating the community’s affordable housing problem.
- No more golf courses!
- Let the resorts provide their own housing for workers 6.1.
- More hard data on impact of growth on scenic values.
- Is this growth happening in a way that it will “pay for itself” in terms of roads, police, schools, etc? What are the fiscal impacts?
- 6.1: Do not approve or change approved resorts. People have invested in resorts expecting the current master plan in place. Predictability should be respected and not changed with this plan.

- I think there are plenty of people who won't understand. "Allow for continued populations of species" Unclear.
- I think "sustain an agriculture economy" is completely unrealistic and very idealistic.
- Wildlife is number one priority-not people – we keep bypassing the #1 priority and talking about how to move people in. We need to limit the #2 on. This is our plan please listen.
- "Native species"
- 6.1: As long as this doesn't mean high density valley development to accomplish this goal.
- In 6.1 add – maintain as world renowned gateway to national parks...
- South Park residents are being more vocal and concerned because you've identify the area for growth, most of it. Why other areas are concerns being seemingly put ahead of and at the expense of South Park. If we can't accommodate 7,000 dus then maybe this needs to be reduced! Or the Town vs. County portion changed 1,650 Towns and 5,300 County? Increase and lower
- Require hotels/resorts to provide rental housing for the generated employees. No fee in lieu. Bond the entity and make it build housing first.
- Yes, less commercial, more residential and more focus on seasonal and rental.
- Hire professional biologist to give input on impact of growth on wildlife.
- Where was commercial in South Park identified? Along Highway, sure otherwise should not be there.
- I do not understand how the County Commissioners can even allow all of these requests for variances and upgrades to zoning to be entertained!!
- Stop any more big developments (or even small) without them providing 50% housing of their employees. No more buy outs.
- The County should provide housing for key county workers. Other businesses need to do more and step up!
- "Green" businesses need to provide 100% employee housing.
- No more resorts, ECT. Absolutely no commercial in South Park.
- How would businesses be attracted to the county? Would they be subsidized? I am against paying to attract them.

- Commuting from outside of the valley is a reasonable part of the housing mix. Furthermore there is supply available and is affordable. Let's focus on making commuting more feasible with support for mass transit or other.
- 6.1 and 6.1.e: We need to keep the "big box" businesses out of our community as they destroy small businesses.
- If we are a community first and resorts second, why do we always get the golf courses, resorts, lodging before the affordable housing? Change status.

#### **Theme 7: Provide Efficient and Quality Community Facilities and Infrastructure**

- The sizes and proposed locations of the 3 proposed county-run daycare facilities are ALL unacceptable for their proposed communities particularly the 250-bed one proposed within the Rafter J road network. This is absurd at its proposed size and impact.
- Protection, preservation of wildlife, and scenic corridors should be the overriding directive, not just something to balance with housing needs.
- Require that services and infrastructure necessary to service development is in place or guaranteed before new development is approved.
- Balance our budget and maintain current community facilities before building new that will increase our taxes.
- More people mean more schools. This affects our property taxes' more infrastructure. This in turn means more people to be and brought in. It's a catch 22. Less growth!
- 7.2: As you go south in the valley isn't water harder and deeper to find?
- 7.7: Green & winter outdoor public recreation spaces we need these in town and SP.
- 7.6: Please address K-12 education we need to guarantee small class sizes, good teachers and buildings.
- 7.6: Too many people not using bus system to get kids to school and after school activities. More coordination needed here.
- 7.8: We need to look at relocating St. Johns hospital to a more centrally accessible location!
- 7.6: The County needs more realistic ways to provide for capitol school cost without selling out to development.
- 7.7: Need to have public outdoor skating facility centrally located.

- High income subdivisions will not let affordable housing go in next to them. Why not?
- 7.6: Available on donated school sites should not drive high density development in places like South Park.
- Our infrastructure is further taxed by huge numbers of tourists. We need more money from their use of infrastructure

#### **(Draft) Teton County – Future Land use Plan**

- Can we get a master plan that does not allow changes in the zoning- so neighbors/owners know and can trust what their neighborhoods will be? Every month my husband reads the paper commenting that “variances are given out like candy” if there were no changes to densities wouldn’t that make commissioners jobs easier!! And we could know where we stand not what some developers P.R guy can talk the commissioners into!
- There is not enough information present with these maps to be able to comment. I did not bring my own downloads of what these mean other than the legend provided here. I find it not helpful and people around this table are making assumptions and basing their comments on uninformed speculation. Also! It’s a big map without a level of detail that helps us discern the boundaries as we on the ground can relate to them, and then understand the clash as boundaries meet.
- What % of population are in areas outside of Town and in 5 acres in the Town of Jackson (see your land use comment) vs. what % are you planning. Is change fair and balanced?
- Survey results indicate people want to focus development in town limit development in rural (development in town 77-83%).
- No more fees in lieu parking which sounds like too small of fee to actually cover the expense!
- No commercial in middle of southern South Park. To retain scenic and wildlife values there should be no up zones to these areas!
- I moved to South Park in 1995 there were elk along the road then and in Porter estate now 13 years later I have not seen elk in two years we are close to losing our herds!
- If the plan doubled the populations that will double the needs for schools etc. Where is that given consideration in the plan?
- No TDR’S based on bonuses, only on base zoning.
- Avoid density increases to South Park beyond ½ mile of school. Do not consider additional services. The transportation is already maxed out keep density in existing core centers. South Park is already too dense.

- 7,000 is too much growth even to accommodate the priorities. 7,000 down to 3-4,000? Change density from 1/35 acres to 1-2 1/2 acres too big of change.
- South Park is a valuable scenic and wildlife area in the valley and has a rich reservoir of workforce those who embody community character.
- Sprawl means different things to different people but to some of us who have lived here for years it's already happening. That's why I'd love to see it capped at current town limits.
- Wildlife should be more weighted and prioritized above all other themes. We are not looking for wildlife just a balanced theme.
- Commercial development brings the need for more employee housing. Require developers to provide 80% of housing required for employees on site. Teton Village should house employees in Teton Village.
- Need to give information from WG&F about keeping elk off of Porter Estates.
- Questions: Protection of Flat Creek counter homes in South Park?
- We need to make sure that the wildlife "expert" inputs are really individuals with wildlife values as their priority and that they aren't getting their back pockets padded by others' \$ interests.
- Maintaining tree corridors on all of South Park Loop essential to character of this neighborhood.
- Keep South Park except most northern by high school rural 1/35.
- South Park is not a center of jobs. Adding density to South end of town places more people away from biggest employer.
- The Westside store why isn't it purple on the map.
- Please correct the mapped NRO SE of Spring Gulch Road.
- Growth needs to be capped at less than 1% spread it around all area don't make one area a sacrifice area.
- For predictability the PUD-AH must be significantly rewritten to limit size of up zone. The PUD-AH if kept should be in overlay area to town. Higher PUD-AH densities should be generated only by buying development rights on land adjacent to the proposed PUD-AH.
- Let's all play by the rules.
- Stop the growth we have plenty of housing not everyone can afford to live here and you will ruin JH as we know it.

- Have strict oversight of people who live in affordable housing. No rentals No vacation homes full time working residents only and not just at the time of application.
- Need to watch conflict of interest with wildlife consultants who are pro development.
- North and South Park are diverse areas, don't lump together separate North= is more dense commercial South = less dense sm. Pockets, rural.
- Employees created by commercial (hotel) should be housed by the hotel developer find a % and stick to that number. Requirements should be the same for each hotel. Find % for restaurants and stick to it.
- Good to maintain conservation easement from Flat Creek to Hwy 89.
- Conservation easement should be goal in natural resource areas of South Park.
- Stop targeting South Park as the only high density affordable/attainable nodes. Wilson and the west bank are on start bus routes already and need to share a larger burden of density than currently proposed.
- Isn't Teton Village one of the largest employers in Teton County? Where is the increased density there?
- If talking carbon footprint why locate more housing south of Town? Should be in Town or in Teton Village.
- If South Park residents/communities don't want commercial development in their area, why would you put it in the plan? What is the rationale?
- Traffic is already bad enough why make the problem worse.
- The planning staff is out of touch with the values of Teton County residents as reflected by their growth, not prevention of wildlife and scenic ideals.
- Why is this increase in business property? There are a limited # of businesses that are grandfathered.
- Single family.
- We need a strong real estate transfer tax to help- 1.Fund affordable housing. (Create this housing in town within  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile of high school road) 2. Create safe areas for wildlife in cross road highways.
- The max build out needs to be lowered!! Especially consider using a rate % growth per year to avoid what has happen in the last 15 years.
- South Park density way to high! Very low growth preferable. Develop necessary items within  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile of high school road. Keep rest of South Park Rural!

- Maximum density? Who determines that? The County Commissioners and the Town Council?
- Do not up zone S. South Park leave it zoned rural. This is a solution not just a comment.
- Where did the 7,000 number come from? Is that 7,000 people or units? How will this affect the public works?
- Please do not sacrifice South Park ....slow growth throughout County.
- Reduce build out numbers from 7,000 homes, The old Comp Plan was drafted prior to the conservation of huge parcels of developable land for golf courses has pushed the burden in South Park.
- Maintain town density growth boundary at High School Rd.
- Give what the public infrastructure for 7,000 new homes will cost the tax payers.
- If wildlife is the overriding value can we make all decisions in terms of how it affects wildlife? If it has negative impact then any action should modified.
- We need a real overarching theme a “prime directive”. #1 wildlife and open space are not covering quality of life in Town.
- Protect all areas of High School Road from increased density.
- 7,000 new units is too much. Suggesting 2,500 new units. This will create/intensify a land rush but better now to preserve something we still have and treasure than lose it all. And maybe 2,500 is too much, what are hard costs on per additional person basis infrastructure traffic services etc.
- Survey results clear that build out should not be increased to accommodate affordable housing high density.
- Can we grow without increasing highways to say 4 lanes? Can wildlife cope survive, maintain populations with 4 lane highways.
- Ask whether 7,000 should be allowed?
- Wildlife is most important theme our community includes people animals and land.
- The density proposal for South Park is not consistent with its existing scale and character from principle 2.2 South Park is not a node now it is same rural single family residential with scenic open space qualities.
- Absolutely no commercial should be allowed in South Park only commercial now is on Highway 89.
- To achieve the themes reduce build out numbers.

- No growth in Buffalo Valley, Alta no transfer of development to South Park.
- Importance of wildlife values within South Park and to south on Snake. Dense population would negatively impact.
- Don't start with 7,000 as a goal. There is no need to transfer density from places where it won't be built anyway. Reduce this number otherwise you won't be able.
- Limit to 2,500 additional units.
- I disagree with any up zone anywhere in the County including South Park unless 1. There are guaranteed for down zoned in areas with meaningful wildlife habitat and scenic value 2. Conservation easements are acquired before up zone.
- On "affordable" housing all the "mitigation fees" are a scam they transfer the cost via "cheaper quality" affordable and to the free market buyer. Why not use a real estate transfer tax to fund that!