



Appendix I: Buildout Numbers and Assumptions

APPENDIX I: BUILDOUT NUMBERS AND ASSUMPTIONS ■

Buildout Taskforce Town/County Summary

With 7/1/10 Planning Commission certified development potential caps

	Town	County	Total
Residential – bold numbers were added to get PC recommended caps			
Existing DUs		4,697	
Existing ARUs		999*	
Existing Employee Units		50	
Total Existing Units	3,898	5,746	9,644
Potential Base DUs	1,130	3,567	4,697
Potential PRD DUs	266	3,651	3,917
Potential Residential ARUs	384	10,496*	10,880
Potential Nonresidential ARUs		797*	797
Potential Employee Units	754	309	1,063
Total Potential Units	2,534	18,820	21,354
PC Recommended Cap on Potential	2,534 + County transfer units + nonres conversion units	4,673 + PRD potential TBD	7,207 + County PRD potential TBD + nonres conversion units
Short-Term Rental Units			
Existing Short-Term Units		1,250	1,250
Potential Short-Term Units		155	155
PC Recommended Cap on Potential		155	155
Nonresidential			
Existing nonresidential floor area (sf)	4,576,840	3,476,829	8,050,669
Potential nonresidential floor area (sf)	3,436,798	3,179,295	6,616,093
PC Recommended Cap on Potential (sf)	3,436,798	3,179,295 + res conversion in Resorts + new light industrial	6,616,093 + res conversion in Resorts + new County light industrial

* The Buildout Taskforce calculated 12,292 possible County ARUs and 384 existing. Since 9/24/09 further staff research and Planning Commission discussion has modified the number of existing ARUs to 999 and separated residential from nonresidential associated ARUs.

APPENDIX I: BUILDOUT NUMBERS AND ASSUMPTIONS ■

Teton County Assumptions

Highlighted assumptions are most accountable for the differences between the various buildout calculations

	2007 Clarion Snapshot	4/3/09 Draft, Appendix I	Buildout Taskforce
Existing DUs Data Source ¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2000 Census plus building permits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning Department database as of February 2009 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning Department database as of July 2009
DU Potential Calculation Methodology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Zoning applied to gross “vacant” or “ag” land per Assessor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Zoning applied to each parcel as if vacant Existing units subtracted at Land Use District level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Zoning applied to each parcel as if vacant Existing units subtracted parcel by parcel Existing conditions were not ground-truthed
Existing Nonres Floor Area Data Source	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gross nonresidential floor area from Assessor data for all parcels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessor data for “commercial” properties augmented by Building and Planning data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessor data for “commercial” properties augmented by Building and Planning data
Nonres Floor Area Potential Calculation Methodology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Zoning applied to gross Assessor “vacant” land per zone no infill potential represented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Zoning applied to each parcel as if vacant Existing floor area subtracted at Land Use District level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Zoning applied to each parcel as if vacant Existing floor area subtracted parcel by parcel
Lodging	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Counted as nonres floor area, not distinguished 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Counted as nonres floor area, not distinguished 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lodging floor area distinguished from other nonres floor area Lodging units within that floor area identified
Units that can be Rented Short Term ³	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All counted as DUs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some counted as DUs Some included as nonres floor area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All counted as segregated units because there is no regulation as to their residential or nonresidential use Floor area not included in lodging or total nonres floor area Units not counted as dwelling units or lodging units
Campgrounds on Private Land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Counted as nonres floor area, not distinguished 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Counted as nonres floor area, not distinguished 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Campsites counted as lodging units Campground floor area counted as lodging floor area
Single/family ownership of multiple parcels ³	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some consideration in allocation of vacant/ag Rural land into density categories for PRD calculation Pre June 30, 2008 mass division of parcels into 35s 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some consideration of contiguous ownership in PRD calculation (Gill, Lockhart, Lucas, Resor, JLC) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Combined site potential considered in all cases where it could be determined: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AC BSA minimums contiguous Rural PRDs noncontiguous Rural PRDs
Existing nonconforming nonres development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not considered 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where identified in Rural zone, .007 possible FAR applied 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No expansion No reversion to residential development
Existing public/quasi public development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not considered 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumed to redevelop to maximum nonres capacity of neighboring zoning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No expansion No reversion to residential development

	2007 Clarion Snapshot	4/3/09 Draft, Appendix I	Buildout Taskforce
State School Sections	• Not included	• Counted as Rural	• Counted as Rural
Other State and Federal Property	• No development potential	• No development potential	• No development potential
PRD ³	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applied to all Rural zoned vacant/ag land 20% reduction applied at County level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applied to Rural zoned parcels with a BSA >23.33 ac 20% reduction applied per parcel Round down applied per parcel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PRD bonus units beyond base zoning represented separately Applied to Rural zoned parcels with a BSA >23.33 ac Round down applied per parcel 23% reduction in PRD bonus units applied per Land Use District based on historic use of the PRD
PUD-AH ⁴	• not included	• not included	• not included
Reduction Factors ^{2,3}	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20% reduction in residential density applied to all “vacant” land in all zoning districts 28% reduction in residential density applied to all “ag” land in all zoning districts 20% reduction in FAR applied in all non-resort zoning districts Inefficiency factor of 15-30% applied in all non-resort zoning districts 	• PRD reduction of 20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PRD bonus unit reduction of 23% - based on historic use BP floor area reduction of 33% - based on recent applications²
Use Mix	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AC – 80%/20% nonres/res OP – 70%/30% nonres/res 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WC – 100%/50% nonres/res (mistake) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WC – 50%/50% nonres/res
Conservation Easements ³	• Not considered	• Parcels entirely under conservation easement assigned potential of 0 units	• Parcels under conservation easement assigned potential allowed by conservation easement
Wild and Scenic Designation	• Not in effect	• Not in effect	• Considered in calculation of development potential
Planned Resorts			
• Existing Res	• not identified	• not identified	• 17 DUs
• Potential Res	• 1,229 DUs	• not identified	• 549 DUs
• Possible Res	• not identified	• 221 DUs	• 566 DUs
• Existing Nonres	• not identified	• not identified	• 1,423,000 sf
• Potential Nonres	• 295,600 sf	• not identified	• 2,322,000 sf
• Possible Nonres	• not identified	• 2,990,000 sf	• 3,745,000 sf
• Existing Short-Term	• not identified	• not identified	• 488 units
• Potential Short-Term	• not identified	• not identified	• 104 units
• Possible Short-Term	• not identified	• not identified	• 592 units

	2007 Clarion Snapshot	4/3/09 Draft, Appendix I	Buildout Taskforce
Effective Residential Densities by Zone:			
• AR	• zone did not exist in County	• 1 unit/lot	• 1 unit/lot
• AC	• 1.28 units/vacant acre	• 0 units	• 1 unit/lot if BSA<30,000 sf • 0 units if BSA>30,000 sf
• SU	• 3.2 units/vacant acre • 2.88 units/ag acre	• 1 unit/lot if platted • 4 units/BSA acre if not platted	• 1 unit/lot if platted • 4 units/BSA acre if not platted (subdivision in the SU district must be done by PRD so these units were listed in the base zoning column)
• SF ³	• 0.2 units/vacant acre	• 1 unit/lot or 0.33 units/ acre	• 1 unit/lot or 0.05-0.33 units/acre based on 1978 zoning
• RU	• 0.069, 0.137, or 0.206 units/vacant acre • 0.062, 0.123, or 0.188 units/ag acre	• 0.069, 0.137, or 0.206 units/BSA acre (see PRD notes above)	• 1 unit/parcel or 1 unit/35 acres – base zoning • 0.086, 0.171, or 0.257 units/BSA acre for PRD (see PRD notes above)
• OP	• 4.5 units/vacant acre	• 1 unit/lot	• 1 unit/lot
• WC	• zone did not exist	• 9 units/BSA acre	• 9 units/BSA acre
• BC	• 0 units	• by parcel	• 1 – 2,500 sf SFD per parcel where reasonable based on existing conditions and allowable expansion
• BP	• 0 units	• 0 units	• 0 units
• P,P/SP	• 0 units	• 0 units	• 0 units
• PD/PR	• as approved	• as approved	• as approved

APPENDIX I: BUILDOUT NUMBERS AND ASSUMPTIONS ■ TETON COUNTY ASSUMPTIONS

	2007 Clarion Snapshot	4/3/09 Draft, Appendix I	Buildout Taskforce
ARUs and Required Employee Units by Zone:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARUs and EUs not included 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARUs and EUs not included 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARUs and EUs represented in separate columns • potential is a function of possible minus permitted existing • CC&Rs not considered unless enforced by Teton County
• AR	• n/a	• n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • as approved in DEV
• AC	• n/a	• n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 ARU/lot if BSA<30,000 sf • 0.273 EUs/1,000 sf of potential nonresidential floor area if BSA>30,000 sf • 0 additional ARUs if BSA>30,000 sf
• SU	• n/a	• n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • prohibited
• SF	• n/a	• n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 ARU/DU that is not a townhouse, condominium, or deed restricted affordable unit
• RU	• n/a	• n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 ARU/DU (including PRD units)
• OP	• n/a	• n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 units
• WC	• n/a	• n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0.276 EUs/1,000 sf of potential nonresidential floor area • 0 additional ARUs
• BC	• n/a	• n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0.055 EUs/1,000 sf of potential lodging floor area, 0.273 EUs/1,000 sf of potential nonresidential floor area • additional ARUs up to 33% of the allowed floor area at 850 sf/unit
• BP	• n/a	• n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0.009 EUs/1,000 sf of potential nonres floor area • additional ARUs up to 10.2 ARUs and EUs/BSA acre
• P,P/SP	• n/a	• n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 units
• PD/PR	• n/a	• n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • as approved
Effective Nonres FARs by Zone:		•	•
• AC	• 0.132	• 0.35	• 0.35
• RU	• No nonres use assumed	• 0.007 – where nonres use identified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no expansion of existing nonres
• OP	• 0.181	• 0.35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • existing development
• WC	• zone did not exist	• 0.35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0.175
• BC	• 0.21	• determined per parcel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • determined per parcel
• BP ²	• 0.408	• 0.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0.4
• P,P/SP ²	• no floor area assumed	• equal to surrounding zoning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no expansion
• PD/PR ²	• as approved	• as approved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • as approved

	2007 Clarion Snapshot	4/3/09 Draft, Appendix I	Buildout Taskforce
Residential Totals			
• Existing Res	• 7,200 DUs	• 5,930 DUs	• 4,700 DUs
• Potential Res	• 5,200 DUs	• 6,190 DUs	• 3,570 Base Zoning DUs • 3,650 PRD Bonus DUs • 7,220 DUs with PRD
• Possible Res	• 12,700 DUs	• 12,120 DUs	• 8,270 Base Zoning DUs • 11,920 DUs with PRD
Nonresidential Totals			
• Existing Nonres	• 4,600,000 sf	• 3,670,000 sf	• 3,474,000 sf
• Potential Nonres	• 1,200,000 sf	• 4,600,000 sf	• 3,179,000 sf
• Possible Nonres	• 5,800,000 sf	• 8,270,000 sf	• 6,653,000 sf
Short-term Rental Units			
• Existing	• n/a	• n/a	• 1,250
• Potential	• n/a	• n/a	• 155
• Possible	• n/a	• n/a	• 1,405

¹ The difference in existing dwelling units is a result of the difference between census dwelling unit counts and Planning Department dwelling unit counts. Below is a best possible reconciliation of the numbers.

	Town	County	Total
2000 Census	3,861	6,406	10,267
Building Permits for new units 2000-2008	387	1,035	1,422
2009 Existing DUs (Clarion methodology)	4,248	7,441	11,689
2000 Census units on Federal Land	(0)	(766)	(766)
Units counted as short-term rentals by Taskforce	(0)	(1,250)	(1,250)
Reconciled 2009 Existing DUs	4,248	5,425	9,673
Taskforce Existing DUs	3,898	4,696	8,594
Unreconciled Difference	350	729	1,079

The Taskforce and Staff do not know the exact methodology the US Department of Census used in calculating the existing units in 2000, and therefore cannot identify possible sources of error. The Taskforce numbers for Town were ground-truthed by an employee of the Town Planning Department who knew the local geography and planning definitions of a unit, indicating that the Census count of units is likely high for planning purposes. The Taskforce cannot ground-truth the County numbers because of the scale of the undertaking.

The Taskforce made an attempt to reconcile the difference between Census numbers and the Planning Department numbers – making no value judgment as to which number is more accurate. The difference is 13 %. An attempt to reconcile the remaining difference will probably require ground-truthing all county properties. The Task Force does not have the time or resources to undertake this effort.

Because of the methodology used by the Taskforce, Planning Department existing data was used to calculate potential development under the current regulations because parcel by parcel methodology generally calculates potential development by the calculation: *potential development = possible development – existing development* and Census data is not available by parcel.

The Taskforce number is based on Planning Department data and is more than likely an understatement of existing units. Planning Department data indicates vacancy and land use. Most properties in Teton County are allowed only one unit. Where the land use of a property indicated multiple units were approved that property was looked at specifically. While the vast majority of properties are only allowed

one unit there are historically nonconforming properties with multiple units that the Planning Department does not know about.

Note that property taxes are determined by property – not units. The census count of units is not a count of properties and the Assessor periodically visits each property in the Town and County to ensure that the full extent of the improvements on the property is being taxed.

² The percentage of allowed BP floor area assumed to be realistically possible, the accurate representation and classification of Resort allowances, and the assumed (re)development of public/quasi public uses account for 979,606 sf (70%) of the difference between Appendix I and the Taskforce potential numbers and 1,839,170 sf (90%) of the difference between Clarion and Taskforce potential numbers. Note that some PQP uses occur in the BP zoning district. This is reflected in the Appendix I and Taskforce numbers, that same disaggregation cannot be done for Clarion numbers.

	Clarion	Appendix I		Taskforce	
	Potential	Existing	Potential*	Existing	Potential
BP	819,311	586,317	1,289,198	617,595	631,625
PQP	0	207,280	1,588,818	573,976	0
Resorts	295,600	1,934,329	1,055,671	1,423,177	2,322,456
Other	58,542	938,074	663,313	859,081	226,214
Total	1,173,452	3,666,000	4,597,000	3,473,829	3,180,295

* By omission, 843,569 sf (600,661 in Teton Village-Resorts; 128,778 near JHG&T -Other; 114,130 at Spring Creek-Other) of short-term rental condos were counted in the existing numbers that were not added into the possible, thus understating potential. No potential floor area was assigned to these condos, but the subtraction of existing floor area from possible at the land use district level would cause an understatement of potential for other nonresidential properties. The adjusted Potential numbers would be 1,656,332 sf in the Resorts; 906,221 sf in Other; and 5,440,569 sf Total. However, for comparison's sake the potential numbers stated above are more consistent with the Taskforce's decision not to count short-term rental units as nonresidential floor area.

³ Differences between the Taskforce base zoning potential and the estimated Appendix I base zoning potential are minimal and largely result from the more specific analysis of the RA allowances on each parcel in the NC-SF zoning district and the inclusion of the units allowed on conservation easements which are mostly in the Rural zoning district. By omission, 496 units (328-Resort, 93-NC, 75-PD) were counted as existing in Appendix I without being counted as possible, thus understating potential under in Appendix I by that amount. No further potential was assigned related to any of the properties but their subtraction from the possible at the land use district level understates the potential of other parcels in that district.

The difference between Taskforce potential and Appendix I potential is not largely attributable to short-term rental unit assumption because only 144 more short-term rental units can be built under the current regulations. However the number of possible units is affected by the Taskforce's segregation of short-term rental units. 909 units (1,405 possible short-term rental units minus 496 units errantly not included) of the difference in base possible units between Appendix I and the Taskforce numbers can be attributed to short-term rental assumptions. There are slight differences in printed Appendix I numbers and those below due to rounding in Appendix I.

Appendix I existing numbers were not determined parcel by parcel and therefore comparing differences in assumptions has to be done by comparing possible buildout in each district. Appendix I numbers were not disaggregated into base zoning and PRD possible units so the numbers below are best estimates of the breakdown. Clarion calculations were not broken into base zoning and PRD bonus potential either, and the numbers below are also best estimates of the breakdown.

With regard to Rural PRDs the changes in assumptions from Appendix I made by the taskforce were to look at allowances by conservation easements, apply the historically used percentage of potential PRD bonus units actually proposed, and apply that reduction factor at the land use district level instead of the parcel level to avoid the cumulative impacts of the required rounding down on each property.

	Potential Units			Possible Units	
	Clarion	Appendix I	Taskforce	Appendix I	Taskforce
NC-SF	866		1,190	4,522	3,675
Rural (base)	513		1,220	1,793	1,959
Rural (PRD)	2,333	2,894	3,651	2,894	3,651
Suburban	255		174	398	258
NC-PUD	1,229		282	1,483	1,381
Resorts			549	691	566
Other	8		152	310	425
Total (base)	2,871	3,267	3,567	9,197	8,264
Total (w/PRD)	5,204	6,161	7,218	12,091	11,915

⁴ The Planned Unit Development-Affordable Housing tool was not included in any of the numbers, because the regulation is discretionary. The lack of historical evidence of how and where a project using the tool might be approved makes it difficult to make any predictions about its use. Only two PUD-AHs have ever been approved. The Millward Project done by the Teton County Housing Authority north of the Calico on the Moose-Wilson Road consists of 49 affordable units on 8.27 acres (5.93 units/acre). The Glory View Subdivision just east of the Melody Ranch Subdivision was originally approved for 24 units on 2.99 acres (8.02 units/acre) to be a mix of market, affordable, and attainable units; upon sale to the Jackson Hole Community Housing Trust the actually built development consisted of 8 affordable units and 7 market units (5.02 units/acre). The proposed PUD-AH Osprey Creek development of 38 affordable and 36 market units on 14.97 acres (4.94 units/acre) just north of the Millward project on the Moose-Wilson Road was denied. The proposed PUD-AH Teton Meadows Ranch development of 125 affordable, 125 attainable, 150 employment restricted, and 100 market units on 288 acres (1.73 units/acre) was withdrawn due to a moratorium on PUD-AH proposals on sites greater than 20 acres prior to Board of County Commissioners action on the proposal.

Town of Jackson Assumptions

	2007 Clarion Snapshot	4/3/09 Draft, Appendix I	Buildout Taskforce
Methodology	Acreage	Parcel by Parcel	Parcel by Parcel
Mix of Use	Varied	100% Residential or 100% Commercial	75/25 Mix, 100% Commercial, or 100% Residential
Town Square -FAR	.65	1.83	1.83
UC & UC-2 FAR	.65	.80 and 1.3	.80 and 1.3

APPENDIX I: BUILDOUT NUMBERS AND ASSUMPTIONS ■

AC - FAR	.25	.325	.325
AC/LO - FAR	.25	.65	.65
OP & OP2 - FAR	.65	.46 and .65	.46 and .65
Affordable/ Employee Units	Included	Not Included	Included, Employee Units Separate Breakdown
Snow King Potential	395,000 SF	680,000 SF	658,000 SF
Accessory Residential Units	Not Included	Included	Included, Separate Breakdown
Planned Residential Development	Not Included	PUD Used Instead	Included, Separate Breakdown
Dwelling Unit Size	1500 SF	1200/1500 SF	1200 SF
Approved PMUD Numbers	Not Included	Some Included	All FDP Approved Included
Potential Dwelling Units	5,073	1,590	2,399
Non-Residential Square Footage	664,482 SF	4,856,000 SF	3,562,647 SF