

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
01 Introduction	<p>At the two presentations of this plan that I went to, the impression was given that the two stated themes, I and II have been given equal status. That is not what this community has said it wants. Apparently, other sources were considered. The public should know who or what these source are.</p> <p>The oft repeated assurance that many concerns will be taken care of in the LDRs rings hollow considering the history of so many variances given, seemingly for the asking. More of the limits should be outlined in this Comp Plan so we will know what we will actually get.</p> <p>I would like to address some of the details in various parts of the plan and I will do so at a later date, but very soon.</p>	Carol Wauters	5/15/2009 15:31
01 Introduction	<p>There is much in this draft of the Comp Plan that I can support. However, i do also have major concerns. There is so much that has been over looked, omitted, ignored or avoided, that I believe it would be best to start over again. Perhaps take the 1994 Plan and revise it rather than scraping it and writing a new plan.</p> <p>The major difficulty is that this proposal does not follow the repeatedly expressed community support for the permanent preservation of wildlife and open space as our top priority. To effectively protect and maintain our wildlife, we need to have solid, scientific information so that we can be assured that we will not destroy or degrade crucial habitat. We do not have current information ...The NROs are seriously out-dated and there are some notable gaps where we have very little solid science to guide us. Those gaps are the Snake River corridor and the Teton Village Rd. These are the very places where the draft proposes to increase density drastically.</p> <p>I feel strongly that we should not proceed with approving any increased density until we have the science to inform us as to exactly what the consequences, short and long term, will be. There is way too much growth, both residential and non-residential, allowed for and the rate of growth is not meaningfully dealt with. Rather only monitored.... to be dealt with apparently once there is a problem. And the stated goal is to be our historical rate of growth which if it is the last ten years would be too rapid a pace.</p>	Carol Wauters	5/15/2009 15:08
01 Introduction	<p>I commend the effort that went into the draft of the Comprehensive Plan. It is always easier to find the flaws in a piece of work than it is to actually sit down and draft such a large and comprehensive body of work. I largely agree with it in spirit. I especially support the strategic desire to increase predictability and reduce discretionary review. The move away from a focus on resort activities towards the community is to be applauded. We need to stop being a community where the profits are privatized and the costs are borne by the community.</p> <p>In this spirit, the gross community impacts of the potential commercial development proposed by this plan should be analyzed in advance of completion of the plan. It is only by doing such an analysis that we will know whether the assumptions proposed by this draft plan are reasonable or not. In the same vein, the draft plan should address the potential impact of the residential buildout on public facilities. The plan simply contemplates that the quality of services should remain the same. Where are the impacts contemplated to be the greatest?</p> <p>I believe there are additional meaningful flaws and omissions in the plan, which are worthy of consideration. In general, there is a lack of specificity to the plan in several areas.</p>	Cathy Kehr	5/14/2009 14:37
01 Introduction	<p>I am opposed to the draft comprehensive plan. This plan should be more appropriately called the Real Estate Agents, Developers and Contractors Guaranteed Pension Plan. Only lip service has been given to the county's first two themes(Promote wildlife stewardship and natural resources and Manage growth responsibly).I would like to see limited and more closely managed growth not the drive to maximum "build out" that seems to be projected. Projected raises in sales tax to seven and eight cents, massive increases in property taxes and a real estate transfer tax to support all the needed infrastructure are not acceptable. We cannot grow our way out of growth related problems.</p>	Charles I Dahl	5/11/2009 16:21
01 Introduction	i support cathy tompkins views as her neighbor!	Chris Jay	5/15/2009 17:02
01 Introduction	<p>Thank you for all of your efforts and thoughtfulness you have put into the planning process and presenting something you believed met the needs and the wants of the community. Jackson and Teton County residents have varied and strong opinions so getting a consensus is a very difficult thing.</p> <p>My personal feedback is that we need a plan for manageable growth, there will be people coming to Jackson and property owners have rights, all of which need to be considered. No growth is not realistic or consistent with what many of us believe is reasonable.</p> <p>Your efforts to be far reaching and look beyond the next ten years may have been overly ambitious. As a result that may have added confusion for some people who react quickly.</p> <p>I have had more people wanting to "bend my ear" on the proposal and meetings than any other subject for quite a while. The Wilson and Aspens plan (nodes) may be the ones raising the most passion, the residents I have heard from are troubled.</p> <p>The nodes themselves may be too specific. Although the intent of focusing growth is logical, it has resulted in people focusing on "their node" rather than thinking or considering the entire plan.</p> <p>There will be growth and large property owners deserve the right to consider options and have them evaluated in a fair and open manner. I suggest that openmindedness be maintained and the focus be on getting the plan about right but not hung up on getting every detail of everyone's priorities covered...if so, we will never get out of the planning stage (getting the last apple off the top of the tree is hard to do and sometimes even dangerous!).</p> <p>Getting a plan forward will require flexibility on everyone's part but we do need to move forward.</p> <p>Thanks again for all of your hard work thus far and thanks for allowing the public to provide input and feedback.</p>	Ed Liebzeit	5/15/2009 15:57
01 Introduction	<p>The purpose of the plan, just being a 10-15 year plan, can not also mean that it can be sustainable. Sustainable is a longer range concept. There is a conflict here. The word sustainable is over used throughout the plan. Because it is so over used it becomes meaningless. Sustainable should only be used in the context of protecting Jackson Hole's irreplaceable wildlife, scenery and community character.</p>	Gail Jensen	5/16/2009 21:39

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
01 Introduction	<p>Simply stating over and over that you are attempting to "manage growth responsibly" does not make it so. The residents of Wilson, by which I mean the downtown Wilson area as well as the area in the Aspens, DO NOT WANT THE GROWTH YOU ARE PROPOSING FOR OUR COMMUNITY.</p> <p>You are proposing to change the character, the tone, the living quality and the structure of life in our town, and we feel you are doing so against our vehemently stated wishes.</p> <p>Finally, the "nodal" concept is flawed fundamentally, does not take any real efforts to directly address infrastructure (saying the developers will deal with it is NOT acceptable) and seems to be a rationalization for dumping development in our laps, again, against the wishes of the members of the community you are planning to ruin.</p>	Gal Bar-or	5/7/2009 22:13
01 Introduction	<p>Comments on the draft of the County Comprehensive Plan</p> <p>My intention had been to comment on the various sections of the draft but the more I think about the whole process the more I feel that the timing for this planning effort is just plain wrong:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> As the economic base of this community is tourism and real estate, and there is huge economic uncertainty at all levels, local, state, national and international, no one knows what impact this uncertain climate will have on this community, and for what period of time.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Also, the town and county are making the push to "Go Green" and to become leaders in this movement, to set examples for other communities on how to lower carbon footprints. Isn't it backward to adopt the Comprehensive Plan before having the Green initiatives in place?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Although I support efforts to "protect wildlife and open spaces, manage growth responsibly, and provide workforce housing," I feel that the numbers proposed for the "nodes" are excessive. I know that currently there is frequent "gridlock" on the roads (knowing how long it sometimes takes me to get out of my subdivision, Skyline Ranch, onto Highway 22). The idea of adding those hundreds more cars sounds like a recipe for disaster, and certainly doesn't fit with reducing the carbon footprint.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> I am aware that this draft of the Comprehensive Plan fails to evaluate the impacts this amount of development will have on many parts of the community. As a former Teton County School Board member, it makes me shudder to think of the numbers of new schools that would have to be built, not to mention all of the other requirements for human services, law enforcement, and so on, that would be needed should the numbers suggested materialize. This at a time when cutbacks are being required in these areas due to loss of revenue in the state.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> What happened to "Community Character," that has been so important to the people of this valley for so long? I could go on, but I know that you're hearing from plenty of people who are alarmed at the potential for the destruction of what most hold dear about this place. Be careful. There is a real potential for "Killing the Goose that Laid the Golden Egg."</li> </ul>	Jean Jorgensen	5/14/2009 10:49

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
01 Introduction	<p>My comments focus on the proposed changes in the draft comprehensive plan to the Aspens and Teton Village areas. Dramatic changes are projected for these areas in the future. Virtually all of the projected growth in the Teton Village area appears to have been planned and approved whereas the projected, proposed growth in the Aspens "node" is presumably subject to discussion and changes.</p> <p>I have resided in the Aspens since 1995. The general character of this area has changed little since I moved here. Some growth has occurred in the residential and commercial sectors. A bicycle path has been built. Wildlife abounds in the Aspens. Moose and deer are prevalent. A variety of smaller mammals are frequently observed. It is, today, a pleasant place to live. Unfortunately, traffic on Highway 390 has increased to the point where entry into, and exit from, the Aspens has become more difficult. Summertime, ski season, and "rush hour" are the most difficult times. As Teton Village grows, more traffic on Highway 390 can be expected. It is widely acknowledged today that traffic on highways 22 and 390 can be a problem.</p> <p>Wildlife collisions on Highway 390 are already a problem. Signs urging drivers to be cautious are present today.</p> <p>While I support the themes outlined in the draft comprehensive plan, I cannot support the proposed significant increase in commercial and residential units in the Aspens "node". Creating "town centers," or "nodes" in Wilson, Teton Village, or the Aspens seems to go against the theme of designating the town of Jackson as the heart of Jackson Hole. The present character of Wilson and the Aspens should be preserved. Public polling and my personal conversations with neighbors have not shown me support for the proposed growth in the Aspens "node."</p> <p>Teton Village has long been recognized as a village, or node, where high density development can be anticipated. That development alone will have serious consequences for the West Bank Traffic on Highway 390 can only increase. Pressures on nearby Grand Teton National Park and the Moose-Wilson road will increase. Increased landscaping and sewage loads will likely increase contamination of the near-surface aquifer and likely increase nutrient loads to nearby Fish Creek. (Treated effluent from Teton Village is presently injected into the ground.)</p> <p>Wildlife on the West Bank will be affected through increased development of their habitat, increased collisions with motorists on the roads, and the increased population of dogs and cats that accompanies the increased human population.</p> <p>While I support efforts to increase "multi-modal" transportation in the valley to reduce traffic on our roads, I am not optimistic that increased growth and density on the West Bank can be mitigated by increased "multi-mode" transportation alternatives. It has been shown, time and again, that people are wed to their cars. If "multi-mode" transportation can be shown to be timely and cost-effective, more people will use it. However, as vehicular traffic on roadways is reduced by multi-modal transportation, more people are likely to resort to using their vehicles. In short, the increased development of commercial and residential properties on the West Bank will increase traffic on an already strained roadway.</p> <p>My recommendation would be to not advocate in this comprehensive plan the increased growth and densities projected for Wilson and the Aspens. Let us see what results with the already approved expansion of Teton Village and try to mitigate the impacts of that expansion. In particular, any projected growth in the Wilson and Aspens areas should be predicated on the ability of the existing transportation system and roadways to handle that growth. Present traffic on highways 22 and 390 would justify a go slow approach in increasing population and densities in the West Bank nodes. Furthermore, efforts should be made to protect the existing wildlife on the Westbank because it is noteworthy and significant. The draft comprehensive plan is flawed in reasoning that the core theme of protecting wildlife in Jackson Hole can best be met by directing more growth and density to areas like Wilson and the Aspens where, some might reason, there is relatively little wildlife and habitat.</p> <p>While I support the concept of providing services and work near where people live, there is no guarantee that people will follow the pattern. For example, a commercial establishment in the Aspens, such as a laundromat, may not be useful to Aspen residents because most of the residences and condominiums already possess washers and driers. The hypothetical laundromat may be more useful to residents of Teton Village and thus encourage more vehicular traffic on highway 390 for those who simply wish to do laundry. Furthermore, workers who reside in Teton Village may initially work in Teton Village, but may later change jobs to work elsewhere in the valley.</p> <p>I applaud the concept in the draft of having regular reviews of how the comprehensive plan is working, but I have to say again that I think the magnitude of the changes being proposed for areas such as Wilson and the Aspens are too big for starters.</p>	Jeff van Ee	5/15/2009 9:02
01 Introduction	<p>The comprehensive plan is supposed to be a long range plan. I am afraid that once the significant, proposed changes in the West Bank nodes are approved, it will be difficult to reverse those changes if the impacts of that growth are more significant than projected. The current economic climate will have long-lasting effects, and these impacts on the residential and commercial sectors of Jackson Hole should not be ignored. I am not convinced that, in the long run, the core values of Jackson Hole will be preserved with this draft comprehensive plan. This comprehensive plan envisions a more urbanized valley with not just one town center, i.e., the town of Jackson, but town centers at Wilson, the Aspens, Teton Village, and South Park. A key component of this comprehensive plan is expansion of the existing commercial sector. For each new hotel and motel room and for every increase in commercial space there will be an increase in workers. With people arguing that we do not have enough worker and affordable housing to meet our present needs,, are we going to get ahead of the curve by advocating further, dramatic increases in the commercial sector? And what kind of establishments are we talking about? Reducing growth in the commercial sector would be good, in my opinion. Incentives could be provided in reducing already permitted growth in the commercial sector by allowing certain growth in specific areas that might not be permitted.</p> <p>Jackson Hole has changed since I moved here ,and it will continue to change. The town of Jackson has always been, in my mind, the heart of the area. Wildlife is an important attribute that distinguishes this area from many other mountain, resort areas in the nation and in the world. Open spaces and viewsheds are an important component of the Jackson Hole experience. I am not alone in valuing these things. I can only hope that they will be preserved for those who follow me.</p>	Jeff van Ee (cont.)	5/15/2009 9:02
01 Introduction	<p>Planning</p> <p>I live in Cottonwood and the proposed 1500 homes is way to dense.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Need a road first that parallel High School Road.</li> <li>2) Need another play ground for all the children that are in the Blair apartments as well as for dogs and people whom attend our cottonwood park.</li> <li>3) Need a large setback like they have in front of the high school.</li> <li>4) Need to develope the infrastructure first prior to the home plans.</li> <li>5) Do Not dump anymore traffic on High School Road it is dangerous enough.</li> </ol>	Jim Workman	5/9/2009 15:45

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
01 Introduction	<p><b>PLEA FOR A PLAN BASED ON SOLID NUMBERS</b></p> <p>If the community is to accept the sacrifices that go along with growth, the Comprehensive Plan must be founded on rock-solid numbers rather than fuzzy math. Unfortunately, the numbers published in the draft Comp Plan are nowhere near as solid as they need to be.</p> <p>I'm writing to urge you to begin by subjecting the buildout numbers in the draft Comp Plan to peer review comparable to what would be required if the Comp Plan were going to be accepted for publication in a scientific journal. In my view, an independent review of the numbers must resolve and explain the obvious discrepancies in the numbers before any votes are taken on whether the Comp Plan draft should go forward.</p> <p>To wit:</p> <p>1. There still remains a large unexplained gap between the numbers in appendix I of the Comp Plan draft and the "snapshot" numbers generated last year by Clarion, Collins, Fehr &amp; Peers, a well-respected consulting firm that the county hired to compile baseline numbers for both existing county residential units and commercial square feet. As an illustration of how far the two sets of numbers diverge, Clarion's 2008 report states (page 21): "Approximately 7,200 housing units . . . are in the unincorporated county today." A footnote in the Clarion report said these figures are based on "Housing Needs Assessment 2007." However, page I-4 of the Comp Plan draft states - without giving any sources or further explanation - that there are only 5,930 existing dwelling units in the unincorporated part of Teton County. This is an alarming discrepancy of 21 percent in the simplest category - counting the number of existing housing units. There are similar disturbing discrepancies in the number of square feet of commercial space and the number of housing units that are permitted under today's existing zoning. As part of your efforts to gain public acceptance of the Comp Plan, I advise you to issue a peer-reviewed set of accurate numbers before the community can be expected to think about the pluses and minuses of the Comp Plan for the future. If we base the plan on Junk Numbers, there is no way the community can achieve consensus on where we should be going.</p> <p>2. The column entitled "2009 LDR Potential Development" on page I-4 of the Comp Plan draft should be recalculated so that the Town and County figures are calculated on the same basis. As far as I can determine, the Town's figures in that column are based on what landowners are entitled to under the current base zoning, whereas the County's figures in the same column are not based on current base zoning. Rather, the county's figures apparently contain an estimate of how much density bonus the landowners will get. It seems to me that a column should be inserted in the chart that shows "2009 LDR Potential Development" in both the Town and County under a common assumption -- and that assumption should be spelled out.</p> <p>3. There seems to be an inconsistency in the way workforce units are treated in the same chart. The county figures seem to include a 25 percent increase in units for workforce mitigation, whereas the Town's figures apparently don't include any increase for employee housing units. This makes the Town's figures seem too low. I realize the Town hasn't given final approval to the 25 percent, but this seems very likely to happen. Thus a footnote would be appropriate explaining the divergence in methodology.</p> <p>4. The Clarion "snapshot" numbers referred to in the first numbered paragraph above have been deleted without explanation from the internet version of his report that is now an appendix to the draft Comp Plan. At the least, the planners should put a note on the cover sheet of the Clarion report revealing that it is a revised document. In my opinion, you'd be better off to restore the deleted numbers so that the public could see the discrepancies in numbers cited above.</p> <p>Summing up: To gain the trust of the public, planners and elected officials need to make decisions that are based on the best available science.</p>	Joe Albright	5/17/2009 22:12
01 Introduction	<p>The vision of the community is not accurate according to all the public input. The public has expressed quite clearly that we want limits on growth as a primary and necessary basic goal, in order to enable the public's commitment to protect our wildlife, scenery and small town way of life. Limited growth should be explicitly stated as a primary goal in itself, against which all other goals must be measured. All other wishes, such as employee housing, are only acceptable so far as they support limited growth. They must not be excuses for variances that undercut the PRIMARY GOAL OF LIMITED GROWTH. We don't have a shot in hell of protecting our valley, our wildlife, our small town life if growth is merely moved around, moved into taller buildings, etc.</p>	Karin McQuillan	5/3/2009 14:05

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
01 Introduction	<p>My comments begin generally on the draft Comprehensive Plan -- and perhaps with a comment that you really do not hear much, certainly as often as you should. Thank you. The staff and elected officials worked hard, and community-wide we should give it our general support.</p> <p>As with any comprehensive document, it is a work in progress and the feedback is very important -- but please don't let those loud voices who oppose this or that particular provision drown out the larger message that generally this is a positive and important document.</p> <p>You are headed in the right direction and have presented and good balance between protecting both our community of great people and this special place with wildlife.</p> <p>Your plan shows an increased protection of wildlife, reduction in development in rural areas and an emphasis on workforce housing. The nodes are smart planning. And it will be a given that they won't please everyone. But we all have to live as a larger community and accept front and backyards alike.</p> <p>It was interesting to hear the public presentations that indeed we are talking about a very, very, very small section overall of private land as a base. One tenth of 1 percent indeed is a small place for people habitat.</p> <p>I'm grateful for the recognition of the economy in this plan. Responsible growth is important. In fact, if you didn't include responsible growth -- as some of the opponents are asking -- it would be highly irresponsible of you as elected officials! This community is suffering with the rest of the nation from the downturn economically. I hope you remember this: The fact is the majority of our community goes to work every day. Payrolls and paychecks are the majority of us -- and some are too busy working to earn a living to comment or get involved in this.</p> <p>More than ever, we need to emphasize our economic health here in Teton County.</p> <p>Specifically in Teton Village, workforce housing is welcome, but I too hope you work with us in a positive dialogue to create the best Teton Village mix and plans. Only workforce housing -- without accompanying planning for interesting commercial and diversity -- will risk a man-camp in Teton Village. If only workforce housing allowed, you will drive up car trips in record numbers as people will need to travel to get economically better priced daily living services. The workforce is a vital and active part of our community. To deny the kinds of commercial interests that appeal to workers and visitors -- with pedestrian qualities -- is poor planning for Teton Village.</p> <p>The Village needs vibrancy. For quality of life, for good business and for positive tax revenues flowing to County and Town. Furthermore, keep in mind, Teton Village as an economic engine of the County is a green one. Recreation and fun. That should be encouraged via smart planning.</p> <p>In general, Teton Village must be a well-planned, positive place that is aesthetically pleasing with many options and choices for everyone. We look forward to an active dialogue with the County in the future to achieve that goal.</p> <p>But again, generally many of us give you our support of this draft plan overall.</p>	Kenneth Shore	5/6/2009 15:26
01 Introduction	WAY WAY WAY too much density! How did the Total Buildout jump so from prior plan and drafts?? Please PLEASE do not approve this plan as written, but allow additional time to get it right. I know we're all exhausted and rather fed-up with this whole process, BUT it matters enormously so don't give up and approve just to have it over with. Allow public input to mean more than that of the 'experts'; we, after all, should be the ones to decide where we want our elected officials to take us. PLEASE VOTE NO AND REWORK THE PLAN. Thank you.	Linda Gunther	5/15/2009 13:29
01 Introduction	As an employee of the US Forest Service and volunteer for Wyoming K-9 Search and Rescue, I can not express enough the importance of affordable housing. I commend and appreciate the people who commit their time and energy to a crucial work of affordable housing.	Lindsey N Kennedy	4/25/2009 18:12
01 Introduction	The purpose claims to be a rewrite/update of the 1994 plan, but clearly is not. During the 1970s, 1980s and the 1994 efforts the highest priority was and is to protect wildlife and open space. That priority is not reflected in this 2009 draft comprehensive plan	Patty Ewing	5/17/2009 23:24
01 Introduction	The Vision Statement must be fixed! "preserve and protect the area's ecosystem." PERIOD Delete the 2nd part of the statement. Including the above with the second part of the vision statement on Page 7 is NOT what the public said at any of the meetings I attended, and with one exception, I attended all of the input meetings.	Patty Ewing	5/18/2009 0:43
01 Introduction	As a 17 year resident of Wilson I am totally opposed to proposed plan for the future development of Wilson as set forth in the May 6th edition of the JH News & Guide. The statement by Mr. Daugherty that Wilson's character "COULD" change by virtue of the plan is disingenuous at best. If that reflects his judgement he should seek a new line of work and try to sell bridges in New York.	R H Vaughan	5/7/2009 14:48
01 Introduction	I strongly oppose the addition of 500 possible new homes in the Wilson "node." Wilson and the Aspens should not be "nodes," as the additional traffic caused by so many new housing units would kill animals and make our roads and schools overcrowded. The residents of Wilson came out this evening in strong and emotional opposition to so much growth. It would ruin the good conditions which attract people to live here.	Suzanne Harris	5/7/2009 22:17

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
01 Introduction	<p>I am submitting a full comment on the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan in this Introductory section of the Feedback portion of this website. I am also submitting portions of my comment in other sections. It does not appear that any comments have been submitted as yet, which I find worrisome. My husband and I attended the community meeting on May 6, 2009 at the Wilson School. It would be extremely disappointing if the important questions raised and the many impassioned comments made at that meeting were not appropriately recorded.</p> <p>Although new Jackson-area residents, we've been coming to the region for winter vacations for more than 25 years. In fact, my first glimpse of the Rockies was looking at the Tetons as my plane landed in Jackson Hole in 1982. Every time we returned to the region, the build-up was shocking. Two years ago, we finally decided to buy, fearing that we would never be able to find a permanent home here if we waited any longer. Fate was with us when we made that decision, since my husband found a position here and we were able to move much sooner than expected.</p> <p>It was the character of the region that drew us here: the sheer, naked beauty of the mountains and the valley; the friendliness of the residents; the hominess of the town; the ubiquitous commitment of all who lived here to protecting the character of this unique region. We moved here to be a part of this community that so closely aligns with our own personal character. We live in Wilson; our home is less than ten miles from Hoback Junction.</p> <p>We are concerned about the inclusion of Wilson as one of the nodes slated for expansion by the Comprehensive Plan. According to the Plan, Wilson already has mixed-use facilities that have locally oriented non-residential uses, which provide local residents with basic services. The Plan states that the intensity of any development would be higher in town where the locally oriented uses serve the entire community and limit dependence on trips into town. In terms of building form and orientation, further development would include two- and three-storey buildings located fronting the street with mixed uses that provide for morning-through-evening vibrancy and where pedestrian corridors could be utilized while accommodating automobile transport. The Plan calls for the development of mixed-type residences that include single family, duplex, triplex, and fourplex construction, along with limited retail facilities in appropriate locations. According to the Plan, the building form and orientation of such structures will be compatible with neighborhood character. We respectfully ask where tri- and fourplex housing is compatible with the character of Wilson, or where additional retail facilities would be appropriate? Even though the Plan states that single family mixed development is only appropriate to provide workforce housing, we are puzzled as to where such structures would fit in with Wilson as it has evolved over the past 150 years.</p> <p>According to the Plan's discussion of managing growth responsibly in District 11 (Wilson), the Wilson node comprises an area within ~1/4 mile of the Wilson commercial core that is deemed appropriate for town-level densities. The buildout calculations call for increasing nonresidential existing floor area from 51,000 to as much as 171,000 or greater. Buildout numbers also call for increasing residential development from 170 dwelling units to as many as 520 dwelling units, which would increase residential density from 0.94 to as much 3.08. Essentially, the Plan suggests that Wilson expand at least three-fold. How can such expansion possibly preserve the character of Wilson?</p> <p>The Comprehensive Plan states that "the priority in Wilson is the provision of housing opportunities to benefit the community." Is this meant to benefit the Wilson community or the Jackson/Teton County community? Expansion of Wilson to provide for the housing needs of the broader community would exploit the educational, commercial, sewer, emergency, recreational, and transportation services of the immediate community. While it would appear on paper that the vibrancy and sustainability of Wilson would be enhanced, a three-fold residential expansion would certainly strain existing services beyond the breaking point. Furthermore, the Plan states that "all development in Wilson should be designed to protect riparian corridors." Any expansion within ~1/4 mile of the Wilson commercial core would involve riparian habitats.</p>	Vicki L. Rosenberg	5/11/2009 23:05

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
01 Introduction	<p>In the Introduction to the Comprehensive Plan we read about the community vision adopted in 1994 and confirmed in 2008. We agree with every one of the points made: protection of scenic vistas and wildlife habitat for generations to come; maintenance and enhancement of environmental quality; promotion of and support for a diverse social and economic population, including provisions for a resident work force; preservation of the traditions and character of the Rocky Mountain West and Wyoming; and assurance that development on private lands in Teton County was compatible with surrounding public land values and uses. We also understood that the community recognized that a new plan should map areas appropriate for certain land uses in order to give landowners, developers, neighbors, and elected officials a measure of predictability regarding land use decisions and actions, so that priorities of and relationship between community values would be addressed. We particularly appreciate that measurable indicators would be developed with any new plan that would hold everyone involved accountable for the cumulative impacts of decisions made.</p> <p>We understand that the development of a new Comprehensive Plan particularly addresses the issue of sustainability within our region, so that development meets the needs of the present community without compromising the ability of communities that evolve in the future to meet their own needs. It is notable that the proposed Comprehensive Plan guarantees that decisions about development extend to the preservation and protection of the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. Specifically, the Plan states that, while recognizing that growth and development are necessary to meet the human needs of the community, the impact of local decisions must be understood in a regional context because of the ecological significance of our surroundings. To this end, two foremost priorities were developed that drive the focal community themes around which the Comprehensive Plan was formulated: 1) promotion of wildlife and natural resources stewardship, and 2) responsible management of growth.</p> <p>In terms of the first priority, the Plan seeks to maintain viable populations of all native species and to preserve the natural, scenic, and agricultural resources that define Teton County's character. There's that term "character" again. In the chapter detailing this first community theme, the Plan once again addresses the need for updated mapping before any decisions about development or community change can be made. Many residents of Teton County are seriously concerned about the disruption of wildlife migration corridors, should any regional development plan be adopted before mapping is updated. Community residents apparently agreed with the limitation of development and population growth to county nodes, the "Y" and downtown Jackson. In no part of the Comprehensive Plan or its appendices is it recorded that community residents agreed where those county nodes would be located.</p> <p>The second priority of the Plan details how growth in this region will be managed responsibly. We agree with the Plan's statement that future development, including redevelopment and infill, must occur in a measured, deliberate, and predictable way so it does not detract from the existing natural environment and community character. While the Plan does not define the carrying capacity of the region, it does describe a 10 Future Land Use Plan that will direct decisions related to growth in this community. In fact, those who developed the Comprehensive Plan have provided excellent maps and other visuals that depict how the Plan's themes, principles, and policies will be implemented in both the areas appropriate for conservation and those appropriate for development in such a way that community-wide priorities will be honored.</p>	Vicki L. Rosenberg (cont.)	5/11/2009 23:05

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
01 Introduction	<p>We are impressed with the detailed breadth and depth of the Comprehensive Plan. Certainly, the developers of the Plan have exercised due diligence in bringing to the community such a well-structured design for growth, development, and conservation within the region. Of grave concern to us, however, is that the Plan states that this design will be used to inform future zoning and land development. We understand that community members called for buildup projections and some means of gauging the process of growth. The Plan reports that the community supports more population in the Town of Jackson in order to preserve the agricultural and natural resources in the county. It also states that "a large majority of the community agrees to limit development in rural parts of Teton County while allowing more development and population growth in certain county nodes such as Aspen/Pines, Teton Village, Wilson, South Park, and Hoback." Nowhere in the plan does it explain how or why these areas were selected for expansion. Time and again, spokespersons for the Comprehensive Plan have emphasized that the Plan is only a plan, and does not define zoning maps or land development regulations. Yet, a strategy referred to repeatedly within the chapters of the Plan states that zoning maps and base development right regulations should be updated and amended to be consistent with the 10 Future Land Use Plan. The 10 Future Land Use Plan, or "FLUP," is an integral part of the Comprehensive Plan. The plans for residential and unit developments, for affordable housing developments, and for mixed use developments appear to already be in place under the guise of "just a plan."</p> <p>If adopted, will the Comprehensive Plan adhere to its stated principle that new development regulations will protect existing character and promote sustainability? Will it truly consider "how well a proposed development fits' into the setting in which it is to be located ?" When it states that "incentives that promote desired conservation and development are also needed" does it mean that administrators of the Plan will pay off residents within county nodes and the Town of Jackson to expand housing and local convenience commercial? The Plan also states that annexations will be used for town expansion, and that criteria will be adopted to guide such seizure appropriately.</p> <p>We wholly support the promotion of the Town of Jackson as the "heart" of the region. From a sustainable perspective, it is certainly desirable for at least 65% of the Town's workforce to reside in the immediate vicinity. The vast majority of workers are unable to afford a home valued at \$2 million, the current average. Perhaps employers should, indeed, take on a larger responsibility for housing their workers. Perhaps it will be necessary to develop multi-family housing. We agree with the majority of community members that the need for local workforce housing conflicts with other community values such as preservation of wildlife habitat and natural resources, reductions in traffic, and preferred development patterns. We believe that that provision of deed restricted workforce housing should take priority over additional commercial or resort development make room for the workforce before developing businesses that require more workers. This would uphold Theme 5, which calls for the community to remain a community first, and a resort second; to maintain a vibrant economy while preserving wildlife, natural resources, and community character. As the Plan reports, the community expressed concern that growth primarily oriented to serving visitors, has little community benefit and may compromise community character.</p> <p>Theme 6 of the Comprehensive Plan addresses the transportation issue in Teton County, stating that ideally, any strategy adopted would reduce resident and visitor reliance on single-occupancy vehicles while still allowing safe, efficient, and economic travel. Repeatedly, the notion of bicycle and transit use in the Town of Jackson and in and between county nodes is suggested as a means to alleviate local traffic. We certainly agree that mass transit is desirable, but dependence on bicycle use anywhere outside of the Town itself is unrealistic. More importantly, we believe that Teton County planners should develop a working relationship with WYDOT to increase the viability of alternate modes of transportation within the Town of Jackson as well as in/among other county locales, not simply investigating internodal transit.</p> <p>As new, but passionately involved members of the Wilson and Jackson/Teton County communities we wish to express our hope that planners, administrators, and elected officials read closely the Comprehensive Plan before adopting it as the absolute paradigm for future development in this region. The Plan is a work of art and its intricate detail is staggering. Unfortunately, it appears that a number of the Plan's expectations have not yet been met: updated mapping of wildlife habitats and migration corridors; updated zoning maps and amended base development right regulations; coordination between Jackson/Teton County planners and WYDOT; determination of congruence between stated plans and local character. Surging forward to adopt this Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan without careful consideration of these and other issues significant to the residents of the varied parts of this community can only be detrimental to all concerned in the long run.</p>	Vicki L. Rosenberg (cont.)	5/11/2009 23:05