

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
10 Future Land Use Plan	<p>The Plan again mentions theme 1 and 2 as if the were on equal footing. Prioritize the community's top priority!</p> <p>"County Nodes are appropriate for some levels of development to serve community needs" but elsewhere you say that County Nodes are appropriate for town-level density. Which is it?</p> <p>In the Land Use Classifications Table (10.1), single family mixed type cold be manifested as single family home, duplex, tri-plex, or four-plex buildings. Even though the maps are not regulatory, what is to stop a developer from covering their land with four-plexes, even with some "community benefit" provided? What ground do elected officials have to stand on to say "no," to such developments?</p> <p>Under "Buildout calculations:" "The county rural districts contain almost all of the mapped critical wildlife habitat" There is an important distinction between "all" and "all mapped" critical habitats. Because it is impossible to make decisions based on data when the data does not exist, it is critically important to collect that data. We cannot contend that there are no wildlife values in particular areas in the valley when we KNOW that there are significant data gaps in terms of critical wildlife habitat. There are provisions in Theme 1 that suggest collecting more data, and updating old data. The Plan needs to consistently acknowledge this data gap and actively strive towards filling it, and not making decisions about location and amount of growth until we have a better sense of the impacts.</p>	Becky	5/15/2009 17:03
10 Future Land Use Plan	<p>The projected growth rates on page 86 are again based off of recent growth rates, which are likely to prove extremely aggressive. Growth rates over the past decade were fueled by leverage that will not be replicated again in our lifetimes. Use of the historic non-residential growth rate from 2000 to 2008 is extremely erroneous as it would include the 4 Seasons hotel, which was completed in 2005. While it might make some sense to plan ahead for excessive growth, it also puts pressure on the community to make decisions in a hasty fashion that might otherwise be made more thoughtfully over time.</p>	Cathy Kehr	5/14/2009 14:46
10 Future Land Use Plan	<p>The Buildout Calculations (Part 3) are the most confusing part of this document especially when combined with App. 1. The ranges create some unacceptable numbers--specifically the non-residential new floor area. Doubling the non-residential square foot imprint on this valley will create an unacceptable number of new employees--and the housing numbers do not reflect (as far as I can see) taking care of the employees and their families. Again--this issue seems to be driving the plan rather than balancing our future by paying attention to what the valley can support while saving habitat for wildlife--particularly winter habitat and migration routes. Coming to grips with a balance on growth potential will require a look at optimal numbers and not just "more of the same" as this plan proposes. If we don't start addressing this issue now we will certainly irreparably harm this valley's future. What happened to your ad: "Growth Rate regulation should be implemented to slow the impacts to development natural resources and community infrastructure." I don't see this as part of the plan.</p> <p>Putting in place a serious and on-going way of monitoring buildout as well as analyzing impacts --before the fact-- is equally important. This plan doesn't accomplish this. Wildlife is a fragile part of the picture and the most vulnerable. Too many people will cause irreparable harm to this valley--we already have negatively impacted many habitats. Continuing to "mess with Mother Nature" without reigning ourselves in will destroy what we have. This plan should take these potential impacts into more serious consideration. Saying that growth will continue at its current rate and suggesting that shoving that growth into a few nodes will solve the problem is very short sighted. We can do better</p> <p>Where is the discussion to trade more intense development in town and nodes for maintaining less density in the county. It appears that the increase in development allowed in some locations is just an "add-on"--there are no resulting reductions somewhere else.</p> <p>Table 10-1 Land Use Classifications are confusing in that there is no reference to the existing zones that these will be replacing--particularly in town. Also, to find out what is going on in each of the Districts, you have to go back and forth to this table to figure out what applies. This information should be included where it applies in each district.</p> <p>The Mixed-Use visitor orientation classification includes existing resort districts AND other non-resort areas--will defacto resort district opportunities be available to these areas--as an example "Old West Cabins"</p> <p>Kelly is included in the Single Family Low classification which says that is should be served by sewer and water, but no mention of this is made in the Kelly District description. If sewer is added to Kelly this could have huge impacts--it could turn Kelly into another "node."</p>	Diane Hazen	5/15/2009 21:16
10 Future Land Use Plan	<p>Predictability is a term that was brought up repeatedly in the Comp. Plan presentation, but it is absent from the written plan even though it is a significant part of any future plan. In order to establish predictability, the Comp Plan needs to demand uniformity in zoning to ensure predictability of how neighborhoods will be developed.</p> <p>We need to eliminate spot zoning so that all parcels on the same street in the same area have the same zoning. We also need to eliminate rezoning developments so that we avoid unacceptable density levels in subdivisions and in town such as the Teton Meadows' project that requested a variance in zoning so they could build 500 houses/condos on a property zoned for 50. Such an increase in density should be prohibited, so it isn't even considered by the Town Council or the County Commissioners.</p>	James Hawley	5/15/2009 18:15
10 Future Land Use Plan	<p>The plan in general is well conceived and meets the principal concerns of the people in Teton County. The one problem I have is that the build out numbers are too high. Certainly, in Wilson, the method by which the upper bound of 520 additional homes was reached (assuming the density of West Street for all of Wilson) is unacceptable. I believe the build out numbers should be no greater than that which is possible under existing regulations.</p>	Richard Hobbins	5/15/2009 21:49