

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
10.10 District 10: Aspens	<p>Under the new plan, developers would have to ask for an amendment to the comprehensive if they want a property's zoning to change. To secure the amendment, an applicant would have to garner the votes of at least three of five county commissioners. Only after the reclassification is approved could a development be proposed. I read this in the May 13th guide interview with Alex Norton. My problem with this is what's different - we have the same situation now - stay with the old plan is what I think. Alex either misspoke to me or the paper got it wrong. He told me after the village meeting that to change the approved new plan, if approved, it would require the town and county approval. I felt that it was a better solution but now find there are a lot of same old politics going on and we are being told and not listened to. Sorry to say I find it disheartening.</p>	Betty Chamberland	5/14/2009 12:15
10.10 District 10: Aspens	<p>Since the first studies were done in the 1980s the area of the Porter Ranch in South Park has been identified as the most appropriate area for high density development. Here planners have the opportunity to work with a clean slate in their efforts to create new housing opportunities. This is very different from the Aspens and the Town of Wilson. Here you have existing communities who have over the years built and enjoyed small subcommunities. It is very unsavory to have a group of planners descend on these communities and propose a significant change in the character of these communities. I believe that The Aspens and The Town of Wilson should be entirely removed from the consideration as nodes for increased development. 390 and 22 are already approaching capacity for comfortable and safe travel. With the additions to Teton Village and the increased density there, travel particularly on 390 is going to become unbearable. Those housing units slated for these two areas should simply disappear or be reallocated to the other nodes. Given wildlife, economic and infrastructure considerations they really should just disappear.</p>	Bland Hoke Jr.	5/15/2009 17:16
10.10 District 10: Aspens	<p>Let's see -- you want us to absorb a 30 fold increase in density over what is now allowed. Why? To help out those developers who are building in Teton Village and in town. Can't see a good reason to do that for them. These hot shot planners said they wanted to bring predictability to the process. What kind of predictability did they bring us? For the last 30 years the area near the Aspens was to be built one per 35 acres. Then in one quick thrust while everybody is out of town, surprise -- not 10 units, but 310 units. That's predictability!!!</p>	C Schwender	5/11/2009 21:50
10.10 District 10: Aspens	<p>The biggest incremental impact in this plan is on the Aspens where there is currently little to no allowable incremental residential development under current zoning, and where the new draft comp plan anticipates the potential for an aggregate 85% increase in residential units. When did the Aspens become designated as a node for increased density? There is no mention of the Aspens as a node for increased density in the prior Comprehensive Plan. The 1994 Comprehensive Plan only cites limited commercial growth potential at the Aspens. As discussed in Appendix B - 1994 Plan Analysis, "the 390 corridor is not called out in the 1994 Plan as a location for Affordable Housing". The community survey used to compile the current plan asked participants a rather innocuous question of whether there should be "additional residential development within 1/4 mile of the Aspens." While the results were not overwhelmingly positive, I doubt the community response would have been positive in the least to a question of doubling the size of the Aspens - as has been proposed in the draft plan. This is such a meaningful break with the past contract with the community, it should not take place. Defining Cheney Lane as part of the "Aspens Node": According to the document, development of this node should be within 1/4 of a mile of the Aspens. (The industry standard for walkability is 1/4 mile). The start of Cheney Lane is 1/3 of a mile from the Westside Store. It is 3/4 of a mile from the end of Cheney Lane to the Westside Store. There is no place to safely walk on or near Hwy 390 in the wintertime. In fact it is downright dangerous. There is no way that the comp plan can mandate that private property owners provide access to others across their land to mitigate access to the commercial areas of the Aspens. To quote the draft comprehensive plan on page 74 - Incremental, site-specific decisions, which are emotionally, politically, and largely tied to a particular application, are not an effective way to implement this plan. Following on - If the Housing Authority didn't own the two parcels at the end of Cheney Lane, would this section be included in the "Aspens Node" at all? Cheney Lane has no place for inclusion in the Aspens node as defined.</p>	Cathy Kehr	5/14/2009 14:41

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
10.10 District 10: Aspens	<p>I am very opposed to the plan for both the Aspens and Wilson. My primary reason is that both of the "pods" on the Westbank are home to year round wildlife. Of course our biggest wildlife population concern in this valley is the decrease numbers of moose. This is not due to predation in this part of Jackson Hole, but due to human development and loss of habitat. Are you all familiar with Dr. Joel Berger's extensive study of our valley's moose population? Teton Village Road is has the highest moose mortality rate in Jackson Hole according to his study. Those of us who live along 390 and 22 are sick of seeing the moose carcasses along the side of those roads. And increase in traffic that has been profound and detrimental.</p> <p>I do see some good ideas and positive aspects to the proposed plan, but the overall number of humans proposed in these two nodes is excessive and the resulting stress on the highways and further degradation of the wildlife habitat is unacceptable.</p> <p>I also own property in Teton Village and vehemently opposed the scale of development that was approved there. Further development on highway 390 in light of what has already been approved is ludicrous.</p> <p>I don't support the high amount of growth set forward on the westbank in this plan draft. I believe we need to grow, modestly, first by redeveloping areas near elementary, middle, high schools as well as jobs in and near the existing "Heart of Jackson Hole". Just looking at the Gregory Lane region, many of those lots could be smartly redeveloped (and using green techniques) where children and adults can easily bus, walk and ride to their destinations.</p> <p>I fully support exploring the 'Hostel' housing idea for our many seasonal employees and would like to see the planners address this low cost alternative immediately.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p> <p>I expect to see large changes made to this first proposal. I believe this valley was never meant to house 'everyone' that might want to live here and this plan does not address smart, slow growth or our precious resources.</p>	Deborah Webb, DDS	5/15/2009 19:22
10.10 District 10: Aspens	<p>We are writing as residents of the West Bank area of Teton County to express our concerns about the basic premise and specific content of the Teton County Comprehensive Plan update which proposes to embody a 10 to 15-year vision for our community's future. We respectfully believe the plan in its present form is seriously flawed in the following areas:</p> <p>The high density "nodes" proposed for the West Bank (Teton Pines) and Wilson communities will significantly compromise the quality of life for both human and wildlife inhabitants of those neighborhoods by greatly increasing traffic volumes on highways 390 and 22.</p> <p>The plan should not in any case be offered for adoption until an updated natural resources overlay can be applied to those areas. Otherwise it will fail to take into account wildlife corridors and wildlife winter range locations and will increase the probability of failing to provide for the use of existing and proven methods of facilitating the free movement of wildlife and reducing the levels of road kill on highways 390 and 22.</p> <p>The proposed system of "nodes" will contribute to an imposed and unrealistic separation of human and wildlife inhabitants as opposed to the encouragement and facilitation of the co-existence of those populations which is the basis for Jackson Hole's unique character and quality of life. To be truly wildlife-driven, our vision should be one of creating a porous environment in which wildlife can move about with relative safety and freedom both in and through populated and open space areas. Otherwise, the open areas become little more than viewing zoos and our communities become segregated zones that are not as wildlife friendly as we want them to be. The plan as drafted does not seem to recognize that wildlife habitat is and should be everywhere and not just in so-called outlying areas. That is what differentiates the unique area of Jackson Hole from a Vail, Colorado, or Sun Valley, Idaho.</p> <p>There is no evidence that the planning authorities have asked themselves why Wilson and Teton Pines are already successful as wildlife-friendly communities with a high quality of life and then looked at how those characteristics can be maintained and improved upon, not how they can be changed into something it was never meant to be and that the existing population would abhor and reject. Communities can and do change, but they should be encouraged to change for the best, not the worst. The idea of becoming a "node" to accommodate some planner's idea of growth and progress does not have much appeal to us or to our neighbors.</p> <p>In conclusion, we believe that the comprehensive plan should be wildlife-driven, not growth-driven and that the entire process should be slowed down until these important questions can be more carefully addressed and understood.</p>	Ernest LaBelle and Frances Pollak	5/12/2009 0:00
10.10 District 10: Aspens	<p>After attending the May 5, 2009 meeting at Nick Wilson's Cafe in Teton Village, I have the following comments.</p> <p>I am strongly opposed to the massive projected planning and development plan which was presented. It did not go unnoticed that some of the committee advisers are developers! Our wildlife migration corridors, infrastructure and ecosystem are demonstrating stress at the present level of expansion, and are in need of updating to sustain our current population. We desperately need a second bridge access to the West Bank. The current bridge is in dire need of repair and at our current population density is overstressed daily. Also, it is a safety issue in the event of a natural disaster.</p> <p>The majority of constituents want "limited" managed growth...the proposed plan being totally opposite to the community's preference and preservation.</p> <p>Affordable housing should be centered as much as possible in town which avoids further increasing congestion on road corridors in and out of Town; and insures easy accessibility to community facilities and services. If, Teton Village requires additional employee housing, it is their development and their responsibility; not the Town's, The Aspens, Wilson, South Park, etc. The ongoing development in Teton Village is "over the top". It has ruined the unique quaint quality it used to have.</p> <p>I would hope, when and if, future affordable housing is constructed that it blend in with the style of the area, rather than the "eye sore" units we are presently stuck with.</p>	F. Harder	5/7/2009 17:22

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
10.10 District 10: Aspens	<p>I have owned a condo in the Aspens since 2000 and recently bought another for my children. I bought here because it is so serene and shows to full advantage the Wyoming I have grown to love----living with nature with wonderful wild views and sightings of wildlife. I DO NOT wish to look at further commercial property or other homes in this wonderful wild area. Please do not make the Aspens like residential city blocks in Jackson. I bought here because of what it is like NOW and not to become a little city.</p> <p>Please note that I am adamantly opposed to additional building in this area.</p>	Francine Fleming	5/2/2009 13:32
10.10 District 10: Aspens	<p>I live north of the Aspens off the Village Road. Other than during the "off season", trying to make a right turn varies between being problematic to a nightmare; turning left, forget it. Permitting more growth at the Aspens and Teton Village will undermine quality of life, as reflected in only one measure---traffic---materially. I vote no.</p>	Fred Margolis	5/16/2009 0:00
10.10 District 10: Aspens	<p>I have been a resident of the Aspens for over 26 years. The wildlife, the neighborhood, the community atmosphere, to mention a few, have kept us here. This "node" idea is one of the most ill-planned, ill-conceived ideas I've ever encountered. Jackson Hole is not a "textbook" community. It is unique in every way and has unique needs. The guise of protecting wildlife by forming these "nodes" is ridiculous. They are already very stressed. This density would kill them. By the way, there are already "vultures" out here meeting with businesses to capitalize on this plan. The young work force does not want to live here. They want to be in town, where the action is. This whole plan needs revamping. It's Jackson Hole.</p>	Helen Cottingham	5/15/2009 19:56
10.10 District 10: Aspens	<p>The increase in the number of nits in the Pines area seems extreme. Highway 390 is already under stress in volume and yet the increased amount of traffic will only increase the problem. Although there are commercial businesses in the area none of them satisfy the day to day needs of residents in the area. The market is great for emergencies like running out of eggs but I have never seen anyone there with a more than a few convenience items in their basket. It is time to quit stating in planning documents that the proximity of a convenience store will reduce traffic to Jackson.</p> <p>Another point in the plan promotes the increased population as it will help justify more off season START bus service. Again and again the bus service is used to justify development. I live next to the Calico and no matter how much the START bus stop is heralded as a solution to traffic volume, the ridership is still very small.</p> <p>Increased density in the area benefits neither the wildlife nor already critical traffic problems. I would like to see the justification based on something other than the fact that there is already density in the area and more empty busses will be made available.</p> <p>Thank You</p>	James Springer	5/12/2009 12:35
10.10 District 10: Aspens	<p>It's dusk, I'm looking at a group of 4 mule deer plus a set of twins bedded down in the wildlife corridor tangent to my Aspens condo.</p> <p>Out my back door today, I viewed a cow moose and her yearling calf grazing on the shrubs, territorial red squirrels, pairs of chipmunks, and the lone female 2 yr. old moose wandered by-her mother was the one killed on the Village Rd. last Jan.'08 by a snowplow during the blizzard-...She keeps close to home here since her mother showed her all the great spots to browse here in the Aspens. A fox has been seen here of late, making his early dawn and dusk rounds, keeping the rodent population in check.</p> <p>These are just some of the wildlife that I experience daily from my condo here at #2111 Windflower, one of two condos that are west of the proposed future bldg.site of residential/commercial growth slated for the east side of the Aspens.</p> <p>It is my understanding that the private land owned by certain valley realtors along our buck rail fence line (our backyard) is scheduled to be developed into perhaps a police station, laundromat, shops, etc.</p> <p>If you head down Kennel Lane on your immediate left all the way down to the split in the road, there is a known wildlife corridor,(mentioned above), that shelters and is habitat to maybe 20-40 different species of wildlife at any given time year-round. Last nite I heard a Great Gray Owl calling. The stately Lodgepole Pine forest is home to a myriad number of bird and waterfowl species in the surrounding wetlands further along the creek there.</p> <p>Now, I ask you, Is this PROMOTING STEWARDSHIP OF WILDLIFE AND NATURAL RESOURCES as your proposed ideal THEME #1 states in The Comp. Plan???</p> <p>Please, I invite you to come sit on my back deck, or take a walk along Kennel lane and just keep your eyes and ears open and take in all that will disappear if you consider high density commercial/residential growth here.</p>	Jean Yurgalewicz	5/7/2009 18:20

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
10.10 District 10: Aspens	<p>I am a nurse and a longtime westbank resident. I was unhappy to hear that the aspens area was being considered as part of the future development plan. Firstly, the aspens is already congested if you ask any year round resident. People who choose to live on the westbank, choose NOT to have TOWN the heart of the area... Thats not what attracted me to jackson wyoming in the first place. The pace at which this town is expanding is very sad. Yes we need workforce housing, but not at the rate proposed nor in the locations suggested. Why not take over more old buildings that are tear downs etc.. Secondly workforce housing should be in town.. not in the aspens. What percentage of jackson residents work in teton village year round.. less than 3 percent?? I work at the hospital and even the hospital doesnt want to develop much out there because their employees want to be close to the hospital.</p> <p>The westbank store and surrounding shopping area is a danger to drive into during the summer due to increase in traffic. The condos areas practically face each other and I do not look forward to the increase in noise and traffic. The construction and cookie cutter housing would provide a decrease in the charm and serenity of the westbank. I already have replaced two windshields last summer due to the debris dropping off of trucks that were on their way to Shooting star ranch. In addition, shooting star has already mapped out affordable housing in that project which I feel in addition to the downtown Wilson development and the one by calico.. we have enough affordable housing. Not to mention the decrease in open land in the residential neighborhoods you are proposing. This is the reason people choose to live on the westbank and you are taking that away from people. I have already seen a dramatic decrease in wildlife since I have lived on the westbank. Basically I strongly oppose and will fight til the bitter end.</p> <p>thank you</p>	Jodi Williams	4/25/2009 0:00
10.10 District 10: Aspens	<p>My husband and I bought a tiny place here in 1979. The whole reason for buying was the beauty, peace, quiet, wildlife and low population. We were able to move here permanently a little over three and a half years ago. We were shocked at the extra development, but you expect some changes in such a time. However, your plan will ruin everything we moved here for: the beauty, peace, quiet, wildlife and low population. You will destroy everything nearly everyone here cherishes. The whole Hole will be destroyed. Please change the plan. Wilson too will be utterly ruined and lose its charming character. With the long winter here the planned extra growth will put too much strain on everything: traffic, air quality, quietness, wildlife, low crime, and on and on. It will become an ugly Piccadilly Circus. Yes, I am an ex-Londoner so I treasure this place more than people from the country. I can't imagine either how all of us will pay for all of the changes.</p>	John and Cynthia Cook	5/14/2009 22:26
10.10 District 10: Aspens	<p>I have owned a unit in the Aspens for several years. I did not spend \$800,000 to now be considered a place for more density and workforce housing. There are to many cars and trucks already on the road. Densities should be increased South of town where there is better and larger roads and access. I enjoy watching the Elk herd just outside the Aspens boundary.</p>	Josh Whetzel	5/3/2009 9:41
10.10 District 10: Aspens	<p>We are opposed to the plan. We feel it doesn't have enough protection in it to maintain the current atmosphere/environment in the Aspens and Wilson. We oppose anything that would bring or encourage more traffic to the area.</p>	Joy & Edward Randall	5/10/2009 21:29
10.10 District 10: Aspens	<p>VERY BAD IDEA! The impact of The Plan will drastically impact the wildlife, natural, and scenic resources. In the long run, Jackson will become just another resort. That is not why people buy in The Aspens or the Jackson/Wilson area. The community is unique and totally in tune with the wildlife and natural resources. I want moose and elk walking by my home and the tress and open spaces for birds and other wildlife to inhabit. The growth plan for The Aspens and the Jackson/Wilson areas in general jeopardize the integrity of the community, in spite of The Plan's claims to "mitigate impacts to wildlife and should allow for wildlife movements and crossings, Ä. LOL what a bunch of bull!!! To mitigate, means to cause to be less harsh or hostile. So who's going to determine what is less harsh or hostile? What is the metric? Anything less than the status quo is not acceptable! If The Plan cannot guarantee that future development will have "NO IMPACT" on the wildlife and natural resources, then it should have never been considered in the first place. WHAT ARE YOU THINKING???</p>	Ken Ballard	5/7/2009 10:11
10.10 District 10: Aspens	<p>I am a property owner living in the Raintree Development for the past 21 years; adjacent to property that may be rezoned from one home per 3 acres to a much higher density. I was previously a 12 year homeowner in the Aspens.</p> <p>Today I observed a deer, a fox, and a cow and calf moose; this is why I came to this valley 40 years ago. Have the designers of this Comprehensive Plan come out and made observations of the wild life or have they hired professionals to do a scientific count of the wildlife and their habits?</p> <p>Have the drafters counted the number of people who now live within walking distance to the West Side Market, a small local convenience grocery, who still drive to get their gallon of milk as compared to the people using no motorized means of travel? Can this small grocery even handle an increase in customers? Or will they need to expand, hire more workers, thus increasing the need for more housing to accommodate increased growth? Have you tried to turn left out of the Aspens during peak travel times?</p> <p>Why is the priority changed for the Aspens area? I think the Aspens area is just as important to the wild life and its scenic value as any other location in this valley. Maybe the Planners should get feedback from the moose.</p> <p>This new Comprehensive Plan isn't smart growth; there is no balance of wildlife and scenic values to human sustainability. The projected expansion of human growth will drastically decrease the wildlife numbers, that's science. The more dwellings created will not enhance the scenic character of his valley.</p> <p>More people, more crime, more traffic, isn't going to lead to a better quality of life. I am against this new plan!</p>	Ken Jern	5/8/2009 0:00

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
10.10 District 10: Aspens	<p>Aspens' growth: The density suggested for the Aspens is wrong. There is not the infrastructure in the commercial area to support more people, except as a commuter society. No post office; no gas station; limited banking facilities; limited food marketing; limited food choices in a range of price levels; limited space at the elementary school and all older students would be part of the mass transport problem. There are not enough jobs to support the workforce, so they will all be community to their employment. This flies in the face of everything you are preaching about limiting road use and creating 'Nodes' of communities.</p> <p>No more growth at the ASPENS!</p>	Liza Hoke	5/15/2009 17:32
10.10 District 10: Aspens	<p>General Comments to Public Process:</p> <p>The Comment period is too short for adequate representation. Many of the owners of properties in the Aspens and surrounding areas are seasonal residents and will not have had the opportunity to even know of the potential changes you are suggesting for their residence areas. They do not receive the local newspapers at their other residence and there have been no mailings or emails sent to inform them of this planning process.</p> <p>No public meeting has been scheduled for the Aspens/Teton Pines areas despite the fact that the proposed housing increase here is 20% greater than proposed for Teton Village, which generates most of the traffic flowing from Jackson, Wilson areas to the Teton Village, not Aspens/Teton Pines.</p> <p>Specific Comments regarding the Aspens/Teton Pines Planning Comp Plan:</p> <p>The two lots identified in the Aspens "Future Single Family Mixed - Type" plan, i.e., dense housing category, have Deed Recorded zoning restrictions on them that prohibit such development. These restrictions PROHIBIT the single family residential subdivision PROPOSED IN THE COUNTY PLAN. These restrictions are State protected and zoning cannot override private restrictions.</p> <p>SHOULD SUCH A PRECEDENT BE SET THAT SUCH DEED RESTRICTIONS CAN BE OVERRIDDEN, THEN INDEED, ALL EASEMENT RESTRICTIONS AND DEED RESTRICTIONS THAT ARE THE BASIS OF JACKSON HOLE LAND PROTECTION EASEMENTS ARE AT RISK. THIS IS WHAT YOUR PLAN FOR THE ASPENS/TETON PINES PROPOSES. IN ADDITION, AT THIS SITE, IT PROPOSES OVER 300 DENSE HOUSING UNITS ADJACENT TO A HIGHWAY WHICH WILL ONLY INCREASE IN TRAFFIC.</p> <p>CONVERSELY, THE AREA OF TETON VILLAGE, WHICH REQUIRES A GREAT DEAL OF EMPLOYMENT FOR ITS ACTIVITIES, IS ONLY SLATED FOR SOME 200+ HOUSING UNITS. TETON VILLAGE INDEED IS THE AREA WHICH WILL GENERATE THE GREATEST GROWTH OF THE TWO AREAS.</p> <p>Might I also ask the obvious but highly unpopular question: Why have we not looked into a low rise building in Teton Village, which would be somewhat invisible against the mountain background and also consider the much needed bridge across the Snake River near the Teton Village location. Both of these suggestions, would provide significant changes to the thinking process to date.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	Lynn and Tony HItschler	5/15/2009 12:53
10.10 District 10: Aspens	I think the proposed increased density in the Aspens is proposterous. Teton Village Rd is basically a dead end road. Enough growth in this area. Please. Lets re-direct the money that is being spent in shifting around densities and spend it in studying "0% Growth". We know we ultimately have to get there so why don't we start now.	Madeleine Emrick	5/17/2009 21:09
10.10 District 10: Aspens	I studied planning in graduate school and the presentation I saw at Teton Village was a textbook planning presentation. Jackson Hole is not a "textbook community". Our community is an extraordinarily unique place and requires an unconventional approach in order to protect its special features. I am outraged that this high density node concept is even being entertained. I am also outraged that certain developers appear to have had privileged access to this concept. Finally, I am extremely angered over the timing of this concept and the limited time for public comment. It could not have been planned more perfectly in order to minimize home owner opposition. Nobody is here now and you know that.	Mike Cottingham	5/15/2009 19:56
10.10 District 10: Aspens	Thank you for the extensive report and information. I would like to correct one element of your Conceptual Future Land Use Map - the Aspens subdivision is mostly owner occupied, rented as long term workforce housing, or as second-home for owners. The Aspens is a very good model of what can be done as a focused area of development. However I hope you do not intend that this area should be increased in density to town-levels. The Town-As-Heart concept should be maintained, and not allowed to spread along highway corridors (ala Steamboat Springs). Thank you.	Pam Foyster	5/5/2009 17:29
10.10 District 10: Aspens	I own a unit in the Aspens. What is the meaning of the Statement on Page 80, in the description of "Single Family Mixed -Type" that states "In the county, single family mixed development is only appropriate to provide workforce housing." For example, does it only allow workforce housing? Or does it allow/require a mixture of workforce and full-price housing? Besides answering my specific question, Please clarify this critical definition in the final document. Thanks	Richard Winter	4/29/2009 15:02

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
10.10 District 10: Aspens	I am writing to oppose the whole notion of proposing such a massive upzone of the acreage around the Aspens . Furthermore, I can't believe we pay you planners to come up with such ludicrous ideas. 310 additional units? Do you honestly think it makes sense to burden the Teton Village Road with more traffic? Where are all the supposed workers going to work? In the town most likely, which will just create more congestion on the TV road and the SR bridge. I live off of Cheney Lane and have moose, fox, raccoons and sometimes elk reside on our property all winter long. Adding more traffic will surely jeopardize their survival, especially the moose where it has been shown that they are already hard hit by traffic accidents. I thought the community's goals were to preserve wildlife and open space in balancing future growth. You apparently didn't listen.	Robin Moyer	4/28/2009 13:49
10.10 District 10: Aspens	I have actively followed this comp plan since the beginning, attending meetings, and being hopeful of an outcome that protects wildlife and the people who have lived in this valley for years. The people have spoken in loud terms...WILDLIFE, WILDLIFE WILDLIFE...have you not heard it? Both Teton Meadows and Osprey Creek (huge density developments) cause an outcry among everyone who loves this valley...we do not want this kind of density. The village road has too much character to be lost with the numbers in which this plan proposes. This plan is out of character, much too dense, and the people of this valley do not want it.	Sami Robinson	5/10/2009 11:04
10.10 District 10: Aspens	Last line of the test states "The Town of Jackson will remain the resort, retail, professional, and civic center of the region." Why is the Town the Resort center of the Region? This furthers the battle between Town and Teton Village for tourists.	Save Historic Jackson Hole	5/15/2009 14:48
10.10 District 10: Aspens	I have lived in the Aspens subdivision since 1975. In 1976 I purchased a condo, in 1979 I built my first home here, and in 1988 I built my present home. The Aspens was designed and is still today a resort development with seasonal occupants in the units. This has allowed the subdivision to have a minimum impact on the environment and wildlife with very little full time use. The actual number of single family residencies is quite small with most lots well over 1/2 and acre or larger. The clusters of multi-family units have limited parking with no garages, vacation type aminities and lots of open space for tourist to enjoy. Your idea to impact this area with full time densely populated full time residence will have a serious negative impact on the full time residents and more importanly, the wild life in the area. (a natural corridor between Fish Creek and the Snake River for the majority of wildlife in the Jackson area). We addressed this concern in detail with the Osprey Subdivision which fortunately was prevented from development. Now it appears you want to create a similar problem to the north in and around the Aspens. Your proposal to develop 50 by 150 size lots for single family homes is completely out of character with the current size homes and acreage in the area. There are no 50 by 150 lots in this area because of wild life concerns when the first comprehensive plan was developed and implimented. It limited growth in this area to protect wild life and the character of the current road. When Teton Pines Resort was developed, it was made quite clear under comprehensive plan that any development would be limited. At that time, the county commissioner even rejected a plan to hook the sewer from the Aspens and Teton Pines into a single line to town (which we agreed to pay for as well as a deposit to the town of \$1,500,000.00 for future development of the town sewer system) because the commissioner did not want dense development on Teton Village Road. Under the comprehensive plan, having a sewer line down the village road would lead to increased density and development. We put in our own system as a result. Years later, the county put in the very line down the village road that we had proposed. The commissioners were right to reject the proposed line because the very concern they address is being proposed today. Teton Village Road is a very unique corridor along the Tetons. Don't ruin it forever with the dense over developed plan that you now are proposing.	Steven Robinson	5/10/2009 10:36
10.10 District 10: Aspens	Regarding the future development of the Aspens on the Village Road ( 390): Is the expansion being planned for after the North Bridge on highway 390 is constructed or after the road has been expanded to 5 lanes with a half dozen traffic lights? We already have seen a significant increase in traffic volume with the Shooting Star area and the Millward affordable project having been added with no change in the road. Not to mention all the development in John Dodge, Teton Pines, and Teton which have all occurred without any change to the road system. The road is already considered over burdened and unsafe by current standards. Will the necessity of creating adequate infrastructure be realized before allowing further development? Is the governing body proactive or reactive? There may be sewer and water but there is certainly not an adequate road system. It will be interesting to see how traffic flows when WYDOT repairs the Snake River Bridge this summer.	Warren Pratt	4/15/2009 0:00
10.10 District 10: Aspens	I have owned a condo in The Aspens since 1987 and wish to object to the further growth of multi family development in this area. I wanted to express my desire to not have the area around The Aspen rezoned to provide the buyers that option. Please consider this as my wish for this growth in theis area. Thank you.	Zippora Stahl	4/29/2009 12:31