

## DOCUMENTATION OF COMMUNITY DISCUSSIONS AND ONLINE SURVEY

### COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT GOAL

The goal of this community engagement effort was to solicit perspectives on several issues related to zoning and parking in the Town of Jackson and Teton County. Town and County staff and decision makers were eager to learn what, if any, types of housing units residents were interested in adding to the different subareas of Jackson, and what parking options people preferred. Toward this end, Town and County staff took a three-pronged approach to community engagement: hosting a Spanish-language meeting, hosting an English-language meeting, and developing an online survey. Although the formats of these efforts were tailored for each context, each sought to gain further insight into what the community desired regarding zoning and parking and, most importantly, why they prefer what they prefer. The format of each engagement effort is summarized below. The remainder of this report captures the key themes and outcomes from all three avenues of the community engagement process.

### ONLINE SURVEYS

On October 20, 2017, Town and County staff posted an online survey to solicit input from community members who either prefer not to attend meetings, cannot attend meetings, or simply prefer to provide their input online. Notification that the surveys had been posted and invitations to complete the surveys were emailed to the Town and County email contact list, October 20. The surveys were open until November 12 at 10 pm. A total of 146 people completed the survey.

For each transitional neighborhood subarea in Jackson, the survey asked participants to share their degree of support for different housing types and their preferred parking alternative. For each stable neighborhood in Jackson, the survey asked participants to share the characteristics they would like to maintain and change/improve, and their preferred parking alternative. Finally, participants were asked to answer several questions related to policy questions agreed upon by the Town Council. The survey included explanatory maps, videos, and diagrams to provide context and help respondents visualize the area/type of housing. Respondents were encouraged to first watch an introductory video and then look to the visual aids to answer the questions.

### SPANISH-LANGUAGE MEETING

The Town of Jackson and Teton County have a large Latino population that has typically not been invited to engage when it comes to zoning and parking issues. Staff worked with influencers in the Latino community and the Teton County Library to recruit people via email, personal visits, and phone calls to attend a Spanish-language meeting to gather feedback on zoning and parking. A native Spanish-speaking facilitator led a meeting on Monday, November 6 from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m., and 26 people attended.

## ENGLISH-LANGUAGE MEETING

In order to gather feedback and spark community conversation, Town and County staff held a community meeting on November 8, from 6:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. Participants were recruited in a variety of ways, including:

- Newspaper advertisements
- Facebook campaigns, including sponsored advertisements
- Email campaigns to those who subscribed to the Engage 2017 Updates list
- Educational presentations to various non-profit organizations and advocacy groups
- Office hours for people to talk one-on-one with topic experts
- Word of mouth

63 members of the community attended this meeting, in addition, members of the Planning Commission and Town Council also attended. After a brief presentation to set the stage and to summarize the key issues, participants were invited to gather in small groups to complete a worksheet that asked them to describe, for each of the six transitional subareas, what type of housing units, if any, they would like to add in this subarea, why that subarea is a good place for additional housing units, what the potential negative aspects of adding units to that subarea, and what parking alternative they thought was appropriate for that area. 10 worksheets were completed. Additionally, participants were encouraged to provide comments (on sticky notes) on the characteristics they would like to maintain and change/improve for each stable area.

## KEY THEMES

### *Transitional Areas*

- Maintain or increase outdoor storage.
- Maintain or increase green space.
- Maintain or improve wildlife safety and connectivity.
- Keep setbacks.
- Generally, people prefer to see less surface parking and more underground parking, particularly in Central Midtown and Midtown Highway.
- More density is supported in Midtown and Central Midtown
- Bike and pedestrian access is very important and should continue to be considered when making zoning/parking decisions.
- Complete streets are supported.
- Neighborhood character should not be sacrificed at the expense of new units and the associated traffic and parking problems.
- Parking scenario A seems most popular overall.
- There is no consensus on the use of ARUs.

### *Stable areas*

- It is important to maintain or improve the amount of green spaces, setbacks, and outdoor storage opportunities.
- Improve sidewalks, lighting, and general walkability and while also improving bike access and connectivity.
- Keep setbacks.

- Maintain low density in areas that are currently low to medium density (single-family homes and duplexes).
- Maintain wildlife connectivity and migration corridors.
- There is no consensus on the use of ARUs.

#### *General Zoning Themes*

- The consensus among the participants at the Spanish language meeting was that the number 1 priority should be to create more housing that accommodates families. This means that affordable housing units should have at least 1.5 bathrooms, should have options for more than just 2 bedrooms, and should have green spaces or playgrounds for kids.
- Some members of the community would prefer that more duplex or triplex models are built to accommodate families.
- There should be a mix of types of housing developed so that the issue of scarcity is also addressed.
- It is important to give priority to family housing units, because children suffer emotionally and psychologically from housing instability.
- Create architectural standards that maintain Jackson's character.
- This is no agreement about adding addition units.
- There is no consensus about the role of deed-restricted housing.
- The current amount of commercial development is adequate and should not be increased.

#### *Parking Themes*

- For all subareas, the majority of survey respondents indicated that they would like to ensure there is plenty of parking on every property so parking is always available with minimal need for public funds to build or manage parking.
- Some community members indicated that that the City and Town should encourage the market to determine parking and require developers to provide parking.
- Many community member suggested the establishment of parking space caps (e.g., one space per housing unit, or one space per worker).
- For many members of the community, parking is only a concern because, in order to afford the rent, they must live with several families in one unit, which creates parking issues. These community members would not mind parking in a parking structure farther from their home and walking home or to work.
- Many members of the community often carpool to work to avoid having to find parking or paying to park all day.

## **TRANSITIONAL NEIGHBORHOODS**

**What portion of the additional 1,800 dwelling units should be transferred from the Rural areas of the County into Town? These units would be in addition to what is allowed by current zoning.**

42%	Prioritize the addition of all 1,800 units to Town (closest to status quo)
31%	Add less than 1,800 units in order to balance housing goals with other desired goals
17%	Add none of the 1,800 units to Town
10%	Other

*Other Responses*

- No units should be imposed on the town. Let market forces find and develop housing wherever it makes business sense.
- About half of the units should be placed in or near the urban core, and the other should be placed in Teton Village to accommodate their growing workforce.
- Annex and allocate a portion of the Porter Estate property, south of High School Road. A responsibly planned medium and high density zoned district (100-200 acres) would effectively address the worker housing issue immediately and well into the future. Otherwise, it was beautifully hypocritical for the county to turn their back on an absolute housing crisis and was their hands of the entire crisis in the name of protecting “open space” and the cost of destroying the last piece of “true community” atmosphere we have—the Town of Jackson. Do not destroy local residential neighborhoods by razing them and creating apartment dorms.
- What happened to the other designated transitional areas? Teton Pines? Wilson? Northern South Park? Why is the town the only thing being considered for these 1,800 units the county decided to transfer? Let us see what the numbers look like when the distribution is spread across all the areas identified.
- 1,800 new units in town is too many. We are overdeveloping this region. They should also not be built in the County for the reasons that they were removed from county development regulations to make commercial development pay to house workers!!!! If we had been doing this all along we wouldn't have the problems we do. We are making it too easy for commercial development to occur at the expense of residents, wildlife and scenic views.
- Teton Village –300 units. Aspen’s—100 units. Wilson –200 units. Jackson –500 units. South Park—500 units. Hoback/Hog Island—200 units.
- Hard to answer not knowing if available land even exists to add 1,800 dwelling units.
- I think it is okay to add units as long as the neighborhoods where they will be located are willing to receive them. I think density is the most appropriate in areas where residents can walk to groceries, post offices, schools. It is okay to have a mix of high density but not at the expense of local neighborhoods.
- I prefer those units disappear entirely. If they are redistributed, they should be added to the core commercial corridor only, and all the units should be workforce deed restricted.
- Keep some in the county
- Dwelling units should be added in complete neighborhoods as needed to workforce housing. Units removed from the county should be banked if not needed. Density allowances alone will not produce housing. Please address economic factors that work to discourage the development of workforce housing
- Why do we need to increase downtown density? Rafter J and Melody have lots of land. Also, should consider using fairgrounds. Silly this is in town.

- Add less than 1800 units but incentivize homeowners to have rentable apartments or guest houses for Teton County employees. There are a lot of homeowners who could benefit from a rental unit on their property which rental could at the same time help a family employed locally. Change the 1000 sq. ft. regulation to a bigger space for those who want to rent to local employees.
- I want to decrease growth overall. Let people commute like they do everywhere in the country.

**SUBAREA 3.2: CORE RESIDENTIAL**

**To what degree do you support allowing Single-Family Housing in the Core Residential subarea? (10 being the highest, 0 being the lowest)**

Answer	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
# of people	53	12	7	10	4	7	1	8	1	3	17

**To what degree do you support allowing Single Family Housing with an Accessory Residential Unit (more details) in the Core Residential subarea?**

Answer	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
# of people	51	7	13	13	4	5	3	2	2	2	19

**To what degree do you support allowing Duplex Single-Family housing (more details) in the Core Residential subarea?**

Answer	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
# of people	55	12	11	11	5	2	1	2	5	1	17

**To what degree do you support allowing 3 Unit Single-Family housing (more details) in the Core Residential subarea?**

Answer	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
# of people	49	5	8	13	7	6	2	2	0	3	23

**To what degree do you support allowing 3 Unit (1 Single-Family and 2 accessory residential units) housing (more details) in the Core Residential subarea?**

Answer	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
# of people	44	6	8	8	5	7	3	1	2	7	26

**To what degree do you support allowing 4 Unit Single-Family housing (more details) in the Core Residential subarea?**

Answer	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
# of people	38	10	9	12	6	3	2	3	1	6	29

**To what degree do you support allowing 4 Unit Multi-Family housing (more details) in the Core Residential subarea?**

Answer	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
# of people	34	11	8	9	7	6	2	5	2	4	28

**To what degree do you support allowing 6 Unit Multi-Family housing (more details) in the Core Residential subarea?**

Answer	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
# of people											

# of people	32	6	5	6	10	5	5	2	2	4	40
-------------	----	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	----

**To what degree do you support allowing 8 Unit Multi-Family housing (more details) in the Core Residential subarea?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
# of people	32	8	1	6	6	5	6	5	1	3	41

**To what degree do you support allowing 8-Unit Tiny House developments (more details) in the Core Residential subarea?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
# of people	32	5	7	10	7	6	2	3	5	4	35

**What types of housing units do you support adding in this area?**

- Lot-by-lot basis
- Smaller (1-8) units
- 4-6 lots that could be suited for multi-family/single family with AU, like in the Glenwood/Millward area
- Single family townhomes/condos, and workforce (deed restricted) housing
- Single family apartments, and maybe 2-3 units (less than 6 units per site)
- West of Cache is different from the east of Cache. The west has more trailer homes and the city will develop workforce housing, so it is a good spot for 4-6 unit structures. The east has more traditional and older single family homes, so buildings should be kept smaller.
- A mix of 1-8 per lot, with an average of 4.
- Zoning with two lots or more. If you must have density, this is the area to do it (put 8 or more units per lot). Setbacks should be decreased. Consider increasing FAR on lots.
- 3-4 story buildings up to 8 per lot, and have apartment complexes where appropriate
- ARUs, duplexes and triplexes, year-round/full-time houses, and smaller/single-family houses.
- Primarily single family

**Which parking alternative best fits your vision for this subarea?**

50%	Ensure there is plenty of parking on every property so parking is always available with minimal need for public funds to build or manage parking
16%	Ensure there is a lot of parking on-street and in public parking lots and structures so parking is always available nearby and more housing can be built
19%	Let the free market determine how much parking is available and where it is located so more housing can be built with minimal need for public funds to build or manage parking
15%	Town will manage parking supply and demand by working with private sector to provide and price on-street and off-street parking

**Which parking alternative is appropriate in this subarea? Why?**

- A or C
- It is important to get cars off the street during the winter especially

- Parking restrictions
- Structure, exists
- A, unless there are grandfathered parking areas, then B
- Explore off-site parking options
- D (to work with private, would need public management –parking permits) and overnight parking
- Let the market have a say. Keep it at one space per unit and encourage shared parking options. Improve transit (infrastructure, sidewalks, bike travel). Maximize public lots.
- Alternate the side of street parking in the winter; have less dedicated parking per unit to encourage development. The public should not be building new garages to subsidize developers but should be managing street parking.
- Need to mitigate winter on-street parking and reduce parking in general
- Alternate side of the street parking (winter) and timing; on street. Have neighborhood permits, and let the private developers provide parking.
- C or D. Restrict parking.

**What characteristics of the Core Residential Subarea would you most like to maintain (e.g., green space, accessory residential units, outdoor storage, accessory structures, uses, setbacks, etc.)?**

- Home Occupations should remain. Setbacks seem fine for all structures.
- Green Space, outdoor storage, setbacks
- More living space, less green strips (aka dog poop zones). Decrease setbacks, encourage outdoor storage, encourage year-round on-street parking with at least two times/week where cars must be moved - aka alternate side of street parking.
- A neighborhood that is typical of nearby areas. Do not overcrowd and encourage off-street parking. Winter driving here is difficult. Let market forces be the guiding factor BUT modify zoning and building codes to make that market development easier, quicker, and less expensive for the new residents.
- Green space
- Outdoor storage
- Potential for home-based business that typically don't have multiple costumers at once. Employees of business must live in the unit.
- Green space is important. Also, accessory units are an underutilized aspect but are you going to have some kind of control on rents? A \$2,000-\$3,000/month tiny house rental isn't going to help the housing situation much. Sorry but you're different from the rest of the state and you need to enact some different laws regarding this.
- Green space
- Residential units. Ample street parking. Do not narrow the streets.
- Not sure what is required now.
- Outdoor storage and setbacks so peoples' toys don't spill over onto public or adjacent properties.
- Green space, storage, uses
- Access to transit and other alternative modes of transportation, access to parks or other open space
- Larger setbacks
- Preserve the existing character of streets and setbacks, particularly in the older part of town. Currently, almost none of the existing houses would conform to the current zoning setback requirements. Zoning should be revised to reflect and preserve the existing historic character of town, which would have the added benefit of allowing additional density on

each lot. Front yard setbacks are particularly egregious since they push new building further away from the street, which is a bad principle of urbanism.

- Green space - yards accessory residential units for renter's outdoor storage parking off the street
- I would like to ensure green space and accessory residential subarea units.
- Green space, uses, setbacks, and parking area on property.
- Maintain a mix of old small residential cabins and some newer structures which gives architectural diversity and neighborhood character. I don't think this area should eliminate single family housing as an option. The people who live there don't deserve to end up surrounded by high rise/high density housing just because they live closer to the center of town. They are no closer to a grocery store than most other parts of town east of Virginian Lane.
- Green spaces & setbacks for pedestrian/bike corridors
- Accessory residential units, some green space. Minimal parking.
- Green space setbacks, ARUs and green space.
- Allowance of multi-family housing in the form of townhomes.
- All
- Private residential structures with SUITABLE out buildings. Density (extra lodging) such as ARU's at the discretion of the property owner and within the style of the neighborhood.
- Green space is nice, but we live in Jackson because of the beautiful nature surrounding us - it doesn't need to be right next door. Storage is important, as most people have gear, and little kids require a lot of extra things (strollers, bike trailers, etc.).
- I do not see any reference to the current permitted AR-Office Overlay, this existing mixed-use zone has provided a reasonable healthy mix of uses and should be maintained in some form. Either add a mixed-use option to these options or zone some of the current office used areas from the existing AR-Office to CR-1 or CR-2.
- People need storage for their "toys."
- Some green space, accessory residential units, pedestrian and bike friendly streets
- Green space. One of the more thoughtful comments I read in the news and guide lately was a gal who simply said, "When we start to value sidewalks and curbs more trees we are losing our way as a town." I understand the need for increased density and agree with it; however, sometime I feel we go a little over the top with our complete neighborhood push. Redmond Ave. thoroughfare comes to mind.
- Lower density, setbacks
- Need good sidewalks, some green space is needed.
- I'd like to see quiet family neighborhoods stay that way. For example, Snow King and East Jackson, east of Redmond. No sidewalks, gardens, old trees, minimal traffic. Additional SMALL units okay but with no parking. Requiring that public transportation go into the places people go on days off as well as working. A bus looping through the park so backpackers can get on and off, a bus down the canyon that can accommodate boats. To the airport and to Moose. Small busses like the senior busses, for town routes to grocery stores and the po. I am not for additional density if it means more traffic in neighborhoods. Also, increased density needs to come with noise limitations. No leaf blowers and backup beepers or chainsaws early in the mornings, evenings and weekends. Mufflers required and other mitigations for loud vehicles. And if increased density means increased rentals, then strong regulation around parties, drunken stumbling around the streets late at night etc. Maybe a distinction between family and transient neighborhoods and definitely green space, but prefer people have yards and gardens vs density with an occasional park.



- Manage to maintain some character to the building so you don't end up with cookie cutter, non-descript, boring facades. Buildings lacking identity makes for a very boring community.
- Green space, sidewalks, bike paths
- Low-density, small-town neighborhood character.
- Population density
- Green space, ARUs
- Outdoor storage and trees, minimal parking and many units without parking as a means of encouraging bicycle, motor scooter and walking
- Green space, setbacks, and on-site parking.
- Green space
- Walkability
- Accessory residential units
- Trees and off-street parking
- Accessory Units and half the existing setbacks.
- Neighborhood character
- Setbacks
- Green space
- Limit heights to Approximately 25 feet, maintain setbacks
- None - this area should have more density - green space is available in the national forest areas that are essentially adjacent, continue to allow residential streets without sidewalks, do not add any new streets that would promote vehicle circulation.
- ARU's
- Green space, sidewalks, street lights with shades
- Accessory units, pedestrian friendly
- Set backs
- On-site parking, multi-family structures
- Residential use and ARUs.
- Keep some in the county
- With every development, there should be setbacks for landscaping and sufficient parking-- at least 1.5 spaces per unit. The rest of the tax payers should not have to pay for parking deficits.
- Maintain single family dwellings with access to green space. The clutter of outdoor storage needs to be managed. Setbacks from waterways for the taller structures needs to be increased.
- Buildings should front streets. Try to avoid street level building walls of all garage doors.
- Green space
- Setbacks and green space.
- The feeling of family residential area, set-backs, not line to line apartments that feel like inner city.
- Green space & setbacks
- None
- Green space, uses
- Setbacks, variety of building types - not homogeneous structures,
- Green space, parking to free up all the on-street parking.
- Cultivable green space required on all new roofs.
- All buildings should be engineered to adapt to and accommodate 2 additional stories beyond what is approved at build time.
- Include some green space

- All of them but allow accessory units with parking. Therefore, maybe the setbacks and green spaces have to be modified some. Can't build an accessory unit without parking.
- Green spaces. Setbacks. Architectural conformity to Western Design. Keep the town green & clean. NO open trash containers outside, need to be hidden or camouflaged. Curbside Recycling pick up. Fines to property/business owners who do not keep their property in a slightly manner.
- low density
- Improve sidewalks and street safety for kids on bikes. Safe routes to schools.
- Setbacks to avoid overcrowding
- With every development, there should be setbacks for landscaping and sufficient parking - at least 1.5 spaces per unit. The rest of the tax payers should not have to pay for parking deficits.
- Maintain single family dwellings with access to green space. The clutter of outdoor storage needs to be managed. Setbacks from waterways for the taller structures needs to be increased.
- Buildings should face streets. Try to avoid street-level building walls of all garage doors.
- Green space
- Setbacks and green space
- The feeling of family residential area and set-backs, not line-to-line apartments that feel like inner city
- Green space & setbacks
- None
- green space, uses
- Setbacks, variety of building types - not homogeneous structures
- Green space, parking to free up all the on-street parking.
- Cultivable green space required on all new roofs. All buildings should be engineered to adapt to and accommodate 2 additional stories beyond what is approved at build time.
- Include some green space
- All of them but allow accessory units with parking
- Maybe the setbacks and green spaces have to be modified some. You cannot build an accessory unit without parking.
- Green spaces. Setbacks. Architectural conformity to Western Design. Keep the town green & clean. No open trash containers outside, need to be hidden or camouflaged. Curbside recycling pick up. Fines to property/business owners who do not keep their property in a nice-looking manner.
- Low density
- Improve sidewalks and street safety for kids on bikes. Safe routes to schools.

**What characteristics of the Core Residential subarea would you most like to change or improve (e.g., green space, accessory residential units, outdoor storage, accessory structures, uses, setbacks, etc.)?**

- For boxy/modern homes, building height should be reduced. ARU setbacks in all zones should be the same as AR zoning.
- Alley access, minimizing street access to all structures. If street access is allowed it should be limited to a single 10'-wide driveway. Wide driveways at every property destroy the streetscape. Any driveways that are allowed should have curb cuts that do not interrupt the detached sidewalk. Streetscapes should be improved from the existing, and streets do not need to be nearly as wide as they currently are in many of the areas.
- Get rid of the mobile homes.

- No ARUs
- More density and less off-street parking
- Reduce clutter of trailers and prefabricated doublewides. Improve the quality of the neighborhood, reduce crowding but provide capacity where possible.
- Green space
- Accessory residential units
- Increased use of alleyways as pedestrian corridors with parking access, one-way streets.
- Less hotels and less structures that add crappy, low-end, low-wage jobs to the economy. So, less tourism development or you will never solve any of these issues and this is a big waste of time.
- Increase of multi-family units- max 6 unit complexes.
- The greater the building density and smaller units, more green space for kids and adults within the block to gather outside or less traffic. ARUs are ok. Allows for single people to rent year-round or temporary friends/visitors to stay but not to rent out for less than a year.
- Parking standards
- Green space
- Complete streets with connected sidewalks, 3- to 4-story minimums, parking maximums
- Larger setbacks
- We desperately need better pedestrian connectivity through sidewalks to enhance the walkability of town. Currently, they are haphazard and disconnected.
- Parking off the street, green space aesthetics of multi-family housing structures.
- I would like to link a vehicle restriction to the affordable housing. For example, one or two car limit per household on any given property.
- Outdoor storage
- Improve or add sidewalks in this area. They work to get people, families, and kids from relying on cars.
- Green spaces and setbacks for pedestrian/bike corridors.
- More density in housing and 4+ stories.
- Look nice
- Three-story residential units seem very large for this area. However, two stories above ground with a livable basement space makes sense.
- This area is underutilized and infill development for multi-family housing should be considered.
- Some
- I think capping the rent on accessory residential units would be good. If you are allowed to have a residential unit on your land, you shouldn't be able to charge \$3,000. It's a privilege to have additional income through a rental, but the max rent should be set, possibly \$2,000.
- Provided for additional density. Adjust the LSRs so that additional parking demands are not the controlling factor. The current zoning is far too 'suburban' in character.
- Street front appearance tidy, outdoor storage on alley side
- Outdoor storage, accessory structures
- Less traffic, more gardens and trees, accessory units if they don't encumber quiet neighborhoods with traffic and noise.
- Minimize long-term street parking, including long-term parking of campers and boats by ensuring residential buildings have enough parking on property and a possibly parking lot for excess and leisure vehicles/trailers.
- Sidewalks, bike paths

- Remove street lights.
- Quality of existing housing stock
- Outdoor storage, accessory structures, setbacks
- Outdoor storage
- Require more parking per unit.
- reduce or eliminate on-street free parking, especially boats and flatbed trailers as they pose the greatest threat to safety
- no outdoor storage, and accessory structures should be limited.
- Detached (NC-2 style) independently owned units.
- Walkability
- Accessory residential units
- Trees and off-street parking
- More accessory residential units, storage units, half the current setbacks.
- ARUs
- There is too much parking, both on streets and off street.
- Increase density, reduce parking requirements, reduce setbacks, reduce green space (national forest is essentially immediately adjacent), add pedestrian and bike connectivity but not with traditional sidewalks, do not add impervious surface to support vehicles or parking that will contribute to additional storm water runoff.
- Green space
- More green space, sidewalks, street lights with shades
- Fewer cars, more walking friendly
- Residential units - we need more of them
- Street lighting
- Core residential should accept the most density, most ARUs and lower setbacks. We need to increase density, lower LSR and increase FAR. If we want housing, we need density to lower the costs or we will keep getting large single houses which will not help solve our housing crisis.
- Multiple housing per lot
- Every cluster of dense living should have sufficient green space around them and enough space for a quality life for everyone, both residents and neighbors. Pocket parks and sufficient spaces for lawn or garden will help to relieve areas from turning into ghettos. The danger of compact living areas is that residents do not take pride in maintenance or ownership in their outside appearance.
- I think we could have more density but only if we ensure green space with that added density. Also, added density should be restricted to the local workforce. Is there another way to restrict units? Tax second homeowners?
- Height restrictions need to be shorter- quit building up. Buildings need to look finished and completed, painted, or finished with some western looking designs. There should not be a themed construction as the finished project. This is not an architectural design competition. Businesses and residents need to look at something and be satisfied with the finished product. Lastly, attention to light pollution needs to be addressed. I shouldn't have to be washed out in light from neighboring businesses or residences.
- Green space
- Increased density with smaller unit sizes and more rentals (i.e. possible turnover)
- Openness that makes one feel comfortable, unlike row houses. Trees, grass, garden spots, even tacky flower beds make me feel like real people live there.
- Maintain and improve green space areas, and small-town characteristics of Jackson.

- Uses
- Accessory residential, setbacks,
- Reduce outdoor storage.
- On-street parking of recreational vehicles. Should be limited and enforced. Need to enforce building standards for existing units. Many are unsafe and unsanitary.
- Discourage use of private automobiles. Reduce parking requirements on property. Implement expensive on-street parking. Reduce width of roads. Allow only Teton County registered vehicle parking on street or in public parking lot/structures. Allow occupancy of 8-unit multi-family lots only to people who do not own automobiles.
- Reduce some setbacks.
- Green spaces. Better use of public areas, especially parks. Put up and maintain “pet clean up” stations. Most town dwellers have dogs. Make it easier for them to walk, pick up after, & play with them.
- More small ARUs. Tiny houses are the true Historic Jackson Hole

#### **Why is this a good place for additional housing units?**

- Proximity to town (location), and there are underdeveloped spaces
- Housing can be up to three-stories (depending on zoning)
- It is close to town; it has public transit; it is already residential; it is close to the resort; and it is bike/pedestrian friendly.
- Proximity to downtown, parks/greenspace, transportation
- Close to bus, parks, the post office, and the downtown commercial core. There is “old” housing stock that in some cases would be difficult to remodel or enlarge. It may result in “tear downs” and may then offer greater density.
- It is walkable, close to jobs, centrally located, and close to transportation. It would reduce sprawl.
- Why is the fairground excluded from discussion? It could provide a lot of housing and decrease traffic
- It is in the heart of town, close to mass transit, has alley access, outside of District 2. It also has underutilized lots and would have fewer environmental impacts.
- It is close to buses, parks, the post office, and the downtown commercial core
- Maintain character, and the ARU model is incentivized.

#### **What are the potential negative impacts of adding units to this subarea?**

- Potential loss of character
- No shopping areas (groceries), and minimal street parking (there would need to be parking on site)
- Complete streets would be compromised (sidewalks and right-of-ways); there would be outdoor storage/on-street congestion; snow storage would be an issue; runoff would lead to impervious surfaces; it does not include the fairgrounds.
- The area has an original character and aesthetic that is worth keeping
- There are no grocery stores, and there are infrastructure challenges.
- People who have lived there could have their quality of life impacted.
- It would change the character and potentially impact viewsheds.
- Already built out, and there are not many empty lots

**To what degree do you support allowing 4 Unit Single-Family housing (more details) in the Midtown Highway Corridor?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
# of people	39	9	13	8	8	4	2	1	5	2	15

**To what degree do you support allowing 4 Unit Multi-Family housing (more details) in the Midtown Highway Corridor?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
# of people	36	5	5	14	9	6	2	3	2	5	17

**To what degree do you support allowing 6 Unit Multi-Family housing (more details) in the Midtown Highway Corridor?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
# of people	36	7	4	13	8	5	4	2	3	1	20

**To what degree do you support allowing 8 Unit Multi-Family housing (more details) in the Midtown Highway Corridor?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
# of people	39	9	5	5	7	6	6	3	3	2	19

**To what degree do you support allowing 8 Unit Tiny Housing (more details) in the Midtown Highway Corridor?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
# of people	27	5	5	6	2	6	2	8	2	5	33

**To what degree do you support allowing 40 Unit Multi-Family housing (more details) in the Midtown Highway Corridor?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
# of people	40	4	7	9	4	6	0	2	6	5	25

**To what degree do you support allowing 80 Unit Multi-Family housing (more details) in the Midtown Highway Corridor?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
# of people	32	7	4	8	5	3	2	2	4	4	35

**To what degree do you support allowing 90 Unit Multi-Family projects with surface parking (more details) in the Midtown Highway Corridor?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
# of people	26	5	4	6	3	3	2	3	5	4	42

**To what degree do you support allowing 90 Unit Multi-Family projects with underground parking (more details) in the Midtown Highway Corridor?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
# of people	33	5	9	2	3	2	1	2	3	6	37

**What types of housing units do you support adding in this area?**

- 4 units and single or multi-family (or hybrid)
- 40 plus units or community/residential mix
- Multi-family (40-90 unit opportunities); multi-purpose residential and community.

- Dormitory-style and larger developments with more than 40 units. It could also have mixed-use residential on the top floors. Put taller buildings here.
- Keep it commercial and build residential on top.
- It is not conducive to residential. Emphasize commercial here, with some housing over the commercial spaces.
- Mixed use (housing on top floors) like Eagle Village. It is important to make sure that commercial/residential financing is eligible on new buildings. There should not be 4 stories to avoid Canyon.
- Put apartments over commercial (80-90 units)
- 6-8 units to 90 units (have a mix). Have a mix of market rental, deed restricted, etc.
- Hybrid mix of commercial and multi-family (12-30 units).

**Which parking alternative best fits your vision for this subarea?**

52% of people	Ensure there is plenty of parking on every property so parking is always available with minimal need for public funds to build or manage parking
10% of people	Ensure there is a lot of parking on-street and in public parking lots and structures so parking is always available nearby and more housing can be built
22% of people	Let the free market determine how much parking is available and where it is located so more housing can be built with minimal need for public funds to build or manage parking
15% of people	Town will manage parking supply and demand by working with private sector to provide and price on-street and off-street parking

**Which parking alternative is appropriate in this subarea? Why?**

- A
- C
- A or B (structure)
- A
- C (there is not much on-street parking available). A little bit of B, with a potential public parking structure or overnight winter parking.
- The developers should manage it.
- A or C
- One spot per bedroom with a maximum of two spaces. The elimination of cars should be encouraged. Private developers should build a parking garage.
- A or B.

**What characteristics of the Midtown Highway Corridor would you most like to maintain (e.g., green space, accessory residential units, outdoor storage, accessory structures, uses, setbacks, etc.)?**

- This is a commercial corridor; the only housing that should be allowed is very high density. Other than that, the uses should remain primarily commercial with the exception of mixed-use developments with ARUs etc.
- Mixed commercial and housing uses. This area is the best candidate for future local/workforce housing and commercial activity.
- I like it now.
- Not much room for on-street parking. Do more with larger apartment complexes, both rental and ownership. more bike/pedestrian interior connectors between developments.

- This area is almost entirely commercial. Very few areas exist for housing, but a few high density rental properties are planned on relatively large parcels with full off-street parking good separation from the highway and screening from view.
- Green Space
- Setbacks and parking
- Green space required for larger developments. No large parking lots. Space for large trees to grow in building setbacks.
- Green space, less chain businesses, less ugly advertising signs, a better bike path, and bike right-of-way over motorized traffic. If you want people to ride bikes, make it a higher priority on our roads.
- You already have sidewalk, pathway, and green along this corridor. Do not jack hammer it up yet again.  
Green space
- Green space and outdoor storage
- Green space, migration
- Commercial businesses
- Height of buildings type of buildings - commercial and not residential
- I like the new developments that are being done by the hospital for their new housing. Other developments should have similar designs.
- Green space
- Setbacks
- Do not make traffic and access any worse.
- Green space, living units above commercial space.
- Green spaces & setbacks for pedestrian/bike corridors
- More density downtown with fewer needing to drive somewhere so parking can be minimized
- Commercial uses
- All
- It is ridiculous to assume that on-street parking will take care of things when you cannot park overnight on the street from November to May. That is not a solution – it is a band aid for a bullet wound.
- Screening from the highway
- Some green space, sidewalks for pedestrians, bike paths, night lighting, parking underground
- I think the "4 stories suitable when hill acts as a backdrop" is an important point to stick to unlike the huge apartment building Joe Rice is building right now. We need the housing, yes, but it needs to fit into our landscape and respect wildlife. That one is already baked, I know - but it's an example of how not to build in my opinion.
- Wildlife pass-through spaces (green)
- Need good sidewalks. Green space is still needed with density.
- Green space
- Do not create a tunnel effect of sameness. Break up building blocks with meaningful/useful open space. You do not want a boring entry to Jackson. In some cases, well-designed parking lots can even break the monotony of long stretches of buildings.
- Vibrant mixed-use development with easy walkable access to groceries, services and jobs
- Residential units with storage
- I like the bike and pedestrian infrastructure currently.



- Focus on business on ground level, and put residential units on 2nd floor. Put residential parking either in back or underground.
- Walkability
- Green space
- Large apartment buildings at the entrances to Jackson ruins the character of our community.
- As Jackson is a gateway to the National Parks, we should work to keep this aesthetic in mind. The empty Farmhouse redevelopment is a prime example of a poor decision.
- Good mix of local businesses
- Visibility of East Gros Ventre Butte from road
- Limit heights
- Sidewalks/bike path
- None - area is a huge mix of use types and density already
- Access to Flat Creek, scenic views
- Residential units
- ARUs
- Single or Duplex Family Houses
- We do not have the facilities--hospital, education, or traffic corridors--to support the sort of dense living you are suggesting.
- Maintain the mountain views with minimal development. Common sense should dictate that there is no space to add residential units. Increasing density is only going to increase traffic problems.
- Commercial development opportunities fronting streets with housing opportunities in rear of property.
- Setbacks
- Relative high density
- Parking must be fully provided by the developers with wildlife corridors so Broadway does not become a barrier to wildlife moving from the buttes.
- Protect wildlife areas and green spaces, such as Karn's Meadow.
- Maintain the spacious views/view corridor/ Design review would be important here to get larger structures along but maintain views.
- Two story, multi-family with onsite parking of two cars per unit.
- Accessory structures (business) mixed with residential on corridor. Setbacks. Some green spaces. Clean up properties! Architectural conformity to Western design

**What characteristics of the Midtown Highway Corridor would you most like to change or improve (e.g., green space, accessory residential units, outdoor storage, accessory structures, uses, setbacks, etc.)?**

- Move buildings closer to the highway so that the sea of parking is located to the side or back of buildings.
- Underground parking would be far better than surface parking for large multi-family developments. Incorporate bike/pedestrian connections into all new development with an eye to creating complete links to adjacent areas of town. Alley access to off-street parking – do not destroy the streetscape or pedestrian network with excessive curb cuts to driveways and parking lots.
- Less parking lots, more density
- Vehicle access can be difficult for a large facility directly on the highway. Frontage roads, connection between a facility or business eases this access and reduces the problem of

collision, especially if the feeder connects to the highway at a road intersection, like with Hillside building.

- Green space
- Green space
- Less visible parking, bike share, and bike access from all directions. Develop alleyways as one-way streets, more apartments/rentals with small businesses on the ground floor.
- Better bike path and bike right of way.
- Permeability for wildlife is essential for them to cross Broadway safely!! Access and buffer around Kearns meadow and Flat Creek are essential. A corridor of dense residences would need green spaces and commercial mixed in. This is already primarily a commercial area already due to its access along the main road. It is easy to find and access by travelers on short visits, but access is not easy for residents who go in and out in all directions, several times a day. With kids and multiple errands, they are unlikely to take a bus even if provided. Also, less safe for people living near busy road. Fortunately, sidewalks, bike path, and grass already there. Not sure where you plan to place the commercial buildings/services that are already there. While I am not for more commercial, it is in an appropriate location. Makes more sense, perhaps, to have a mixed-used/housing, including employee housing and/or private apartments in existing or improved structures. If housing it is, then I would go dense - 90 unit - with parking under (if fault lines will allow) and not quite 2 cars per unit. Again, do not block wildlife by any buildings along Broadway and to Karn's Meadow and Flat Creek access.
- Green space
- Green space, ARU
- Complete streets
- Move parking behind or below buildings, create a welcoming entrance to town that is appropriate for larger buildings and commercial uses.
- Minimal live/work units, maintain commercial business and less residential.
- The corridor should be enhanced to promote a conversion from a highway commercial character by encouraging buildings to come closer to the street and allowing for denser development and placing parking at the rear of the lot. Pedestrian and bicycling improvements that are adequate along W. Broadway need to be extended past the Y to the rest of the street.
- Aesthetics of buildings - no metal boxes for any type of building
- More green space and force developments to build garage parking or incorporate underground parking for developments.
- Outdoor storage
- More housing would be an improvement, but parking has to be provided nearby, if not on-site.
- I would like to see more living units above offices with parking available to all.
- Green spaces & setbacks for pedestrian/bike corridors
- What the hell is outdoor storage? That sounds stupid.
- Change strip malls into mixed commercial and residential uses with parking below ground, where practical.
- Some
- Provide for aggressive redevelopment of the current 'strip mall' development pattern! Aggressively look to increase transparency of walking, biking, wildlife, and vehicles. Adjust the LSRs so that additional parking demands are not the controlling factor. The current zoning is far too 'suburban' in character and vehicles.
- Green space, night lighting, sidewalks for pedestrians, bike paths, parking underground

- setbacks
- More free space
- Any up-zone of density should be restricted to workforce-occupancy, deed-restricted housing only.
- Careful planning of entrance and exit to main streets. Wildlife corridors
- It would be nice to have a pedestrian and bicycle bridge. It would be nice if there was a single-track trail that started at Dairy Queen and ended at High School Butte Trailhead.
- Do not put high density right on 'Broadway' in the commercial area. It will change the character of Jackson forever.
- Walkability
- Make Karns meadow into a park.
- It should not be overly urban.
- Put a bus stop at the new post office.
- It has always seemed somewhat piecemeal on the right side of the road going into downtown—random businesses, not particularly appealing visually, and too much gravel and concrete.
- Be very careful of adding to the existing traffic mess.
- Allow 4 stories, reduce parking requirements, do not add impervious surface for vehicles connections or parking,
- Create some kind of theme so it is not such a hodgepodge.
- Decrease green space and LSR with migration paths, decrease setbacks and increase FAR.
- Careful planning for the flow of traffic, especially in high season. Attention to the architecture so that we maintain the traditional character of the town.
- Less parking, more green space. Better walkability and public transit.
- Planned infrastructure development needs to occur before any structures are built instead of knee jerk reaction to some temporary housing needs. I would stress the importance of open, green spaces within the community.
- More cohesive design character.
- Setbacks
- Maybe an additional traffic light to both slow traffic, and ultimately allow for easier build-out for residential and commercial use
- It is a prime commercial corridor and appearance is important. Landscaping required
- As density increases, consideration of the small-town characteristics that makes Jackson special need to be preserved.
- Parking lots either underground or behind the buildings, whether business or residential.
- We need more multi-family but keep it at two-story and make certain there is parking.
- Require cultivatable green space on all roofs and otherwise discourage cars and parking. Implement high parking fees and only to those who have Teton County registered vehicle. Do not provide on-site parking. Instead use this space for open green cultivatable space.
- More rental housing
- None
- Green spaces. No outdoor storage visible from the road. Bike path beautification.
- Embrace Flat Creek. It's a disgrace. It's also a gem if we plan for its protection and enjoyment.

#### **Why is this a good place for additional housing units?**

- Because there is empty space to fill
- The community exists already.

- It is not an enticing part of town, so this could be a revamp. It is underutilized but close to downtown.
- There is a large opportunity to add a substantial number of units, which is the most enticing to developers.
- It is a good place for mixed-use development. It is close to the bus, biking/walking is easy, so there is less need for parking. It is good for people working in town.
- It is already dense, and is not aesthetically pleasing in its current state.
- It is close to the main infrastructure and has access to amenities. It is already mixed-use and high density.

**What are the potential negative impacts of adding units to this subarea?**

- Noise and pollution due to heavy traffic. It should not create a “canyon” down Broadway with huge, tall housing complexes.
- An increase in traffic
- There is some instability with the soil. It is right of a major thoroughfare.
- There may be some issues with access to public roadways (it is difficult to move many cars on/off highways). It would narrow the wildlife corridor. There are runoff issues and impervious surfaces.
- The current zoning generally precludes residential.
- It would impact the wildlife corridor
- Traffic considerations—it could be dangerous. It blocks wildlife connectivity to Karns Meadows.
- Increased traffic, wildlife implications (there may need to be mitigation near Flat Creek), and no on-street parking.
- There should be directional entry to busy roads with U-turn lands at red lights.
- There would be increased traffic.

---

**SUBAREA 4.2 NORTHERN HILLSIDE**

**To what degree do you support allowing Single-Family Housing in the Northern Hillside subarea?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
# of people	35	4	7	5	10	7	3	1	2	6	16

**To what degree do you support allowing Single Family Housing with an Accessory Residential Unit (more details) in the Northern Hillside subarea?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
# of people	32	5	5	8	8	7	2	2	4	4	20

**To what degree do you support allowing Duplex Single Family housing in the Northern Hillside subarea?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
# of people	22	3	6	5	6	7	4	1	3	6	31

**To what degree do you support allowing 3 Unit (1 Single-Family and 2 accessory residential units) housing (more details) in the Northern Hillside subarea?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
# of people	28	3	6	3	9	6	1	4	4	5	27

**To what degree do you support allowing 4 Unit Single-Family housing (more details) in the Northern Hillside subarea?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
# of people	25	3	6	3	4	3	4	3	6	6	32

**To what degree do you support allowing 4 Unit Multi-Family housing (more details) in the Northern Hillside subarea?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
# of people	24	2	6	1	6	3	4	2	5	4	37

**To what degree do you support allowing 6 Unit Multi-Family housing (more details) in the Northern Hillside subarea?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
# of people	21	3	4	2	5	4	2	0	7	7	37

**To what degree do you support allowing 8 Unit Multi-Family housing (more details) in the Northern Hillside subarea?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
# of people	22	3	5	1	5	2	3	1	7	5	40

**To what degree do you support allowing 8-Unit Tiny House developments (more details) in the Northern Hillside subarea?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
# of people	20	5	4	6	3	6	2	3	3	6	34

**What types of housing units do you support adding in this area?**

- 1-3 units
- 1-3 units (Gamble post-slide)
- Close to 22. There is a potential for multi-family.
- Town houses, condos (west), single family, duplexes (Budge Drive), or mixed use (e.g., behind Cutty's).
- East side can accommodate more density. Further west, have 1-2-unit housing and only do redevelopment.
- This is a possible good spot for more or larger units, but avoid "slide" problems (make sure there are good engineers). There are issues with wildlife crossings (lots of deer on the hill), but there are no real "line of sight issues" because it blends in with the hill. Therefore, buildings could be taller.
- Residential on either side of Highway 22.
- High density, wildlife sensitive development
- Why are 4.1 and 4.3 considered separately?
- 5-6 story buildings, or 8-12 complexes up to 80 apartment units. Put residential over commercial along Highway 22. In 2-3 bedroom units, there are often many different people (not one family) and each individual needs a car to get to work. If we reduce the amount of parking, we need to give them more options.
- Tiny homes, any single units of the first two rows, and mixed use.

- Limit multi-family to 3 units.
- 16 units (on Lou Clark's old land). The lower one is deed restricted. There should be few other houses, if any, because it is in a slide area; most of it is already private housing.

**Which parking alternative best fits your vision for this subarea?**

63% of people	Ensure there is plenty of parking on every property so parking is always available with minimal need for public funds to build or manage parking
4% of people	Ensure there is a lot of parking on-street and in public parking lots and structures so parking is always available nearby and more housing can be built
23% of people	Let the free market determine how much parking is available and where it is located so more housing can be built with minimal need for public funds to build or manage parking
10% of people	Town will manage parking supply and demand by working with private sector to provide and price on-street and off-street parking

**Which parking alternative is appropriate in this subarea? Why?**

- A (it is remote)
- A or C
- A
- A. There are circulation concerns (pulling into traffic). On-site parking is needed, with one spot per worker. Reduced parking is not realistic because of the hillside and the highway as barriers.
- A (not widening roadways) with overnight winter parking.
- Developers should manage parking.
- Put in subterranean parking.
- Utilize existing parking (e.g., rental lots), and allow private developers. Perhaps a fee-in-lieu of parking.

**What characteristics of the Northern Hillside subarea would you most like to maintain (e.g., green space, accessory residential units, outdoor storage, accessory structures, uses, setbacks, etc.)?**

- Seems this area is troublesome for development. Density should not really increase much based on the limited space, access and dangers to the hillside.
- 40- to 100-unit apartment complexes.
- Traditional aesthetics, no beach houses or glass boxes
- There is very little buildable area on the hillside unless one or more existing lots are cleared. The area above the Budge Drive Slide is not buildable. If possible, two access paths (Budge Drive and another) should be maintained.
- Green space, setbacks
- Not suitable for housing
- Given landslides and the fact it is a southern hillside and critical wildlife habitat, build somewhere else for crying out loud.
- This area needs to be left alone due to fault line, hillside construction difficulties, and difficult and expensive access. Also, once you go up the hillside even 25-50' you add considerable visual disruption not to mention stress on wildlife that use the Butte Hillside in the winter. Any houses built for these slopes would be unaffordable by the requirements of construction.

- Green space
- The stability of the hill worries me. I am against any development which was create potential slide issues.
- Green space and migration corridors
- Green space, as most of this area is elevated and visible from around town.
- Green space. No development
- Green space and accessory structures
- No new single-family homes. Priority should be placed on wildlife green space between structures.
- Green space, living space over office space, and proper parking space on the land.
- Duh. You have got to be kidding me. No more landslides!
- Green spaces and setbacks for pedestrian/bike corridors
- Again, let's limit needs for cars so we can limit parking. Parking requirements for dense housing are too onerous.
- Open areas for wildlife movement.
- All
- I'm not sure it is a great idea to build in this area - if the slide doesn't hold, is the town out another \$20+ million? If the area has been shown not to be structurally sound in the past, I think that might be a good enough reason to keep it wild.
- Views to the hills behind
- I'm going to take space here to talk about the tiny house theory. I think they look terrible and we should stop employing them. Go up and bundle as appropriate but the tiny house thing escapes me. Looks like a shanty town/man camp and not Jackson Hole.
- Green space
- Hopefully, we have learned our lesson in this hillside area; there should be no added density except maybe tiny homes.
- I don't think the hillside should be built up. Steep slopes are not the place for development
- Don't overcrowd this area.
- I miss all the trees that were removed before Walgreens was built. The raw hillside – even worse now with the slide. Hopefully some restoration of green can be incorporated with the work that is being done.
- Green space, wildlife connectivity
- Green space and residential units
- Do not continue to build into the hillside; there is already too much traffic and congestion in this area. It is the main transportation route into town from the west and south, and we do not want another Budge Hill Slide!
- Green space
- Embrace the landslide factors in advance
- Keep it wildlife friendly.
- Wildlife compatibility
- Green space to decrease impact to winter wildlife
- Open space
- Wildlife habitat, winter range, scenery
- Protection of wildlife migration routes/habitat
- Single-family Homes
- There is not much space for adding a great deal of housing to this area and its proximity to the "Y" makes entrance and exit to this area somewhat dangerous.

- The area needs to be cleaned up. Mostly, development needs to be limited due to the instability of the hillside. The heavy equipment playground, trying to build a reinforcement wall will not stop the hill from sliding and the last thing that is needed is high density residential units in that area.
- Green space
- Green space. I don't think it is desirable to do any build-out there.
- Stability of the hillside can never be guaranteed, I can't support intensive development.
- Protect the open space that currently supports large numbers of wildlife, such as deer. Keep access to a minimum, allowing only one access road.
- none
- Ensure there is parking for all units onsite. This is critical to not increasing congestion in on street parking. I support multi-family but not when parking is limited.
- Leave some green space.
- Green spaces
- Save these south-facing slopes for wintering mule deer

**What characteristics of the Northern Hillside subarea would you most like to change or improve (e.g., green space, accessory residential units, outdoor storage, accessory structures, uses, setbacks, etc.)?**

- Landslide may affect density.
- Efficient solar-capturing design, solar farm parking lot for any large complexes
- None
- Green space, setbacks
- Not suitable for housing
- More attention to the poor creatures who have less and less space to winter.
- Green space
- Complete streets
- Taller buildings with more density.
- Keep green space, and add public access/park area for a great view of town and mountains (if ever possible).
- I'm not sure that this area is suitable for much increased development except for the redevelopment of the sites along 22 past the Y.
- Limits on vehicle ownership for anyone in low-cost housing.
- Outdoor storage
- Improve green space and wildlife corridors
- Keep it natural so it doesn't slide onto Broadway.
- This area is underutilized for housing.
- Green spaces & setbacks for pedestrian/bike corridors
- Older single-family residences could be redeveloped into higher-density, multi-family homes.
- Some
- I am comfortable with increased density, but access off of Highway 22 should be a significant concern and should be a controlling factor.
- I am surprised that the Town/County would want more development here after the disaster with Walgreens. This has really damaged local government's reputation. I also think this would make traffic on West Broadway much worse.
- Architectural design standards like Dynia development
- Did the town learn nothing from the landslide? This area should not be developed



- Any increase in density should be limited to workforce-occupancy, deed-restricted housing only.
- Green space, environmental protection of the hill side
- Setbacks
- I think the landslide has shown us what happens when you keep digging into a hillside.
- Wildlife areas, open space, dog-free housing
- Best place for vertical design.
- Increase density, reduce parking requirements, reduce setbacks, reduce green space requirements
- Fewer miscellaneous buildings; keep development away from geologic hazard areas
- This area has enough problems already so keeping construction, traffic and people to a minimum is the better way to go.
- Increase density, increase FAR, lower LSR and exempt basements.
- Single-family homes only
- I would like more care taken to study the geology of the area to make sure the hillsides are stable and can support additional buildings.
- Um, landslide??
- Keep development of the area to a minimum and maintain the wildlife corridor for the animals that pass through that area.
- Provide access via signalized intersection on Broadway. Minimize access, except right turn in; right turn out, on Hwy. 22.
- Green space
- Leave as is
- Seems like a good location for some density increase, given proximity to stores and public transport. But with the hillside, not too much.
- Stabilize the hill.
- Allow 90-unit, multi-family housing on hillsides. Require cultivatable green space on all roofs and otherwise discourage cars and parking. Implement high parking fees and only to those who have Teton County registered vehicle. Do not provide on-site parking. - Instead use this space for open green cultivatable space.
- Fewer dead mule deer on West Broadway

#### **Why is this a good place for additional housing units?**

- There is an empty space to fill
- Local to commerce. There is space for development and it may be less expensive.
- There is room for development, access to infrastructure services, and would help with “anti-sprawl”.
- Updating current housing stock is good. There is proximity to some services (although not currently easy access to these services).
- Large units would not obstruct views and could be designed to blend into the hillside. Land is available.
- It is undeveloped and close to services/transportation
- It is already commercial, and there is high traffic along Broadway.
- It is underutilized (same as 4.1), and there are lower development costs. There is denser development in the western portion of 4.2.
- The east end might be open to development (e.g., Johnson’s land could be duplexes, and the area behind Cutty’s could be mixed use).

**What are the potential negative impacts of adding units to this subarea?**

- They may have to drive to get up there; it is steep (potentially unstable) land.
- There is an unstable foundation (potential for landslides is high).
- Access and wildlife
- Circulation of entering traffic would be an issue. It would be a difficult area for pedestrian/bike access. It is on a hillside. There are long-term property owners there. Wildlife would be an issue.
- It is not well connected, and it encroaches on wildlife corridors. It is on a hillside so runoff and impervious surfaces is an issue.
- It is an important wildlife crossing.
- The topography is challenging, and it is a wildlife corridor.
- It is an unstable building environment.
- Public transportation access, and ingress/egress issues.
- Unstable topography
- The traffic circulation in and out of the area is a concern.

**SUBAREA 4.3: CENTRAL MIDTOWN**

**To what degree do you support allowing 4 Unit Single-Family housing in Central Midtown?**

Answer	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
# of people	39	7	5	10	14	6	2	1	2	2	9

**To what degree do you support allowing 4 Unit Multi-Family housing in Central Midtown?**

Answer	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
# of people	40	6	3	9	14	5	1	1	1	3	12

**To what degree do you support allowing 6 Unit Multi-Family housing in the Central Midtown?**

Answer	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
# of people	38	8	4	9	12	3	1	1	1	3	13

**To what degree do you support allowing 8 Unit Multi-Family housing in Central Midtown?**

Answer	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
# of people	38	8	4	7	11	1	1	2	2	4	15

**To what degree do you support allowing 8 Unit Tiny Housing in Central Midtown?**

Answer	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
# of people	26	4	3	5	11	3	1	3	2	3	28

**To what degree do you support allowing 40 Unit Multi-Family housing (more details) in Central Midtown?**

Answer	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
# of people	33	5	8	4	8	3	6	0	3	4	20

**To what degree do you support allowing 80 Unit Multi-Family/Commercial projects (more details) in Central Midtown?**

Answer	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
# of people											

# of people	26	5	6	3	4	6	2	1	4	4	31
-------------	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

**To what degree do you support allowing 90 Unit Multi-Family projects with surface parking (more details) in Central Midtown?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
# of people	19	5	2	6	4	5	1	0	5	7	37

**To what degree do you support allowing 90 Unit Multi-Family projects with underground parking (more details) in Central Midtown?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
# of people	33	4	7	3	6	1	0	0	5	4	31

**What types of housing units do you support adding in this area?**

- 40 plus unit housing and mixed use units
- High density apartments/condos, both rental and ownership, with an emphasis on workforce housing.
- Creative density and 40-80 unit buildings
- 8-40 units. This is a good area for more density, but would require displacing existing housing.
- A myriad of types. Square footage, duplexes, 4-plexes, and a few developments 40-acre.
- More density, and larger units than in 3.2. This is the best opportunity for 4 plus story buildings.
- Some mixed use, up to 4-story apartment complexes
- Larger units and tiny homes should be here. 8-90 unit apartments with high density.
- 12-20 multi-family units, with a hybrid of commercial and residential

**Which parking alternative best fits your vision for this subarea?**

51% of people	Ensure there is plenty of parking on every property so parking is always available with minimal need for public funds to build or manage parking
16% of people	Ensure there is a lot of parking on-street and in public parking lots and structures so parking is always available nearby and more housing can be built
18% of people	Let the free market determine how much parking is available and where it is located so more housing can be built with minimal need for public funds to build or manage parking
15% of people	Town will manage parking supply and demand by working with private sector to provide and price on-street and off-street parking

**Which parking alternative is appropriate in this subarea? Why?**

- C or D. Possible housing structures could develop more parking, and there should be shared parking.
- Put in shared parking options; make use of commercial lots for residential. Put in a reduced parking requirement, and encourage rideshare programs and public transportation.
- D. Install overnight, winter parking. Use neighborhood permitting. This area is also ideal for new parking structures.

- Encourage the market to determine parking (redevelopment parking), and install requirements to have one space per unit.
- Developers need to figure out parking.
- Winter, on-street parking needs to be mitigated and made year-round. In general, parking should be reduced.
- Have less parking requirements, more on-street parking, and a parking garage.
- C or D.

**What characteristics of Central Midtown would you most like to maintain (e.g., green space, accessory residential units, outdoor storage, accessory structures, uses, setbacks, etc.)? mixed use development.**

- Love the idea of mixed use in this area. Retail on the first floor, housing on the second floor. Bring back the PMUD zoning tool!!!
- Small businesses on lower levels, housing above
- This area is nearly 100% built up. If a sizable lot(s) become available (demolition of existing buildings) then a multi-family structure, similar to the Teton Village employee housing, might be built.
- Green space
- It's already so dense; teardowns would be the only option.
- Keep library, keep buffer to Karn's Meadow and allow for wildlife to move through it without adding any amenities to this open space.
- Outdoor space, better and more bike right of ways.
- Green space
- I don't support large housing units (more than 6 multi-family units). Too much density for my tastes.
- Uses, green space, and storage
- Mixed-use character
- Good area for dealerships, franchises, and department stores along with high density housing. Keep mom-and-pop retail stores in Town square area that add to the brand of Jackson.
- Green space, accessory residential units
- Mixed-use should be mandated. If you are going to have a new business you should be able to house all of your employees.
- Setbacks
- Green space, setbacks, and proper parking on the land.
- Walkability and proximity to stores and services. Green space, too.
- Green spaces & setbacks for pedestrian/bike corridors
- See previous answers
- Mixed commercial residential and civic uses (parks, library)
- Mix of living units with neighborhood amenities like restaurants, small grocery stores, barber shops.
- Please maintain that public park. We very nearly lost a good portion to the proposed dog park and as this area grows up and in-fills Powderhorn Park will be more important than ever
- Density is OK here, not very large, will impact community character, shadows on streets, to urban
- This could be urban high-density, shops, good walkways, bike paths, good bus system. Keep green areas.

- Bike paths, sidewalks
- Vibrant mixed-use development with easy access to shopping, services, and jobs.
- Green space, neighborhood scale
- The mix of businesses and housing, but keep housing units to smaller number—no big-number units.
- Walkability
- Housing density
- Do not build the ghettos of tomorrow.
- Keep the traffic moving.
- Green space
- The feel of the Crabtree nook
- Maintain commercial flavor, especially service/commercial-type uses
- None
- Bike paths
- Green space, Flat Creek
- Single and duplex Housing
- Mixed-use development.
- Don't allow developers to fill up blocks with rectangular housing blocks.
- I like the quiriness that Midtown is developing. There are some cool shops, restaurants, etc.
- If I wanted to live like this I would move to New York or L.A. Increased density of homes is not the answer- maintain open spaces!!
- Redundant access from all directions create opportunity for dense, multi-family housing. High density developments (40 - 90 units) should be developed in multiple buildings to maintain modest scale buildings.
- Slow traffic
- Maintain parks, sidewalks, trails, green space.
- None. This area is such a mix that it lacks a really strong identifying characteristic or personality to maintain.
- Max of two stories with plenty of parking. I am not supportive of limited parking. It is unrealistic.
- Low density, limiting growth

**What characteristics of Central Midtown would you most like to change or improve (e.g., green space, accessory residential units, outdoor storage, accessory structures, uses, setbacks, etc.)?**

- Surface parking kills the larger developments, but underground parking (or reduced parking requirements) makes these much better. Integrate high quality bike/pedestrian connections in all new development with the goal of providing complete links to adjacent areas of town.
- More bike/pedestrian access between and in and around developments.
- Affordable units for those without a car
- Green space
- Mix with denser housing in some parts, and lighter in others. If increasing to denser units of housing, have more parking under, also mix with commercial (staying within overall limits for commercial in Jackson).
- Outdoor space, better and more bike right of ways
- Green space

- Complete streets
- Incentivize mixed-use, below-grade parking, complete streets with connected sidewalks
- This is a good area of town for high-density units and department stores. Move industrial properties to Gregory Lane area.
- Parking - streets are usually crowded
- Reduce the need for street parking.
- Outdoor storage
- Get rid of McDonald's. Turn the Virg into housing neighborhood with green space.
- Green spaces & setbacks for pedestrian/bike corridors
- Redevelop old, run-down residential areas and strip malls.
- Provide for aggressive redevelopment of the current 'strip mall' development pattern!! Aggressively look to increase transparency of walking, biking, wildlife, and vehicles. Adjust the LSRs so that additional parking demands are not the controlling factor. The current zoning is far too 'suburban' in character.
- Bike paths
- I like the ideas of underground parking and leaving space for common area green space.
- Any expansion of density should be limited to workforce-occupancy, deed-restricted housing only.
- Green space
- Walkability
- Housing density
- Long-term livable conditions
- Allow smaller lot size to encourage residential redevelopment. Look into one-way streets to improve vehicle movement and build the Snow King Bypass.
- Green space
- Build on the County Fair lot
- Sidewalks
- Increase density, allow 4-story, reduce parking requirements, reduce setbacks, reduce green space requirements
- More green space, keep building heights low enough that views are not obstructed
- Create more housing in areas like this to get and keep more employees closer to work!
- Decrease parking requirements for commercial. Albertsons and K Mart are full on Christmas day when the stores are closed because they are private de facto public parking lots for START. At other times, they are seas of parking lots which are rarely full so are over parked. Increase density.
- Surface parking kills the larger developments, but underground parking (or reduced parking requirements) makes these much better. Integrate high quality bike/pedestrian connections in all new development with the goal of providing complete links to adjacent areas of town.
- I hope to see pocket parks or tree-filled landscapes in every neighborhood. Without them, we will accommodate more people than our town can manage comfortably.
- Too much space is used for parking. Not walkable enough. I like the idea of the 80-unit residential/commercial, but does it have to be surface parked? Can we do underground?
- Height restricted structures. People come to this town for the views, not to stare at the backside of a building.
- Walking, bicycling, ease of access to Garriman
- Maintain a family feeling to the area with trees, grass, and landscaping.

- This is an area that could accommodate some higher density development because it already has some of this in place.
- Good area for a density increase with proximity to transportation, stores, existing bike/pedestrian infrastructure. As for parking, I think a central, vertical parking structure here could work, such that the residential lots don't waste space on parking. Also, I'd like to see less parking provided - e.g. this could be a good place for carless housing options.
- Utilize this open space that isn't used for much.

**Why is this a good place for additional housing units?**

- It is near commercial areas and has access to grocery stores, etc. (within walking distance)
- Walkability, public transit, and other services are available.
- Proximity to Highway 22 and proximity to groceries. It is the best chance for development money, and it would not disrupt single family character.
- It cannot displace the library or bus barn. Is it possible to displace the mobile home park?
- Access to groceries, TLLIB, post office, START, parks, pathways.
- It is walkable, close to jobs, in a central location, and close to transportation. Density is alright, but in exchange for density the town and county should mandate/incentivize low-impact/high-efficiency development.
- The area has access to mass transit and is walkable. Greenspace is present, and the density already exists.
- High density already exists here, so the infrastructure is in place, and there is access to public transportation.

**What are the potential negative impacts of adding units to this subarea?**

- Traffic could be introduced to 89/Broadway/Scott, etc.
- Be careful not to overbuild. There was a divided perspective in the group: some want height restrictions (less than 3-stories), and some welcomed height (especially in this area).
- There are runoff and impervious surface issues. The community bears the burden for the storm water treatment costs. It would increase traffic, and there is a lack of connectivity to the downtown area.
- It adds traffic to Broadway and Snow King, and. 80-unit buildings would create a significant character change.
- There would be a change in community character, and increased traffic issues.
- It may infringe on green space.

---

SUBAREA 5.1: WEST JACKSON HIGHWAY CORRIDOR

**To what degree do you support allowing 4 Unit Single-Family housing in the West Jackson Highway Corridor?**

Answer	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
# of people	27	3	9	8	4	9	3	0	0	6	16

**To what degree do you support allowing 4 Unit Multi-Family housing in the West Jackson Highway Corridor?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
# of people	24	4	10	9	7	7	3	1	0	4	16

**To what degree do you support allowing 6 Unit Multi-Family housing (more details) in the West Jackson Highway Corridor?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
# of people	24	2	8	8	8	6	4	0	1	4	19

**To what degree do you support allowing 8 Unit Multi-Family housing (more details) in the West Jackson Highway Corridor?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
# of people	25	3	9	7	5	7	3	4	0	4	17

**To what degree do you support allowing 8 Unit tiny housing (more details) in the West Jackson Highway Corridor?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
# of people	19	3	1	6	4	7	5	1	2	3	30

**To what degree do you support allowing 40 Unit Multi-Family housing (more details) in the West Jackson Highway Corridor?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
# of people	26	3	5	3	5	5	1	3	3	4	23

**To what degree do you support allowing 80 Unit Multi-Family/Commercial projects (more details) in the West Jackson Highway Corridor?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
# of people	25	4	4	3	5	5	3	1	2	5	28

**To what degree do you support allowing 90 Unit Multi-Family projects with surface parking (more details) in the West Jackson Highway Corridor?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
# of people	15	5	3	3	6	5	1	0	2	5	37

**To what degree do you support allowing 90 Unit Multi-Family projects with underground parking (more details) in the West Jackson Highway Corridor?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
# of people	26	3	5	2	5	4	1	0	2	4	31

**What types of housing units do you support adding in this area?**

- Dense housing units, up to 3 stories, with 40 units or more (if possible)
- 40 plus unit housing and mixed used/commercial blend units.
- Multi-family, 90-unit buildings in the lot off Stellaria Lane.
- Mixed use apartments (if developed for livability, the area needs improvement). Eagle Village is a good model.



- Larger developments (20-40 units), and mixed used. This area needs commercial space, but housing could be added in the upper floors.
- Preserve commercial on either side of the Highway. Put housing behind the commercial area. Increase FAR/density for housing.
- This area is a continuation of 4.1. There should be mixed use housing (on top floors).
- This is the most appropriate area for 90-unit buildings. Look to Eagle Village as a model for bulk/scale.
- 20-80 units. This is a hub for out-of-town workforce.

**Which parking alternative best fits your vision for this subarea?**

55% of people	Ensure there is plenty of parking on every property so parking is always available with minimal need for public funds to build or manage parking
12% of people	Ensure there is a lot of parking on-street and in public parking lots and structures so parking is always available nearby and more housing can be built
22% of people	Let the free market determine how much parking is available and where it is located so more housing can be built with minimal need for public funds to build or manage parking
12% of people	Town will manage parking supply and demand by working with private sector to provide and price on-street and off-street parking

**Which parking alternative is appropriate in this subarea? Why?**

- C or A. We can get away with fewer cars because of the bus system. Parking is the developers' responsibility. The reality is that people own cars.
- Create a transportation hub, and have shared parking.
- A. The large parcel offers space for parking.
- While parking is needed, it is important to improve access to transit. Have one spot per worker, encourage underground parking, and look to Eagle Village as a model.
- B. Overnight winter parking, or park and ride. Not much on-street parking.
- Install a parking garage that allows one car per unit (or make it consistent with existing regulations). Add a bus stop or two (increase START).
- A parking deck is possible here.

**What characteristics of the West Jackson Highway Corridor would you most like to maintain (e.g., green space, accessory residential units, outdoor storage, accessory structures, uses, setbacks, etc.)?**

- This area should maintain a healthy supply of commercial uses versus residential, unless the residential project was very high density. Bring back the PMUD.
- Get rid of all the junk down there. It's an eyesore! Stop light at the whole food store and Stellaria lane. Manage parking along the access roads.
- More visible, better bike access, and right of ways over traffic - also wildlife protections where needed.
- Affordability
- Again, this area is nearly totally built up. As before, if land became available then mixed use, housing over business, may make development sense to a market forces developer. Zoning and Building regulations would have to be streamlined to make development for rental use attractive.
- Green space

- Strictly commercial
- Keep buffers to Flat Creek!
- I feel if we allow larger multifamily units (exceeding 6 units) we destroy the character of a residential community.
- Uses, green space, and storage
- Screening from adjacent neighborhoods. Green space
- Keep area focused on commercial business. Encourage national brand stores to stay in this south part of town to differentiate new town from old town Jackson.
- Increase green space
- Setbacks
- This area should all be living space over offices! Every new business built should include a space to house at least 50% of their employees. If they have employees that already have housing they can rent out those spaces.
- Mixed-use, housing with commercial. Some green space is needed.
- Green spaces & setbacks for pedestrian/bike corridors
- Not a good place for families to live since the highway is too busy. Keep commercial.
- No place for residential, except mixed-use. Need room for commercial.
- Bike paths, green space, sidewalks
- Vibrant mixed-use development.
- Flat Creek corridor and the bike path is nice. If the view of the hillside can be preserved, it should.
- Keep the larger number of units outside of Jackson.
- Bus line
- Commercial and industrial area
- Safety of people and animals
- Bike lanes
- Bike path
- Some green space in this transition area should stay.
- Single and duplex housing
- Mixed-use
- The assets of this neighborhood are Flat Creek and the small businesses. Flat Creek lends it beauty; at the same time, it is in danger of flooding in the spring. Overbuilding here would be a big mistake.
- Buffers around Flat Creek and green space. Pathways.
- Height restricted buildings with a minimum of 100 -oot setback from Flat Creek should be maintained. In addition, light and noise pollution will need to be addressed to assist the residents in the adjacent area. Green space has to be maintained due to the numerous animals that reside in the area.
- Commercial development opportunities fronting street with residential opportunities in rear
- Mixed-used construction.
- This is a commercial zone and it should mostly stay that way, leaving residential development to other areas off the highway (the hillside, midtown). I would be in favor of a few dense, large apartment complexes, but not smaller duplex, quad-plex etc.
- Need to keep housing to two stories and two cars per unit parking.

**What characteristics of the West Jackson Highway Corridor would you most like to change or improve (e.g., green space, accessory residential units, outdoor storage, accessory structures, uses, setbacks, etc.)?**

- Bring back the PMUD.
- More trees, better treatment of the highway and access road. And a sidewalk that's not a snow storage zone in winter. WYDOT really needs to step it up in this area of town.
- Bike access and visibility, wildlife attention
- Needs more trees and less business signs.
- Commercial updates
- Larger housing units could work here if elongated and can take advantage of views over Flat Creek, but need to be set back from creek. Mixed commercial/housing as is already in area (I think) also suits as is already partially commercial. But again, don't add to overall commercial total of town!
- Green space
- Complete streets
- Screening from adjacent neighborhoods. Green space
- Redevelop to include mixed-use, remove parking lots along the highway, connected sidewalks
- Less to no residential.
- Hide all parking to underground structures. Limit how many vehicles any low-cost home owner can have.
- Outdoor storage
- This area should all be living space over offices! Every new business built should include a space to house at least 50% of their employees. If they have employees that already have housing they can rent out those spaces.
- Less sprawl, more residential.
- Green spaces & setbacks for pedestrian/bike corridors
- Provide for aggressive redevelopment of the current 'strip mall' development pattern! Aggressively look to increase transparency of walking, biking, wildlife, and vehicles. Adjust the LSRs so that additional parking demands are not the controlling factor. The current zoning is far too 'suburban' in character.
- Screening, bike paths
- Green space along highway, parking hidden if possible
- Needs sidewalks and bike access
- It looks too industrial with little character - exceptions being Car Corner, JH Foods, and new Prugh development.
- Bike paths, green space, sidewalks
- Any increase in density should be limited to workforce occupancy deed restricted housing only.
- Green space
- It would be nice to move the ugly car dealership out of town. Access to Jackson Whole Grocer is difficult for bicyclists and merging or crossing the road is difficult for all users.
- The character of Jackson Hole is ruined by large apartment houses. Crime breeds in large apartment complexes
- Annex the Porter Ranch around the High School for multi-family housing.
- Put a bus stop at the new Post Office
- Increase density, allow 4 story, reduce setbacks, reduce green space requirements
- Buffers/setbacks/mitigation for development done along Flat Creek

- Increase density and allow more ARUs on single family lots.
- Surface parking kills the larger developments, but underground parking (or reduced parking requirements) makes these much better. Integrate high quality bike/pedestrian connections in all new development with the goal of providing complete links to adjacent areas of town. Improve the street frontage with better bike/pedestrian access. Use the right of way not for frontage roads but for better interfaces with buildings and for better bike/pedestrian facilities. Increase density and shorten walking distance between buildings (i.e. put the parking in back so you don't have to walk across a giant parking lot to get to the building from the street).
- This subarea lies along an earthquake fracture. Allowing heavy density--either commercial or residential--would be a terrible mistake.
- Again, if adding big apartment buildings, underground parking is preferred. Will need better transit if we add this much density. Big apartment buildings should be restricted to workforce (this goes for all of my answers).
- The Town needs to get on board with WYDOT to maintain parking restrictions adjacent to the highway and planning of traffic lights. Controlled access points need to be addressed.
- More cohesive design character
- Reduce traffic entry points. Add pedestrian & cycling crosswalks. Potentially allow for 4-story construction
- Currently this area is primarily commercial. Adding any green space, walkways, parks would improve this space.
- I'd like to see redevelopment here, away from the strip-malls and parking lots in the front of businesses.
- Require cultivatable green space on all roofs and otherwise discourage cars and parking. Implement high parking fees and only to those who have Teton County registered vehicle. Do not provide on-site parking. Instead use this space for open green cultivatable space.

#### **Why is this a good place for additional housing units?**

- There is access to transportation to get to jobs, and it is close to services. It is not a conservation area, and it is under-developed. It is a more "industrial" area, away from tourists, and does not have a distinct community character.
- It is near commercial outlets and access to groceries, etc.
- It is a 4-acre lot, close to the creek, off the highway, close to schools, shopping, pathways, etc. It could revitalize businesses in the area. It has access to public transit.
- There is the potential for improvement, and services are available.
- This is an opportunity to build up and increase FAR.
- It is already developed for density. The infrastructure and access make this area good for development.

#### **What are the potential negative impacts of adding units to this subarea?**

- There would be an increase in traffic to an area that already has a lot of traffic. There would not be a "residential feel" if the area only has high-density housing and businesses.
- There could potentially be more traffic at 87 and Broadway, Scott, etc. It is far from the square and village.

- It would increase traffic loads. It is not “residentially friendly” in its current state. There is not great walkability.
- It is close to the loud highway, and there is poor walkability (it needs “friendlier” sidewalks). Commercial may be a better fit.
- There are issues with runoff and impervious surfaces, and it is difficult to access public roadways.
- It would increase traffic.

---

SUBAREA 5.3 HIGH SCHOOL BUTTE

**To what degree do you support allowing Single Family Housing with an Accessory Residential Unit (more details) in the High School Butte subarea?**

Answer	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
# of people	33	8	9	4	7	4	1	1	0	5	11

**To what degree do you support allowing Duplex Single Family housing in the High School Butte subarea?**

Answer	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
# of people	31	8	13	5	6	5	1	0	0	2	10

**To what degree do you support allowing 3 Unit Single-Family housing in the High School Butte subarea?**

Answer	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
# of people	30	7	10	3	12	4	1	0	1	1	14

**To what degree do you support allowing 3 Unit (1 Single-Family and 2 accessory residential units) housing (more details) in the High School Butte subarea?**

Answer	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
# of people	23	4	11	4	10	1	3	2	3	1	17

**To what degree do you support allowing 4 Unit Single-Family housing in the High School Butte subarea?**

Answer	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
# of people	29	7	11	0	12	3	2	1	2	0	17

**To what degree do you support allowing 4 Unit Multi-Family housing in the High School Butte subarea?**

Answer	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
# of people	27	5	8	4	12	3	0	4	2	3	15

**To what degree do you support allowing 6 Unit Multi-Family housing (in the High School Butte subarea?**

Answer	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
# of people	25	4	6	7	7	5	2	2	2	2	20

**To what degree do you support allowing 8 Unit Multi-Family housing in the High School Butte subarea?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
# of people	24	5	9	6	7	5	0	2	4	3	18

**To what degree do you support allowing 8-Unit Tiny House developments in the High School Butte subarea?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
# of people	21	5	4	2	5	7	3	2	0	5	24

**To what degree do you support allowing 40 Unit Multi-Family housing (more details) in the High School Butte subarea?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
# of people	23	4	1	3	3	3	2	2	3	6	30

**What types of housing units do you support adding in this area?**

- 4-unit single family (with parking underneath). Every lot should/could have 2 units
- 20-90 units, and commercial/mixed use units
- Multi-family and multi-level buildings and sunlit basement units.
- Duplexes, workforce housing (deed restricted). Taller buildings are appropriate in this area.
- 40-80 units. Increase density here.
- 40-unit buildings; potentially have 4 stories with parking on level 1. Gregory Lane should also be considered for this plan.
- It is too tight, and there are too many conflicts (specifically around the school zone). Stay away from this area.
- This area is rezoned for higher density housing. Take advantage of grade when building.
- This area is less critical than others.
- It is possible to have 40-80 units here. This is the best area for dense development.

**Which parking alternative best fits your vision for this subarea?**

55% of people	Ensure there is plenty of parking on every property so parking is always available with minimal need for public funds to build or manage parking
10% of people	Let the free market determine how much parking is available and where it is located so more housing can be built with minimal need for public funds to build or manage parking
18% of people	Town will manage parking supply and demand by working with private sector to provide and price on-street and off-street parking
16% of people	Ensure there is a lot of parking on-street and in public parking lots and structures so parking is always available nearby and more housing can be built

**Which parking alternative is appropriate in this subarea? Why?**

- A. Put parking underneath units.
- Mixed community/housing parking.
- C or A.
- Have one spot per worker or less.

- A. Overnight winter parking.
- A or B. Less parking with disincentives for having too many cars. B is to have mandated “adequate” parking per current code.

**What characteristics of the High School Butte subarea would you most like to maintain (e.g., green space, accessory residential units, outdoor storage, accessory structures, uses, setbacks, etc.)?**

- Cottonwood trees
- Suburban look, green, open space
- Maintain the traditional (single-family house) feel of the area. This might include ARU's depending on the location and nearby structures.
- Green space
- Keep low profile of buildings around base of Butte.
- Green space
- Green space and storage
- Industrial area
- Great location for families with children, green space, accessory residential units
- Improve green space
- Setbacks
- This area should all be living space over offices! Every new business built should include a space to house at least 50% of their employees. If they have employees that already have housing they can rent out those spaces.
- Denser housing
- Green spaces & setbacks for pedestrian/bike corridors
- Screening, bike paths
- Residential housing because it is close to schools
- Green space and wildlife access
- Good place for density near schools, out of site, good connectivity
- There is a wonderful mix of odd stuff here--it's character is unique in Jackson. The biggest conflict is the herd of mule deer that come off the hill to eat hay provided to horses in the area.
- Access to HSB trailhead
- Green space and setbacks; the area has a lot of traffic and too much housing will either add to congestion or create the need to spend more money on adding infrastructure to support it.
- Bus line
- Trees
- Green space
- This area needs a face lift. Increasing density would hopefully help.
- This area is grossly under-developed.
- Single and duplex housing
- Bus line
- More density
- Sidewalks
- Increase density. This is next to schools and supermarkets and is the appropriate place for significant up-zoning and multi-family large apartment complexes which are inherently workforce housing, even without deed restrictions, i.e., Blair place.
- Better bike/pedestrian connection along South Park Loop and to school campuses.

- This area is wonderful for low-income family housing, but special concern should be given to sidewalks for children to walk to school and to the grocery store.
- Setbacks from the roadway and schools need to be increased.
- Walkways offer easy access to schools for young people. Use low-rise construction to maintain views. Setbacks for cycling and views
- Keep the large trees.
- This area is in need of significant redevelopment.
- Low density to limit population growth

**What characteristics of the High School Butte subarea would you most like to change or improve (e.g., green space, accessory residential units, outdoor storage, accessory structures, uses, setbacks, etc.)?**

- Require underground parking for large developments and incentives for solar energy development.
- How will you control rent on these accessory units?
- Green space
- More family housing near the school makes sense - not fancy as could use the amenities already in the area. Also it is near shopping, etc. already. Apartment building units seem too small for families, otherwise a single larger number of unit would make sense.
- Green space
- Outdoor storage, setbacks, street and sidewalk improvements
- Complete streets
- I would like to remove residential in this area and focus on industry.
- Get rid of the ugly trailer parks
- Outdoor storage
- This area should all be living space over offices! Every new business built should include a space to house at least 50% of their employees. If they have employees that already have housing they can rent out those spaces.
- Fix Gregory Lane so people can walk/bike safely to schools, services, stores.
- Green spaces & setbacks for pedestrian/bike corridors
- I like green space. Distance from South Park Loop Road to housing is safer for kids.
- Any increase in density should be limited to workforce-occupancy, deed-restricted housing only.
- Some provision should be given to playgrounds, soccer fields, and other areas for creating community.
- I think it is fine the way it is.
- More cohesive design character.
- Could be a place for slightly higher building regulations because it is lower ground, but not over three-stories high.
- This is prime for density and redevelopment. Also, since it is against the Butte and low on the south side of the road, significant height could be allowed here, giving a boost to density without the impact of looking/feeling big. This topography is part of what allows me to support a big 40-unit development. Of course, it also offers good accessibility to stores, transport, etc.
- Require cultivatable green space on all roofs and otherwise discourage cars and parking. Implement high parking fees and only to those who have Teton County registered vehicle. Do not provide on-site parking. Instead use this space for open green cultivatable space.



**Why is this a good place for additional housing units?**

- There are small lots, and development would not block views because it is up against butte.
- It is not conducive for single unit buildings, and it is close to schools.
- It has great access to schools, shops, and START, and the walkability is high.
- Residential is appropriate close to schools, parks, and fields.
- It is near Smith's, pathways, and strip clubs.
- It is close to schools, near existing density, does not obstruct views, and the traffic is not bad there.
- It is close to schools, and services are nearby.

**What are the potential negative impacts of adding units to this subarea?**

- Development would add to school-hour traffic and would increase noise/activity in that area. It is not as close to services and jobs.
- There may be increased congestion if there are too many cars/units, and entry at egresses may be an issue.
- There are constricted sites leading to parking problems, and it would be important to monitor the number of curb cuts. There may also be issues with emergency access.
- Pedestrian improvements are needed (integrated with the existing). There may be potential wildlife issues.
- There are issues related to runoff and impervious surfaces, and there is poor connectivity to the downtown core.
- There is natural water there.
- It is important there are more surface traffic options for egress or entry.

**Any other comments related to Transitional Neighborhoods?**

- How will you keep rent remotely reasonable for the entrepreneurs and so forth? Probably need to rethink your rent control/lack of control.
- Most of the areas discussed are heavily developed. Some buildings (trailers or pre-fabs) might be replaced with traditional housing with some allowance for ARU's.
- Let sleeping dogs lie.
- Many of these are currently commercial areas. Not sure where these services will go? Some are providing important services and a mixed-use neighborhood would seem to accommodate added residential as well as continuation of businesses. While encouraging commercial to remain, I do not support more commercial overall in Jackson! There is too much already and it leads to more housing demand. We will never keep up. Adding housing density where there are already open space features to ameliorate tighter living conditions is good, but compromising the wildlife and stream quality values is not. These areas need buffers!
- I think every effort should be made to remove residential from this area.
- Clean up the properties in this area because they are eye sores.
- Living space over office space is the way to go here.
- Green spaces & setbacks for pedestrian/bike corridors
- I like neighborhoods to be safe for people living there, best to separate large commercial from residential. I love the idea of work area/commercial first floor, living space above.
- Keep some architectural distinction and character in all these areas, especially on the primary roads that lead into town – keep them interesting!
- New density should be focused into the urban core with easy walkable access to shopping, services, and jobs. Density should taper off with distance from the core commercial corridor. We don't need any new free market housing or commercial.

- Single family without additional ARU
- Stand up to the NIMBYS
- It does not seem like anyone can redevelop with RB zoning. Maybe CR-2 or UR?
- I think any neighborhood can accommodate varying types of housing, provided they are properly designed.
- It is my belief that the more housing we can get built the better!
- If we want housing to be built, we need density or we will not get more units and be left with single family dwellings.
- Every neighborhood needs lawn areas or focal features that bring people together.
- Any density added should somehow be restricted to local workforce. These are not luxury units for tourists. I'll leave it to the experts to decide how to ensure locals use the density we add. I understand that it becomes difficult for developers when we require restrictions. Are there ways to lessen the cost of building? I have heard our building code makes things very expensive here. Can we provide more flexibility?
- Of everything that has been proposed I am most appalled at the ARU suggestions. This is not allowed in my neighborhood but you have now planted the seed that it is okay. Higher density housing is only going to make things more congested and brings on a different set of problems.
- When providing answers above that called for on-site parking, this answer does not indicate support for the current parking requirements. It simply means that the locations require reliance on on-site parking. Reducing existing parking requirements is appropriate in many instances.
- Architecture should be approved based on allowing greatest amount of open space, light, and minimizing personal automobile use.

**STABLE SUBAREAS**

**Which parking alternative best fits your vision for this subarea?**

59% of people	Ensure there is plenty of parking on every property so parking is always available with minimal need for public funds to build or manage parking
11% of people	Let the free market determine how much parking is available and where it is located so more housing can be built with minimal need for public funds to build or manage parking Ensure there is a lot of parking on-street and in public parking lots and structures so parking is always available nearby and more housing can be built
17% of people	Town will manage parking supply and demand by working with private sector to provide and price on-street and off-street parking Ensure there is a lot of parking on-street and in public parking lots and structures so parking is always available nearby and more housing can be built
13% of people	Ensure there is a lot of parking on-street and in public parking lots and structures so parking is always available nearby and more housing can be built

**SUBAREA 3.1: EAST JACKSON**

**What characteristics of East Jackson would you most like to maintain (e.g., green space, accessory residential units, outdoor storage, accessory structures, uses, setbacks, etc.)?**

- Green Space, setbacks, outdoor storage
- Green space, accessory residential units, and all the normal neighborhood stuff
- General grid design of the neighborhood, alleyways—I like my neighbors.
- Setbacks should remain ample, so that there can be parking space and room for trees to grow. There should be no more "complete streets," except maybe E Kelley if designed properly.
- Maintain the "single-family" house feel and look of the area.
- Setbacks
- The single-family character with gardens and yards makes this a pleasant neighborhood and adds tax value to the community as a whole. Parking seems to be sufficient at this time. Perhaps parking permits for residents would prevent overflow parking from nearby denser areas.
- Keep it a "residential" single-family community.
- Keep the current integrity of the street widths. Do not reduce the width. The Redmond Street renovation project was a disaster. Dangerous vehicle congestion in the summer and snow build-up from plowing in winter reduces the width by another 3' on each side. No bueno!!
- Single-family residential, with minimal multi-family units.
- Preserve historic character by modifying zoning setbacks.
- Single-family homes with yards and parking, accessory structures, outdoor storage—it looks like a great neighborhood.
- Green space and the wonder trees
- Leave it the way it is according to our rules. They are good and should not change.
- Green space, setbacks, accessory residential units, outdoor storage
- Keep floor area allowances the same. Setbacks off alleys should be 10' minimum. Accessory residential units should be limited to one detached or one attached.
- Green space
- Green space and setbacks for pedestrian/bike corridors
- Walkable neighborhoods, accessory residential units, some green space
- Front yards should be well-kept and outdoor storage should be out of sight
- Keep it green.
- Leave it like it is
- Quiet, single family small town, low density, low traffic, non-urban neighborhoods
- Lower housing density, and no accessory residential units
- Green space, single family, and no accessory residential units
- Limit 3 units per lot. No on-street parking in winter. Keep rodeo grounds. Keep height at 28'
- Reduced setbacks mean fewer nonconformities
- Move rodeo grounds and replace with housing
- The mix of townhouses and single-family dwellings has a good balance. Do not give up May Park, Phil Baux Park, or Mike Yokel Pk. and pay attention to the value added that they give to their neighborhoods.
- Small-scale building walls that face street
- Ease of access to Cache Creek and Elk Refuge. Low-rise construction.
- Family-safe neighborhood
- Maintain all green spaces & setbacks.
- Character and low density

- This is core residential - I like the open space it mostly offers, with some denser hubs on the main arteries with bus access (Kelly, Redmond, Hansen). Between the small amount of increased density, the more open lots with single-family creates a good mix in the neighborhood.
- Green space and single-family homes with at least two parking spaces on property.
- Keep the winter moratorium of parking on the street.
- green space (parks)
- Green spaces and setbacks

**What characteristics of East Jackson would you most like to change or improve (e.g., green space, accessory residential units, outdoor storage, accessory structures, uses, setbacks, etc.)?**

- It needs better sidewalks, parking enforcement, and START services.
- This area seems to be right next to transitional zoning. These areas should also be transitional with increased density.
- Get rid of the mobile homes and bizarre structures.
- No accessory residential units
- More accessory residential units, fewer setbacks (especially in alleys) more bike and pedestrian connectors between developments. The backside of Snow King via Cache Creek Drive is a great example. Emmanuel never completed the connection when he developed love ridge and his smaller project located downhill. Fewer single-family homes.
- Accessory residential units are appropriate if placed above a garage. Building aesthetics should be in good taste with consideration of neighbors and should not compromise limited views and encourage the building next door to be torn down (don't "box in" someone). Flat roofs allowed only with solar development incentive.
- Encourage as much off-street parking as possible. Allow accessory residential units if possible, especially if that would improve parking or improve the basic housing (replace trailers or dilapidated housing). There should be grant relief from Zoning and Building Codes to accommodate improvement.
- Setbacks
- Improve green space
- Outdoor structures must mirror the design of the residence. There should not be any junk or additional toys spread across yards and in public view.
- No accessory residential units
- Complete streets
- Complete streets and connected sidewalks
- Avoid multi-family units and businesses.
- Metal box houses with super small yards
- Remove all the ugly trailers and mobile homes in the area and allow for beautiful, revitalized structures to be put in.
- Street parking
- Leave it the way it is according to our rules. They are good and should not change.
- Convert church properties into something more useful.
- Keep open space around structures and limit footprint size. There should be more and better sidewalk connectivity.
- Green spaces and setbacks for pedestrian/bike corridors
- Walkable neighborhoods are important. Allow for a little more density and height.
- Continue to support the existing accessory residential unit options.

- Aggressively look to increase transparency of walking, biking, wildlife, and vehicles.
- Adjust the LSRs so that additional parking demands are not the controlling factor. The current zoning is far too 'suburban' in character.
- Front yards should be well kept, and outdoor storage should be out of sight.
- Maintain some green space, and outlaw second homes. Second homes are killing the neighborhoods.
- Remove street lights, and reduce START services to a less intrusive level.
- More bicycle and pedestrian, fewer cars.
- Less ARUs
- Accessory residential increase
- Get rid of on-street parking of RV trailers, boats etc.
- More accessory structures
- Reduce parking requirements, reduce setbacks, do not make sidewalks mandatory, and increase pedestrian connectivity (through block connections) where possible.
- Sidewalks, street lights with shades
- Lighted streets and sidewalks
- This area needs a big increase in ARUs which can only happen with a decrease in LSR and an increase in FAR and a decrease in parking.
- Way better sidewalks and bike connections, narrower streets, slower traffic, and sidewalks
- This area seems to be right next to transitional zoning. These areas should also be transitional with increased density.
- Residential neighborhoods; single-family or duplex type. This is family area.
- Keep accessory residential units.
- Green space, setbacks
- Accessory residential
- Trees
- No commercial uses.
- Green space and setbacks from street
- Green space - free street parking
- ARU's
- None
- Single-family homes
- ARU
- Single and duplex housing
- Green space, parks, and access to public lands
- Make certain that there are sufficient bike lanes and sidewalks so people can move around town with minimal auto use.
- I guess it's been decided that that only east Jackson is a "stable neighborhood"? You must be joking.
- Avoid the growing tendency to place living area on second level and front street with garage doors.
- Change the zoning to NO ARU's. NO PUD's as a development tool from Redmond and East.
- Accessory residential units that are consistent with character
- Limit outdoor storage.
- Get rid of the on-street boat, RV and trailer parking. There is no enforcement and it ruins the characteristics of the neighborhoods.

- Require cultivatable green space on all roofs and otherwise discourage cars and parking. Implement high parking fees and only to those who have Teton County registered vehicle. Do not provide on-site parking. Instead use this space for open green cultivatable space.
- Green spaces, setbacks, parking on streets

---

#### SUBAREA 3.4: MAY PARK AREA

#### **What characteristics of the May Park area would you most like to maintain (e.g., green space, accessory residential units, outdoor storage, accessory structures, uses, setbacks, etc.)?**

- Keep green space and parking as it is.
- All those things
- Building heights, green space on each property, smart parking design to maximize space
- Try to maintain a neighborhood environment, which means single family or apartment/townhouse neighborhood
- Setbacks
- Keep the current neighborhood characteristics by keeping it single-family residential. No multi-family and no ancillary add-on units.
- Green space
- Green space and trail access
- Increase green space.
- Green spaces and setbacks for pedestrian/bike corridors
- Green space, and keep walkable neighborhoods
- The existing high density is good and should be maintained and allowed in the future.
- Quiet, single family small town, low density, low traffic, non-urban neighborhood.
- Keep existing housing density.
- Green spaces, access to recreation areas, affordable housing, wildlife permeability
- More green spaces around rectangular buildings that are edges (built to sidewalk)
- Forest access – agree
- May Park is great.
- Family and small household
- Open space, setbacks
- Senior/disabled living space
- Trees
- Keep it as it is.
- Green space
- Allow 4-story buildings.
- Open space and low structures so views are available
- ARU
- Single and duplex housing
- I don't know this neighborhood at all, so I can't comment.
- Ease of access for seniors to senior center and May Park.
- Keep current green spaces, add more parks, walking areas, senior development areas.
- I like this neighborhood as is.
- Green space, single-family homes with at least two on-property parking spaces. Winter moratorium of parking on the street.
- Do not touch May Park

**What characteristics of May Park Area would you most like to change or improve (e.g., green space, accessory residential units, outdoor storage, accessory structures, uses, setbacks, etc.)?**

- Get rid of the mobile homes
- Please ticket all the cars and boats that park all summer along the east side of the park and in the garden parking area.
- Maintain character, fill in lots with single-family homes, improve alleyway aesthetics with one-way streets, allow tiny home accessory residential units.
- There is one LARGE, potentially developable space in this East Jackson area. The present or a future owner may eventually decide to build on it with a variety of housing that is SIMILAR to that to the north of Hansen and east of Rancher. If so, and if development plans promise reasonable housing, then zoning and building restrictions should be eased in exchange for such development.
- Setbacks
- Green space
- No accessory residential units
- Complete streets
- Better signage and usage of green space and trails. Focus on single family residential.
- Remove the retirement center zoning and encourage the relocation of retired persons from this area to more geographically comfortable parts of the country.
- Outdoor storage
- Sidewalks please! Why is there no connectivity from the senior center to Broadway along Rancher or Nelson Drive?
- Green space and setbacks for pedestrian/bike corridors
- Continue to support the existing accessory residential unit options.
- Provide for a dog park in May Park.
- Remove street lights. Reduce frequency of START service to lessen large bus intrusion.
- Raise building height, higher density, lower off-street parking requirements, and less green space on lots
- More street lighting, especially in winter.
- Ability to park near home
- Maintain single family, duplex or hi-plex
- Move all the cars that park in the ditch along Rancher, trailers too
- More development of May Park with benches, art, senior-friendly areas
- Access to equipment i.e. Phil Bavx or Mike Y.
- Single family with 2 ARVs per property; Parking – 3BR = 2 spaces, 2BR = 2 spaces, 1BR = 1 space, on site; Some zoning would have to be changed (SR = AR).
- BARs and CSRs setbacks need to be relaxed in some cases (zone by zone)
- Less ARUs
- Stop on-street parking for RV trailers, business vans, etc.
- Keep it natural
- Reduce parking, do not require sidewalks, reduce setbacks, and reduce green space requirements.
- Increase ARUs, decrease parking and LSR, and increase FAR to get density.
- Better sidewalks on Hansen
- I worry that second home owners are buying up East Jackson and May Park areas.
- Leave it alone
- Increased use of sidewalks and START bus.

- Could be an area to focus on senior development due to proximity of the Sr. Center.
- Limit outdoor storage.
- Eliminate RV, boat, and trailer street parking. They are unsightly and no one pays attention to the 72-hour limit.
- Require cultivatable green space on all roofs and otherwise discourage cars and parking. Implement high parking fees and only to those who have Teton County-registered vehicle. Do not provide on-site parking. Instead use this space for open green cultivatable space.

---

SUBAREA 4.4 MIDTOWN RESIDENTIAL

**Which parking alternative best fits your vision for this subarea?**

60% of people	Ensure there is plenty of parking on every property so parking is always available with minimal need for public funds to build or manage parking
18% of people	Let the free market determine how much parking is available and where it is located so more housing can be built with minimal need for public funds to build or manage parking
13% of people	Town will manage parking supply and demand by working with private sector to provide and price on-street and off-street parking
9% of people	Ensure there is a lot of parking on-street and in public parking lots and structures so parking is always available nearby and more housing can be built

**What characteristics of Midtown Residential would you most like to maintain (e.g., green space, accessory residential units, outdoor storage, accessory structures, uses, setbacks, etc.)?**

- Green space should be kept.
- Flat Creek
- Buffer Karns Meadow with smaller developments/single family instead of major developments such as the Sagebrush property.
- Maintain it as-is. The area is totally filled with single-family apartments and town houses.
- Green space
- Buffers to Flat Creek for wildlife are essential. Flooding of Flat Creek also requires setbacks. Bike trail and hiking access are already present, so leave it as it is.
- Green space
- Maintain green space and outdoor storage for existing residences.
- Green space and setbacks
- Residential units
- Increase green space.
- Accessory structures
- The mix of housing types is good. Smaller single-family lots keep these prices relatively affordable.
- Green spaces and setbacks for pedestrian/bike corridors
- The trees along Snow King drive are great, and the public access to trails on Snow King should be kept.
- Protect wildlife corridors. The Flat Creek zone is crucial habitat
- Maintain a mix of single-family and multi-family homes.
- Limit homes to two stories.



- Green spaces, access to recreation areas, affordable housing, wildlife permeability
- More green spaces around rectangular buildings that are edges (built to sidewalk)
- Forest access – agree
- Green space
- Accessory residential
- Keep it as it is.
- Green space and free street parking
- Single and Duplex Housing
- This poor area suffers from being cut off by surrounding commercial areas and dense traffic flow at peak times of day. People who live there like the Creek and some access to hiking trails on Snow King, but flooding is a big problem as far as I can tell.
- Keep respecting the Creek!
- Same as above.
- Setbacks, low-rise construction. Ease of access to forest land
- Formalize and maintain wildlife corridors.
- Maintain the residential neighborhood feel. Maintain wildlife space, Flat Creek as it is, setbacks, and lower density development.
- This area seems already fairly dense with the apartments and condos. I think that should be maintained, thus the status quo.
- Green spaces, architectural conformity Western design. Wildlife movement space.

**What characteristics of Midtown Residential would you most like to change or improve (e.g., green space, accessory residential units, outdoor storage, accessory structures, uses, setbacks, etc.)?**

- Reduce Creek setbacks from 50' to 25', if not even less.
- No accessory residential units
- Create better bike paths and access.
- There are too many parking lots. Let us park on the street all year. Do not add more parking garages. Both items are not mutually inclusive.
- Less pavement, more underground/covered parking, and create incentives to renters who have fewer vehicles.
- If a structure is slated for demolition and rebuilding, then take steps to have the developer build better parking and housing density (within limits).
- Green space
- Ensure outdoor storage structures mirror the design of the residences. No junk or toys allowed in yards in public view.
- Connected sidewalks and complete streets
- This is a good place to think about multi-unit residential or large-residential complexes.
- Outdoor storage
- Force more parking on-property for any new developments or building projects.
- Denser housing could be explored.
- Eventually, these older condominium projects will need to be rebuilt. Given the ownership issues, that will not be an easy task. What is the best way to incentivize condo owners to redevelop to higher densities?
- Continue to support the existing accessory residential unit options.
- Protect Flat Creek
- Less ARUs
- Increased accessory residential

- Allow residents along busy traffic corridors to install block walls for traffic noise mitigation.
- Pathway needs a safer connection to Snow King Ave bike lane.
- Increase density, allow 4-story buildings, reduce parking requirements, and reduce green space requirements.
- Increase density by increasing FAR, decreasing LSR and parking.
- Use buffers/setbacks/mitigation for development around Flat Creek.
- Better bike/pedestrian connections to the pathway and Snow King.
- Some attention should be given to relieving this area of heavy traffic and flooding in the spring.
- The density of Town Homes is good, but I'd like to see them better designed. We end up with large parking spaces and common spaces that aren't very useful for residents.
- Make sure that any new structures are at least 100 feet away from Flat Creek. You have to get the flooding problem figured out before you can allow building. This is another area that is a "stable neighborhood." Leave it alone.
- Addition of low-rise parking structure, perhaps on Post Office site
- Do not add residential growth.
- Require cultivatable green space on all roofs and otherwise discourage cars and parking. Implement high parking fees and only to those who have Teton County registered vehicle. Do not provide on-site parking. Instead use this space for open green cultivatable space.
- Extend pathway corridors

---

SUBAREA 5.5 WEST JACKSON RESIDENTIAL

**Which parking alternative best fits your vision for this subarea?**

64% of people	Ensure there is plenty of parking on every property so parking is always available with minimal need for public funds to build or manage parking
20% of people	Let the free market determine how much parking is available and where it is located so more housing can be built with minimal need for public funds to build or manage parking
12% of people	Town will manage parking supply and demand by working with private sector to provide and price on-street and off-street parking
5% of people	Ensure there is a lot of parking on-street and in public parking lots and structures so parking is always available nearby and more housing can be built

**What characteristics of West Jackson Residential would you most like to maintain (e.g., green space, accessory residential units, outdoor storage, accessory structures, uses, setbacks, etc.)?**

- Green Space and setbacks
- The neighborhood feel
- Pedestrian connectors
- Green space and mature trees
- Maintain it as is.
- Setbacks
- Keep the density with green areas and the access to schools.
- Green space
- It is okay the way it is.
- This area is well planned and balanced.

- This is a residential neighborhood, and a good place for families with kids.
- Maintain green space
- Green space and housing
- The blend of housing types/intensities is good.
- Green spaces and setbacks for pedestrian/bike corridors
- On-street parking does not work in a town where you cannot park overnight on the street from November to May. This is not a realistic option.
- There are an interesting mix of structures
- Bike paths, sidewalks, bus shelters
- Green space, single-family houses, low-speed limits on roads, and limited access
- CWP – Rangeview has setbacks on the Plat; CCRs in place already
- Keeping local green spaces that make their neighborhood so great
- Green space
- Accessory residential units
- Open space
- Green space
- Free street parking
- ARU
- Single and duplex housing
- Green spaces are nice. Do not widen roads or take out trees. It seems like a nice mix of housing and apartments.
- Low-rise construction, green space, bike pathways, and pedestrian access
- Maintain rental apartments.
- The suburban feel - setbacks and green space as is
- No change

**What characteristics of West Jackson Residential would you most like to change or improve (e.g., green space, accessory residential units, outdoor storage, accessory structures, uses, setbacks, etc.)?**

- Maybe add more ADUs
- The lack of sidewalks, poor use of open space, and lack of accessory residential units. Also, it is important to factor in the Indian Trails connector.
- Xeriscaping, solar development, wildlife corridors, green developments, affordable and energy efficient buildings
- None
- Setbacks
- Green space
- Complete streets
- Yards can be limited, outdoor storage is limited, and there are super small, shared driveways
- Outdoor storage
- Finish the Tribal Trail Road to connect to Highway 22 in a manner that is safe for the neighborhood.
- Since this area is virtually all enabled by PUD development, it is not clear how it can be changed, but more sidewalks would be a great improvement.
- Green spaces and setbacks for pedestrian/bike corridors
- Continue to support the existing accessory residential unit options, if any.
- It is okay as it is.

- Bike paths, sidewalks, bus shelters
- Restrict multi-unit development
- Wide Whitehouse Ln south of Boyles Hill is too narrow with on-street parking.
- Change CCRs and allow ARV
- Bus lines
- Increased accessory residential units
- Outdoor storage
- Keep it local.
- Allow 3-story buildings, increase density, allow accessory structures, reduce parking requirements, and do not require sidewalks.
- Increase density by increasing FAR, decreasing LSR and parking and encouraging multiple ARUs.
- A prime example of poor planning of high density housing with the new homes west of Seneca Lane. The town created its own parking problems!
- Good place for rental apartments. Leave it as-is.
- None

---

**SUBAREA 6.1: LOW TO MEDIUM DENSITY NEIGHBORHOODS**

**Which parking alternative best fits your vision for this subarea?**

64% of people	Ensure there is plenty of parking on every property so parking is always available with minimal need for public funds to build or manage parking
22% of people	Let the free market determine how much parking is available and where it is located so more housing can be built with minimal need for public funds to build or manage parking
7% of people	Ensure there is a lot of parking on-street and in public parking lots and structures so parking is always available nearby and more housing can be built
7% of people	Town will manage parking supply and demand by working with private sector to provide and price on-street and off-street parking

**What characteristics of the Low to Medium Density Neighborhoods subarea would you most like to maintain (e.g., green space, accessory residential units, outdoor storage, accessory structures, uses, setbacks, etc.)?**

- Allow accessory residential units to remain.
- Keep the old houses. There should be no big two-story homes on small lots, because these huge boxes on tiny lots are ruining this neighborhood.
- Keep the neighborhood feel and add more accessory residential units.
- Single-family with possible accessory residential units above a garage would be preferred
- Maintain it as is.
- Green space and setbacks
- Green space and migration corridors
- Green space and low density
- Open space
- Greenspace, accessory structures, and residential units
- Keep it the same.
- Maintain green space.
- Increase the lot size and outlaw second homes.

- Green space, low density, low intensity, small town, non-urbanized, dark sky, peaceful neighborhood
- Keep existing housing density. No density increase and no accessory residential units
- Green space
- Accessory residential units
- Keep them low density.
- Green space and free street parking
- None
- ARU
- Single and duplex housing
- Not sure
- This area need to protected from the high-density developments that can occur short distances away. Flat Creek's green space and animal corridor must be protected as well. The fact that they are single-family residences must be protected.
- Maintain single-family street fronts.
- Green space
- It is full and developed. Leave it as residential like it is.
- Maintain these areas as they are.
- Setbacks and green space - the openness, lack of density in these areas
- Protect waterways
- No change

**What characteristics of Low to Medium Density Neighborhoods subarea would you most like to change or improve (e.g., green space, accessory residential units, outdoor storage, accessory structures, uses, setbacks, etc.)?**

- Encourage basements and single-story homes.
- The hideous two-story homes that take up the whole lot (overshadowing neighboring homes) and replicate each other without any architectural creativity are terrible. Leave some yard space. Try to keep that from happening through zoning. There will be row houses in there soon.
- There is a total lack of bike/pedestrian access. Why not just put a gate up at each of these communities and privatize them?
- Nothing
- Green space
- No accessory residential units
- Allow outdoor storage only if it has a foundation and conforms to the exterior of the existing construction.
- Keep green space as much as possible.
- Accessory residential units
- Remove or update properties with mobile homes or trailers.
- Outdoor storage
- Keep it the same.
- Develop denser housing in Indian Trails.
- Green spaces and setbacks for pedestrian/bike corridors
- Continue to support the existing accessory residential unit options.
- The START Bus should not traverse these neighborhoods. Remove accessory residential units. Remove street lighting. Remove truck/bus route designation.
- Increase the quality of housing stock.

- Less ARUs.
- Increase accessory residential units.
- Don't allow more density.
- One ARU should be allowed. I realize this can be affected by CC&R's, not just zoning.
- Increase density, do not require sidewalks, increase pedestrian through block access, reduce parking requirements, and allow accessory residential.
- Increase density by increasing LSR.
- Protect for wildlife.
- ARU's will not be allowed. Setbacks from Flat Creek need to be increased and height restrictions on structures need to be in place.
- Less outdoor storage.
- Protect wildlife corridors through these areas
- Develop the fairgrounds for residential and move the fairgrounds to south of town.
- No change

---

SUBAREA 6.2 UPPER CACHE

**Which parking alternative best fits your vision for this subarea?**

67% of people	Ensure there is plenty of parking on every property so parking is always available with minimal need for public funds to build or manage parking
20% of people	Let the free market determine how much parking is available and where it is located so more housing can be built with minimal need for public funds to build or manage parking
7% of people	Town will manage parking supply and demand by working with private sector to provide and price on-street and off-street parking
6% of people	Ensure there is a lot of parking on-street and in public parking lots and structures so parking is always available nearby and more housing can be built

**What characteristics of the Upper Cache subarea would you most like to maintain (e.g., green space, accessory residential units, outdoor storage, accessory structures, uses, setbacks, etc.)?**

- Allow accessory residential units to remain.
- Maintain existing characteristics, and maintain rural feeling
- Green space, opens space for wildlife to live and move around
- Access to trails
- This area is nearly platted for single-family homes. Many are vacant and a few are actively up for sale. There are a few that may be platted for larger lot sizes that may make sense to down-zone to build extra single-family homes. The hillside nature of many lots makes building difficult and expensive.
- Setbacks
- This area needs to remain open due to wildlife pressures already.
- Green space
- Leave it alone. Keep the green space and setbacks
- Green space, migration corridors
- Green space, accessory residential units and structures, outdoor storage
- Keep equestrian use in this area.
- It is a wildlife habitat, so tread lightly.
- Green space

- Green space and setbacks for pedestrian/bike corridors
- Please keep a check on perforated development. Maintain wildlife corridors and green space.
- Green space, wildlife corridors
- Outlaw second homes.
- Keep the rural, quiet, non-urbanized, wilderness transition character of the area.
- Green Space – This is also an area where everything should be bear-proof
- Wetland setbacks
- Good the way it is. Keep it natural, character of Jackson
- ARUs (give it time); Yes, to bear STDs; Park on property no additional
- Access to NFS trails.
- Green space
- Keep it low-density
- Green space, free street parking
- Open space, semi-rural character
- ARU
- Single and duplex housing
- Access to public lands.
- The mix of single-family houses, trailers, and ranch areas seems comfortably well-balanced.
- Maintain single-family street fronts.
- Green space, low-density.
- Maintain the rural quality that it is! Do not allow any development that increases pressure on wildlife.
- This should be least dense - this is right into wildlife habitat and I would not want any more development here.
- Keep it rural
- All. No change.

**What characteristics of Upper Cache subarea would you most like to change or improve (e.g., green space, accessory residential units, outdoor storage, accessory structures, uses, setbacks, etc.)?**

- Leave it alone.
- It needs to be quieter with less Snow King amusement park overflow.
- Add accessory residential units, decrease setbacks, and add more trail access.
- Where feasible, accessory residential units should be considered. Because of the difficulty of construction on some lots, zoning and building codes should be studied to allow relief (cost reduction) to make housing more affordable but still allow a reasonable owner/developer profit.
- Setback
- Green space
- Improve setbacks and ensure outdoor storage buildings mirrors the residences design.
- Nothing
- Outdoor storage
- Bear-proof garbage cans and other prudent regulations to protect wildlife are needed.
- Green space
- Continue to support the existing accessory residential unit options.
- Aggressively look to increase transparency of walking, biking, wildlife, and vehicles.

- Adjust the LSRs so that additional parking demands are not the controlling factor. The current zoning is far too 'suburban' in character.
- Clean up some of the clutter allowed/present now.
- No street lights
- Could be like Aspen Dr.; Single-family homes and apartments.
- Less ARU's
- Keep it wild and keep it low density.
- Reduce parking requirements. Do not require sidewalks, increase pedestrian through block access where possible, increase density, and allow accessory units.
- Increase density.
- Pathway next to street for safe bike/walk access to forest.
- Do not widen roads or zone for one type of housing.
- Protect for wildlife movement/habitat. Game and Fish maps (I think) show this area to be important habitat for moose. We need to keep it this way.
- It should be up to the homeowners to decide how they want to use these larger lots, not the Town of Jackson
- NO ARU's! Larger lots, protect heavy wildlife corridor!
- Review hillside regulations to prevent instability
- Don't allow on street RV, Boat, or trailer parking for more than 48 hours and enforce it.

#### **Any other comments related to Stable Neighborhoods?**

- Stop building huge two-story homes on small lots.
- No complete streets, sidewalks
- Maintain the rural neighborhoods
- Keep them stable but allow them to fill out as less dense neighborhoods.
- Do not add density!
- Parking is at a premium in certain neighborhoods. Especially those with streets that have only one side of available parking. Also, not sure why some of the newer large projects are allowing access off single lane, unpaved alleys. Especially those that have access to two-lane paved roadways.
- Keep equestrian use in this area.
- Stable means stable. The recent change to allow accessory residential units in the NC and suburban zones does not hold with the definition of stable.
- Allow for accessory residential units in all neighborhoods but keep density low.
- There should be no increase in density. START bus should not be allowed. Remove street lights. No increase in heights or bulk.
- Don't dump density in these neighborhoods.
- In all of these neighborhoods, we should experiment with allowing on-street parking during the winter on alternating days to allow for snow plowing. It works elsewhere, so why not try it here. Use fines to pay for signage. If it works, it will free up a lot of space to house our workers.
- I believe in ARU's as a way to mutually benefit the homeowner and the Town. ARU's should be encouraged.
- Leave it alone.
- Again, I think by promoting high density structures you are going to get more problems rather than solving them. Why not work on the traffic flow and control and let the market dictate what is needed.



- The parking questions throughout the survey pose compound questions that link two different ideas. For example, on-street parking is linked to town parking lots/structures. On-street parking is encouraged throughout survey, but town parking lots/structures are not encouraged in most places.
- Allow for some higher density, based on reduced parking space (e.g. underground parking) or common-area living (e.g. senior/assisted living).
- Leave it as a low-density neighborhood
- Do not allow any development. Keep the small-town characteristics of Jackson and protect the wildlife that Jackson has.
- Important to quality of life here in Jackson. Don't ruin them!
- No
- Don't dump density in these neighborhoods.

## POLICY QUESTIONS

### How many of the 1,800 units (or whatever number of additional units you support) should be tied to requirements or incentives for workforce and/or deed-restricted housing?

45% of people	The number of deed-restricted units should be based on meeting a specific community goal, such as the 65% local workforce housing goal.
29% of people	Require the same deed-restriction rate for 1,800 units as currently required by the LDRs for new housing (status quo) Require workforce deed restriction for all additional units
23% of people	Require workforce deed restriction for all additional units
2% of people	Other

#### Other Responses

- All (or at least most) should be deed restricted as affordable housing.
- Teton Village - 300 units, Aspen's - 100 units, Wilson - 200 units, Jackson - 500 units, S Park - 500 units, Hoback/Hog Island - 200 units

### What motivated you to select the answer you did?

- Since the units taken from the County down-zone were mostly market units they should be replaced as market units.
- I am horrified that you are manipulating the housing market like this. You are playing with fire. It is not the government's responsibility to provide housing. Let the businesses who pay people low wages bear this cost. I do not know who came up with this 65% goal but I do not agree with it.
- Do not add 1,800 units! Any units added must be deed-restricted.
- These should be for people who live and work in this community and can demonstrate as such. Do they live here full time? I do not think they should all be tied to an employer, though. If you get fired (or quit!), do you lose your home? Or, if you live and work here but are a sole proprietor, you should be able to demonstrate that and qualify as well.
- When you increase the mitigation rate substantially, you are placing a growth cap on the entire community. Incentives and density are what makes good planning sense, coupled with limited parking requirements.
- A desire to reach the local workforce housing goal was the motivating factor.
- Create and maintain diverse housing options.
- I selected none because deed restriction and the assumption of 1,800 units and 65% local housing are incorrect. It is logical to attempt to house as much of the local workforce in or

near town, but not at the expense of arbitrarily specifying the quantity of units or the incentive for awarding workforce housing relief. Use the "carrot" of building relief for marketplace developers to supply our needs. If a workforce lottery is undertaken, with certain "requirements" for the residents, then those requirements must be checked from time to time to assure compliance with the threshold under which application and the award to the winners is maintained. This prevents deeded ownership and requires annual rental contract re-certification.

- I did not like any of the options. Get rid of deed restrictions.
- I tried to connect rational goals to rational restrictions in the hope of actual results.
- I am not in favor of building just deed-restricted housing. What about retired people?
- I do not want additional units to be speculator projects.
- Workforce housing would be better addressed by the free market.
- It is working now and offers developers options. Playing too much with free market can create unfavorable side effects.
- We want to bring the workforce into town, so all new units should go to employees working in the town.
- Jackson is losing its workforce due to lack of truly affordable housing. \$1,800 per month is not affordable for the average worker.
- What we have decided on is a good measure and we should keep it. We should look at tiny home parks like a mobile home park. The big difference is that people would own their land like any single-family home, and they would pay taxes as well.
- If many of these 1,800 units go in northern South Park, then a portion should be deed restricted. If they are to be crammed into the rest of town, then the public deserves a greater trade-off in the form of affordable housing.
- The affordability issue is not going to be addressed unless there is a higher number of deed-restricted or affordable rental units. The free market in Jackson does not and will never work for local workforce wages.
- We need to balance the Valley and not overwhelm any one area.
- I do not think everything should be deed-restricted, but there should be some incentive for reaching our 65% goal. However, I am not convinced 65% is even attainable.
- There are enough private real estate homes to cover the amount of people who are not working in Jackson but want to move here. Any new units should support the workforce. Also, no one wants to live in an apartment building surrounded by part-time owners who illegally VRBO their place because they are only in Jackson three months out of the year.
- We have a housing crisis. There are not sufficient incentives for developers to build low-income housing.
- Some people will just want a place to live without running a business with employees.
- That is our stated goal in the Comprehensive Plan. The reality of us getting there can be debated, but I think it is a goal to strive for.
- Most developments are being green-lighted without affordable or attainable housing. This increased density should provide more of that since it is clogging up the Town.
- We do not need any more free-market residential or commercial development. Any new residences should be workforce-based, deed-restricted housing only. Workforce occupancy restrictions are less onerous and will be more attractive to developers. This form of restriction also puts the burden of subsidizing workers on employers rather than taxpayers. Need-based deed restrictions put the burden on the taxpayer and are inappropriate.
- Maximum benefit to address workforce housing shortage
- I am not interested in increasing second homeownership in town.

- I support concentrating development in Jackson. I do not support additional deed-restricted or subsidized housing.
- 65% is too high.
- We need more housing for the non-super rich.
- Should be tied to a community goal, but 65% may be unrealistic.
- Prioritize long-term workforce housing over short-term rental.
- There is an assumption within the planning office that we need to supply workforce housing; I do not think we need to do that. The Valley may be already full. Maybe we need to look at that.
- To truly achieve a community, all members of the community should be living within the community.
- The community should not be forced to accommodate private businesses needs in perpetuity. This is a beautiful and still-wild gateway community in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. The status quo is reasonable. 100% is unrealistic. 65% means chasing our tail as we grow and grow and grow and grow.
- Housing for 1,800 people should be in County, not Town.
- In general, I am not supportive of deed restrictions. I think any workforce housing should be for rent, would rather the size of units, allowable rents, full-time occupancy requirements, not short-term (less than one year), dictate rent. Right now, the availability of units is so constrained that it is influencing cost. If we allow more density and more units to be built, hopefully the free market can provide the rental units needed for workforce housing.
- When we were sold on reducing density of over 2,000 units in the County - it was not sold as swapping market rate units for deed restricted. That is a bait-and-switch.
- I would support deed restriction on all 1,800 if there were priorities placed on essential Town/County employees getting the units. We need to keep our police, teachers, nurses, snow plow drivers, etc. in town.
- None of the above. We want to keep our family-friendly neighborhoods. No additional housing, period.
- Allow for flexibility with deed-restricted units but don't completely de-incentivize new development.
- I am afraid that the people living here now will give up a quiet, sleepy town to high-density living that requires more fire protection, police, and schools only to find that greedy speculators have taken advantage of everyone. I fear that the TOJ will not protect workforce housing for those workers we really need here.
- I worry that the 65% goal is a moving target. As we grow, we will have to keep working to meet this goal. Why not restrict everything to start. I'm not interested in seeing this community grow bigger in order to accommodate non-locals. I would say that 'workforce deed restrictions' need to include retirees. Many retirees will be moving out of their single-family homes and looking for smaller homes in more walkable neighborhoods.
- I don't think there should be any ties to work force housing, but that is not an available choice.
- Restricting all relocated units is the ideal, however some non-restricted units will be needed to create financially viable developments.
- Flexibility is needed in response to ongoing challenges to the community and the elected officials should be the mechanism by which we make those decisions (i.e. not fixed in perpetuity), but the process must remain open (as it is).
- The goal is to provide affordable housing, not for developers to get greedy.

- I'd like to say all should be deed restricted, but I don't think we'll get redevelopment then at all. Thus, I want to go back to the drawing board to get a mix of deed restriction and free market - but more than 25% if possible! - to get redevelopment and restricted housing.
- I think we should make it a pure lottery based upon working here in Jackson. No preference given to employees of the County, Town, State or not for profits. All working residents should have an equal chance. Only limitation is income level and the number of residents in a single unit.
- All units should be rental units and restricted to workforce with a minimal 6-month lease.
- I believe in a free market, this is America after all. Deed restrictions are a double edge sword. General speaking, the largest investment a young family has is their home. They should have the benefit of profiting off that investment, not be limited to someone else's priorities. When you put price restrictions on properties, incentives to improve or maintain property is dwindled. Many are forced to break deed restrictions, by "illegally" renting to others to meet financial obligations. Then when they are eligible to sell the profit they may have receive is nonexistent. How will they ever be able to move forward??? The housing plan needs to be better! Maybe offering better financial options. Change deed restrictions & allowing those in the program a chance receive more from their investment. Reward those who actually work to improve their property, life, and community and stop giving to those who take it for granted.
- I don't think the government should be doing central planning. If businesses need workers, they can provide the housing for them based on market rates
- Healthy communities have most of their citizens living together in the day, overnight, and on weekends, not fragmented by mountain passes, long commutes, and major economic and ethnic disparities.

**Should the amount of commercial development potential in Town be reduced? If so, how?**

32% of people	Yes, we should try to reduce commercial development potential through incentives, but not require reductions
31% of people	No, we should keep commercial development potential at current levels (Status Quo)
15% of people	Yes, we should allow the transfer of commercial development potential from one property to another
22% of people	Other

*Other Responses*

- Commercial development should not equal a need for more housing.
- Yes, reduce it. Too bad in the past they did not know what the impacts of what we have now would be. How can we solve our problems when all this commercial development just increases the amount of bad jobs, puts pressure on the housing market, causes issues with traffic, wildlife habitat, and generally decreases the livability of this place?
- We should not limit commercial development, but instead allow or encourage it IF it meets other needs, such as mixed-use housing.
- It seems that we have an over-abundance of vacant commercial property.
- No commercial development unless it provides housing for employees that it generates.
- Commercial development should be freely allowed but architecturally controlled.
- Consider increasing commercial development in some areas such as midtown, downtown, and west Jackson.
- Commercial development should only be allowed in certain areas of town.
- Yes, some commercial areas could be rezoned for residential.

- It depends on the type of commercial. The tourist/ultra-wealthy commercialization is bad but local-friendly commerce mixed with housing can be a win-win.
- We should create a tool similar to the Land Trust to purchase commercial rights and permanently retire them.
- We should have increased impact fees to ensure commercial development pays its fair share of all impacts on traffic, housing, schools, EMS services etc. and not grandfather new businesses even if they are the same as previous businesses in the same location
- Commercial development should be based on demand, not arbitrary calculations.
- Yes, increased development is only adding to the work force problem.
- Commercial development should be allowed, predicated that the project should help the community: reduce traffic, make housing attainable, reduce wildlife conflicts, reduce environmental impacts, reduce trail head crowding, reduce pet impacts, pay its own way with the impacts on schools, sewers, and infrastructure.
- If commercial development is allowed, it creates more of a housing crunch, until the housing problem is solved, commercial development should be limited.
- Yes, we should reduce commercial development potential.
- Commercial down-zoning is lawful and appropriate in places where new commercial is likely to do more harm than good.

#### **What motivated you to select the answer you did?**

- Let the free market reign and allow property owners to use their land as they see fit.
- Thanks to commercial development, this community will never catch up with the need for housing. Taxpayers should not have to pay for workforce housing.
- I have common sense and an understanding of the logical progression of events (and how they impact each other).
- We need to cultivate other types of business in Jackson Hole and foster diversity.
- Artificial limits should not be placed on a free market choice to bring a commercial business to Town. If such a use is proposed and may help in other areas (parking and housing), then it should be permitted (even encouraged), and with some easing of development restrictions in exchange for the help it would bring.
- The degree of commercial zoning did not create the current issues regarding housing for employee/transient and middle class workers. Absolute lack of leadership in planning produced a complete absence of supply in housing. The crisis already exists; we do not have a "little cough" we have cancer and we need a major solution reaching 20-30 years in the future. It is just too easy and lazy to blame it all on commercial development. If you cut all future commercial development to zero, effective immediately, you still would not cure the existing problem. Stop the band aid approach and do something meaningful without slamming your current constituents (Town citizens) and existing community. Annex part of the Porter Estate – this precedent was established with Cottonwood (literally across the street) and the Blair neighborhood. We act as though the "supply" of land is at zero; it is not. I cannot imagine the Porter estate would turn a blind eye to being the hero and replacing a few Herefords for "cash cows" that flow a mega cash annuity for eternity.
- This was a hard one. I would like to reduce commercial development overall as it just stimulates more development. Transferring commercial development from one area to another could allow for more mixed-use housing. But it also sounded like it could reduce commercial by allowing residential to have similar return on real estate. Whatever would help reduce pressures of development of commercial and therefore housing is my goal.
- There are too many empty buildings.
- Taking people's property rights that they have invested in is ridiculous!

- We are in a huge housing hole. We will never catch up with housing need if the commercial development is allowed at current mitigation rates.
- I do not want to see more growth.
- Despite the negative press regarding commercial development and our desperation for workforce housing, commercial square footage is needed to provide middle- and low-income residents access to needed goods and services.
- I am not a fan of multi-use facilities. I believe people come to visit and live in Jackson for the feel of the town. I think residential, industrial, commercial/large name brand business, and mom and pop businesses should be segregated within reason.
- I think we should reduce the amount of corporate development in the town and only allow small business owners or smaller companies to operate within the county.
- Not sure what the solution is on this point. I am not sure the Town can sustain any more commercial development. Where are the employees going to live?
- The Virginian and the base of Snow King could be developed as housing, not lodging or other commercial.
- Current by-right development should be allowed. The problem is the Town and County had no courage or vision to hold all prior commercial development over the last 50 to 70 years accountable for any housing mitigation standards, or they were so low it did almost nothing. Now, the grand illusion today is to make the rest of the citizens pay for the sins of our past for not holding the vast majority of commercial development accountable. Why are we not going back to all current commercial development and assessing their cost for the housing problem? They created the problem and they need to be the major player to resolve it.
- What would the commercial development be? We do not need more hotels, restaurants or t-shirt shops, and all of those would require more employees. We need solutions to house the people we already have and not to house more people through commercial development.
- I do not think reducing commercial development is necessary, but I do not think increasing it is necessary either. We do not need more rug shops, art galleries, fur shops, or t-shirt shops, though. I would love to see something different (an indoor playground for kids, a Greek restaurant)—anything but Kmart.
- More commercial development will only exacerbate the housing and traffic crises.
- The allowable commercial development potential is already more than we need, so we do not need to add any. I would like to see small business commercial rather than big box commercial.
- Reducing commercial should in theory reduce housing demand. and I am hopeful with the right incentives it might work.
- There is already plenty of commercial development in town.
- When I first saw the towns zoning in the 80's my reaction was, "well everyone got what they wanted" because it was so disorganized. In some ways, multi-family zoning is as lucrative as commercial and the transition could be made without too much trouble.
- We do not need a pendulum swing. Please, no more hotels/motels!
- Commercial developers should be allowed to stay with what they have and be given the maximum flex to move transfer rights as well.
- Commercial development increases our overpopulation problems and their concomitant traffic and housing challenges.
- There is too much commercial already; City Council does not want to downzone, and transferring commercial elsewhere could have unintended consequences.
- Jackson has more than enough commercial development.
- We've got more than enough commercial, especially hotels
- Seems least worst

- Empty commercial buildings could be made into housing. Already sufficient commercial development including future buildout projections
- I moved to Teton County in 1991 and am not a fan of growth for growths sake. I am also a business owner and property owner and realize this document will dictate the next decade of decisions or more. We need some new ideas.
- All new business should pay their fair share. There should be no grandfathering.
- Commercial is not the evil of housing. The housing study showed institutional drives housing needs.
- We are a resort town and the commercial element of our town is crucial to maintain the level of visitors we receive each year.
- Additional commercial development creates additional jobs therefore additional housing needs. We need a 2 year or more moratorium on new commercial development.
- I fear that the TOJ will allow more hotels and condos for people who have no commitment to the area's high quality of life. I do not want to see more people are lured to live here when they do not contribute to the quality of life. I fear giving up the character of the Town without any gain for the common good.
- Our community has a growth problem, and our economy drives this growth. We can't continue to grow and still be the community we want to be. Therefore, we have to make sacrifices. I choose to sacrifice the economy over our community character and our natural resource values. This being said, I hope somebody does some serious research on what happens when you limit commercial development potential. Will we end up only with high-end stores? Will we end up with chains, being large enough to afford the costs? Maybe we can shut the airport down before we limit commercial development; that would also help us with our growth. I'm half serious with that comment. Jackson is a desirable place to live, and it's easy to get to. If we make it harder to get to, we may not grow as quickly. We may not be as desirable for tourists. This would help us be the community we want to be and not the resort we are becoming. I know it sounds radical, but I think we have to be a little radical to break out of the 'growth-is-good' paradigm. I don't want to see Jackson become a Disneyland. I will accept growth if it comes in the form of a growing community that cares about ecosystem stewardship.
- "Because it is common sense as to the cause and effect relationship of business in this town.
- The Town currently has sufficient retail and restaurant development, and might only need some office space development. Exchanging commercial for residential would lead to some more focused density in many areas.
- Past planning attempts have not reduced the scarcity of housing, reduced traffic, preserved the aspects of Jackson Hole that make people want to live here.
- The Comprehensive Planning process was a five-year community wide process to plan for a stable economy while protecting the environment and keeping our community vibrant. This current process should implement the Comp Plan, not modify its goals.
- There is a long history of down-zones in town. No person has a right to potential development that has not been vested though action. We need far less commercial potential and zero additional lodging potential.
- I would like to require it, but I am not sure how to do so. Thus, I answered that I want to see incentives offered to reduce commercial development. I'd also like to see the Town come up - if possible - with ways to require reductions.
- I don't know enough about the current situation to comment.

**What types of development should be subject to architectural design standards?**

44% of people	Require architectural design standards only for commercial and multi-family
---------------	---

	buildings (3 or more attached units) in Districts 3 – 6
25% of people	Require architectural design standards for commercial development and larger multi-family projects (e.g., 10 units or more) in Districts 3 – 6
7% of people	Require architectural design standards only for commercial development in Districts 3 – 6 (closest to status quo)
25% of people	Other

*Other Responses*

- No more square metal boxes!
- All things! Example being that new kid jail located at the base of Saddle Butte. And the big cookie cutter homes in Gill addition. And the crap like Blair Apartments.
- Apply "design review" to all commercial and most residential construction.
- Maybe commercial in the downtown area and other commercial areas
- Require architectural standards to include less metal - new west design.
- Require architectural design standards for commercial, multi-family, and large multi-family projects .
- Minimum design standards for all development, DRC for larger commercial, residential, and mixed-use developments.
- Architectural design standards are contributing to the high cost of building and should have a lower priority.
- All new buildings should comply with current architectural design standards, materials. Current standards allow flexibility in design styles.
- Require design standards across the board - more western character, less funky square buildings
- Architectural design standards should be set and adhered to for all development.
- I am ambivalent about design standards. They prevent horrendous looking buildings, but some of the coolest buildings in town were built before standards were in place.
- Require standards for multi-family building units of more the 4.
- There should be no new architectural standards. It adds too many costs.
- Jackson would look a lot better if a few basic standards of taste were developed.
- Require architectural design standards for any building added to the town.
- Architectural standards should apply to all development.
- All development!
- None
- Require architectural design standards for all buildings in all districts.

**What motivated you to select the answer you did?**

- Let property owners judge how to develop their land.
- An affront to taste? No, I support de-incentivizing slap job construction, then sold (or rented) at overinflated prices. You should have to pay a lot if you are going to profit a lot.
- Let's not uglify Jackson with poorly designed multi-family housing units.
- Any development should mesh as best as possible with use, look, and feel of the surrounding area and the western neighborhood heritage of Jackson. Some review approvals will be totally obvious and very quick, but some which produce a unique development at odds with local and usual buildings that should be subject to more and more detailed review depending on how far from the nearby designs it deviates.
- Limit change for its own sake.
- Too much regulation
- To see the Town improve its character



- Safety and consistency
- We are transitioning from a town full of Boise Cascade homes to a town full of box homes. Neither is very attractive.
- Jackson has a reputation to upkeep!
- All units should be pleasing to the eye.
- We are a western town that many visitors come to see so we should keep the western theme in all buildings within 4 blocks of our main roads.
- No more boxes, please.
- The flat front modern "box design" epidemic in Jackson just keeps rolling along. This will likely not change unless the DRC has members who do not "sell" this design as their bread and butter business.
- Small residential developments should have some architectural design standards but they should not be onerous. Allow freedom of creativity. Designs will change throughout time and it's not for planning and building to dictate smaller projects.
- Maintain Jackson's character
- I like a mix of well-thought out design based on the purpose of the structure. I do not like cheap industrial design with no effort to look inviting or pleasing.
- To be honest, and this may seem a bit shallow so apologies - but if I see another "box" spring up around town I'm going to scream. Can we realize this is the west and we're taking this urban design a little too far? I don't want everything in log hues - don't get me wrong but - we seem to be at a glut of "new west" designs at the moment.
- Units being built are getting uglier every year. The character of the Town is changing for the worse. Standards might help if they're actually enforced.
- Try to maintain some interesting character and diversity of styles so everything doesn't look the same.
- I am ambivalent about design standards. They prevent horrendous-looking buildings, but some of the coolest buildings in town were built before standards were in place.
- It should be the same as District 2 standards to be consistent with local character and consistent with surroundings.
- Architectural design standards are necessary, but boring.
- If moving to larger units, there should be design standards.
- The character of the Town is changing one building at a time. If we do not keep our character we will be just like any-town New Jersey.
- The design process is directly connected to the unaffordability in Teton County. It's become a Mafia.
- Jackson feels like a truck stop on the way to Yellowstone and could be so much better than it is today
- Architectural standards are important throughout the Town.
- Architectural review is very subjective and is very costly to developers when the ARC changes its mind. Architectural review's legal basis is suspect. How does it relate to health safety and welfare of the citizens of Jackson? Where is the rational nexus?
- Seeing what has been built in Town in the past few years
- There should be standards for all buildings.
- Sometimes less is more when it comes to requirements. I understand the need for some areas to look a certain way, but to tell home owners that they have to build the exterior with certain materials and colors is not conducive to anything but having more rules and regulations.
- Keep planners out of the process as much as possible.

- Parking design and street design can make or break a project. Lot layout can directly impact the streetscape, so it's important even for smaller projects.
- While I do not think we should require a town that looks as monotonous as Santa Fe, regulations should assure some compatibility in the colors of buildings and the materials that are used here for construction. I want to keep as many old log buildings and national registry buildings as we can. I want to see codes for protecting buildings from earthquake damage, as we are likely to suffer a 6.5 earthquake or better. I hope we don't permit so much building that we get trashy urban-like areas. I hope to see real neighborhoods encouraged where people have ways of relating to each other.
- Some of our out-of-character multi-family units that have been built recently.
- Development should not be allowed to run rampant and dictate how the town develops and what it will look like.
- Highly personal architecture should not present a problem in low-unit residential projects, whereas standards are certainly necessary in large-scale projects.
- We do not need the urban, post-modern look in Jackson. We need to maintain the small-town integrity that Jackson is losing.
- As buildings get bigger, character standards become more important to evaluate.
- Some of the rentals and commercial development in this area is declining property values due to their cheap, non-mountain architecture. This is bad for long term housing and commercial economic health.
- Quality of life
- Local government is too controlling.

**Any other comments related to the questions in this survey?**

- The short-term greed and lack of long-term planning really saddens me, as well as the pressure to roll on projects that contribute to the Towns projects exerted on our local politicians.
- Be flexible and use common sense.
- You cannot set important and serious restrictions on individual free market development (and choice of neighborhood to live in and travel) by way of a popularity contest. The thought given to these answers will be FAR LESS than the thought (Planning) that went into the far-reaching restrictions implied by these questions.
- Allow at least four stories for multi-family units to enhance density, reduce housing costs, and accommodate more workers.
- Jackson is quickly losing the old-town western feel to modern architecture. Older buildings are approaching their life cycle/span and being replaced with buildings that do not "conform" to the old west feel. Without clear oversight this town will lose its Old West identity that everyone loves.
- I don't understand why every new development has to have the blueprints start from square 1. Why can't we use the same blueprints that other resort towns use? It costs so much money to have everything done specially and for the first time.
- Get rid of modern architectural styles, they are not Jackson.
- This is way too long of a survey!
- Thank you.
- You are making assumptions about growth when most property owners in town want no additional growth in town!
- If you drive around town off-season, you can find plenty of empty buildings--the Marriott, the Buffalo Club, the Jackson Hotel, and the Hilton Suites. In your planning, please pay attention to limiting the number of people who want to own and use spaces for speculation

and vacationing alone without contributing to community or quality of life here in Jackson. A mix of housing is fine, but attention must be paid to balancing opportunity for all classes. Regulations must be put in place to protect the middle class and the work force.

- I think the Town and County needs to stop, take step back, and let residents decide what is needed and/or wanted in their neighborhoods. Right now, impulse is dictating development and that just can't be allowed to happen.
- The inputs surrounding the issue are quite complex, and those who stand the most to gain (either developers, land owners, or community activists) will likely have the most sophisticated and partisan positions. This is a welcome opportunity to have some input, but it is clear that the situation cannot be solved by survey alone. Engage 2017 has done a good job of soliciting community input.
- When you ask people if there's enough, they're not likely to say yes. Be careful asking residents if there is enough parking in their neighborhoods, and be mindful of our community's traffic reduction goals established in the Comp Plan and ITP. More parking = more vehicles. More vehicles = more traffic.
- We need tight regulations on growth and development. There is a limit to the number of residents that this area can accommodate without ruining Jackson and surrounding areas. We may have already exceeded this limit and it is now only possible to cap further development to preserve what Jackson once was, which is a small rural town that supports and enjoys the wildlife in the area.

**What type of pedestrian improvements, if any, should be required for new development?**

49% of people	Sidewalks should be required for commercial services with surrounding residential areas and also between major residential neighborhoods
23% of people	Additional sidewalks should not be required of private landowners but the Town may add sidewalks using public funds where necessary
17% of people	Sidewalks should be required primarily to connect commercial services with surrounding residential areas
11% of people	Other

*Other Responses*

- No sidewalks or complete streets in Cache Creek area
- Walking seems fine. Do better with bike paths, rights of way, and promoting bike use and commuting. I think we can do a lot better.
- Sidewalks should be built by developers for safety in the neighborhood.
- Sidewalks should be provided for commercial space but not required for residential.
- Sidewalks everywhere. Town needs to make this a priority over sewer and water and other not needed infrastructure. Stop chip sealing
- Sidewalks are nice in the urban core, but should not be forced on the periphery residential areas.
- Sidewalks should be required to connect existing sidewalks or for new commercial buildings. The developer should be responsible to pay for them, not the Town.
- Walkability throughout all parts of the town is to everyone's benefit.
- Sidewalks should be required for commercial areas but not residential.
- I think we have enough sidewalks currently. We are only a town of 10,000 people for goodness sakes.

**What motivated you to select the answer you did?**

- Your town is sadly lacking sidewalks and is dangerous.

- Do not like Redmond Street bump outs, narrow street, sidewalks and little parking.
- We need to encourage walkability. We are so far behind!
- Sidewalks may provide a mode of transportation for residents to local destinations, not for daily middle-distance "commuting". Primarily, they provide for a safe travel route near residences. If an existing development is undergoing extensive renovation, and if there is space, installing sidewalks should be "encouraged" but not required. If the Town wants to retro-fit an area with sidewalks for safety, they may do so with the agreement of the land owner.
- If the public wants sidewalks, let the public pay for them.
- We must have street parking with adequate safe widths. Don't sacrifice neighborhood road space where sidewalks are unnecessary & not in demand.
- Sidewalks around busy buildings should be included for safety. Connecting to neighborhoods also good, but some of these are wide and make the whole area look suburban. It's not always necessary on small streets.
- I think that is best; sidewalks are good.
- Encourage walking.
- Sidewalks should be installed and maintained by the Town, not private land owners.
- Wow this town is active! It's critical everyone stay safe and have sidewalks/designated paths to use.
- Sidewalks and bike lanes should be placed on all streets and areas to help accommodate pedestrian traffic.
- We need a way for our non-motorized friends to get to work and school and for our visitors to get around. We also need to control the vehicle emissions and encourage bike and walking.
- We can't have people walking in the road anymore. It is too crowded, there is too much traffic, and it is too dangerous. The more we encourage people to walk, the more we reduce traffic, too.
- The Town should adopt a more aggressive sidewalk connection plan in residential neighborhoods.
- If you want developers to solve housing problems, don't saddle them with infrastructure improvements that should be solved by the town. Do I need to add the missing link of sidewalk in front of my house in east Jackson as part of building my house or duplex? No, the Town should already have that in place.
- Almost getting hit several times while walking on the road with my children
- Encourage people to walk!
- In good weather having sidewalks is safer and people are more likely to walk.
- I said it before in this survey but I'll say it again. I think we're taking the complete neighborhood thing a little far. Seems we're trying to jam urban solutions into a rural town. Grass is OK and we don't need a sidewalk or bike path to everything (and I'm a biker!)
- Pedestrian access through the Town of Jackson is already good - without additional sidewalks. Commercial development should provide them for their spaces.
- Actually, as many new sidewalks as possible. They are used!
- Sidewalks are nice, but they can "suburbanize" residential areas, and damage small town, rural character.
- Increase and encourage walkability and multimodal transport connectivity from denser residential areas to commercial core.
- The Town should be responsible for sidewalks. Sidewalks in the center of Town are appropriate. Any sidewalks in residential areas should also be maintained by town or not developed.

- Sidewalks are great.
- This is actually the Town's responsibility and should be taken care of by the Transportation Department, not private developers. People need sidewalks, just like cars need roads. Walking is transportation.
- Walkability is critical for good communities
- Walkability
- Safety and walkability
- Don't pave paradise more than necessary just because a consultant said we should.
- I have kids and there are too few invitations for safe walking.
- Pedestrian connectivity is very important but adding impervious surface and increasing storm water runoff is a consideration. Residential speeds should be 15 mph, speed bumps and bulb outs should be used to reduce speeds and pedestrian safety which can be accomplished without traditional sidewalks. Though block pedestrian access should be added where possible. Off-street bike/pedestrian paths similar to what have been constructed in our community so far should be prioritized.
- Stop passing the cost of public improvements onto private citizens. If the Town wants a public pathway, it should build it at its expense in the right-of-way.
- Being tired of walking along streets with no sidewalks
- Since this is a community that is very much for pedestrian movement, sidewalks are a must!
- Keep planners away from developing "complete" Streets!
- Providing sidewalks is a basic component for improving mobility for all residents. Some stable sub-areas probably do not need sidewalks, but most areas do.
- We know from big city development that sidewalks connect neighbors to each other and people to commercial areas. I'd like also to see all parts of the Town connected to bus lines through sidewalks.
- If sidewalks are installed in the residential areas than I would expect the Town install them at public expense and to maintain them.
- Automobile density (i.e. 1 person-1 car) should be discouraged and be a central part of all public policy decisions in the town.
- I see people walking in the roadways in the winter, it is unsafe and unconscionable to allow more development in unsafe ways.
- I live in town, and I frequently walk on errands, to visit friends, and for exercise. The lack of sidewalks and the sad state of some existing sidewalks make it difficult for me, and unsafe for my child.
- I want more sidewalks. I want sidewalks on every road and I want bike lanes.
- We have over spent on pathways relative to their use.
- I do not want public funds spent on sidewalks
- Cars and streets are awesome. Safe, convenient, quick, personally tailored trips, etc. Sidewalks and safe bicycle movement facilities are even better, healthier, safer.

**Should the Town strive to increase the number of street and pedestrian connections by encouraging or requiring that all blocks be reduced in size to be more similar in size to those in downtown?**

45% of people	We should require street/pedestrian connections as part of redevelopment and new projects, likely as part of the subdivision process and/or development approval process
35% of people	The street network in Town is essentially set and adding new connections would not provide significant benefit

18% of people	We should incentivize street/pedestrian connections as part of redevelopment and new projects where appropriate (Status Quo)
2% of people	Other

*What motivated you to select the answer you did?*

- It ain't broke, don't fix it.
- I like it the way it is.
- That seems ridiculous, and a massive project for really minuscule benefit, unless I am misunderstanding this question.
- This is an excellent idea. Make it easier for all of us to walk and bike to the office, to visit neighbors and to get out and exercise on the trails without driving to the trailheads.
- There are very few streets that could be added to improve traffic flow - nor is there space for new major streets with major effort (tribal trails?). The only exception to this might be W, Snow King / Maple Way at Scott lane, straighten out the kink in the "back road" around the center of town. This would require the destruction of several homes, still a major effort.
- Pedestrian crossings should be clearly marked and maintained, AND areas where crossing is not allowed should be marked, even barricaded (W. Broadway at west side of Glenwood).
- Pedestrian crossings must be controlled, especially in the core area by summer tourists. They are not immune from being run over just because they are in a cross walk, but they still step out in front of moving traffic at the most inopportune times without considering or waiting for a break in traffic flow. I suggest a band of roving Cowboy crossing "assistants"!
- I like my town pretty much as it is.
- This sounds like an academic concept that would have terrible results in practical application. We live in a mountain town at an elevation of over 6,000 ft. and we get mountains of snow from November to April. You can't apply sun belt pedestrian incentive concepts to a community that lives in hard winter conditions, where walking for the masses is very limited & biking is nonexistent for 5 months of the year. It's simply naive.
- All needs not be the same.
- Sidewalks are needed
- The lack of pedestrian connectivity is unsafe for everyone, particularly children and elderly community members.
- This is a reasonable economic solution. I also think the town should identify areas that could be improved/benefit with pedestrian sidewalks/paths and work to improve those areas with the property owners.
- If it is a law then people will have to do it.
- Unless you are talking about rezoning the fairgrounds, this question seems irrelevant in Town for roads. Sidewalk connections should be a priority and carefully evaluated with new projects.
- Break up the superblocks
- Again, I think the Town should be responsible for the majority of pedestrian connections.
- Whenever you have a chance to improve the livability/walkability of an area you should have the legal authority to do it
- I don't want to overbuild
- The downtown blocks are much preferable to cul de sacs and curvy suburban style roads.
- Smaller block size would work better. Although the pattern is mostly set.
- This requirement is important to ensure safe and logical in town travel. It would be great if dirt single-track was used more as a pedestrian and cyclist connection between residential and commercial and schools.

- This is a misleading question. You are talking about connectivity for all modes of travel yet you reference only pedestrians. This is really all about bike paths and forcing bike paths on property owners.
- Reality
- Adding more sidewalks reduces parking and is a nightmare in winter due to narrowing streets too much.
- We should not do anything to add to travel ways for cars. Congestion will encourage use of alternative modes. Autonomous vehicles will be a game changer and the questions in this survey are probably already "out of date". Pedestrian and bike access should be increased - especially mid-block where possible. Traditional sidewalks are not needed.
- This would require multiple takings of private property for sidewalks. Who comes up with these utopian ideas?
- To increase new connections could take away for possible housing opportunities.
- Especially in midtown, shorter blocks and better bike/pedestrian connections will greatly improve mobility. This should be required of new development or redevelopment. Unfortunately, there have already been a few recent redevelopment projects where this opportunity was missed.
- The more we can do to encourage pedestrians and mass transportation the better, but planners should also be practical about the limits of sidewalks in times of deep snow and humps of ice alongside the roads. Only so much pedestrian use is possible in the dead of winter.
- I don't think we should be incentivizing any specific mode of transportation. Tourists are not arriving here by bicycle or foot transport and it seems to penalize the residents while creating unsafe driving spaces.
- More roads are not necessary; Jacksonites tend to be physically fit and able to walk a few extra yards to reach a destination. Resources should be allocated more towards multi-modal transportation solutions than to expanding the existing road grid.
- The irregular blocks of Jackson add to its unique charm. There is no need to change them as they are now.
- More sidewalks!
- If we increase density, we need to have more options for cars to move through Town.
- Dead ends and cul-de-sacs are totally appropriate for cars but not for sidewalks and pathways.
- Again, too much government micromanagement and waste of money

## PUBLIC COMMENT

- If you do not know the neighborhoods well, this is a difficult process.
- No public parking decks in Jackson town
- Lift the winter parking ban
- Add Gregory Lane to the discussion!
- All town parking should be permitted for residents. The permits should be valid for neighborhoods in summer and valid in all of the town during winter.