



## LDR Restructure & Administrative Procedure Update Town Worksheet

The purpose of this worksheet is to gather comment on the draft LDR reorganization and administrative procedures update released May 28, 2014. The draft reorganizes the LDRs to make them zone based, and also updates the administrative procedures and use definitions and classifications. Please reference the LDR Restructure & Administrative Procedure Update Table of Changes for a summary of what content the draft amends and what content the draft merely reorganizes.

There are 3 columns in the worksheet. The first is for editorial changes that staff should fix prior to adoption, but do not require public discussion. The second is for changes that should be discussed as part of this amendment process because they involve content changes proposed in the draft. The third is for changes that should be considered in future LDR amendments, but are beyond the scope of this draft. Where staff believes that a certain column is not applicable it is grayed out, however you may still provide comments in a gray box.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Organization: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_

	<b>Editorial Change</b>	<b>Content Change</b>	<b>Future Change</b>
<b>Article 1</b>			
1.1: Title	•	•	•
1.2: Authority	•	•	•
1.3: Purpose and Intent	•	• 1.3.4: What incentives? – needs explaining, and further opens the discussion to the fact that we do need to offer developer incentives to mitigate prohibitive high land costs.	•
1.4: Organization of LDRs	•	•	•
1.5: Applicability	•	•	•
1.6: Relation to Other Regs	•	• 1.6.3 should be deleted. This should be left to Planning Director's interpretation when conflicts arise.	•
1.7: Establishment of Zoning	•	•	•

	Editorial Change	Content Change	Future Change
1.8: Transitional Provisions	•	• 1.8.3 Should be removed and deleted. This proposed regulation is truly unfair to previous approvals as applicants pursued the permit process under different regs that should be honored by their respective approvals and conditions. I realize this is not always ideal, but is certainly ethical to uphold the private property rights landowners were entitled to for each approved permit.	•
1.9: Nonconformities	•	•	•
1.10: Severability	•	•	•
<b>Article 2</b>			
2.1: All CN Zones	•	•	•
2.2: Character CN Zones	•	•	•
2.3.1: TS	•	•	•
2.3.2: UC	•	•	•
2.3.3: UC-2	•	•	•
2.3.4: UR	•	•	•
2.3.5: AC-TOJ	•	•	•
2.3.6: AR-TOJ	•	•	•
2.3.7: OP-TOJ	•	•	•
2.3.8: OP-2	•	•	•
2.3.9: BP-R	•	•	•
2.3.10: BP-TOJ	•	•	•
2.3.11: BC-TOJ	•	•	•
2.3.12: RB	•	•	•
2.3.13: MHP-TOJ	•	•	•
2.3.14: NC-TOJ	•	•	•
2.3.15: NC-2	•	•	•
2.3.16: S-TOJ	•	•	•
<b>Article 3</b>			
3.1: All Rural Area Zones	•	•	•
3.2: RA Character Zones	•	•	•
3.3.1: R-TOJ	•	•	•
<b>Article 4</b>			
4.1: All Special Purpose Zones	•	•	•
4.2.1: P/SP-TOJ	•	•	•

	Editorial Change	Content Change	Future Change
4.2.2: P-TOJ	•	•	•
4.3: Planned Resort Zones	•	•	•
4.4.1: All PUD Zones	•	•	•
4.4.2: PUD-TOJ	•	•	•
<b>Article 5</b>			
5.1: General Env. Stds.	•	•	•
5.2: Env. Stds. for Specific Areas	•	•	•
5.3: Scenic Standards	•	•	•
5.4: Natural Hazard Protection	•	•	•
5.5: Landscaping Standards	•	•	•
5.6: Sign Standards	•	•	•
5.7: Grading, Erosion, Stormwater	•	•	•
5.8: Design Guidelines	•	•	•
<b>Article 6</b>			
6.1.1: Use Schedule	•	•	•
6.1.2: Classification of Uses	•	•	•
6.1.3: Open Space Uses	•	•	•
6.1.4: Residential Uses	•	•	•
6.1.5: Lodging Uses	•	•	•
6.1.6: Commercial Uses	•	•	•
6.1.7: Amusement & Rec. Uses	•	•	•
6.1.8: Institutional Uses	•	•	•
6.1.9: Industrial Uses	•	•	•
6.1.10: Transportation Uses	•	•	•
6.1.11: Accessory Uses	•	•	•
6.1.12: Temporary Uses	•	•	•
6.2: Parking Standards	•	•	•
6.3: Employee Housing Reqs.	•	•	•
6.4: Operational Standards	•	•	•
<b>Article 7</b>			
7.1.1: Dev. Option Schedule	•	•	•
7.1.3: UCD	•	•	•
7.1.4: Mobile Home Park	•	•	•
7.2: Subdivision Standards	•	•	•
7.3: Open Space Standards	•	•	•
7.4: Affordable Housing Stds.	•	•	•
7.5: Development Exactions	•	•	•
7.6: Transportation Facilities	•	•	•
7.7: Required Utilities	•	•	•
<b>Article 8</b>			
8.1: General	•	•	•
x8.2: Common Procedures	•	•	•
8.2.1: Pre-application Conference	•	•	•
8.2.2: Environmental Analysis	•	•	•

	Editorial Change	Content Change	Future Change
8.2.3: Neighborhood Meeting	•	•	•
8.2.4: Application Submittal	•	•	•
8.2.5: Determination of Sufficiency	•	•	•
8.2.6: Staff Review & Rec.	•	•	•
8.2.7: PC & DRC Recommendation	•	•	•
8.2.8: All Decisions	•	•	•
8.2.9: PD & Eng. Decisions	•	•	•
8.2.10: BOA/Council/BCC Decisions	•	•	•
8.2.11: Performance Bonds	•	•	•
8.2.12: Issuance and Filing	•	•	•
8.2.13: Amendment of Approvals	•	•	•
8.2.14: All Public Hearings	•	•	•
8.3: Physical Dev. Permits	•	•	•
8.3.1: Sketch Plan	•	•	•
8.3.2: Development Plan	•	•	•
8.3.3: Building Permit	•	•	•
8.3.4: Grading Permit	•	•	•
8.3.5: Sign Permit	•	•	•
8.4: Use Permits	•	•	•
8.4.1: Basic Use Permit	•	•	•
8.4.2: Conditional Use Permit	•	•	•
8.4.3: Special Use Permit	•	•	•
8.5: Dev. Option/Subdivision Permits	•	•	•
8.5.1: Minor Development Plan	•	•	•
8.5.2: Subdivision Plat	•	•	•
8.5.3: Exempt Land Division	•	•	•
8.5.4: Boundary Adjustment	•	•	•
8.6: Interpretations	•	•	•
8.6.1: Formal Interpretation	•	•	•
8.6.2: Zoning Compliance Verification	•	•	•
8.7: Amendments to the LDRs	•	•	•
8.7.1: LDR Text Amendment	•	•	•
8.7.2: Zoning Map Amendment	•	•	•
8.7.3: Planned Unit Development	•	•	•
8.8: Relief from the LDRs	•	•	•
8.8.1: Administrative Relief	•	•	•
8.8.2: Variance	•	•	•
8.8.3: Appeal	•	•	•
8.8.4: Beneficial Use Determination	•	•	•
8.9: Enforcement	•	•	•
<b>Article 9</b>			
9.1: Purpose	•	•	•
9.2: Rules of Construction	•	•	•
9.3: Abbreviations	•	•	•

	Editorial Change	Content Change	Future Change
9.4: Rules of Measurement	•	•	•
9.5: Definitions	•	•	•



## LDR Restructure & Administrative Procedure Update County Worksheet

The purpose of this worksheet is to gather comment on the draft LDR reorganization and administrative procedures update released May 28, 2014. The draft reorganizes the LDRs to make them zone based, and also updates the administrative procedures and use definitions and classifications. Please reference the LDR Restructure & Administrative Procedure Update Table of Changes for a summary of what content the draft amends and what content the draft merely reorganizes.

There are 3 columns in the worksheet. The first is for editorial changes that staff should fix prior to adoption, but do not require public discussion. The second is for changes that should be discussed as part of this amendment process because they involve content changes proposed in the draft. The third is for changes that should be considered in future LDR amendments, but are beyond the scope of this draft. Where staff believes that a certain column is not applicable it is grayed out, however you may still provide comments in a gray box.

Name: George Putnam  
Organization: Pierson Land Works, LLC  
Date: 6/30/14

	<b>Editorial Change</b>	<b>Content Change</b>	<b>Future Change</b>
<b>Article 1</b>			
1.1: Title	•	•	•
1.2: Authority	•	•	•
1.3: Purpose and Intent	•	•	•
1.4: Organization of LDRs	•	•	•
1.5: Applicability	•	•	•
1.6: Relation to Other Regs	•	•	•
1.7: Establishment of Zoning	•	•	•
1.8: Transitional Provisions	•	•	•
1.9: Nonconformities	•	•	•
1.10: Severability	•	•	•
<b>Article 2</b>			
2.1: All CN Zones	•	•	•
2.2: Character CN Zones	•	•	•
2.3.1: AC-TC	•	•	•
2.3.2: AR-TC	•	•	•
2.3.3: WC-TC	•	•	•

	Editorial Change	Content Change	Future Change
2.3.4: OP-TC	•	•	•
2.3.5: BP-TC	•	•	•
<b>Article 3</b>			
3.1: All Rural Area Zones	•	•	•
3.2: RA Character Zones	•	•	•
3.3.1: BC-TC	• Not sure if Specially Named Subdivisions need to be listed under Max Floor Area & Max Site Dev. if there are no BC zoned properties in those subdvisons.	• No Condos or Townhouses in BC is new and significant. This should be discussed in public forum.	•
3.3.2: MHP-TC	•	•	•
3.3.3: NC-TC	• It would be helpful to have man-made pond setback listed. • Sub E 6 – it would be helpful to have clarification as to how base density is calculated in RA 6/3 if areas are in both RA6/3 and RA 3. Similar to Sub E 5. Also whether the .8 DU threshold applies here as well –per Sub E.5.e.	•	•
3.3.4: S-TC	•	•	•
3.3.5: R-TC	• It would be helpful to have man-made pond setback listed.	•	•
<b>Article 4</b>			
4.1: All Special Purpose Zones	•	•	•
4.2.1: P/SP-TC	•	•	•
4.2.2: P-TC	•	•	•
4.3: Planned Resort Zones	•	•	•
4.4: PUD Zones	•	•	•
<b>Article 5</b>			
5.1: General Env. Stds.	• Sub 5.1.1.D.2.b No streams are specified below as stated.	•	•
5.2: Env. Stds. for Specific Areas	• There are no provisions listed for amending the NRO. What is the process and procedure to amend the NRO?	•	•

	Editorial Change	Content Change	Future Change
	Can an amendment be made? Would it fall under Section 8.7.2 – Zoning Map Amendment?		
5.3: Scenic Standards	•	•	•
5.4: Natural Hazard Protection	•	•	•
5.5: Landscaping Standards	•	•	•
5.6: Sign Standards	•	•	•
5.7: Grading, Erosion, Stormwater	•	•	•
<b>Article 6</b>			
6.1.1: Use Schedule	•	•	•
6.1.2: Classification of Uses	•	•	•
6.1.3: Open Space Uses	•	•	•
6.1.4: Residential Uses	•	•	•
6.1.5: Lodging Uses	•	•	•
6.1.6: Commercial Uses	•	•	•
6.1.7: Amusement & Rec. Uses	•	•	•
6.1.8: Institutional Uses	•	•	•
6.1.9: Industrial Uses	•	•	•
6.1.10: Transportation Uses	•	•	•
6.1.11: Accessory Uses	•	•	•
6.1.12: Temporary Uses	•	•	•
6.2: Parking Standards	•	•	•
6.3: Employee Housing Reqs.	•	•	•
6.4: Operational Standards	•	•	•
<b>Article 7</b>			
7.1.1: Dev. Option Schedule	•	• Condominium/Townhouse subdivision is not allowed Rural Zone – but it is allowed as permitted development under a PRD which is allowed in the Rural Zone	•
7.1.2: PRD	•	• Sub D allows townhouses and condominiums but this is not allowed under 7.1.1.	•
7.1.4: Mobile Home Park	•	•	•
7.2: Subdivision Standards	•	•	•
7.3: Open Space Standards	•	•	•
7.4: Affordable Housing Stds.	•	•	•
7.5: Development Exactions	•	•	•
7.6: Transportation Facilities	• 7.6.2.D – These separation distances do not appear to be	•	•

	Editorial Change	Content Change	Future Change
	consistent with current WYDOT standards for similar roads		
7.7: Required Utilities	•	•	•
<b>Article 8</b>			
8.1: General	• It would be helpful to add a reference to the counting days section 9.4.2.A at the beginning of Section 8. Or be clear in all references to days that it means calendar days unless otherwise stated.	• Known contents and revision stipulations of the Administrative Manual should be provided prior to the approval of these LDR's. Especially application submittal requirements and review procedures. I can understand the flexibility having a manual may allow but it is difficult to understand how this helps predictability for the public.	•
8.2: Common Procedures	•	•	•
8.2.1: Pre-application Conference	•	•	•
8.2.2: Environmental Analysis	•	•	•
8.2.3: Neighborhood Meeting	• Sub B – it is confusing to say “See Divisions 8.3-8.8” for when a meeting is required and then have 1. below say they are encouraged, but not required.	•	•
8.2.4: Application Submittal	• It would seem appropriate to have some reference under this section referring to the application requirements as outlined in the Administrative Manual if this is to be the method for providing what the contents of the submittal must be.	•	•
8.2.5: Determination of Sufficiency	•	•	•
8.2.6: Staff Review & Rec.	•	•	•
8.2.7: PC & DRC Recommendation	•	•	•
8.2.8: All Decisions	•	• Deleting Extraordinary Circumstances time extension ability should be	•

	Editorial Change	Content Change	Future Change
		discussed in a public forum.	
8.2.9: PD & Eng. Decisions	•	•	•
8.2.10: BOA/Council/BCC Decisions	• Are there “technical approvals” other than Subdivision Plats that could be exempt from findings of fact, conclusions of law? If not, why not just say Subdivision Plats.	• Sub E. What are the terms of the remand process? Are there any limits to how long this could take at all? This adds quite a bit of uncertainty to the path to a vote before the BCC.	•
8.2.11: Performance Bonds	•	•	•
8.2.12: Issuance and Filing	•	•	•
8.2.13: Amendment of Approvals	• Sub 5. It would be helpful to clarify what standards items under this sub-section must follow. IE – do you have to submit a final plat in per section 8.5.3? Something else? How do you get to the BCC? What is the review procedure. Currently these are done as “Final Plat” applications...	•	•
8.2.14: All Public Hearings	•	•	•
8.3: Physical Dev. Permits	•	•	•
8.3.1: Sketch Plan	•	•	•
8.3.2: Development Plan	•	• No longer able to extend a development permit beyond 18 months.	•
8.3.3: Building Permit	•	•	•
8.3.4: Grading Permit	•	•	•
8.3.5: Sign Permit	•	•	•
8.4: Use Permits	•	•	•
8.4.1: Basic Use Permit	• Typo in Sub D.2. “grading permit”? Should be Basic Use Permit?	•	•
8.4.2: Conditional Use Permit	• Typo in Sub D.2. “grading permit”? Should be Conditional Use Permit?	•	•
8.4.3: Special Use Permit	• ypo in Sub D.2. “grading permit”?	•	•

	Editorial Change	Content Change	Future Change
	Should be Special Use Permit?		
8.5: Dev. Option/Subdivision Permits	•	•	•
8.5.1: General	•	•	•
8.5.2: Minor Development Plan	• There do not appear to be any zone standards in Articles 2-4 that allow a minor development plan for subdivision. "Subdivision Plat" should likely be removed from Sub D Effect of Approval.	•	•
8.5.3: Subdivision Plat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To maybe help confusion the first threshold in the plat chart on page 8-41- not all subdivisions plats that are filed under this section will be submitted following a development plan approval. Some plats - condominiums - may happen years later.</li> <li>• Under board of county commissioner's decision it references Section 8.2.10 where the remand provision is included. This seems at odds with the statement the BCC will approve or deny the application based on the findings of this section.</li> </ul>	•	•
8.5.4: Exempt Land Division	•	•	•
8.5.5: Boundary Adjustment	• Under applicability - Since adjusting lot boundaries within (or involving) a platted subdivision requires a final plat, it is very confusing to combine the discussion with adjusting boundaries between non-subdivided parcels. This could benefit from	•	•

	Editorial Change	Content Change	Future Change
	more clear language. • You have to look in three places to understand what it takes to do a boundary adjustment 8.5.5, 8.5.3, and 8.2.13.C.		
8.6: Interpretations	•	•	•
8.6.1: Formal Interpretation	•	•	•
8.6.2: Zoning Compliance Verification	•	•	•
8.7: Amendments to the LDRs	•	•	•
8.7.1: LDR Text Amendment	•	•	•
8.7.2: Zoning Map Amendment	• Would amending the NRO fall under this section and be required to follow the same standards?	•	•
8.7.3: Planned Unit Development	•	•	•
8.8: Relief from the LDRs	•	•	•
8.8.1: Administrative Relief	•	•	•
8.8.2: Variance	•	•	•
8.8.3: Appeal	•	•	•
8.8.4: Beneficial Use Determination	•	•	•
8.9: Enforcement	•	•	•
<b>Article 9</b>			
9.1: Purpose	•	•	•
9.2: Rules of Construction	•	•	•
9.3: Abbreviations	•	•	•
9.4: Rules of Measurement	• Clarification as to where measurements are to be made to determine land between levees and banks of rivers/streams would be helpful under BSA and ASA definitions. •	•	•
9.5: Definitions	• It is my understanding that elevated decks having grass/vegetation growing under them are not considered site development. Is this no longer the case? • There is a typo in the last sentence of Grade, Finished – “another	•	•

	<b>Editorial Change</b>	<b>Content Change</b>	<b>Future Change</b>
	standards" should be "another standard"		

## Alex Norton

---

**From:** Christen Hutton Holt <cholt@piersonlandworks.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 01, 2014 9:47 AM  
**To:** Alex Norton  
**Subject:** RE: comments for ldr restructure.

Your welcome.

I would like for it to be on the record that 30 days to review 800 pages of newly formatted code is not nearly enough time. It should have been at least 90 days. I know you guys are behind schedule, and I sympathize with that, but the public should get more time. I just found a lot of new things last night that I would like to include in my worksheet on the record too. Can I resubmit my worksheet still?

---

**From:** Alex Norton [<mailto:anorton@tetonwyo.org>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, July 01, 2014 8:34 AM

**To:** Christen Hutton Holt

**Subject:** RE: comments for ldr restructure.

Christen,

Thank you for taking the time to review and sent comments.

Alex

---

**From:** Christen Hutton Holt [<mailto:cholt@piersonlandworks.com>]

**Sent:** Monday, June 30, 2014 3:08 PM

**To:** Alex Norton

**Subject:** comments for ldr restructure.

Christen Holt Planning Project Manager



---

**pierson land works LLC**

post office box 1143  
180 s willow street  
jackson, wy 83001  
tel 307.733.5429  
fax 307.733.9669  
piersonlandworks.com



## LDR Restructure & Administrative Procedure Update County Worksheet

The purpose of this worksheet is to gather comment on the draft LDR reorganization and administrative procedures update released May 28, 2014. The draft reorganizes the LDRs to make them zone based, and also updates the administrative procedures and use definitions and classifications. Please reference the LDR Restructure & Administrative Procedure Update Table of Changes for a summary of what content the draft amends and what content the draft merely reorganizes.

There are 3 columns in the worksheet. The first is for editorial changes that staff should fix prior to adoption, but do not require public discussion. The second is for changes that should be discussed as part of this amendment process because they involve content changes proposed in the draft. The third is for changes that should be considered in future LDR amendments, but are beyond the scope of this draft. Where staff believes that a certain column is not applicable it is grayed out, however you may still provide comments in a gray box.

Name: Mary Gibson  
Organization: JHCA  
Date: 7/2/14

	<b>Editorial Change</b>	<b>Content Change</b>	<b>Future Change</b>
	<i>Use this column to identify typos and other editorial changes that staff should make prior to adoption, but do not require public discussion.</i>	<i>Use this column to propose additions, modifications or subtractions to sections of the LDRs that have significant content changes as a result of this draft, the 2012 comp plan.</i>	<i>Use this column to propose additions, modifications, or subtractions to sections of the LDRs that have not changed as a result of this draft, but should be updated in future LDR amendments.</i>
<b>Article 1</b>			
1.1: Title	•	•	•
1.2: Authority	•	•	•
1.3: Purpose and Intent	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• We see one of the main shifts in this comp plan as the elevation of wildlife and wildlife considerations, including habitat, to the highest level of consideration. And this should carry through to the regulations. Such are our comments on Article 1.</li><li>At Div. 1.3. Purpose and intent, we would add after "and the general welfare of the present and</li></ul>	•

Editorial Change	Content Change	Future Change
	<p>future inhabitants", as well as <u>wildlife and wildlife habitat of this community....</u></p> <p>At 1.3.1. Implementation of the Community Vision, we would add after "Preserve and protect the" ecosystem quality in the areas <u>under our jurisdiction in this ecosystem</u>, in order to ensure a healthy environment <u>and climate, for wildlife, community inhabitants, visitors, and our ecologically significant GEM and PEAS community (Gateways to Environments of Major Significance and Places of Ecological and Aesthetic Significance)</u>, which underlie the visitor portion of our economy, for current and future generations. <u>The community goal is to lead in implementing strategies for climate and more sustainability, in protection of wildlife and natural and scenic resources and open space.</u></p> <p>At 1.3.2. Implementation of the common Values of Community Character, A. 1. Maintain healthy populations of all native <u>plant and animal</u> species and preserve the ability of future generations to enjoy the quality <u>and quantity of the natural and scenic resources, the wildlife and wild places, wildlife habitat, open</u></p>	

Editorial Change	Content Change	Future Change
	<p><u>space and agricultural resources.....</u></p> <p>2. <u>Endeavor to consume less energy per person than we do today. We will endeavor to reduce our reliance on fossil fuels and lay plans to protect our community and natural resources from the effects of climate change.</u></p> <p>B. 1. Direct future <u>population</u> growth into a series of connected, Complete Neighborhoods, in order to preserve critical habitat, <u>habitat connectivity, scenery, open space and to reduce wildlife conflicts with new and existing development</u>, in our Rural Areas. <u>Increase density and redevelopment in approved complete neighborhoods and additions to those neighborhoods, where appropriate, lessen the need to go out and expand into undeveloped areas and green fields.</u> We will endeavor to minimize the impacts of new development on our public lands, while our recreation will impact those places regardless. The goal is to make the most ecologically suitable places for development be the places we encourage residential development. Direct the majority of growth into areas of</p>	

Editorial Change	Content Change	Future Change
	<p><u>existing infrastructure and services.</u></p> <p>2. The town of Jackson will continue to be the primary location for jobs, housing, shopping, educational and cultural activities <u>as the hub and heart of the community.</u></p> <p>C.1. <u>Pursue</u> a variety of workforce housing.....locally <u>may</u> also live locally.</p> <p>2. <u>Pursue a more</u> sustainable, vibrant, stable .....</p> <p>3. <u>Pursue options so that</u> residents and visitors <u>can</u> safely, efficiently.....the region using <u>multiple</u> modes of transportation <u>with emphasis on multi-modal in addition to automobile on a going forward basis, with priority</u> on modes that reduce reliance on single occupancy trips. Plan for freight movement, movement of goods into our community, as we are not self reliant and import much of what we eat and need.</p> <p>4. <u>Ensure delivery of</u> timely, efficient and safe high quality services and facilities....</p> <p>1.3.3</p> <p>A. <u>Actively pursue</u> the desired future ....</p> <p>B. <u>Actively pursue</u> the policy objectives.....</p>	

	Editorial Change	Content Change	Future Change
		<p>C. <u>Actively pursue</u> the character-defining....</p> <p>1.3.4 Predictable Regulations, <u>Incentives</u> ...</p> <p>What follows does not contain any incentives and we encourage you to add them in, rather than deleting the word.</p>	
1.4: Organization of LDRs	•	•	•
1.5: Applicability	•	•	•
1.6: Relation to Other Regs	•	•	•
1.7: Establishment of Zoning	•	•	•
1.8: Transitional Provisions	•	•	•
1.9: Nonconformities	•	•	•
1.10: Severability	•	•	•
<b>Article 2</b>			
2.1: All CN Zones	•	•	•
2.2: Character CN Zones	•	•	•
2.3.1: AC-TC	•	•	•
2.3.2: AR-TC	•	•	•
2.3.3: WC-TC	•	•	•
2.3.4: OP-TC	•	•	•
2.3.5: BP-TC	•	•	•
<b>Article 3</b>			
3.1: All Rural Area Zones	•	•	•
3.2: RA Character Zones	•	•	•
3.3.1: BC-TC	•	•	•
3.3.2: MHP-TC	•	•	•
3.3.3: NC-TC	•	•	•
3.3.4: S-TC	•	•	•
3.3.5: R-TC	•	•	•
<b>Article 4</b>			
4.1: All Special Purpose Zones	•	•	•
4.2.1: P/SP-TC	•	•	•
4.2.2: P-TC	•	•	•
4.3: Planned Resort Zones	•	•	•
4.4: PUD Zones	•	•	•
<b>Article 5</b>			
5.1: General Env. Stds.	•	•	•
5.2: Env. Stds. for Specific Areas	•	•	•
5.3: Scenic Standards	•	•	•

	Editorial Change	Content Change	Future Change
5.4: Natural Hazard Protection	•	•	•
5.5: Landscaping Standards	•	•	•
5.6: Sign Standards	•	•	•
5.7: Grading, Erosion, Stormwater	•	•	•
<b>Article 6</b>			
6.1.1: Use Schedule	•	•	•
6.1.2: Classification of Uses	•	•	•
6.1.3: Open Space Uses	•	•	•
6.1.4: Residential Uses	•	•	•
6.1.5: Lodging Uses	•	•	•
6.1.6: Commercial Uses	•	•	•
6.1.7: Amusement & Rec. Uses	•	•	•
6.1.8: Institutional Uses	•	•	•
6.1.9: Industrial Uses	•	•	•
6.1.10: Transportation Uses	•	•	•
6.1.11: Accessory Uses	•	•	•
6.1.12: Temporary Uses	•	•	•
6.2: Parking Standards	•	•	•
6.3: Employee Housing Reqs.	•	•	•
6.4: Operational Standards	•	•	•
<b>Article 7</b>			
7.1.1: Dev. Option Schedule	•	•	•
7.1.2: PRD	•	•	•
7.1.4: Mobile Home Park	•	•	•
7.2: Subdivision Standards	•	•	•
7.3: Open Space Standards	•	•	•
7.4: Affordable Housing Stds.	•	•	•
7.5: Development Exactions	•	•	•
7.6: Transportation Facilities	•	•	•
7.7: Required Utilities	•	•	•
<b>Article 8</b>			
8.1: General	•	•	•
8.2: Common Procedures	•	•	•
8.2.1: Pre-application Conference	•	•	•
8.2.2: Environmental Analysis	•	•	•
8.2.3: Neighborhood Meeting	•	•	•
8.2.4: Application Submittal	•	•	•
8.2.5: Determination of Sufficiency	•	•	•
8.2.6: Staff Review & Rec.	•	•	•
8.2.7: PC & DRC Recommendation	•	•	•
8.2.8: All Decisions	•	•	•
8.2.9: PD & Eng. Decisions	•	•	•
8.2.10: BOA/Council/BCC Decisions	•	•	•
8.2.11: Performance Bonds	•	•	•

	Editorial Change	Content Change	Future Change
8.2.12: Issuance and Filing	•	•	•
8.2.13: Amendment of Approvals	•	•	•
8.2.14: All Public Hearings	•	•	•
8.3: Physical Dev. Permits	•	•	•
8.3.1: Sketch Plan	•	•	•
8.3.2: Development Plan	•	•	•
8.3.3: Building Permit	•	•	•
8.3.4: Grading Permit	•	•	•
8.3.5: Sign Permit	•	•	•
8.4: Use Permits	•	•	•
8.4.1: Basic Use Permit	•	•	•
8.4.2: Conditional Use Permit	•	•	•
8.4.3: Special Use Permit	•	•	•
8.5: Dev. Option/Subdivision Permits	•	•	•
8.5.1: General	•	•	•
8.5.2: Minor Development Plan	•	•	•
8.5.3: Subdivision Plat	•	•	•
8.5.4: Exempt Land Division	•	•	•
8.5.5: Boundary Adjustment	•	•	•
8.6: Interpretations	•	•	•
8.6.1: Formal Interpretation	•	•	•
8.6.2: Zoning Compliance Verification	•	•	•
8.7: Amendments to the LDRs	•	•	•
8.7.1: LDR Text Amendment	•	•	•
8.7.2: Zoning Map Amendment	•	•	•
8.7.3: Planned Unit Development	•	•	•
8.8: Relief from the LDRs	•	•	•
8.8.1: Administrative Relief	•	•	•
8.8.2: Variance	•	•	•
8.8.3: Appeal	•	•	•
8.8.4: Beneficial Use Determination	•	•	•
8.9: Enforcement	•	•	•
<b>Article 9</b>			
9.1: Purpose	•	•	•
9.2: Rules of Construction	•	•	•
9.3: Abbreviations	•	•	•
9.4: Rules of Measurement	•	•	•
9.5: Definitions	•	•	•



## LDR Restructure & Administrative Procedure Update County Worksheet

The purpose of this worksheet is to gather comment on the draft LDR reorganization and administrative procedures update released May 28, 2014. The draft reorganizes the LDRs to make them zone based, and also updates the administrative procedures and use definitions and classifications. Please reference the LDR Restructure & Administrative Procedure Update Table of Changes for a summary of what content the draft amends and what content the draft merely reorganizes.

There are 3 columns in the worksheet. The first is for editorial changes that staff should fix prior to adoption, but do not require public discussion. The second is for changes that should be discussed as part of this amendment process because they involve content changes proposed in the draft. The third is for changes that should be considered in future LDR amendments, but are beyond the scope of this draft. Where staff believes that a certain column is not applicable it is grayed out, however you may still provide comments in a gray box.

Name: Francesca Paolucci-Rice

Organization: Jorgensen Associates, P.C.

Date: 2014-07-08

Notes below are not based on a complete or exhaustive review, but only on certain sections I have had time to read as of this date.

	<b>Editorial Change</b> <i>Use this column to identify typos and other editorial changes that staff should make prior to adoption, but do not require public discussion.</i>	<b>Content Change</b> <i>Use this column to propose additions, modifications or subtractions to sections of the LDRs that have significant content changes as a result of this draft.</i>	<b>Future Change</b> <i>Use this column to propose additions, modifications, or subtractions to sections of the LDRs that have not changed as a result of this draft, but should be updated in future LDR amendments.</i>
<b>Article 1</b>			
1.1: Title	•	•	•
1.2: Authority	•	•	•
1.3: Purpose and Intent	• 1.32 - change health populations to healthy populations	•	•
1.4: Organization of LDRs	•	•	•
1.5: Applicability	•	•	•
1.6: Relation to Other Regs	•	•	•
1.7: Establishment of Zoning	• 1.7.3 Add reference to access to the Official Zoning Map via the Teton County Website • 1.7.4.H. the referenced aerial photos should also be available on the county website; no 1993 aerials are currently	•	•

	Editorial Change	Content Change	Future Change
	include in the GIS; could the 1993 date be in error? 1.7.6.A. and B. the references to the Town should be changed to the County.		
1.8: Transitional Provisions	• 1.8.2.C.e. Why is Moulton Ranches included, but not South Park Ranches? There is one ownership in South Park Ranches at 5 acres – and it seems minimum lot size should be recognized in this area as 2.5 acres	•	•
1.9: Nonconformities	•	•	•
1.10: Severability	•	•	•
<b>Article 2</b>			
2.1: All CN Zones	•	•	•
2.2: Character CN Zones	•	•	•
2.3.1: AC-TC	•	•	•
2.3.2: AR-TC	•	•	•
2.3.3: WC-TC	•	•	•
2.3.4: OP-TC	•	•	•
2.3.5: BP-TC	•	•	•
<b>Article 3</b>			
3.1: All Rural Area Zones	•	•	•
3.2: RA Character Zones	•	•	•
3.3.1: BC-TC	•	•	•
3.3.2: MHP-TC	•	•	•
3.3.3: NC-TC	•	•	•
3.3.4: S-TC	•	•	•
3.3.5: R-TC	•	•	•
<b>Article 4</b>			
4.1: All Special Purpose Zones	•	•	•
4.2.1: P/SP-TC	•	•	•
4.2.2: P-TC	•	•	•
4.3: Planned Resort Zones	• 4.3.4.B. In general the Master Plan should be referred to as the Master Plan, as amended over time, e.g. Area Two is governed by the Planned Unit Developme-	•	•

	Editorial Change	Content Change	Future Change
	<p>Planned Resort Master Plan, title... as it has been amended over time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.3.4.D.4. the s.f allowed for institutionsl uses is 9,500 not 6,500 – see pg VIII-3 of Master Plan as recently amended.</li> <li>• 4.3.4.D. in general I suggest removing references to specific numbers to avoid having to amend the numbers should the Master Plan be amended again in the future.</li> <li>• 4.3.4.K should read Services shall be administered by the Teton Village Improvement and Service District and other similar public service entities, <b>or by the mentioned Owners Associations as indicated in the approved Area</b></li> </ul> <p>Two Resort Master Plan</p>		
4.4: PUD Zones	•	•	•
<b>Article 5</b>			
5.1: General Env. Stds.	•	•	•
5.2: Env. Stds. for Specific Areas	•	•	•
5.3: Scenic Standards	•	•	•
5.4: Natural Hazard Protection	•	•	•
5.5: Landscaping Standards	•	•	•
5.6: Sign Standards	•	•	•
5.7: Grading, Erosion, Stormwater	•	•	•
<b>Article 6</b>			
6.1.1: Use Schedule	•	•	•
6.1.2: Classification of Uses	•	•	•
6.1.3: Open Space Uses	•	•	•
6.1.4: Residential Uses	• 6.1.4.E. per table 7.1.1 Mobile Homes can be used only in Mobile Home Parks but it also seems they can be used in PRDs per section	•	•

	Editorial Change	Content Change	Future Change
	7.1.2.D. is this true?		
6.1.5: Lodging Uses	•	•	•
6.1.6: Commercial Uses	•	•	•
6.1.7: Amusement & Rec. Uses	•	•	•
6.1.8: Institutional Uses	•	•	•
6.1.9: Industrial Uses	•	•	•
6.1.10: Transportation Uses	•	•	•
6.1.11: Accessory Uses	•	•	•
6.1.12: Temporary Uses	•	•	•
6.2: Parking Standards	•	•	•
6.3: Employee Housing Reqs.	•	•	•
6.4: Operational Standards	•	•	•
<b>Article 7</b>			
7.1.1: Dev. Option Schedule	•	•	•
7.1.2: PRD	• 7.1.2.D. Can any PRD in any zone have mobile homes? This should be made clear by reference to other sections.	•	•
7.1.4: Mobile Home Park	• 7.1.4 - typo. as Planned Residential Developments – not as a Planned Residential Developments. Can any PRD have mobile homes? – should be clarified.	•	•
7.2: Subdivision Standards	• 7.2.1.6.d. Does the County Engineering Department have the capacity to store mylars of as-built drawings and is two sets of prints along with mylars and electronic copies superfluous?	•	•
7.3: Open Space Standards	•	•	•
7.4: Affordable Housing Stds.	•	•	•
7.5: Development Exactions	•	•	•
7.6: Transportation Facilities	•	•	•
7.7: Required Utilities	•	•	•
<b>Article 8</b>			
8.1: General	• 8.1.3 I assume manual will also be on the website and statement should indicate this.	•	•

	Editorial Change	Content Change	Future Change
8.2: Common Procedures	•	•	•
8.2.1: Pre-application Conference	•	•	•
8.2.2: Environmental Analysis	•	•	•
8.2.3: Neighborhood Meeting	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This step seems unnecessary, impractical, and unduly burdensome on applicants. Additional time for neighbor review could be provided if neighbor notices went out with the request for technical review. Should there be significant concern expressed by neighbors, at the discretion of the Planning Director, a special neighbor meeting could be required.</li> <li>Posting of a sign on the subject property, except perhaps in Town seems like an ineffective means of notification.</li> </ul>	•
8.2.4: Application Submittal	•	•	•
8.2.5: Determination of Sufficiency	•	•	•
8.2.6: Staff Review & Rec.	•	•	•
8.2.7: PC & DRC Recommendation	•	•	•
8.2.8: All Decisions	•	•	•
8.2.9: PD & Eng. Decisions	•	•	•
8.2.10: BOA/Council/BCC Decisions	•	•	•
8.2.11: Performance Bonds	•	•	•
8.2.12: Issuance and Filing	•	•	•
8.2.13: Amendment of Approvals	•	•	•
8.2.14: All Public Hearings	•	•	•
8.3: Physical Dev. Permits	•	•	•
8.3.1: Sketch Plan	•	•	•
8.3.2: Development Plan	•	•	•
8.3.3: Building Permit	•	•	•
8.3.4: Grading Permit	•	•	•
8.3.5: Sign Permit	•	•	•
8.4: Use Permits	•	•	•
8.4.1: Basic Use Permit	•	•	•
8.4.2: Conditional Use Permit	•	•	•
8.4.3: Special Use Permit	•	•	•

	Editorial Change	Content Change	Future Change
8.5: Dev. Option/Subdivision Permits	•	•	•
8.5.1: General	•	•	•
8.5.2: Minor Development Plan	•	•	•
8.5.3: Subdivision Plat	•	•	•
8.5.4: Exempt Land Division	•	•	•
8.5.5: Boundary Adjustment	•	•	•
8.6: Interpretations	•	•	•
8.6.1: Formal Interpretation	•	•	•
8.6.2: Zoning Compliance Verification	•	•	•
8.7: Amendments to the LDRs	•	•	•
8.7.1: LDR Text Amendment	•	•	•
8.7.2: Zoning Map Amendment	•	•	•
8.7.3: Planned Unit Development	•	•	•
8.8: Relief from the LDRs	•	•	•
8.8.1: Administrative Relief	•	•	•
8.8.2: Variance	•	•	•
8.8.3: Appeal	•	•	•
8.8.4: Beneficial Use Determination	•	•	•
8.9: Enforcement	•	•	•
<b>Article 9</b>			
9.1: Purpose	•	•	•
9.2: Rules of Construction	•	•	•
9.3: Abbreviations	•	• Add BSA and ASA	•
9.4: Rules of Measurement	•	• 9.4.7.3 – requiring a street yard setback from a garage door has always been problematic. E.G. consider an approximately 3 acre tract - 365' X 365' with the centerline of its 60' wide access road being the front property boundary, a 20' wide garage located 50' from the access road ROW , and the garage door facing the rear of the property. This requirement would force a street yard setback on the rear property line even though the garage is 265 feet from the rear of the property.	•

	Editorial Change	Content Change	Future Change
9.5: Definitions	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bank – add reference to ditches.</li> </ul> <p>On what does the elevation of the bank have bearing?</p>	•