



Jackson / Teton County Comprehensive Plan: Illustration of Our Vision

Character Districts Number Analysis

In the course of approving the policies of the Comprehensive Plan, the elected officials directed staff that, “preservation of natural resources and community character are more important than planning based on an arbitrary number; but that, a build-out range should be calculated based on the developed Character Districts and compared to the buildout allowed under the current regulations.”

Below is an analysis of the draft Character Districts based on the approved Growth Management Program. The draft Character Districts estimation (precise development potential can only be calculated from regulations) is compared to current regulations. The draft Character Districts achieve all policies of the Growth Management Program while also maintaining some potential to achieve better habitat, scenic, and open space protection without requiring full development or redevelopment of all transitional areas or development of northwest South Park.

On the reverse of this sheet is an expanded table that illustrates the continuum of implications as development potential is increased and decreased. The columns are not scenarios, they are representative points along the continuum. The minimum and maximum columns are inconsistent with the draft Character Districts, but representative of more drastic implementation approaches.

Existing Development:

- roughly **9,900** dwelling units
- located **58%** (5,700) in Complete Neighborhoods, **42%** (4,200) in Rural Areas
- over **65%** of the workforce living locally

Approved Policies of the Comprehensive Plan:

- **AMOUNT** – limit overall development to roughly a doubling of existing development
- **LOCATION** – at least **60%** of new units in stable/transition areas and at most **40%** in Rural Areas
- **TYPE** – maintain at least **65%** of the workforce living locally

	Current Regs	Draft Character Districts
DEVELOPMENT PATTERN ASSUMPTIONS		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2009 Buildout Taskforce assumptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some PRD and/or Rural subdivision • Increase in Town transition areas • Increase in Aspens/Pines • Possible increase in northwest South Park
Consistent with All Approved Policies?	NO	YES
AMOUNT		
additional dwellings	11,100	11,100
Consistent with Policy 3.1.a?	YES	YES
LOCATION (of additional dwelling units)		
stable/transitional areas	41% (4,600)	60% (6,700)
preservation/conservation areas	59% (6,500)	40% (4,400)
Consistent with Policy 9.1.b?	NO	YES
TYPE (percentage of units occupied by the workforce to maintain a 65% resident workforce)		
existing workforce housing	100%	100%
new units in stable/transitional areas	100%	≥ 78%
new units in preservation/conservation areas	≥ 38%	≥ 37%
Consistent with Policy 5.1.a?	NOT LIKELY	LIKELY



	Character Districts		Minimum		Maximum		
DEVELOPMENT PATTERN ASSUMPTIONS							
allowance for PRD/NC Subdivision	some	less →	no	→	no		
increase in Town Transition Areas	yes	less →	no	more →	maximum		
increase in Aspens/Pines	yes	less →	no	more →	maximum		
increase in northwest South Park	maybe	less →	no	more →	maximum		
increase in Wilson	some	less →	no	more →	maximum		
increase in Teton Village	no	→	no	more →	yes		
Consistent with All Approved Policies?	YES	FEWER →	NO	→	NO		
AMOUNT							
additional dwellings	11,100	9,600	8,200	6,800	8,200	9,600	11,100
Consistent with Policy 3.1.a?	YES	→		YES	→		YES
LOCATION (of additional dwelling units)							
stable/transitional areas	60% (6,700)	60% (5,800)	60% (4,900)	65% (4,400)	71% (5,800)	75% (7,200)	79% (8,700)
preservation/conservation areas	40% (4,400)	40% (3,900)	40% (3,300)	35% (2,400)	29% (2,400)	25% (2,400)	21% (2,400)
Consistent with Policy 9.1.b?	YES	YES		BETTER	BETTER →		BEST
TYPE (percentage of units occupied by the workforce to maintain a 65% resident workforce)							
existing workforce housing	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
new units in stable/transitional areas	≥ 78%	≥ 87%	≥ 98%	100%	≥ 86%	≥ 74%	≥ 65%
new units in preservation/conservation areas	≥ 37%	≥ 38%	≥ 39%	≥ 58%	≥ 45%	≥ 45%	≥ 45%
Consistent with Policy 5.1.a?	LIKELY	LESS LIKELY →		NOT LIKELY	MORE LIKELY →		MOST LIKELY