



Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan – Draft Character Districts Composite Elected Official, Planning Commission, & Staff Identified Changes 1/10/12

District Title	<p style="text-align: center;">Red Change</p> <p><i>Changes to the sub district text, boundaries or attributes that are necessary in order for the sub districts to better meet the direction contained in the approved Comprehensive Plan. These changes will be discussed at the work session and could change the Illustration of our Vision Chapter.</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Green Change</p> <p><i>These changes represent modifications that do not change the intent or meaning of the sub districts or Chapter such as; graphic modifications, typos, wording or clarification of text. These changes will be provided to staff and made if possible. These changes will not be discussed at the meeting; however a list of the changes will be maintained.</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Blue Change</p> <p><i>These changes represent future actions, steps or studies. These additional studies, actions and steps could be necessary to meet the vision and goals of the plan, monitor its success and make change happen consistent with community values. These will be added to a current list and considered as part of the annual work plan and monitoring program outlined in the Comprehensive Plan.</i></p>
<p>Overall</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow 4th floor in Town if open space created in return • Attach population projections to areas where additional growth is said to be acceptable • Remove reduction of house size in County 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add additional language respecting private property rights • Stronger reinforcement of Policy 1.4.c throughout Districts • Ensure consistent language throughout • General editing to clarify language and remove typos • Refine maps to be more legible and properly aligned • Ensure Character Defining Features illustrations and pictures to match text • Greater continuity between Districts in Features Maps (ie E/W connector on District 10 map) • Avoid phrases within sentences such as “in this area,” “in this district.” • I particularly like using the emphasis on stability as a foundation against which proposals for change in some of the districts are referenced. And I support and agree with how the character districts are defined and described • When are complete streets appropriate or not outside of town and in the periphery? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine what types of businesses fit the “year round” definition we are trying to attract to the county. This may help determine how to create an environment that entices those businesses to the area. • Complete Neighborhoods: “high-quality design” is in the eye of the beholder • Consider a North Bridge • “Platted neighborhoods” might be more appropriate than “complete neighborhoods” in the rural areas.
<p>I Introduction</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reformat for improved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

Why	Why Illustrate the Vision		clarity	
How	How is the Vision Illustrated	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is it accurate to say that Rural areas are focused on ecosystem stewardship and complete neighborhoods are focused on Community Character? • Comp. Neigh/Rural Chart: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Indicate classification of each district ○ Add legend • Substitute “have” for “provide”: “Complete neighborhoods have....” • Clarify purpose of Neighborhood Forms • Make transect more consistent with Character Defining Features descriptions • Under Special Consideration for Clustering: will protect wildlife habitat, increase open space and preserve scenic vistas.” • Goal should be added in Conservation (Rural Neighborhoods): A goal will be the removal of dwelling units when doing so will improve the overall preservation of open space and/or wildlife habit. • Goal under Clustering: transportation planning will be integrated. • Under Special Considerations for Habitat/Scenic: Limit house size and overall footprint of development. • Pg 6 = label the size as acres. • Can’t abide the graphics /neighborhood forms the drawings communicate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add bullet under Complete Neighborhood: “The goal for any new development will be to incur no net cost to the community (added tax burden).”

	<p>What Does the Illustration Address</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove attributes from Character Defining Features maps 	<p>more.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CN/R Table <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add Classification (CN or R) Heading to table Better explain strikes/spares Associate Neighborhood Form with each subarea Improve explanation of generality of location of features on the Character Defining Features map Pg 8.3. delete second "elements of". Pg 9.6. add "is" between map and not 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
<p>1</p>	<p>Town Square</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 or 4 story buildings should be allowed Consider enlarging the district to include Wort Hotel etc. The square is not that big and perhaps should be more centered to tourists than as the "center of community life". 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add 3.2.a as an objective Add 3.2.b as an objective Add 6.3.d as an objective Add 4.2.f as an objective Pg 11, are proposed street closures permanent or temporary? And "and other public amenities will be encouraged" doesn't make sense. Pg 12 Map, is the Wort parking shown or is that the parking behind New York City Sub? No ped. access through Jack Dennis, how will that ever happen, remove from plan. What about underground parking? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage more lively businesses, cafes and restaurants, to create vitality. Consider requiring businesses to remain open later during peak seasons.
<p>1.1</p>	<p>Town Square</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
<p>2</p>	<p>Town Commercial Core</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about through routes or bypasses if this area is fully developed 3-4 story buildings should be allowed Add 1.2.a as an objective Less density near flat creek 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add 4.1.d as an objective Add 6.2.b as an objective Add 6.2.c as an objective Add 6.3.a as an objective Remove 6.3.e as an objective, non-locational Add 7.1.c as an objective Remove 7.2.a as an objective, applicable communitywide Add half-circle on future habitat More emphasis on reincorporating the creek 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> into the community • Seems like some clarifications about the role of SK Ave as a through route would help • Add 3.2.a as an objective • Add 3.2.b as an objective • Add 6.3.d as an objective 	
2.1	Snow King Resort	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add more detail to what is meant by “size and scale of structures . . . to be much larger than those typically allowed in other areas of town.” • Add 6.3.d as an objective 	•
2.2	Snow King and South Cache Corridors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow 3-4 story buildings at ends and 2-3 in middle 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Center for the Arts” not “Center of the Arts” 	•
2.3	Downtown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add future desired characteristic: buffer flat creek from development • Subarea as starting point for LO discussion not final LO boundary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify that lodging is also allowed in Town Square 	•
2.4	Public/Civic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg 16, Map change forest service property from Stable to Transitional 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perhaps reword the last sentence in this section. 	•
2.5	North Cache Gateway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only allow 2 story buildings as a gateway to town. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very difficult to determine this district location boundaries on map. • Focus on Flat Creek as recreational and public access amenity • Consider using another depiction for the gateway that is not the same as the Broadway illustration. 	•
3	Town Residential Core	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove 4.1.c as an objective, applicable townwide • Add 4.3.a as an objective • Add 4.3.b as an objective • Remove 4.3.S.2 as an objective, it’s a strategy not an objective • Add 7.1.c as an objective • Remove 7.2.a as an objective, applicable communitywide • Encourage yards, landscaping, small 	•

			<p>footprints for single-family, detached dwellings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better pathway interconnection between neighborhoods and parks • Add 3.2.a as an objective • Add 3.2.b as an objective • First paragraph ends with and second paragraph begins with same words. Rewrite for grammar. 	
3.1	East Jackson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Daylight and enhance Cache Creek through town 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage yards, landscaping, small footprints for single-family, detached dwellings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
3.2	Core Residential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove allowance for more than 3 units per lot and more than 3 stories • Specifically define multifamily housing subarea 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage yards, landscaping, small footprints for single-family, detached dwellings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
3.3	Institutional Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be TRANSITIONAL • Transition to more commercial character and move to District 2 • Move fair/rodeo and transition to workforce housing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thought this was moving to Karns Meadow with Bus Barn? Why in this section?
3.4	Multi-family Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
3.5	East Broadway Mixed Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could allow for 3 story near core scaling down to 2 story near hospital 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move to District 2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
4	Mid-Town	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add policy 1.2.a • Pg 31, If more landscape buffers are going to be required, buildings should get taller to compensate • Delete the “locals downtown” statement as a character goal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add 1.1.c as an objective • Add 4.1.d as an objective • Add 4.3.a as an objective • Add 4.3.b as an objective • Add 5.2.d as an objective • Add 5.3.b as an objective • Add 7.1.c as an objective • Remove 7.2.a as an objective, applicable communitywide • Add 7.2.d as an objective • More emphasis on reincorporating the creek into the community • Clarify that existing lodging will redevelop as 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where is that round-a-bout supposed to be?

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> another use • Encourage yards, landscaping, small footprints for single-family, detached dwellings • Pg 30, map, move wildlife corridor, it is being shown on top of an approved development. • Realign Snow King at Scott • Add policy 3.2.a • Add policy 3.2.b • Add policy 6.3.d 	
4.1	Highway Corridor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3-4 story with a setback. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discusses residential and commercial – office? • Would like some consideration of crossing Broadway. It bisects the district. If crossable, it could provide commercial on both sides of Broadway • If this is for local convenience, it needs local convenient transportation rather than the auto style development. • Broadway needs setback & landscape treatments that are proportional to the road width, with parking off street/ behind building. Landscaping that supports screening. • Emphasize importance of wildlife issues on West Broadway 	•
4.2	Northern Hillside	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow 4 story or increased heights in some areas to mitigate scars and address hillside 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage yards, landscaping, small footprints for single-family, detached dwellings 	•
4.3	Central	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg 32, If more landscape buffers are going to be required, buildings should get taller to compensate 	•	•
4.4	Residential	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage yards, landscaping, small footprints for single- 	•

			family, detached dwellings	
4.5	Karns Meadow	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The connectivity goals include connecting west side of Broadway with Snow King 	•
5	West Jackson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add policy 1.2.a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add 4.1.b as an objective Add 4.1.d as an objective Add 4.2.c as an objective Add 4.3.a as an objective Add 4.3.b as an objective Remove 5.2.b as an objective, applicable communitywide Add 5.3.b as an objective Add 6.2.b as an objective Add 6.2.c as an objective Add 7.1.c as an objective Encourage yards, landscaping, small footprints for single-family, detached dwellings Add policy 3.2.a Add policy 3.2.b 	•
5.1	Highway Corridor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pg 37, If more landscape buffers are going to be required, buildings should get taller to compensate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add discussion of connectivity to residential areas Minimize new road access to 89 and encourage consolidation of roads Not sure why we call out auto dealers 	•
5.2	Gregory Lane Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove “significant amount” in reference to residential use Greater focus on allowing for High Tech/R&D by enhancing infrastructure and promoting full use of potential floor area Delete hierarchy of industrial over livability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make language more consistent with subarea 7.1 	•
5.3	South Park Loop Road	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider adding community level planning effort separate from standard LDR effort 	•
5.4	School Campuses	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “improved alternative mode connectivity” is unhelpful planner speak 	•

5.5	West Jackson Residential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Ownership”: Are we forgetting the Blair apartments? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
5.6	Northwest South Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher priority over infill if for a PRD that locates development from rural areas to 5.6 • Should be STABLE, this area of South park is in the scenic overlay; future growth should be not in the NRO or SRO if possible • Add vision for redundant streets, variety of housing types, wildlife permeability if developed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move subarea to District 10 • Seems uniquely suited for transferred/clustered density, eg from Porter Estate • Development in this area must support the goal of maintaining a 60/40 ratio between development in complete neighborhoods and development in the rural county • Define a baseline level of development in places like the north end of South Park that can only be exceeded if and when development potential is vacated and shifted away from rural areas. There should be more ‘enabling’ language in this part of the plan that encourages property owners and developers to use discretionary tools and voluntary transfers to shift development to locales like the north end of South Park (after infill development in other places has run its course) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
6	Town Periphery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be RURAL. More of the characteristics of rural areas are present • Statement that further subdivision not encouraged. • Add policy 1.2.a • Pg 41 Not sure about the min and max building size restriction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove 4.1.c as an objective, applicable townwide • Remove 7.2.a as an objective, applicable communitywide • Remove half-circle on future walkable amenities • Add half-circle on future abundance of landscape • Add: Smaller buildings and larger yards that enhance wildlife permeability will be encouraged. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If this is to remain a complete neighborhood, there should be more explanation as to why since the text seems to imply that it is more rural in nature now and the future is planned that way as well. • Mention pathways with start and ped in intro. • Seems permeability and corridor symbol should be flipped. Corridor should be solid, permeability should be dotted 	
6.1	Low to Medium Density Neighborhoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USFS site is transitional move to 3.4 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buildings on hillsides will avoid steep slopes, avalanche terrain and wildlife habitat. • Pg 43 Remove language about fencing 	•
6.2	Upper Cache	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No future subdivision 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg 44 Remove language about fencing. Please clarify, having horses is okay but that the Chuck Wagon has to go? 	•
6.3	Snow King Slope	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Town Hill” is kind of jargon 	•
7	South Highway 89	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classify district as RURAL • Add policy 1.4.c • Add policy 6.2.b 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove 3.1.d as an objective, Add 3.2.b as an objective • Remove 5.2.e as an objective, applicable communitywide • Remove 6.3.d as an objective, non-locational • Make future scenic a half-circle • Add half-circle on existing limited, detached residential • Add: Clustering of light industrial development out of and away from wildlife habitat and open spaces will be promoted when possible. • Amend text: “To protect the Development and redevelopment will avoid 	•

			<p>crucial wildlife habitat and movement corridors on the hillsides as well as riparian areas in this district.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add policy 4.4.b • Would like a stronger statement about wildlife permeability especially if there is more development in this area. • Pg 48 Map Two southern wildlife crossings, grey back because they are in different Districts than this one. 	
7.1	South Park Business Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wildlife crossings not appropriate • Greater focus on allowing for High Tech/R&D by enhancing infrastructure and promoting full use of potential floor area • Remove language promoting High Tech/R&D 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address convenience commercial relationship to 10.1 • Allow workforce housing but limit families • Pg 49 Encourage architectural and landscaping enhancements not at the expense of light industry. How is this done? Does this need to be reworded? 	•
7.2	Hog Island Home Business	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What viewshed is protected by moving back from the highway? 	•
8	River Bottom	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow equestrian facilities on larger parcels to promote the western character of our community • River bottom should allow public access to the river – low impact pedestrian/bike, cartop boat launch/takeout. Public use of Levee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove 1.1.g as an objective, applicable communitywide • Add 3.1.c as an objective • Make future scenic a half-circle • Discuss management of river access in Existing + Future text • Add ½ circle to walk able schools and commercial, primarily from Tucker and John Dodge (Aspens Market and C-Bar-V Ranch school both within ½ mile) • Potential to separate areas of River Bottom, several developed areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider adding ARUs for the specific purpose of workforce housing

			<p>are not as rural as other areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Watch the use of the word “small” to describe housing type. Does this suggest we will have different sized houses in different zones? • Public and commercial access to what? 	
8.1	Solitude/John Dodge/Tucker/Linn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg 53, add the word natural in front of waterbodies. • Allow appropriate subdivision to continue • Question whether clustering among large lots is better than not. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incentives for reducing density and removal of dwelling units will be evaluated and applied if considered effective 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excluding Solitude, this is more like District 6, in that it is a buffer between a Complete Neighborhood and the rural areas. It also has other features of more complete neighborhoods. (Proximity to schools, restaurants, START service, etc.) • Add ability to utilize ARUs or mechanisms for workforce housing on site
8.2	Large Parcels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow appropriate subdivisions to continue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
8.3	Canyon Corridor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify inappropriateness of subdivision • Clarify: “The highway parallel to the river will be addressed in this area.” How? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
8.4	Hoback Junction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perhaps this district and the Aspens/Pines are more similar than originally viewed. They both have some commercial and some residential, but are not complete neighborhoods.
9	County Valley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add 3.1.c as an objective • Page 57 Add Puzzle Face Ranch to the list of protected scenic vistas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
9.1	Jackson Hole Golf and Tennis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rewrite, goals are not grounded in reality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large dwelling units would be allowed only in return for significant improvements to wildlife habitat, additions to open space and when there would be no net loss of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

			<p>work force housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “It will incorporate clustering, reduction in building size and other methods to increase wildlife permeability.” Seems like clustering buildings can be a bigger problem than separated larger buildings. 	
9.2	Agricultural Foreground	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit additional equine uses that will serve both the local and tourist community, as well as, the necessary buildings to house and maintain them. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
9.3	Nethercott/Wenzel/ 3 Creek/ Lower Melody	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg 60 Do not reduce building size 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify inappropriateness of subdivision 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
9.4	Gros Ventre Buttes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify inappropriateness of subdivision 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
10	South Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add 3.1.c as an objective • Add policy 7.2.a • What does “directed into or adjacent to areas of existing development” mean? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
10.1	Southern South Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change to Transitional designation • Delete focus on maintaining areas as undeveloped open space • Delete sentence regarding interconnection of subdivisions • Should be divided so that the area West of Rafter J is the new area slated for potential additional density 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
10.2	Central South Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would like to call out recreation and public access to flat creek. Preservation of corner of 89 and HS Road and call out "gateway" characteristics, design in this area • Better location for Fairgrounds • encourage development to the north of this 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

		<p>district, closer to existing services - not north and south</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg 64 Map Change 10.2 area west of wildlife corridor that is mapped Preservation to Conservation 		
11	Wilson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove 5.2.e as an objective, applicable communitywide • Remove 6.2.b as an objective • Add 6.2.c as an objective • Text is slightly contradictory: "It will retain....that serve the residents and visitors of Wilson without attracting vehicle trips." To serve visitors, it must attract at least some vehicle trips. Perhaps language to the effect of "would not be a destination retail center." 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
11.1	Wilson Commercial Core	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further define future character 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
11.2	Wilson Townsite	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg 70 define "possible accessory residential unit." Just make them allowable assuming lot constraints 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
11.3	Wilson Meadows	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
11.4	South Wilson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "One detached residential unit per three acres <u>or more</u> will remain the character of the area." 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
12	Aspens/Pines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connection to River & public access in this area to support recreation uses. Better parks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add 5.2.d as an objective • Add 6.2.c as an objective • Add ½ circle to minimal nonresidential development, there is not much compared to the residential development. • Pg 74 Map How can ped. Connection happen through the golf course, remove. • Sketch on IV-75 needs a compass rose. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
12.1	Aspens/Pines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be stable and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 3.2.e. should be 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

	Commercial Core	allow for redevelopment of existing commercial space, as needed, but because over ½ of this district is in the NRO, no further development should occur	removed because with the proposed development, there is no room for quality open space. In addition, this objective seems to contradict the objective 7.3.b, if the plan goes ahead as written today	
12.2	390 Residential Core	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change to Stable designation • Should clearly address transportation issues before additional development allowed. • Are public parks appropriate? 	•	•
12.3	Aspens/Pines Residential	•	•	• Add ability to utilize ARUs or mechanisms for workforce housing on site
12.4	390 Residential South	• Approx 5 lots 50x150 would fit into a one acre lot. Should more density than 1du/1 ac be considered?	•	•
13	Teton Village	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow for noncontiguous PRD and workforce housing units • Stronger emphasis to encourage combination of the master plans • Elaborate on the amount of additional commercial, office and residential units will be allowed. In a general range. • Add policy 1.2.a • Add policy 1.2.b • Add policy 1.2.c • Requiring extensive water treatment plants here seems reasonable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add 5.2.d as an objective • Add 6.3.a as an objective • Add half-circle on existing walkable amenities • Enhance discussion of Resort character • Add policy 4.1.b • Add policy 5.2.c • Add policy 5.3.a • Add policy 5.4.a • Pg 78 Map If a school is a desired amenity for the Village shouldn't the School Tract be shown as part of this District? 	•
13.1	Teton Village Commercial Core	•	•	•
13.2	Teton Village Residential Core	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow higher density residential to meet 60/40 tie density increases to transportation plans. • Address wildlife permeability 	• Only resort that should be allowed to expand beyond master plan. Request should come with commensurate other benefits, including transportation and public	•

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> and affordable housing Pg 80 Map Since Shooting Star is platted and built, shouldn't it be mapped as Stable? 	
13.3	Teton Village Single Family	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow higher density residential to meet 60/40 without expanding footprint 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
14	Alta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add 1.1.b as an objective Add 3.1.c as an objective Add 5.3.b as an objective Remove 6.3.d as an objective, non-locational Remove 7.2.c as an objective, Add 7.3.a as an objective 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add ability to utilize ARUs or mechanisms for workforce housing on site
14.1	Alta Farmland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
14.2	Alta Core	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1/3 acre lots equal about two town lots, 50x150. Should the possibility of smaller lots be considered? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workforce housing is not illustrated on the map, but is referenced in the text Typo , Third sentence, change character to lots 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
14.3	Grand Targhee Resort	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stronger statement about permanent conservation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify that Targhee shouldn't grow beyond Master Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
15	County Periphery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus character discussion on reducing impacts and maintaining outlying communities Permit additional equine uses that will serve both the local and tourist community, as well as, the necessary buildings to house and maintain them 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add 1.2.a as an objective Add 3.1.c as an objective Add 3.5.a as an objective Add 5.3.b as an objective Remove 6.3.e as an objective, non-locational strong priority for conservation, Not sure how START fits here Pg 91 Remove concept that future development could negatively impact everything. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add ability to utilize ARUs or mechanisms for workforce housing on site
15.1	Large Outlying Parcels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
15.2	Buffalo Valley Residential/ Game Creek/South Fall Creek	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rewrite, goals are not grounded in reality. Limiting house size is a problem for me. I don't know what's too big or why. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Move all of Buffalo Valley to 15.3 Clarify inappropriateness of subdivision Is wildlife permeability an issue here that prompts the need to "restore"? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
15.3	Buffalo Valley Highway Ranches	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reformat subarea so that Buffalo Valley is its own 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to address the relations between Moran 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

		<p>Preservation Area focused on maintaining existing open space, school, and convenience commercial</p>	<p>at one end and the Hatchet at another end.</p>	
15.4	Kelly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “but commercial uses will not be expanded beyond something on the scale of a small pub or grill to serve residents and visitors.” • Permit additional equine uses that will serve both the local and tourist community, as well as, the necessary buildings to house and maintain them 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • START to Kelly does not seem realistic. • There is more commercial than the Kelly store and post office. What about live work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •