

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
10.12 District 12: South Park	I live in Indian Trails and have a vested interest in maintaining our quiet, low-keyed neighborhood. I would not like to see Tribal Trail and Rt. 22 connected. The Conservation Easement on the land between Boyle's Hill Rd. and Rt. 22 is a particularly beautiful part of the Hole with the Tetons viewed to the west, encompassing Boyle's Hill and bordered by High School Butte and a small ranch to they east. It includes a wetland being rehabilitated, a horse farm, cattle (in the past.) It is a small wonderland, filled with birds and mammals, appreciated by many, not only the residents but also users of the bike path as a flat, natural area, from which to view spectacular scenery. Indian Trails is an area filled with families with young children. If there is another route which a connector road to take, it would save this little jewel in its beautiful setting.	Amy Stoffelmayr	5/14/2009 13:39
10.12 District 12: South Park	<p>I am a resident of Cottonwood Park. We moved to Jackson 6 1/2 years ago from Salt Lake City, UT to enjoy the open space, wildlife, and small mountain town atmosphere. The proposed comprehensive plan would destroy many of the values that we hold dear.</p> <p>Growing up, I lived in Durango, CO. I watched minimally-regulated growth completely change the character of that town over the course of 30 years. Also, as a resident of Salt Lake City, I watched as rampant growth took over the Park City valley. What was once a mountain town became overrun by dense housing developments.</p> <p>To preserve Jackson, we must learn from the demise of other mountain communities. Please listen to the results of the public survey, and consider the consequences of the current proposal.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Residents ranked what they saw as the valley's priorities. The planners are not using those findings as a guideline. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Wildlife #1</li> <li>b. Growth #2</li> <li>c. Town as Heart #3</li> <li>d. Housing needs #4</li> <li>e. Economy #5</li> <li>f. Transportation #6</li> <li>g. Services #7</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Open space must be preserved along the western portion of High School Road, south of the artery! With the current housing, schools and light industry in the area, the road cannot handle more traffic and the area needs more park space.</li> <li>3. NO commercial or light industry use. The eastern end of High School Road is densely developed, and additional light pollution would further deteriorate our night skies.</li> <li>4. Future development south of High School Road MUST have at least one east-west connector to Highway 89/189/191. High School Road is for SCHOOL traffic only and is already very congested.</li> <li>5. The valley growth rate must be limited to 1.5% per year. Even at these levels the town will grow quickly!</li> </ol> <p>Please review these comments and consider them in the course of developing a new comprehensive plan! This plan will guide our communities development for many years to come, and we need to take action now to avoid the pitfalls of other mountain communities.</p>	Ann Mattson	5/14/2009 8:15
10.12 District 12: South Park	<p>I have the following concerns about the South Park Development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.) 1/8 of a mile (660 ft.) set-backs from South Park Loop Rd. is inadequate. There should be set-backs of at least 1/4 mile from both this road and the High School Road. The only ditch that conveys water from the Leek Ditch over to the Dairy Subdivision (where there are water rights, appears to be the one along the South side of High School Road). Further, why do we care more about keeping this "gateway" (East of Flat Creek)open from development, while congesting the NW side of Flat Creek. Seems that we are giving preference to tourists visiting Jackson Hole at the expense of the folks that live and work here. Why not actually maintain open spaces and "scenic vistas" rather than giving that impression to passing travelers, who would find something very different if they drove just a mile to the West.</li> <li>2.) What about infrastructure? Will connector roads (East/ West) and other roads be in place before they determine how many units will be packed in to this area. What about open space? Rangeview seems to be very well planned and laid out, almost too well, as we get a lot of traffic from folks visiting Rangeview Park from all over town (but especially Blair Place and Ellingwood). As I understand it, the open space in Rangeview was detremined by the # of residents (when you add all of the additional use and potentially even more from the other side of High School Road, this makes me feel like I live in the center of a housing project). I'm concerned that there will be a toilet bowl effect, with Rangeview Park at the center (especially when the Tribal Trails connceter goes through). Thank you for your time and consideration.</li> </ol>	Bodean Barney	5/12/2009 10:59

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
10.12 District 12: South Park	<p>Change the priority to "Limit Growth Responsibly"</p> <p>A main theme priority in South Park should be preservation of scenic vistas and open space. May tourists drive into town and stop to take pictures of the area from the highway. This open space and scenic vista will contribute to sustaining our economy.</p> <p>The other theme should be limit all growth to the northwest corner adjacent to high school road.</p> <p>Delete all references and statements about developing from north to south. This is a dangerous topic and gives a green light for extensive development in South Park rather than preservation of open space.</p> <p>The use of the term "town development pattern" does not fall under the definition of responsible. Please change this to "Community Needs Development Pattern". I do not know of a single person who would like to see Town Development in South Park.</p> <p>The addition of a priority to create very large areas of infiltration wetlands (could be stormwater treatment wetlands for Town runoff) to lands that are converted from flood irrigation practices in South Park. This will ultimately provide groundwater recharge that Spring Creek (near 3 Creek Ranch) and other South Park wetlands need to be sustained. For example, portions of the Rafter J ponds stay ice free in the winter and provide crucial winter habitat for Trumpeter swans.</p> <p>Flat Creek needs a minimum 150' buffer from development. Development of South Park with town level development from north to south will completely degrade this waterbody. This should be seriously stated in this section.</p>	Brian Remlinger	5/8/2009 17:33
10.12 District 12: South Park	<p>Let's talk sustainable. What do you want to be sustainable in your lifetime?</p> <p>I'm a grandmother. I might not be around to fight the next fight. The last comprehensive plan in 1994 I was at my parent's house on the Village road watching my mother die and trying to help my father cope. My mother was 57. There are some things in life that when you let go you can't get them back.</p> <p>The entire community said that wildlife in our backyards, in our meadows, on our hillsides, drinking from our ponds, creeks and river banks was our most important community value. And in this new comprehensive plan draft (let's hope it's only a draft) the planners are flipping us off. Once we've been taken advantage of they'll keep coming back for more.</p> <p>I made my husband go to the South Park planner's meeting. My neighbors wouldn't go because, well, you know the saying "Fool me Once". What I heard at my Planner's neighbor meeting was, "Cindy we are going to take your most important community value and transfer it to Alta, Buffalo Valley, Hog Island, and Kelly. Not to worry. The wildlife in your neighborhood will learn to use the cross walks and read the signs. If they do make it to Alta, Buffalo Valley, Hog Island, or Kelly there will be "Affordable Wildlife Housing" to meet their needs." In exchange we will take the development rights from Alta, Buffalo Valley, Hog Island and Kelly and move it to replace your wildlife's habitat.</p> <p>If the planners heard the valley say, "slow the impacts of development" (News and Guide Oct 15, 08), by regulating growth", what dictionary are they using? In my dictionary, Daniel tells me that slow means to proceed at less than the usual speed. (It also means stupid or sluggish which is another can of worms.)</p> <p>Jeff Daugherty our county planning director and Alex Norton a county planner explained that this comprehensive plan would be a road map for citizens and elected officials as far as where development should be in the county and town. -----Who told Jeff and Alex? Who and where did their comprehensive plan data come from? It didn't come from "We the People".</p> <p>The Planner's power point slide show is just as smooth and creamy as your granny's fudge. But they don't say anything about where they bought the ingredients or what this comprehensive plan is going to do to our girlish figure.</p>	Cindy Hill Stone	4/26/2009 0:00
10.12 District 12: South Park	<p>I am opposed to your proposals for South Park. You have NOT listened to South Park residents. I do not want "managed growth". I want the jewel that is Jackson hole protected. I do not want green fields turned into housing.</p> <p>I support a moratorium on new development, and only new building on sites that are already developed with existing structures.</p> <p>I do not see the growth envisaged as responsible; more houses= more people = more cars= less wildlife and a damaged ecosystem.</p>	Craig Leslie	4/22/2009 15:07
10.12 District 12: South Park	<p>I am a resident of Cottonwood Park</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We must have Green space from cottonwood park extending from the High school to South Park road, extending 1000 feet to the South. This can be used as a park or future school property. Our two parks in cottonwood are used by everyone in the area and overused.</li> <li>2. NO commercial use, we have Smiths and other stores 1/2 mile away!!!! We Do not need any more light pollution. !!!!</li> <li>3. Future development MUST have at Least one east-west connector to Highway 189. High School Road MUST not be used as a main artery. IT IS A SCHOOL ROAD ONLY!!!!!!!!!!</li> <li>4. Growth rate of 1.5% / year.</li> <li>5. Planners are not following the Survey. Look at what the people said, you have altered the results.             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Wildlife, #1 not 6</li> <li>b. Growth, #2 not 1</li> <li>c. Town as heart, #3 not 7</li> <li>d. Housing needs,#4 not 2</li> <li>e. Economy, #5 not 3</li> <li>f. transportation, #6 not 4</li> <li>g. Services #7 not 5</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	David Pfeifer	5/12/2009 10:37

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
<p>10.12 District 12: South Park</p>	<p>Thank you for accepting my comments. I am a resident of Cottonwood Park Neighborhood. I came to Jackson from my home state of Colorado in 1977 with every intention of returning. I was on a summer climbing trip and had a job at a local summer camp. I ended up with a complete life here. I think the reason I stayed was people here had a sense of what was valuable, not in terms of dollars, but in quality of life. I hope that my suggestions are helpful. I know that I am part of Jackson's overall growth too.</p> <p>First of all, developing of land as an economy is flawed. Second, importing labor is a sign that business is flawed.</p> <p>Maintain an economy for the citizens. Jackson in the 1970's supported itself with a tourist based industry. Granted, there weren't huge profits but the community was very happy. Is there any chance we could return to just hosting visitors and showing off our beautiful county? The plan seems to be designed for expansion of town as if this type of growth is necessary for our survival. I think we're more unique.</p> <p>Specific to my concern: We work a huge amount of hours to come home and enjoy our nice, quiet neighborhood in Cottonwood Park. We are, for the third time, threatened with a super high density development right next door. This "node" has been kicked around the county and again landed on our doorstep. Nobody that I know wants the Porter Estate to be a city. I would welcome a mirrored image of Cottonwood Park in density (1/3 of proposed) and character to provide opportunity to our next generation of "in community" citizens on that land. Bear in mind that Cottonwood Park originally did not attract the buyer that would get a Sotheby's broker very excited but it did provide Jackson's current citizens a quality home. We have one of the most diverse neighborhoods in the County. We want to continue to maintain our "neighborhood character" as all of the other Town of Jackson subdivisions have claimed when a large development was proposed in their backyard.</p> <p>Please don't use the area for density trade, bonus, credit, whatever, for somebody's profit elsewhere. I suggest we take that off the table completely. Any trade for open space belongs in South Park. This property can be put on the market in a form attractive to the community, not to the outside opportunist. Also, it's not free enterprise if we pack it full of subsidized housing.</p> <p>Please adjust colors on the District 12 map to reflect the open space buffer zone along High School Road discussed with Cottonwood Park residents or schedule another meeting with the residents to confirm and clarify this proposed buffer zone. We would like to see this buffer zone be 1/4 of a mile (not 1 1/2 city blocks). If this buffer zone has been discarded please advise us.</p> <p>I think that an access corridor would be appropriate along Flat Creek, rather than allow it to be privately held. Maybe the District 12 map should suggest this, in color.</p> <p>Roads, in particular the "East-West connector", parks, water, sewer, should precede coloring of the map. Draw some lines and dimensions even if it's just preliminary, we'd get a better feel for what you are thinking.</p> <p>Wildlife, Scenery: Our moose and deer like the view of the Snake River Range as much as John Dodge moose enjoy the Teton view.</p> <p>Also note, and I'm sure you have, that quite a few old time citizens have moved to other areas e.g. Star Valley to have more space for horses, etc. and still work in Jackson. This is their choice and there is no reason to add more workers to replace them. They are still here, working.</p>	<p>Dennis Jesse</p>	<p>5/17/2009 22:58</p>
<p>10.12 District 12: South Park</p>	<p>The northwest end of South Park is a logical extension of town densities. This should be done by annexing in phases as development warrants. However, the text and the map have contradictions. The rest of South Park is very confusing. On the map, the area suggested for development seems to grow with each version of the map, the remainder being shown as Agriculture/Rural. But, while wildlife is significant during several times of year (particularly winter), Wildlife &amp; Natural Resources are shown as next to last in terms of importance. Also, South Park is inexplicitly excluded from the list (Policy 1.6a) where conservation easements would be appropriate. Even though the importance of the Flat Creek corridor and view sheds are noted--there is no protection mechanism for these areas--much less wildlife migration/winter habitat protection.</p> <p>Density bonuses in the "node" of South Park are not clear--this node should be more of a transitional node to lower density housing. There needs to be more recognition of the importance of protected open space in South Park. It is not clear whether this node will be expanding dramatically in the future. On page 110 of the plan, in the first paragraph development of 1/4 to 1/2 mile in the NW part is described, then in the second paragraph "The northern 3/4 miles of South Park is appropriate for town-style development..." Is this all the way to Hwy 89 including the corner of High School Road?</p> <p>The language and the map related to South Park appear to be contradictory.</p> <p>Even 6 Pronghorns spent the summer in South Park as recently as 2006--to ignore wildlife in South Park is untenable. It is rich with birds and mammals.</p>	<p>Diane Hazen</p>	<p>5/15/2009 21:58</p>

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
10.12 District 12: South Park	<p>In my opinion, one of the biggest flaws of the failed attempt to develop the Porter Estate was the commercial development slated for the frontage of High School Road. That plan was noxious in terms of density, undue increased traffic on High School Road, and the significant loss of green space to predictably intrusive commercial buildings.</p> <p>At our neighborhood meeting at the Cottonwood Park community center early this winter (prior to the May meeting), we discussed these concerns with the planners, with an emphasis on the imperative of open space on High School Road. The planners indicated their understanding and agreement of the usefulness of this point.</p> <p>This new plan has no green space on High School Road, nor do I see any green space down toward Rafter J except for what I assume is the Lockhart property.</p> <p>I would like to see a significant buffer of green space, the same depth as the high school property, running all the way from the high school to South Park Road. Why does the plan specify the preservation of the scenic character of South Park Rd. but not High School Road? I agree it is a beautiful road to drive or bike down. However, the mostly part-time residents of Three Creek can't see the road over the berms, while Cottonwood residents enjoy the scenic vista of the Porter Estate from High School Road and the view is of enormous value.</p> <p>Better yet why not extend the green space to protect the scenic value of South Park Rd as well and simply centralize the development and extend it south to make up for lost space?</p> <p>The other imperative is for one (or two) new east/west road(s) connecting the proposed mixed use parcel to Hwy 89 and preferably no entrance or exit on High School Road at all. If and when Hwy 22 is connected to South Park Rd. there should also be appropriate redirection of traffic flow to mitigate new traffic on High School Road coming from Hwy 22.</p> <p>The plan indicates the east/west road would be created as development occurs, but I think it should come first. If not, there is no way to avoid the huge trucks and other new construction traffic on High School Rd. during the lengthy development phase.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of my concerns.</p>	Ellen Nolan	5/14/2009 23:22
10.12 District 12: South Park	<p>Cottonwood park was the first neighborhood development for the "service industry" and working class of jackson. For over twenty years our community has been trying to catch up to the housing demands. I realize development will happen. District 12 has dover apartment, Blair place, and 3 creek employee units. Flat creek business center, gregory lane industrial park, and smiths plaza.</p> <p>1) prior to any future development. please give us "open/green space" on the south side of cottonwood park. the "hole" strip from middle school road to southpark loop. it should extend far enough south to maintain the visual astetics of munger mountain region, green knoll, and mesquito creek. minimum of 2500 ft.</p> <p>2)The proxsimty(sp) of professional services and retail to our district is the highest per capita of all the districts in teton county. the is no need for future commercial growth.</p> <p>This proposal has negative effects for the goal of town (lets start saying community at heart, how about region at heart). You asked our opinion. your plan DOES NOT SUCCEED IN ACCOPMLISHING ANY OF THE SURVEY RESULTS. TO ACHIEVE REGION AT HEART WE MUST WORK TOGETHER. YOUR ACTIONS DO NOT REPRESENT ANY OF THE HEART.</p> <p>The high school has all windows on the north side. the shop is on the creek and visable from the gateway(poor water quality/ visually bad). the year round soccer field where designed to have people kicking balls at cars not nets. these are just a few example of poor planning in our district. You dont need a phd to design an industrial park the can handle semi's. "s" turns on gregory lane?????????</p> <p>p.s. build out should not block lines of sight of pedestrians or vehicals.</p> <p>less angst + more trust + town/county/region at heart.</p> <p>I may not type well, or spell well. please dont make obvious mistakes. slow down.</p>	Gordy Richman	5/13/2009 22:09
10.12 District 12: South Park	<p>While I can not claim residence in the valley for a long time (6yrs), I can add some thoughts on what I hope occurs to my home current and future in Cottonwood Park. My thoughts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Keep growth rural in South Park</li> <li>2. Open space along the High School Rd.</li> <li>3. New development south of HS road, will need another east/west rd, and keep commercial nil or minimal as there is enough traffic and light pollution as it is.</li> <li>4. NO upzoning in town kill pmd's, and strict adherence to the plan/zoning that is/will be in place</li> <li>5. Keep the plan and just as important, future legislation and or zoning and property development decisions, in line with what the survey states.</li> <li>6. I understand that this area makes sense for some town like density, but lets not dump everything here. All of the county areas need to be part os the solution. Including the west bank and east jackson , my self just like me owners in those areas do not want their vision of Jackson to be overrun by growth and development.</li> <li>7. Do not over grow the valley. Just because it can be bigger does not mean better.</li> </ol>	Greg Bigler	5/15/2009 8:48

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
10.12 District 12: South Park	<p>I am a resident of Rafter J subdivision.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We must have green space from Cottonwood Park extending fro the Highschool Rd. to South Park Rd, extending 1000 ft. to the south. This can be used as a park of future school property. The 2 parks in Cottonwood are used by everyone in the area and overused.</li> <li>2. NO commercial use. The Smith's plaza is enough. More light pollution is not needed.</li> <li>3. Future development must have at least one east-west connection to Hwy 89. Highschool Rd. MUST NOT be used as a main artery. IT SHOULD REMAIN A SCHOOL ROAD ONLY.</li> <li>4. GROWTH RATE OF 1.5% per year.</li> <li>5. Planners are not following the survey. You have altered the results!                         <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Wildlife: #1 NOT 6</li> <li>b. Growth: #2 not 1</li> <li>c. Town as heart: #3 not 7</li> <li>d. Housing needs: #4 not 2</li> <li>e. Economy: #5 not 3</li> <li>f. Transportation: #6 not 4</li> <li>g. Services: #7 not 5</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Greg Olson	5/14/2009 19:10
10.12 District 12: South Park	<p>According to the results from the community survey, it does not appear that the connection road from hwy 89 is a desired thing. If fact, it seems like the road is completely unwanted.</p>	Jessica Yeomans	5/10/2009 21:18
10.12 District 12: South Park	<p>You have slated far too much growth and development for the South Park area. We don't need that much housing in this areas. High School Road cannot support that degree of development. Wildlife migration will also be unforgivably adversely affected.</p> <p>The current economic situation has resulted in less demand for new housing in Teton County. You should re-evaluate all plans for growth, in all areas of the County, at this time, since your data and comments from the public advocating more housing are now outdated.</p>	Jill Moberg	5/15/2009 17:11
10.12 District 12: South Park	<p>I do not know why you bother to take public comments on a comprehensive plan for Teton County. The public has repeatedly said that their priorities are for wildlife preservation, open space, and affordable housing. Yet your actions seem directed at development to the detriment of all of these three factors. Perhaps, it lets you feel better to believe that you have taken public comments, but public desires have had no impact.</p> <p>In addition, the expense of a master plan seems to be wasted. Even with the prior comprehensive plan, it seems to have had no impact on your approval of developments. The plan called for 35 acre lots in rural overlays. However, if 350 acres were to be developed, first it was increased from 10 lots to 25 as bonus density for clustering and leaving open space. Then, it was increased to 50 if affordable housing was included. Finally, "we don't want affordable housing in our upscale project" so the dense housing was put in South Park. The final result was a project that instead of having 10 millionaire homes, we get 50 millionaire homes that probably put more strain on services and affordable housing than was solved.</p> <p>Either quit the charade or truly listen to the public. South Park is a major wildlife corridor, and currently has a rural character. We don't want it to become a solid, high density housing development.</p>	Jon Parker	5/11/2009 0:00
10.12 District 12: South Park	<p>I agree that the No. part of South Park is a logical place for residential growth outside the town of Jackson. I am encouraged by the possibility that such growth will include attention to Safe Streets designs, and effective public transit. I am relieved to see the map include a mix of density types suggested for the South Park area. I really cannot picture what the proposed buildout might actually look like on the ground. It all sounds like A LOT.</p>	Karen Jerger	5/15/2009 3:33
10.12 District 12: South Park	<p>I think the conceptual land use is acceptable. I live in Rafter J and believe that building between High School Road and Melody is a good option. Not only will adding homes in this area give people who work in Jackson places to live, but it will also provide jobs to all of the people who will be needed to build the homes.</p>	Kate Rohrstaff	5/15/2009 14:32

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
<p>10.12 District 12: South Park</p>	<p>I just think that unless you solve the problems we have right now and use the laws we have on the books to reign in the renting of single family homes to 4, 5 and 6 people by landlords in supposedly single family neighborhoods, this trend will just spread South to any new neighborhood and history then repeats itself. People are going to find a way to cram as many into a house to save on rent. All at the expense of the live in owners who are trying to make ends meet and make their home a home not just a frat house. There is no regard for the speed limit and safety of the children playing. These single family homes are suppose to have no more then 3 unrelated people in them. I just went around the corner of my place to a house and asked them to get the cars off the lawn (what was left of it!)clean up the trash and the empty beer bottles. At that time I think they had 5 kids living in the house. They had a bar set up at the end of the garage and fire wood and skis here and there. Not pleasant to look at. Plan all you want but it will be for nothing if you can't preserve the single family neighborhood. It is indeed an admirable proposal to try to persuade people to use alternate modes of transportation such as biking, taking the bus, car pooling and last but not least your feet. The Teton County, Town of Jackson Comprehension Draft Plan is trying to do just that, with an overall reduction of single occupied vehicles (SOV's). The plans' success relies on the good graces and athletic capabilities of our future residents that would live in the proposed new South Park town hub. A reality check is needed when we grow bigger instead of better. Before I get to the realty check I just want to say I love the proposed programs about home mail delivery, encouraging and or requiring students to take the bus, walk or bike (don't forget skateboarding) to school and employee carpooling incentives. We should back them 100%. Although I think we should forget about encouraging students not to drive to school. Bribing works best with teenagers. Now, fantasy verses reality. Do you really think people in the future South Park town hub, living that far away from their jobs and services in Teton Village, Wilson and town are going to give up their car to take the bus, walk or bike? The only South Park residents that will possibly walk or take the bus are the employees at the South Park convenience stores selling four dollar a gallon not so fresh milk, overpriced beer and cigarettes. Now suppose they do hop on their bikes or walk to the stores or work. Don't you think they'll have trouble getting through those unplowed pathways in the winter? I know several people including a lot of kids that have that problem right now. There is also that highly visible but nobody wants to do anything about it problem of overcrowded non family occupied rental homes with five and six cars in the driveways, on the lawns and on the streets (snow plow drivers love the last one). I don't think that a new South Park town hub is going to solve it. The rent is not going to be any cheaper and if tenants can save a lot of money and landlords look the other way; South Park is going to end up having the same problems other single family neighborhoods are having right now. That brings me to the calculations on the build out number of up to 1500 units for South Park over the next 10 to 15 years. I know, I'm not supposed to worry, it's just a number. Instead of 3,000 more cars coming out of South Park it will probably be more like 4000 cars when the above rental trend spreads there. I keep hearing the plan is just guidelines. Well, let's guide it a little more. Why don't we just take a breather, listen to the majority of the constituents who want "limited" managed growth and scale this plan back. What's the rush? The economy is not heading anywhere fast, anytime soon. In the mean time we can work on solving the problems we have by building more affordable Category 1, 2 and 3 homes in town, closer to work and services so our future residents don't wear out so many shoes and bicycle tires. Clear the most used pathways in the winter or groom them all and break out the cross country skis! Give single families back their neighborhoods by creating on work site employee housing like seasonal hostels with a few more creature comforts for the singles that just need someplace to sleep, store their skis, bikes and kayaks. Nothing fancy they're up all night and day anyway either working or playing. That's why they came to Jackson Hole. Improve the bus system we have by doing two way loops so you don't have to go all the way around town to get to Smith's from Cottonwood! I like sightseeing but we should leave that for the tourists.</p>	<p>Kathy Tompkins</p>	<p>4/29/2009 0:00</p>
<p>10.12 District 12: South Park</p>	<p>For South Park, the following 2009 Plan adjustments are in order:                      -Wildlife and Natural Resources should be first priority for the South Park district                      -Clearly articulate the entire district as containing important wildlife, connectivity, and scenic values, using language similar to that in the current (1994) comp plan.                      -Delete language that states South Park will be built out from 'North to South starting at High School Road.'                      -Exhaust in-fill in town before considering any expansion into new County nodes, including NW South Park.                      -Drastically reduce the proposed NW South Park 400-acre, 1,500-unit housing node, both in footprint and number of units, consistent with a less-growth plan.                      -Clearly state that any density incentives used for the reduced NW South Park node will be derived from permanent open space protection within the district only, not from Alta or Buffalo Valley.                      -At least 50% of any density incentive in any County node or targeted Town growth area to be derived from permanent open space incentives (not solely from workforce housing), still leaving 50% available to incentivize additional deed-restricted workforce housing.                      -The reduced NW South Park node to have a pull-back from both High School (for a park) and South Park Loop Roads, to respect the educational nature of HS Road and the scenic value of South Park Loop.                      -The design of any development in the reduced NW South Park node to allow wildlife movement permeability.                      -The placement of an East-West connector road in South Park should precede any new development in the Northwest corner of South Park and placed close enough behind the high school to alleviate traffic on High School Rd.                      -The design of the reduced Northwest corner of South Park should not be connected directly to High School Road but to the new East-West connector road.                      -No annexation of the new reduced Northwest corner of South Park until it is designed and approved under County LDR criteria. No annexation as a whole, to then fall into Town design standards.                      -The Tribal Trails connector between South Park Loop Road and HWY 22 not even considered until all solutions for improving the 'Y' intersection are exhausted, and assurances made that no new traffic would be diverted onto High School Road.</p>	<p>Kathy Tompkins</p>	<p>5/15/2009 16:36</p>

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
10.12 District 12: South Park	<p>Thank you for reading and considering the following letter. Most residents in Jackson feel the true values we have expressed were not prioritized in the Comp Plan. I look forward to discussions over the next few months.</p> <p><b>JACKSON'S HOLE</b></p> <p>Let's face it, if it were not for the unparalleled beauty of our Tetons, the abundance of open space, and the incredible wildlife outside our backdoors, how many of us would choose to move to Jackson? Without those qualities, this isolated town might as well be just a Hole. According to the most recent Comp Plan, we are about to lose two of those three qualities in the next several years, should this plan go unchallenged. With maximum growth as the Plan's priority, open space will be the exception and wildlife will be forced to retreat even further from our view. The South Park Neighborhoods are being targeted with attention to maximum build-out with minimal regard for our wildlife and scenic values. We, as a community, must be aware that this undeveloped area of town is our last chance to ensure that the qualities we value about Jackson will remain for future generations. There can be an incredible opportunity to create a better, 'green' community South of town, not just bigger, with careful planning. It is clear, the message our Planning Department has sent in favor of big development, is that Jackson Hole should be just a Hole.</p> <p>Survey after survey has shown overwhelming support for least or no growth options, protecting our wildlife, increasing transit over building new roads, and scenic values as the priorities for Jackson Hole residents. Our Comp Plan should not focus on build-out, but focus on build-in! Now is the time our Comp Plan should focus to improve our infrastructure: maintain least growth patterns though out Jackson, mandate all future construction be 50% green building materials, expand public transportation routes, redesign the Y intersection as a roundabout (solves traffic delays, saves fuel, reduces pollution) , expand recycling methods with curb pick up, require any new development must meet 1:1 minimum open space ratios, and promote and maintain all wildlife habitat/ migration routes.</p> <p>Let us look for solutions to make our town better, not bigger. Build-in strategies will keep us stronger for future generations, not weaken us through big build-out. Let's keep the name Jackson Hole much more than just a Hole.</p>	Linda Aurelio	4/28/2009 0:00
10.12 District 12: South Park	<p>We strongly object to the density proposed for South Park. The community clearly expressed its opposition to such density during the Teton Meadows application, and also the Comprehensive Plan public input process. South Park has never been a "node"; it is a semi-rural suburban outskirts area of Jackson, with open space, water meadows, and wildlife dependent on those resources. The effect of designating it a node, and allowing higher densities, will be to severely impact one of the Valley's key wildlife corridors. Moreover, it would simply move Jackson outward, creating both the need and the excuse for more high density further south.</p>	Marv and Julia Heilesen	5/15/2009 17:47
10.12 District 12: South Park	<p>Greetings and thank you for taking my comments,</p> <p>In regard to district 12 I feel this plan misses the mark of what the community is looking for. I attended many meetings and had many more discussions along the way where I heard that wildlife and scenic values lie at the core of what our community values most. I heard from planning staff in the last Rafter J informational meeting that wildlife and natural resources can't be the priority theme in every district and agree there is some merit in that statement. However to place those values second to last in south park is completely contrary to what I heard the public say.</p> <p>To manage growth responsibly is something that we should strive for and I think most of us agree that south park is a logical place for SOME growth. I also like starting at the north end (closest to town and public services) with the most density and moving south accordingly. That said, the plan as it stands calls for too much growth - it seems like we're actually striving for build out when we should be moving more slowly and more carefully.</p> <p>I also have some concern about some of the vague language in the plan. The difference between development a half mile from high school road, continuing south along south park loop and three-quarters of a mile from HS road moving south is enormous and that seemed to be brushed over in the Rafter J meeting. I'd suggest setting firm 1/2 mile parameters so there is no grey area - we'll inevitably be fighting over those questions in the future if we don't.</p>	Mike May	5/15/2009 16:41
10.12 District 12: South Park	<p>I live in Cottonwood Park and am very concerned about adding more traffic to an already busy High School Road. We have 6 schools that create a lot of traffic (both auto and pedestrian). Cottonwood Park, Rangeview and Blair Apartments are very dense and adding 1000 or more homes would inundate High School Road. I firmly believe that there MUST be an East-West road connecting all these new homes/businesses to Route 89 as well as South Park Loop. I feel that this connector road should be worked out before any development whatsoever is started. Another concern is open space. With Blair Apartments having no playground of their own, they all come to the Rangeview Park. Please consider adding playground equipment/parks and more than 1/8 mile (660 ft) setback of open space. People love living in Cottonwood &amp; Rangeview. It seems emulating our developments instead of cramming lots of homes in would make sense. Please help us keep High School Road safe and Cottonwood Park a great place to live.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	Patrice Banks	5/8/2009 11:56
10.12 District 12: South Park	<p>Classifying the Valley Springs Ranch as inappropriate for growth in the next 10-15 years, but possibly appropriate in the future makes sense and is something he agrees with. The existing road off of Hwy 89 that accesses the Valley Springs Park would be an appropriate connection from Hwy 89 to South Park Loop.</p>	Phil Wilson	5/4/2009 0:00

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
10.12 District 12: South Park	<p>I have been reviewing the latest version on the Teton County Comp. Plan. I know that you are looking for some feed back, but all I have is questions. I see that the Jackson Hole Hereford Ranch is targeted to receive the most density. What I do not understand (and I am not alone) is how it receives this increase.</p> <p>After talking with Jeff Daugherty anf Alex Norton it is confusing on how the commercail and higher density would be divided between the two owners of the Jackson Hole Hereford Ranch? There are so many questions that need answered for me to be able to make comments. What is the base density? What are the PRD multipliers? Are there going to be PRD's? How do we get density from other porperty owners? Are the affordable housing and workforce housing purchased at a discount? With out these answers plus the LDR's it is difficult to make constructive comments.</p>	Robert Gill	5/15/2009 14:06
10.12 District 12: South Park	<p>Development in the NW corner of South Park should be mitigated so it has no impact on High School Road. I strongly feel there should be a buffer between development and HS road. Growth should be limited as much as possible. I generally agree with comments that were developed by Kathy Tompkins and Rich Bloom., see below.</p> <p>Cottonwood Park District 13</p> <p>Neighbors in the Cottonwood Park Subdivisions are concerned with some of the language written to describe our district and our neighborhoods. We find it surprising that of the seven individual themes identified through the process, four of them for district 13 have been defined almost identically. Although we feel strongly that "supporting the existing neighborhood" should be a priority, more weight should be placed on how each theme relates back to its original Ideal, principals and how those work with in the districts.</p> <p>The use of Neighborhood as singular in the themes of this district is not really what is going on and does not represent this district or others effectively. Each district is made up of varying neighborhoods of sizes, types and uses. The clustering, feathering and linking of neighborhoods makes them relate to each other and cause a district to be unified.</p> <p>We love our neighborhood and how it with the other neighborhoods in our district makes a great place to live. The individual designs, community services and circulation create a diverse yet whole district.</p> <p>When reading the written text published in the draft plan we have the following comments:</p> <p>1) Responsible Growth: We hope that the comp plan is using our districts neighborhoods as roll models for future developments since we are almost built out. And since we are almost built out, responsible growth should not be District 13's first priority. The only future growth that may take place in our district is School growth which when designed needs to look further into its impact on the existing neighborhoods of our district. The huge Growth proposed in the neighboring District 12 in the NW corner of South Park is unnecessary and detrimental to district 13. The impact on the schools, roads, parks, scenic and natural resources of district 12 is immeasurable. This proposed growth should be scaled back tremendously. Utilizing open available lots with in the town makes more sense.</p> <p>2) Town as Heart: Continuing to "support" the mixed-use neighborhood is top priority for District 13. The proposed growth of neighboring districts as well as the school district and the impact of the possible Tribal Connector will all affect pro &amp; con, our districts character and attraction for the working families that we are designed for. Proposing more density in the NW corner of district 12 before infilling the town proper does not support this theme. Twisting the theme to state "develop adjacent to" causes more infrastructures to be built instead of using the city roads and utilities already installed.</p> <p>3) Transportation: Balancing the needs of the community and constructing the Tribal connector detract from our district. Protection of these impacts need to be fist and foremost. In addition, the traffic impact of the High School as well as 5 other school that are currently serviced through our district and the proposed growth in the NW corner of South Park need to be equally listed. Prior to any new development, the existing problems need to be addressed. The school district needs to be engaged further to reduce the impact students are having on the neighborhood. The missed opportunity of reducing single car use and increase alternate modes of transportation is a big mistake. Also the lack of small parking areas where county residents can access the amenities and bus stops provided in this district cause damage to personal property.</p> <p>4) Workforce Housing: District 13 is mainly work force housing already. We are mostly built out and therefore this theme is the least priority. However adding the proposed 1500 units of Work Force housing to the neighboring district 12 creates a concentration of this demographic in one area in the county. Designing pockets of work force housing in other locations in the county is more desirable and creates a more diverse community over all. Any density bonuses should only be granted if in fact the work force housing developed by the bonus benefits directly from it.</p>	Robert Wemple	5/13/2009 11:00
10.12 District 12: South Park	<p>5) Community Facilities: Future growth of the schools in this area will impact the district as it relates to traffic congestion, parking locations, impervious parking lots, and light pollution in the evenings and on weekends. Teton County Schools need to be looked at as a developer and held to the same standards of protecting existing neighborhoods as part of their future growth. In addition first responders of Fire &amp; EMT should be considered as needing to have a home some where in our district especially when considering any future housing to be located in the NW corner of South Park. And finally new developments need to be required to create new parks within their neighborhoods and not tax the existing one found in District 13's.</p> <p>6) Wildlife Natural Resources: More and more wild life is being directed into district 13 due to the growth and irrelevant berming along South Park Loop Road which also detracts from our scenic vistas. The potential loss of a scenic corridor to the south due to future development and the blocking of the scenic view to the west is a great deterrent to all who live and travel through this district. Again the people who live and work here should be taken care of before future residents. District 13 should not have to sacrifice ("allowable trade offs for District 13,À are the words from the planners) scenic views and wildlife to accommodate future workforce to the South.</p> <p>7) Balanced Community &amp; Economy: To maintain the existing residential neighborhoods as attractive places to live we can not allow convenience commercial into the proposed housing directly to the south of us in the NW corner of South Park. The Smiths plaza is physically close enough and for both District 13 as well as the NW corner of South Park and it does not make sense economically to compete with a national chain for fuel and groceries.</p>	Robert Wemple (cont.)	5/13/2009 11:00

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
10.12 District 12: South Park	Too many units are allowed in this area. It would cause great damage to the region and major traffic issues that are not addressed.	Robin McGee	5/12/2009 11:17
10.12 District 12: South Park	<p>Developing South Park from the North to the South is a logical pattern, but all of South Park should not be developed with a town development pattern. Appendix I shows that the 1500 units proposed for South Park are not needed to meet the community's needs for the duration of the Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Any development at Town density should be to Town standards for streets, lights, and sidewalks.</li> <li>-There is no need for convenience commercial in northern South Park unless the downtown commercial is reduced by the same amount. Most convenience commercial will fail because residents will not pay more for inferior products. They will drive to Smiths for groceries, their favorite pub for a drink, or their favorite restaurant for a meal. It is an exercise in futility to attempt to control the free market.</li> <li>-Do not add traffic to High School Road. East west connector must be complete before development begins. This should be clearly stated in the Plan. Construction traffic on High School Road is unacceptable.</li> <li>-The view corridor on South Park Loop Road and High School road must be protected with a minimum set back of ¼ mile. This should either be shown on the map or clearly stated in this section. Berms are not an appropriate way to preserve the view corridor.</li> </ul>	Save Historic Jackson Hole	5/15/2009 14:59
10.12 District 12: South Park	<p>I reside in Cottonwood Park. The following are some of my concerns regarding the proposed development in South Park.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is unclear whether all of District 12 will be developed (under this Plan) - from north to south - or if only the areas indicated on the map (400 acres in the northwest corner, Rafter J, Melody, and the industrial area east of Melody) - will have development beyond the rural classification. State specifically what areas will be other than rural. State that the areas shown as rural will be developed based on that designation and will NOT be developed to a greater density. What is meant by developing "north to south"? Either describe what is meant by that or delete it.</li> <li>2. 400 acres and 1500 residential units seems excessive. How about stating that development would be staged as demand supports, with an ultimate buildout not to exceed 400 acres and 1500 residential units? This way appropriate density can be achieved and services provided to a discrete area - not to all of the 400 acres immediately, i.e. avoid scattered development.</li> <li>3. In-fill should be stressed in Jackson (town as heart theme) prior to going wild with development in South Park.</li> <li>4. We had moose and deer moving through Cottonwood this winter. They will be back. Wildlife will be present in any South Park development. This has to be recognized. Wildlife corridors have to be designated and provided.</li> <li>5. Provide at least a 1,000 foot scenic buffer along the east side of South Park road. Do not allow anything other than access roads (perpendicular to South Park only - minimize road length in the buffer, also minimize the number of access roads crossing the buffer) in the buffer. Do not allow noise/view berms to be constructed in the buffer.</li> <li>6. Provide at least a 1,000 foot buffer along the south side of High School Road.</li> <li>7. Perhaps the buffer area along High School Road could be developed as a town park - both for students and for the residents of the new development. Note that Range View Park gets lots of use by people outside of Range View and Cottonwood, since their developments do not have public parks (e.g. Indian Trails, Rafter J). Alternatively, require a public park to be included somewhere in the area to be developed in the northwest corner of South Park - and require it to be done at the start of development, not sometime in the dim future.</li> <li>7. Do not add any additional traffic capacity to High School Road. Keep it with a speed limit of 25 mph. Perhaps add a bike path/sidewalk south of and seperated from the road (similar to that on the west side of South Park Road).</li> <li>8. Cottonwood Park has only one exit from the subdivision and that is onto High School Road. That exit is too close to the Middle School Road intersection to allow a stop sign on High School Road for the Cottonwood intersection. High School Road (per its name) has several schools and lots of children walking along the road. No increase in traffic should be allowed on High School Road - both for safety and maintaining existing quality of life for existing residents. Traffic from the proposed development in northwest South Park should be directed onto the new connector from 89 to South Park Road. Require the construction of that connector before ANY development is allowed in northwest South Park. Note that the connector will have to cross Flat Creek in an environmentally responsible manner - which means it will be expensive. Require the development in the northwest corner of South Park to pay for this.</li> <li>8. The development in the northwest corner of South Park should be required to pay for the expansion of town services (e.g. sewer and water) required for their development.</li> <li>9. Establish a buffer Flat Creek - especially the west side (if it is not already set). Show the buffer on the map.</li> <li>10. In general - stress the themes in the order of importance determined from public comment, i.e., wildlife protection is important, development is not. Development seems to be given more importance than wildlife.</li> </ol> <p>Thank-you for the opportunity to comment</p>	Shelley Sundgren	5/6/2009 21:27
10.12 District 12: South Park	<p>why build all homes...just it makes more money for the developer... build some appartments in the south park node... use less open space to develop for 1500 homes a lot of people dont need houses and are perfect in appartments/condos...people move in and out of town a lot... how are 1500 homes justified...? It all comes down again, to maybe think about a population cap in this town. There are already high density neighbourhods in South Park...and they were inteded to create workforce housing...what happened there and then. Its all in a dream/vision on paper but reality (money) brings it all down to...where quick big bucks can be made...wildlife, town of heart doesnt matter.....anymore.</p>	Sonja Boehne	4/27/2009 15:17