

Comp Plan Public Comment (3/10/12 - 3/13/12)

Date	Name	Comment
3/13/2012	Tillson, Becky Conservation Alliance	<p>Attached is the Statement of Intent for the Comprehensive Plan along with the 360 signatories. Please accept it as public comment on the Comp Plan from the community/neighborhood groups, not just the Alliance.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of this important document.</p> <p>Community Support for a Statement of Intent in the Comp Plan</p> <p>Many committed community leaders have helped to craft a Statement of Intent for the Comprehensive Plan, which is intended to clarify the goals and next steps, and prevent misinterpretation in the future. This is something that we would like to see inserted into the Plan as a documentation of the intent of the Plan and the community.</p> <p>Whereas current regulations allow for decades of growth and a doubling of the built environment we see today; we, the undersigned, respectfully request a statement of intent be added to the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan that reflects the following:</p> <p>Statement of Intent</p> <p>Purpose: To ensure that the community's original intent prevails when competing values create opportunities for differing interpretations for current and future decision makers.</p> <p>It is the community's intent to avoid expanding the urban footprint and to maintain our small, rural, mountain-town character; our quality of life; our unique sense of place; our established neighborhoods; and our stewardship ethic as the gateway to our unparalleled ecosystem on which both our visitor economy and our way of life depend.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It is the community's top priority to permanently protect wildlife habitat & connectivity, scenic viewsheds and agricultural open spaces through permanent protection of these resources. To that end, density increases beyond base property rights will not occur in any location until mechanisms are in place to link that development to permanent conservation. These mechanisms must ensure that any density increases will be phased in slowly over time in small areas.• It is the community's intent that a community-supported and clearly defined amount of growth will result in locations and intensity of development that are predictable. This amount of growth will be calculated prior to adopting the new Comp Plan for each Character District and must reflect and adhere to the stated Vision in the Plan for density neutral solutions countywide.• It is the community's intent to manage growth in a fiscally responsible manner. Developers must pay their costs for public facilities, services and infrastructure created by new development. Costs of development should not be subsidized by or passed on to residents. New development should not be permitted until an adequate level of infrastructure is in place.• It is the community's intent that employee generation resulting from commercial and nonresidential development should not overwhelm the ability to house 65% of our workforce locally.• It is the community's intent that a multi-year implementation plan that is annually updated must include and adhere to a detailed timeline, budget and a prioritized strategy list.
3/9/2012	Hawtin, Bruce Interested Public	<p>I am satisfied that the current comprehensive plan is well crafted and after five years of listening to every single person that is willing to speak up, or email you, I urge you to pass it. I believe the current version provides the safeguards and flexibility to manage and control our growth and meet the challenges of the future. The "Statement of Intent" is a no growth statement and I urge you to not to insert it into the plan.</p> <p>Thank you for your continued efforts.</p>

5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
3/12/2012	LaJeunesse, Debbie Interested Public	<p>Thank you for all your hard work and efforts on behalf of our community to come up with a new land-use plan. I know that the end of the process is nearing and that some in our community are trying to make a last ditch effort to stop and/or amend the conclusions that have been reached so far. I urge you to continue down the path that you have been on, and not get sidetracked by a few vocal groups who, in my opinion, are only worried about their own backyard and not the greater good of the valley. I am talking about the South Park neighbor group and the Village Road Coalition. In my opinion, both the South Park area (District 5: West Jackson and District 10: South Park) and the Aspens/Pines area (District 12) are very logical places for allowing workforce housing, which is one of the most important goals of the current or future land-use plan. This is also where these groups are formed and as typical of most people, they do not want their neighborhoods to change, but these are the most sensible places in the valley to support more development (along with the town of Jackson).</p> <p>These areas are already dense or have undeveloped areas that are adjacent to other built-up neighborhoods which supply housing for the local workforce, and therefore, are logically the place for future density. These complete neighbors have or will have all the necessary characteristics/infrastructure that are needed and can be developed more easily while protecting wildlife with bridges, underpasses and open space/clustering. Housing 65% of our workforce locally is an important goal.</p> <p>Some seem to believe that you all need to define the exact numbers allowed, and I think that this is just a distraction and would allow for even extra arguments and debates; the proposed plan allows for flexibility, which is a good thing. Do not be distracted by this tactic.</p> <p>I believe that the proposed plan, character districts and policies/regulations already in place can be used to create and continue a well-thought out community, one that protects wildlife habitat and natural resources, along with housing.</p> <p>The proposed plan does not go against community will, as some are suggesting, rather, it goes against the NIMBY group's will. They have not yet accepted, or do not want to accept, that there are many more people coming to this valley and they will have to be housed somewhere and that logical place is in the areas of the valley that already have the most development, including the town, South Park and the Aspens area. Some are being unrealistic by suggesting that we protect the rural parts of the county from future development but also limit development of already-developed parts of the county. As you all know, it's hard to have it both ways. Many parts of the proposed plan show continued "Rural areas" which is as it should be, but this means development has to happen in areas where development has already taken place. This is as it should be.</p> <p>Also suggested, is that workforce housing mandates should be thoroughly defined and researched, and one the first steps necessary to implement this, is the Housing Nexus study that is already in the bidding process as instructed by you to the TCHA.</p> <p>The comprehensive planning process has been going on for a number of years and the amount of public input has gotten you and the proposed plan where it is now, please do not let the last minute/special interest groups distract you from the overwhelming input from the rest of us and most especially the goal of housing 65% of our workforce locally.</p> <p>I am writing to you as a private citizen (and as a real estate appraiser who knows the valley intimately, which has helped me to form the opinions that I have developed and express to you today), and not as a member of the Teton County Housing Authority Board (but I take their goal of housing 65% of the workforce locally very seriously).</p> <p>Thank you again for all your hard work and vision,</p>

8: River Bottom

Date	Name	Comment
3/12/2012	Luczo, Stephen Interested Public	<p>I am writing out of concern for certain language regarding the Character Districts in the Comprehensive Plan Illustration of Our Vision. The Crescent H Ranch appears to be in District 8.2 and District 11.4 with some of the mountain properties outside of the designated Character Districts, and I am alarmed with the language that seems to allow for future changes to our existing development regulations.</p> <p>Addressing Character District 8.2, Page IV-51 states: "Development potential will be directed out of this district and efforts to reduce the impact of development on wildlife such as limiting house size and fencing will be implemented." It further states that "Redevelopment efforts will be focused on reducing the amount and impact of development." Page IV-53 states: "Non-development conservation is the preferred land use in this area." "Development potential in this area should be directed into Complete Neighborhoods or clustered..." "Development that does occur will include small structures and limited disturbance..." How these efforts could or would be applied to Crescent H Ranch or to other existing properties in Character District 8 is at best unclear and potentially very troubling.</p> <p>While I wholeheartedly support the preservation of our county's wildlife, our wildlife habitat and our open spaces, at Crescent H Ranch our development is managed to promote those initiatives.</p> <p>I also understand the need to preserve and conserve the yet to be developed open spaces and rural areas- areas that are not currently platted or planned for development.</p> <p>However, any effort to re-regulate, re-configure or re-develop existing, permitted and platted properties will be very strongly opposed.</p> <p>In summary, I am very concerned that the Character District plan is unclear in its intent and can easily be interpreted to be an overreaching approach by the county to control the nature of development in the valley through future regulatory changes affecting both undeveloped areas and areas that are currently platted and developed as subdivisions or single private properties.</p>
3/12/2012	Morse, Richard P. Interested Public	<p>I am a homeowner at Crescent "H" Ranch, and am OPPOSED to the Teton County Commissioners' "Comprehensive Plan, Illustration of our Vision". Please add my objections to those of other Crescent "H" homeowners (and, I suspect, to the objections of other potentially affected home- and lot-owners in The Valley). What I and others purchased (about 20 years ago for me) already contains much of what the County wants in its Plan.....such as wildlife access, keeping our area natural, etc. We certainly do NOT want The County to impose new restrictions on our Ranch properties relative to fencing, size of houses, or interferes in any way with our basic rights as Homeowners.</p>
3/12/2012	Check Into Cash, Inc. Interested Public	<p>We are writing on behalf of Allan Jones, Chairman of Check into Cash, Inc. Check into Cash, Inc. owns the parcel commonly known as Tract 12 at Crescent H Ranch. Tract 12 is currently undeveloped, but has for many years been approved in the Crescent H Ranch CC&Rs for the construction of a single family home.</p> <p>The Crescent H has a very strong and comprehensive set of CC&Rs, and in fact the homeowners have a long history of protecting their investments by enforcing those CC&Rs when necessary. This process of private rulemaking and private enforcement has served the Crescent H very well over the years. The CC&Rs have done a more than adequate job of protecting the Crescent H, its property values, its open spaces, its view corridors and its wildlife. And importantly, they have done so without needless government interference or infringement upon private property rights.</p> <p>The "Vision" that has been proposed deviates greatly from decades of successful development at the Crescent H by suggesting a taking of private property. The proposed taking suggests a material impact upon the enjoyment and value of private property rights.</p> <p>On behalf of Tract 12 and all of the private property owners likely to be damaged by the taking of private property rights inherent in your Vision, we respectfully suggest that you consider alternative ways to achieve your results. At the Crescent H, for example, the existing CC&Rs are more than adequate to protect that Vision. Your support of the existing CC&Rs is something that we would applaud. But moving to take away the rights of private property owners in favor of government intrusion is something that we may be forced to oppose in order to protect our investment and our private property rights.</p> <p>We appreciate your consideration of less intrusive ways to realize your Vision and to protect Teton County in ways that we can all support.</p>
3/11/2012	Sinclair, Nigel Interested Public	<p>Seconded</p>

8: River Bottom

Date	Name	Comment
3/11/2012	Seidler, Stan Interested Public	<p>I am very concerned re. the language and intent of the Comprehensive Plan, illustration of our Vision. While I certainly am passionate about preserving the environment and safeguarding the access for wildlife, several of the statements in the Plan regarding Character District 8.2 are very troublesome. I have owned property at the Crescent H Ranch since 1990, and presume it falls into this District. The language I am referencing is:</p> <p>☒ “Development potential will be directed out of this district and efforts to reduce the impact of development on wildlife such as limiting house size and fencing will be implemented”</p> <p>☒ “Redevelopment efforts will be focused on reducing the amount and impact of development”</p> <p>The Crescent H has very stringent restrictions in our CC&R’s relating to home size, building envelop, etc. Perhaps the most distinguishing characteristic of the Crescent H is the free flow of wildlife, which we cherish and protect. However, the proposed language at leasts hints at infringing on my basic property rights, which I would zealously protect.</p> <p>I sincerely hope that you will revisit the issue, and revise the Plan with the input of affected homeowners. We all share the same basic vision, but this Plan, as it is written, jeopardizes the Vision it is designed to protect.</p> <p>Thank you very much for your consideration.</p>
3/11/2012	Paulson, Bob HOA: Teal Trace	<p>I am writing to you as the Secretary/ Treasurer and a Director of the Teal Trace Homeowners association.</p> <p>After much discussion and review by our board, we want to formally notify you that we oppose the new language included in the Comprehensive Plan that would introduce new and more stringent land use controls over our Teal Trace properties. We have clear and recently approved CC&Rs for Teal Trace and we follow these rules carefully. We also have a stable neighborhood with good respect for nature and proper access to the Snake River.</p> <p>We are concerned that the proposed new language will change the rules on our existing residents and could upset our established community. Also this language could introduce new and unnecessary restrictions on our few homeowners who have not yet built their homes. We only have two properties that have not been constructed but we are concerned that you new restrictions would be unfair to these members of our community.</p> <p>In essence, please leave District 8 rules and regulations as they have been and as they are today. Our community works very well. There is no problem to be solved for us but these new proposals could create unnecessary restrictions and problems for us all.</p> <p>The current plan works for us and everyone understands the rules. Please leave the county rules and our Teal Trace community alone. Thank you.</p>
3/11/2012	Finch, Larry Interested Public	Bob, Great letter.

8: River Bottom

Date	Name	Comment
3/10/2012	Dorros, Myra Interested Public	<p>I am writing out of concern for certain language regarding the Character Districts in the Comprehensive Plan Illustration of Our Vision. The Crescent H Ranch appears to be in District 8.2 and District 11.4 with some of the mountain properties outside of the designated Character Districts. And I am alarmed with the language that seems to allow for future changes to our existing development regulations.</p> <p>Addressing Character District 8.2. Page IV-51 states: "Development potential will be directed out of this district and efforts to reduce the impact of development on wildlife such as limiting house size and fencing will be implemented"</p> <p>It further states that "Redevelopment efforts will be focused on reducing the amount and impact of development"</p> <p>Page IV-53 states: "Non-development conservation is the preferred land use in this area." "Development potential in this area should be directed into Complete Neighborhoods or clustered..." "Development that does occur will include small structures and limited disturbance..."</p> <p>How these efforts could or would be applied to Crescent H Ranch or to other existing properties in Character District 8 is at best unclear and potentially very troubling.</p> <p>While I wholeheartedly support the preservation of our county's wildlife. Our wildlife habitat and our open spaces. At Crescent H Ranch our development is managed to promote those initiatives.</p> <p>I also understand the need to preserve and conserve the yet to be developed open spaces and rural areas~ areas that are not currently platted or planned for development.</p> <p>However. Any effort to re-regulate. Re-configure or re-develop existing. Permitted and platted properties will be very strongly opposed.</p> <p>In summary. I am very concerned that the Character District plan is unclear in its intent and can easily be interpreted to be an overreaching approach by the county to control the nature of development in the valley through future regulatory changes affecting both undeveloped areas and areas that are currently platted and developed as subdivisions or single private properties.</p>

9: County Valley

Date	Name	Comment
3/11/2012	Lupo, Patrick Interested Public	<p>In respect of the pending review of the Comprehensive Plan for Teton County, we would be grateful if the County would continue to recognize Lake Creek Ranch as a "specially recognized project" as in the Prior Plan. See Section 1450 of the Land Development Regulations (LDR's) of 1977 and Docket #06-0001, Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and Order, Dated 6th July 2006.</p> <p>The above reflects the fact that there is a pre-existing Master Plan for Lake Creek Ranch approved by the Board of Commissioners, that the entire ranch (approximately 480 Acres), was placed under a Conservation Easement in favor of the Nature Conservancy, save and except for certain building sites, and that the final plat of Lake Creek Ranch was approved at a regular meeting of the Board of County Commissioners held on December 17, 1996.</p>

10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
3/12/2012	LaJeunesse, Debbie Interested Public	<p>Thank you for all your hard work and efforts on behalf of our community to come up with a new land-use plan. I know that the end of the process is nearing and that some in our community are trying to make a last ditch effort to stop and/or amend the conclusions that have been reached so far. I urge you to continue down the path that you have been on, and not get sidetracked by a few vocal groups who, in my opinion, are only worried about their own backyard and not the greater good of the valley. I am talking about the South Park neighbor group and the Village Road Coalition. In my opinion, both the South Park area (District 5: West Jackson and District 10: South Park) and the Aspens/Pines area (District 12) are very logical places for allowing workforce housing, which is one of the most important goals of the current or future land-use plan. This is also where these groups are formed and as typical of most people, they do not want their neighborhoods to change, but these are the most sensible places in the valley to support more development (along with the town of Jackson).</p> <p>These areas are already dense or have undeveloped areas that are adjacent to other built-up neighborhoods which supply housing for the local workforce, and therefore, are logically the place for future density. These complete neighbors have or will have all the necessary characteristics/infrastructure that are needed and can be developed more easily while protecting wildlife with bridges, underpasses and open space/clustering. Housing 65% of our workforce locally is an important goal.</p> <p>Some seem to believe that you all need to define the exact numbers allowed, and I think that this is just a distraction and would allow for even extra arguments and debates; the proposed plan allows for flexibility, which is a good thing. Do not be distracted by this tactic.</p> <p>I believe that the proposed plan, character districts and policies/regulations already in place can be used to create and continue a well-thought out community, one that protects wildlife habitat and natural resources, along with housing.</p> <p>The proposed plan does not go against community will, as some are suggesting, rather, it goes against the NIMBY group's will. They have not yet accepted, or do not want to accept, that there are many more people coming to this valley and they will have to be housed somewhere and that logical place is in the areas of the valley that already have the most development, including the town, South Park and the Aspens area. Some are being unrealistic by suggesting that we protect the rural parts of the county from future development but also limit development of already-developed parts of the county. As you all know, it's hard to have it both ways. Many parts of the proposed plan show continued "Rural areas" which is as it should be, but this means development has to happen in areas where development has already taken place. This is as it should be.</p> <p>Also suggested, is that workforce housing mandates should be thoroughly defined and researched, and one the first steps necessary to implement this, is the Housing Nexus study that is already in the bidding process as instructed by you to the TCHA.</p> <p>The comprehensive planning process has been going on for a number of years and the amount of public input has gotten you and the proposed plan where it is now, please do not let the last minute/special interest groups distract you from the overwhelming input from the rest of us and most especially the goal of housing 65% of our workforce locally.</p> <p>I am writing to you as a private citizen (and as a real estate appraiser who knows the valley intimately, which has helped me to form the opinions that I have developed and express to you today), and not as a member of the Teton County Housing Authority Board (but I take their goal of housing 65% of the workforce locally very seriously).</p> <p>Thank you again for all your hard work and vision,</p>

10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
3/10/2012	Bloom, Rich HOA: Melody Ranch	<p>While reviewing the on-line staff packet and public comment for the March 14 Character District meeting I noticed it did not include the attached March 1 Rafter J HOA board letter to the commissioners - formally opposing road interconnectivity in district 10. I also have attached the Melody Ranch HOA more complete board position of February 21 - that we copied the Rafter J HOA.</p> <p>I wanted to make sure the Town electeds and planners saw the attached March 1 Rafter J HOA board letter - and for staff to include it as part of public comment under district 10.</p> <p>This issue is easily clarified by the addition of "pathway" in the various district 10 locations where the goal of "interconnectivity" is mentioned. This is consistent with other character districts which have qualifiers for example of "pedestrian" and/or "pathway" on interconnectivity goals.</p> <p>Upon review of the public comment I also noted owners in South Park Ranches and Big Trails subdivisions in southern South Park (which do not have functioning HOAs) have also strongly opposed the concept of forced roadway interconnectivity of their respective private road systems - separated I may note (along with Melody Ranch and Rafter J) by very large parcels of undeveloped rural lands in our sub-area 10.1.</p> <p>I will remind you that Rafter J and Melody Ranch HOA's represent the interests of some 900 homeowners - so trust you will make the requested clarification change by adding the qualifier of "pathway" to the interconnectivity goal in district 10.</p> <p>PS Note Kristine O'Brien has recently be elected to replace David Kauffma on our board</p>
3/5/2012	MacMillan, Kip HOA: Rafter J	<p>We wish to restate the position we made clear in our e-mail of March 12, 2008 that the (Rafter J HOA) Directors reject the idea (vehicular road access) through Rafter J and Melody Ranch subdivisions in the strongest possible terms. Rafter J owns its own roads and our HOA Board unanimously stated that we do not want access from Melody Ranch under any foreseeable conditions. Doing so would increase traffic and adversely affect the quality of life in Rafter J. In addition, our roads are too narrow to meet Wyoming Department of Transportation standards for public streets. In summary, we request that in your future discussions, please keep in mind that Rafter J is not supportive of any direct connection with the former Teton Meadows development or Melody Ranch.</p>

12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
3/12/2012	LaJeunesse, Debbie Interested Public	<p>Thank you for all your hard work and efforts on behalf of our community to come up with a new land-use plan. I know that the end of the process is nearing and that some in our community are trying to make a last ditch effort to stop and/or amend the conclusions that have been reached so far. I urge you to continue down the path that you have been on, and not get sidetracked by a few vocal groups who, in my opinion, are only worried about their own backyard and not the greater good of the valley. I am talking about the South Park neighbor group and the Village Road Coalition. In my opinion, both the South Park area (District 5: West Jackson and District 10: South Park) and the Aspens/Pines area (District 12) are very logical places for allowing workforce housing, which is one of the most important goals of the current or future land-use plan. This is also where these groups are formed and as typical of most people, they do not want their neighborhoods to change, but these are the most sensible places in the valley to support more development (along with the town of Jackson).</p> <p>These areas are already dense or have undeveloped areas that are adjacent to other built-up neighborhoods which supply housing for the local workforce, and therefore, are logically the place for future density. These complete neighbors have or will have all the necessary characteristics/infrastructure that are needed and can be developed more easily while protecting wildlife with bridges, underpasses and open space/clustering. Housing 65% of our workforce locally is an important goal.</p> <p>Some seem to believe that you all need to define the exact numbers allowed, and I think that this is just a distraction and would allow for even extra arguments and debates; the proposed plan allows for flexibility, which is a good thing. Do not be distracted by this tactic.</p> <p>I believe that the proposed plan, character districts and policies/regulations already in place can be used to create and continue a well-thought out community, one that protects wildlife habitat and natural resources, along with housing.</p> <p>The proposed plan does not go against community will, as some are suggesting, rather, it goes against the NIMBY group's will. They have not yet accepted, or do not want to accept, that there are many more people coming to this valley and they will have to be housed somewhere and that logical place is in the areas of the valley that already have the most development, including the town, South Park and the Aspens area. Some are being unrealistic by suggesting that we protect the rural parts of the county from future development but also limit development of already-developed parts of the county. As you all know, it's hard to have it both ways. Many parts of the proposed plan show continued "Rural areas" which is as it should be, but this means development has to happen in areas where development has already taken place. This is as it should be.</p> <p>Also suggested, is that workforce housing mandates should be thoroughly defined and researched, and one the first steps necessary to implement this, is the Housing Nexus study that is already in the bidding process as instructed by you to the TCHA.</p> <p>The comprehensive planning process has been going on for a number of years and the amount of public input has gotten you and the proposed plan where it is now, please do not let the last minute/special interest groups distract you from the overwhelming input from the rest of us and most especially the goal of housing 65% of our workforce locally.</p> <p>I am writing to you as a private citizen (and as a real estate appraiser who knows the valley intimately, which has helped me to form the opinions that I have developed and express to you today), and not as a member of the Teton County Housing Authority Board (but I take their goal of housing 65% of the workforce locally very seriously).</p> <p>Thank you again for all your hard work and vision,</p>

12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
3/11/2012	Watsabaugh, Carla Interested Public	<p>ARE YOU LISTENING??</p> <p>From article in the Jackson Hole News & Guide, March 7th, 2012</p> <p>Quote from Mark Barron:</p> <p>“the push to get elected officials to adopt the statement of intent is not indicative of most county residents’ sentiments and does not outweigh other opinions. Does their voice count? Absolutely. Does it count more than 18,000 or 20,000 other people? You tell me.”</p> <p>With all due respect, I am going to tell you. You have not received 18,000+ letters of support in your favor!!!! You have no business insinuating the 18,000+ residents are not in favor of adopting a statement of intent. More than likely, 16,000 of those people you are talking about have absolutely no opinion whatsoever. Not only are most of them unable to understand the comprehensive plan, most of them have not even read it. Do not include the SILENT majority as a group that agrees with you or your plan. Silence often means apathy. I would be interested to know how many LETTERS or EMAILS you have received that support your thinking, Mark.</p> <p>I have lived in this valley for close to 50 years and have watched the birth and the death of comprehensive plans. I have also watched variances, up-zoning and down-zoning destroy the very fabric of the plan’s intent and goal. The untold amount of hours and the amount of money it takes to write a plan is absurd considering how it eventually becomes eroded.</p> <p>What I don’t hear from ANYONE are the numbers....the Housing Authority has numbers, the Alliance has numbers, the planners have numbers, the developers have numbers. No one wants to talk about REAL numbers. Let’s hear a number!</p> <p>I am going to keep my letter of opposition simple:</p> <p>I am opposed to anything that will change my neighborhood or its character. Not in my backyard??? You bet. I’ve had 50 years of development taking place in my backyard.</p> <p>When it comes to discussing the protection of wildlife in and around the Aspens, Wilson and Teton Village, your talk of design to manage and protect wildlife viability is, frankly, absurd. Many of us have spent the last 6 weeks attempting to reduce the slaughter of wildlife on 390. WILDLIFE ARE INCOMPATIBLE WITH HUMAN DENSITY. Increased traffic over the years, due in most part to added density, is the reason for this. I do not want a four-lane highway on 390. As it currently stands with just two lanes, we aren’t able to manage the speed of traffic and the decimation of our wildlife. What I find absolutely glaring is....I don’t see the county stepping in to help in the efforts to improve this situation.</p> <p>As the editorial in the NaG stated, we are NOT hired guns. WE HAVE ALL LIVED HERE A LONG, LONG TIME. Longer than most of you. We are invested in our community, we have been involved, we have been vocal, we have done our homework, we have witnessed past history. WHY DO YOU CHOOSE NOT TO LISTEN!!!!</p> <p>I regret that I am beginning to see our elected officials playing a huge part in a slogan going around,</p> <p>RAMP UP....RIP OFF AND CASH OUT!!</p> <p>Nothing says it better: The future of Teton County is at stake and it is our responsibility to insure that further development doesn’t degrade our scenic, wildlife and lifestyle values.</p> <p>I EXPECT YOU TO DO IT RIGHT THIS TIME AROUND.</p>

12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
3/11/2012	Siewert, Marylyn Interested Public	<p>My husband and I are visitors to the Jackson area several times a year. We come for the beauty and openness of the scenery, the wildlife and the general rural ambience of the area.</p> <p>After talking to locals and reading the editorial in the "Jackson Hole News and Guide", we were astounded to learn that new land use and density regulations in the County Comprehensive Plan were being contemplated by County officials without giving to the populace specific details of the land use and densities in the plan.</p> <p>The community and the neighbors must be included in the deliberations and must know the proposed densities and land use. This is not Syria but the United States of America where the people are involved in making intelligent decisions that involve them personally and create the communities in which they will live. From what we have heard, the specifics of the Plan are being withheld.</p> <p>From an outsider's point of view, it is mandatory that the rural atmosphere be maintained in the Jackson area. Specifically the drive on Highway 390 to Teton Village is beautiful with its gorgeous vistas and should not be cluttered with high density building and overwhelming commercial development. High density gives an appearance of clutter, degrades views and probably degrades property values as well. High density contributes to intolerable traffic. It appears that the Jackson area already is having major traffic problems. Wildlife habitats and migration corridors must be maintained. Converting private open space to high density will not enhance the community.</p> <p>Please include the citizenry in the decision making and include their ideas in the Plan. Strive to keep the area beautiful and rural so that we visitors will come back. Please maintain the wildlife habitats and migration corridors.</p> <p>Thank you for all the work you have put into this project. I know it is a big job since I was twelve years on a planning commission that wrote a new general plan for our town of Tiburon in California. We look forward to many years of visiting the Jackson area.</p>

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
3/12/2012	Farmer, Jim Interested Public	18-20,000? I seriously doubt it. It's time for our elected officials to shut their mouths, open their ears and listen to people who care and have lived in the valley for a very long time. It's simple. No new density increases in rural areas of the valley. You can't seriously say that you care about the wildlife and migration corridor while approving density increases. They don't work together. You elected officials are messing with the very reason most of us have lived here for so many decades. That reason being the urban character which we so cherish. The future of Teton County is at stake here and it's our responsibility to insure that further development does not degrade our wildlife, scenic and lifestyle values.
3/9/2012	Donnelly, Susanne F. an Interested Public	We are very much against the idea of upzoned "nodes." Such increased density is not in keeping with the character of the Valley. The 1994 Plan is one which we would like to see DECREASED! We didn't choose to live in a place that could become like Aspen, Sun Valley or Park City. Please keep Jackson Hole STABLE and resist the urge of some planners to make this Valley into a more urban community. Density impacts the wildlife which makes Jackson unique!