



**Amendment to Title 9- Subdivision Ordinance to add:
LARGE LOT OR FLEXIBLE FARM SUBDIVISIONS**

Prepared December 28
Planning & Zoning Commission
Work Session January 8, 2013

APPLICANT: Teton County Planning Department

APPLICABLE CODE: Teton County Subdivision Ordinance

REQUEST: Planning Staff is requesting that the Planning & Zoning Commission discuss the idea of allowing large land owners additional options for dividing their land. These options would not alter existing zoning. These options would not be required. All existing subdivision/PUD/One-time-only options would still be available. These options would be options that could be used, or not. The intent is to maintain agricultural land and the rural feel of the county by offering an expedited subdivision process in exchange for decreased density from what would otherwise be allowed.

APPLICABILITY: A-20 Zone

PROPOSAL SUMMARY: There are two proposals that, in staff's opinion, provide similar options. Both would be optional and provide more flexibility for land owners, and perhaps fill in some deficiencies in the current code (for example, to create a three-lot subdivision, the only option available is the subdivision or PUD ordinance which will require three public hearings and probably close to eight months). Neither proposal would change zoning nor decrease any options currently available in the code. The **Large Lot Subdivision** would allow an expedited process to create lots larger than allowed by zoning. This would produce lots that maintain the rural character of the county and decrease the density of lots in the A-20 zone. The **Flexible Farm PUD** would allow lots smaller than otherwise allowed by zoning, but would require that the net-density be reduced from what would otherwise be allowed by zoning and that large tracts of land be maintained as open space- the intent of which is that these tracts could be easily farmed if the PUD was designed with that in mind.

BACKGROUND:

- During the Comprehensive Planning process, maintaining the rural character of the landscape was identified as a core value in our community. Vision Statement for agricultural and rural heritage: "Maintain, nurture and enhance the rural character and heritage of Teton Valley." Policy ARH1.5: "Support the preservation of open space, farmland, natural beauty and critical environmental areas."
- During the Comprehensive Planning process, staff repeatedly heard that large land owners would like more options for what they can do with their land. Policy ARH2.2: "Provide a means for transfer of agricultural land to family members." Policy ARH2.3: "Incentivize maintaining or creating large parcels."

- During the Comprehensive Planning process, staff repeatedly heard that most farmers want to continue to farm, but sometimes need to sell pieces of land to raise capital in order to do so.
- The Comprehensive Plan calls out that potential changes to the subdivision ordinance might include “Large Lot Subdivision Incentives; Family Lot Splits”
 - “Incentives can be created for subdivisions with lots that are larger than the minimum size allowed under the zoning district. This could help make it easier to break off a piece of land to sell when needed. The lots would need to be large enough to help reach the goal of preserving rural character and larger than what the underlying zoning would allow.”
- The proposals are intended to add options to the code for large land owners, particularly those that want to continue to farm and contribute to the rural character of the Valley.

QUESTIONS:

1. Is either or both of these options worth pursuing?
2. Are there other options that should be considered? i.e. a short plat- or ease of process for a 3-lot subdivision.
3. What are the components that ought to be included in an ordinance of this sort?
 - a. What should net density be?
 - b. What should the process be?
 - c. What studies should be applicable?
 - d. To which zone(s) should this apply?
 - e. Should lots be created that are smaller than zoning allows?
 - f. Should there be a maximum number of lots allowed?
4. Will this accomplish the intended outcomes?
 - a. More options for large land owners.
 - b. Maintain rural character.
 - c. Allow farmers who want to continue to farm a way to do that.
 - d. No “abuse.”
5. Are there unintended consequences to these processes? i.e. will we create 40-acre lots throughout the landscape? Is that a bad outcome?