



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Rewrite of the Teton County Comprehensive Plan

Planner: Angie Rutherford

Prepared July 06, 2012 for the Planning & Zoning Commission

Public Hearing of July 10 & 11, 2012

Supplemental information for the Public Hearing of July 10 & 11, 2012.

City Areas of Impact: Staff has met with the Planning & Zoning Commission from Victor and with the City Council from Driggs, and we have had conversations about the intent of the Comp Plan within the areas of impact and what their expectations are for future land uses. Both cities indicate that they would like primarily residential uses in the “town neighborhood” areas. Both Driggs and Victor are comfortable with the following desired uses in the text description of the town neighborhoods. It is staff’s recommendation to adopt the following language and desired uses for the town neighborhood areas as shown on the framework map.

Town Neighborhood: Town Neighborhoods are located within the area of impact and immediately adjacent to the cities of Victor, Driggs and Teton. These areas are in close proximity to electric, phone and other dry utilities as well as public water and sewer services, although that does not imply that these services would be available as a public utility. The unincorporated town of Felt is also considered a Town Neighborhood area although public water and sewer service is not available. In general, further development and densification of Felt is not supported by its residents; however, the desire for a small public park and decreased speed limits were voiced by many. Town Neighborhoods currently include a mix of developed and undeveloped property and have easy access via automobile, bicycle or pedestrian access to town services and amenities. While the intent of this plan is to encourage growth in existing population centers such as our cities, less dense residential uses near the cities would be more desirable than spreading development in the far reaches of the County. In the Areas of Impact, applicable plans and ordinances must be mutually agreed upon by the city and the county and thus will be negotiated further with each city. While the applicable land use plan for the Areas of Impact must be negotiated and mutually agreed upon with each city, the desired future character and land uses for Town Neighborhoods include:

- Single-family, detached housing in low densities consistent with non-municipal services.
- Parks, greenways, and neighborhood amenities
- Safe and convenient street and pathway connections to towns
- Pedestrian amenities and complete streets

Page 55:

Reduce the future potential supply of residential lots by 75%. This statement is not intended to apply to existing lots, nor to reduce the future potential supply of lots on a parcel-by-parcel basis, but rather to apply in aggregate, county-wide. The economic development subcommittee felt that this *could* be done with county-wide 20-acre zoning, but did not want to endorse any mandates or specific tactics on *how* the reduction in future, potential lots would take place.

This statement was created by looking at both historic and projected population growth as it relates to the number of lots that are currently available (about 7,000 in the County and approximately 1,600 in the cities). After adding the number of potential future lots (26,000) to the existing lots, they felt the current potential supply of lots was unneeded and economically burdensome; at full build-out, the current situation could supply 81,600 people if 2.4 people lived on each lot (2.4 is the Teton County average from 2005 – 2010, according to the Census).

The subcommittee agreed that this quantity of potential future lots would only hurt property values as there is not the expectation of significant growth rates in the unincorporated county in the next 20 years. They felt if they reduced the number of potential future lots by 75% (down to 6,500), that 13,500 lots (7,000 existing + 6,500 new) would serve our community for the duration of this plan. To put this in perspective, if Teton County grew at the same growth rate as the last 10 years (5.42%) for another 20 years (most would agree this is unlikely), we would have 29,226 people and need 7,940 new lots (to accommodate 19,056 new people). The community could fill this supply without adding a single lot.

Of course, not every lot will ever be built on, but if an average of two people lived on each new lot that the economic development subcommittee is recommending, our current population would more than triple (to 37,000). Put another way, this proposed potential future lot supply would realistically accommodate all future growth, especially if you add in the additional vacant lots from the cities (1,600) and the existing vacant homes (1,750). Even if just one person lived on each lot, it would more than double our population. For this reason, the economic development subcommittee felt a reduction in future potential supply of lots would be a bold, needed, yet realistic goal. The subcommittee did not feel comfortable saying *how* that reduction should take place, but rather that it should be the goal.

If the planning commission is uncomfortable with a hard number in this statement, it might be amended to read: “Reduce the future potential supply of residential lots to reflect the future need for lots based on projected population growth.” One word of caution, if this statement is taken literally, the reduction might end up being more than 75%.

Add to this section under Subdivision and Zoning Ordinance, “Eliminate density bonuses that are inconsistent with surrounding zoning.”