

**District #2: Public Studio Summary and Recommendations**

**General Design Concepts**

**Pages 8-13**

**Town Council Direction to be included in Draft Regulations is highlighted in yellow**

**All other comments will be considered by Staff for inclusion in the Draft Regulations**

	Public	Design Review Committee	Planning Commission	Town Council
<b>General Concept comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Look at characteristics of each lot with regard to height – sagebrush slope might support something else</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Model individual lot in illustration as well</li> <li>Three different scales for each concept/ modeling, 1 lot, 2 lots &amp; 3+ lots</li> <li>Think about resort character</li> <li>Concepts need to be shown in elevations</li> <li>Clarify if variables are minimum/maximum or ranges for discussion</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How do you measure height on a slope? Consider revising current definition in new regulations</li> <li>Look at sign regulations regarding height flexibility</li> <li>Consider areas where topography (buttes) would allow for additional height; identify other areas where additional height may create a canyon effect and is not desirable</li> </ul>
<b>Upper-story step back</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May need different standards depending on the aspect/direction of street</li> <li>Step back versus skyplane?</li> <li>Allow some projections maybe as a percentage</li> <li>Step back allowed on 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floor</li> <li>What about mezzanines?</li> <li>Upper story step back on a four story building would help “sell” four story buildings to public.</li> <li>Allow four story buildings; use upper story step back to achieve density, but helps with visual impacts associated with tall buildings.</li> <li>This is an important tool to manage one's perception of building mass when viewed from the public realm. I like the distinction of wider streets.</li> <li>Beyond some wider streets, I am not sure I see the difference between retail and truck route areas with third story setbacks. Consider using the open space inherent at St. John's and Miller Park to allow less of a step back.</li> <li>In order to assist with elevation variety, it may make sense to allow some percentage of street frontage that does not step back.</li> <li>Prevents slab elevations and allows more light to the street and more interesting and creative architecture.</li> <li>I feel that the regulations for allowing three story units should be extensive and specific to their proposed locations. The pedestrian experience should be seriously considered when identifying locations for three story units. Not only should the street side elevation of the proposed buildings be reviewed for scale, proportion and character</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will prohibit 3<sup>rd</sup> story on some sites</li> <li>Maybe a percentage stepped back on the 3<sup>rd</sup> story would be more appropriate             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to hold the corner</li> </ul> </li> <li>Don't setback 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup>, not a good street wall</li> <li>Standard 3<sup>rd</sup> floor requirement not the preferred approach need some variation</li> <li>If all step backs are the same it will appear as they are just trying to meet the requirement</li> <li>Skyplane dependency on street width seems cumbersome</li> <li>If it's the same everywhere maybe it's not attractive</li> <li>If it's only 2 stories you should not have a requirement</li> <li>Utilize stories rather than height to allow flexibility</li> <li>How does this work with single lot developments?</li> <li>What about covered porches on a 3 story step back?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General concept that wider streets do not need upper-story step back as much as narrower streets that may need some type of third story treatment good</li> <li>Applying skyplane tool may be preferred upper-story method compared to fixed upper-story setback – maybe not street by street but in a way that makes sense. Skyplane would lead to greater architectural variation than fixed upper-story setback which might result in overly uniform upper-story setback along entire block</li> <li>Residential use of step back area as outdoor amenity space a concern because of potential for the area to become storage use.</li> <li>Agree architecture on truck route should be handled differently than retail zone</li> <li>Variation of step back distance/size important. Allowing a percentage of frontage to be stepped back may be a good solution</li> <li>Stepback area should be used in creative ways, such as for required amenity space</li> </ul>	

*Upper-story  
step back  
continued...*

but all exposed elevations should be as well. The design recommendations for a three story building on a primary street frontage should be different than the requirements for an elevation on a street corner location vs. on a secondary street location vs. adjacent to a public space. They should not be allowed to back up onto single family residential spaces without a significant buffer-- a full standard lot width at least. The design and location of any proposed three story unit should also be evaluated on their potential impact on essential vistas out to the surrounding natural environment as well as their impact on view corridors that display the towns environs. The recommendation that three story units along North cache and Broadway do not need to step back should be re-evaluated after a view inventory and analysis have been completed. The relationship with the surrounding landscape is a huge part of the Town's character and that should be a priority when identifying appropriate sites for three story units. Also, that particular corridor is heavily impacted by vehicular traffic and the pedestrian comfort level is already reduced. Allowing a 'canyon' of development to occur within that corridor will potentially increase the street noise level. Also by not requiring any step back requirements the pedestrian scale is even more awkward and could affect the vitality of that area. That corridor should be examined to see what can be done to increase pedestrian interest, not deter it. This area of North Cache is also adjacent and influential to one of the entry 'gateways' areas of Town which makes it even more imperative to create an experience that is welcoming and reflects the character of the town. There should be distinct transition zones that occur around areas that have the potential for three story units.

- N. Cache should include step-backs.
- Improved
- The Upper Story Step back concept should be included in the rewrite of the Land Development Regulations so it can be written out explicitly and identify specific zones that potentially could allow three level units.
- The Upper Story Step back concept should be included in the rewrite of the Land Development Regulations when taken into consideration with street width as mentioned on N. Cache and Broadway.
- Allows higher density building plans without an imposing feeling for pedestrians.
- Prevent canyon affect and allow more light into street
- We need predictability in development. The step-back should be written into the code rather than addressed on a case-by-case basis through variances or CUPs.
- Included north/south difference

<b>Residential transition</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does this need to be required?</li> <li>• Could it be handled by setbacks?</li> <li>• Important regulation for addressing predictability for homeowners</li> <li>• Jackson needs to increase opportunities for residential whenever possible.</li> <li>• Allow setbacks to be minimal when making transitions to s.f. from urban forms; 5-15' as necessary.</li> <li>• More important in the higher density zones (approaching FAR 2.0), may not be necessary for the lower scale office area at east Broadway and willow (FAR 1.0). These lower scale areas are already providing a transition.</li> <li>• The three story building does not overwhelm it's residential neighbor by having the same setback as the residential requirement.</li> <li>• In addition to the above suggestions there should be very strict landscaping requirements -- installation of large specimens that will provide year round immediate privacy screening for the residential units and that this landscaped area shall include a high percentage of specimen vertical elements to soften second stories. The building setbacks should be substantial and existing view corridors should be considered. Also, a requirement to incorporate public spaces that serve as physical buffers -- pedestrian corridors, green spaces, small plazas etc. should be considered. Parking areas can be used as buffers but they need to have a heavily landscaped zone to visually screen and reduce noise.</li> <li>• In addition to the Setback the transition could be eased by the addition of a step back approach that would apply to 2nd &amp; 3rd levels</li> <li>• Native landscaping and rain gardens should be required.</li> <li>• Refined</li> <li>• The Residential Transition concept should be included in the rewrite of the Land Development Regulations for the same reasons as for the Upper Story Setback. The more specific information we have in the LDR's the less likelihood that independent "interpretation" can occur.</li> <li>• Allows higher density development in the downtown without affecting residential areas in the outlying area. Prevents a closed in feeling and helps to prevent from blocking views for established resident areas.</li> <li>• It must be included to ensure predictability for landowners and to codify the values expressed in the 2012 comp plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maybe this is where skyplane is used</li> <li>• Need to address variable location of residences</li> <li>• Minimum setback important</li> <li>• An overall setback for a commercial building is simpler than incorporating upper floor step backs</li> <li>• Issue amongst residences in residential zones as well</li> <li>• Think about a percentage</li> <li>• Can this be modeled too in conjunction with sun shade study?</li> <li>• Setback/step back could be based upon a skyplane study rather than a set number</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good concept to include</li> <li>• Add landscape requirement in setback reqmt</li> <li>• Define when transition is needed – are alleys adjacent to properties required to have transition vs. street adjacent properties?</li> </ul>	
<b>Build-to</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does it apply to only the first floor?</li> <li>• Must correspond with public frontage requirement</li> <li>• Relationship of public frontage dimension and build to setbacks</li> <li>• Creates pedestrian orientated streetscape while improving public street realm with better street width-to-</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apply to 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> floors</li> <li>• Should be a minimum and maximum</li> <li>• Percentage</li> </ul>		

<p><i>Build-to continued...</i></p>	<p>building height ratios.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With guidelines</li> <li>• In combination with other factors, this is important for positively defining the public realm and interaction between building users and the public.</li> <li>• Everyone has a required front setback requirement that can be 0 but in some cases where the right of way includes a sidewalk and planting area behind the curb.</li> <li>• The public needs to realize that the curb/gutter and sidewalk and planting strip are inside the property line.</li> <li>• I would like to see strict reviews for this concept when used with three story units. The potential to impact the pedestrian space is great.</li> <li>• I am not sure if it should be required for a developer but setting the parameters in which builders have to work with is necessary.</li> <li>• The Build-to-zone could be improved by requiring public art in the form of pedestrian amenities like benches, tree grates or unique sculptural features. Outdoor features that invite discovery and interaction will attract people, promote social interactions and increase vitality.</li> <li>• set back 0/max ?, or 15 feet from back of curb for covered walk way and street grates.</li> <li>• It should be improved and written into the code.</li> <li>• Better</li> <li>• The build to zone concept should be included in the rewrite of the Land Development Regulations because we need rules applied consistently throughout the downtown core.</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Amenity space</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs to be better defined, width and depth</li> <li>• Can it be interior space?</li> <li>• Can it be covered?</li> <li>• Is it just the 1<sup>st</sup> floor?</li> <li>• Need different requirements for different lot widths</li> <li>• Should it be part of the private frontage</li> <li>• What is its purpose?</li> <li>• Requirement adds expense</li> <li>• Where does the parking go with amenity space added</li> <li>• Needs to be a requirement to obtain the public space</li> <li>• Courtyards, plazas, etc. improve public street realm. Important to offer tourists spaces to dwell/people watch/urban picnics.</li> <li>• Should be specific when in code-perhaps undergo special design review process to ensure view sheds are considered along with proposal of development.</li> <li>• As noted above, important to define the public realm.</li> <li>• But, I am concerned about how this is implemented and would not want to see a strict prescribed percentage and/or description ie: it must be 15% of frontage and be a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exciting if variable, all courtyards or all alleys not right</li> <li>• Might allow access to storefronts from these areas which would be good</li> <li>• Width is an issue</li> <li>• Can it be used on 2<sup>nd</sup> floor?</li> <li>• Would it allow semi-public space? (i.e. outdoor seating)</li> <li>• Would interior space (i.e. Broadway Shops) work?</li> <li>• Avoid too much prescription, width and depth – flexibility is key</li> <li>• Is it a tool for public space or design/massing?</li> <li>• If you have pocket parks everywhere they lose their utility</li> <li>• Doesn't always have to be public</li> <li>• If it's a requirement there is too</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percentage of building frontage good idea</li> <li>• Kismet rug amenity space not done well – space can be dark and uninviting</li> <li>• Should not look contrived</li> <li>• Break in the block for cut through good – ex. Kismet</li> <li>• Shady spaces nice for summer similar to Kismet</li> <li>• Is it viable in a single lot scenario? – sliding scale may be good solution, including exemption for very small lots</li> <li>• Apprehensive about exterior amenity space requirement especially on corner lots</li> <li>• Interior amenity space may be beneficial given climate</li> <li>• Consider safety/crime issues with arcades and other internal amenity spaces</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How do you make spaces on adjacent properties work well together?</li> <li>• Safety concerns of areas blind to street</li> <li>• Does build-to percentage do the trick?</li> <li>• Like concept, but seems only doable on multiple lots</li> <li>• Not sure what it is going to produce on a single lot</li> <li>• <b>Seems appropriate for Design Guidelines not as a prescriptive tool</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Great tool, but don't be too prescriptive</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<p>Amenity space continued...</p>	<p>'cut through' the block. There should be a wide range of options (cut through, interior courtyard, additional width of public realm, multi or one story and/or level of public access). Be very careful about similar application across many lot/project sizes, this will become difficult on smaller individual lots. There may be a risk of too much space and reducing the goals of activating the street level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not for single property projects. On multiple lot projects the amenity space breaks up the street façade and creates more light and interest for the inhabitants of the building because of the interior amenity space.</li> <li>• For single property amenity space it is more how the building engages the street; recessed entry, setback space, balcony's, material use, etc.</li> <li>• There could be specific requirements depending what area of town the site occurs. Some of these spaces could be very valuable for public art installations. Again an inventory of designated areas for potential three story units should be available and then the Town should have recommendations for what type of public space would be valuable for the community. Amenity spaces should be made mandatory especially in the downtown zone and they should be subject to the public art fee.</li> <li>• There may be smaller lots where this is not ideal but for larger lots it makes sense. though if it were required at every lot the "specialness" and interest may be less interesting.</li> <li>• The amenity space concept will be greatly improved by asking developers to set aside a percent of their budget for public art in order to activate the space. Without public art, Amenity Spaces will not generate the type of vitality the Town is looking for. If public art in Amenity Spaces is not a regulated part of the development process, then the features added may not be of the quality that contributes to a world-class spaces in our downtown and art or other features may not represent shared community values.</li> <li>• Amenity space should include consideration of bicyclists.</li> <li>• more specific</li> <li>• The Amenity Space concept should be included in the rewrite of the LDR's because it would ensure the inclusion of public oriented spaces in projects which is important to provide in this community</li> <li>• There could be tradeoffs for smaller sites and areas of greater density.</li> <li>• Much like the 3rd floor set back the amenity space creates aesthetically pleasing spaces for pedestrians. Its a concept that helps create community space and allows visitors a unique experience.</li> <li>• We have seen amenity spaces work to increase vitality around the downtown core. Examples include: Crabtree Corner, Gaslight Alley and the Hoke building on Center</li> </ul>	<p>much break in the street wall/ porosity in street wall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leave it as a function of FAR, public space guidelines, and thoughtful design</li> <li>• Crabtree Corner is a good example, but it was designed for its retail purpose</li> <li>• Move it into the public space guideline – then you can fill the box how you like</li> <li>• Can be used to create more storefront</li> <li>• When 2<sup>nd</sup> floor begins to encroach over the space it becomes less inviting (Kismet bldg)</li> <li>• FAR should dictate</li> <li>• It's a width discussion</li> </ul>		
-----------------------------------	---	--	--	--

<p><i>Amenity space continued...</i></p>	<p>Street. All of these have seating and or art or other curiosities for pedestrians to explore and linger over.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We need rules applied consistently throughout the downtown core.</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Floor area ratio</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should there be a maximum FAR for non-residential uses?</li> <li>Make sure you can actually get your FAR</li> <li>Should there be a minimum FAR?</li> <li>To achieve 65% workforce in town and transfer density from county, FAR must be increased.</li> <li>Along with FAR increases, building heights must be increased to 3 &amp; 4 stories, or the densities &amp; FAR's will never be even close to fulfilled. A 2.0 FAR allotment cannot be realized with parking, LSR &amp; 2 story height requirements. Given minimal room to develop horizontally in town, to achieve 2.0 FAR intensity and satisfy LSR, parking, etc. you must be flexible to develop vertically.</li> <li>Concern is that if everyone built to a 2.0 FAR it might not work.</li> <li>An important tool but should be secondary to the public realm experience and perception.</li> <li>I like the notion of a 'build to' FAR envelope (3.0) with a smaller actual FAR (2.0). in much of this area. I also would encourage 'free' FAR for restricted community housing in the higher density zones such as the residential, retail, and truck route.</li> <li>The FAR can never exceed 2</li> <li>FAR must be explained as the result of dividing the Floor Area by the Lot Area. That number is the FAR: bldg. sq. ft. on 3 floors=45,000/(50x150=7500*3=22,500)=2.0 FAR</li> <li>Improved</li> <li>The FAR should be increased to 1.75-2.0 in the downtown and residential core. This helps to alleviate part of the housing crisis and with higher density development projects may make more sense financially</li> <li>We need rules applied consistently throughout the downtown core.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It's good. Its prescriptive, but allows creativity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concept generally good</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Private Frontage General</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is build-to- percentage a frontage type or zone requirement</li> <li>May need a lodging private frontage type</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allow secondary frontage to be different if you hold the corner</li> <li>Require primary frontage on both frontages of a corner lot</li> <li>Lodging has more public access should be treated differently</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Positive concept</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Private Frontage Shopfront</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For retail and most offices; frontages should be public, zero setbacks.</li> <li>I like the notion of build the form that is desired and with less focus on the use.</li> <li>Design the regulation to have the structure and appearance meeting the character goals and allow for uses to evolve over time. In residential character zones,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Verticality has historic context and current appeal</li> <li>Transparency should be a minimum</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The higher floor-to-floor is a benefit</li> </ul>	

<p><i>Private Frontage Shopfront continued...</i></p>	<p>there may some potential for use of the more transparent appearance at more busy corners (such as Gill and Millward) with other more private appearances used in mid-block.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shopfronts right on property line, no landscaping.</li> <li>• Signage? Salt Lake City has no control of signage in a large part of the city and it is very ugly as a result</li> <li>• I think we need to combine the shop frontage concept with the office frontage for a more diverse pedestrian experience. The concept of solid storefront elevations is more urban than our community requires. Allowing for a combination creates more opportunities for architectural public space designs</li> <li>• The shopfront concept can be improved by requiring developers to activate the pedestrian spaces with public art, both functional and stand-alone. Alleys are frequently used by people to get through town, yet they are often neglected in planning and certainly in the upkeep of buildings. Developers should be encouraged to address their alleys in creative ways.</li> <li>• Include considerations for landscaping and accessibility</li> <li>• The Shopfront Private Frontage concept should be included in the rewrite of the LDR's because as long as a "cookie-cutter" type effect is not the result. Variety is more appealing than the same building front.</li> <li>• We need rules applied consistently throughout the downtown core.</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Private Frontage Office</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some office frontages should be semi-private, depending on function, use, parking, requirements, etc.</li> <li>• I like the notion of build the form that is desired and with less focus on the use.</li> <li>• Design the regulation to have the structure and appearance meeting the character goals and allow for uses to evolve over time. In residential character zones, there may some potential for use of the more transparent appearance at more busy corners (such as Gill and Millward) with other more private appearances used in mid-block.</li> <li>• Office frontage setback from property which allows for landscaping</li> <li>• This concept can be improved by having developer's group green or open spaces into pocket parks that include pedestrian amenities like public art, landscaping and seating, encouraging people to take breaks or hold meetings outside. All developers should be required to collect rain water for use in landscaping.</li> <li>• Again, as long as varieties of projects are still encouraged and not a one type of frontage fits all office spaces.</li> <li>• We need rules applied consistently throughout the downtown core.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is 30' high enough in office zone – doesn't allow for different forms especially gable form – 46' may be better.</li> <li>• Need to coordinate required floor heights with overall building height to avoid flat-roofed structures</li> </ul>	

<b>Private Frontage Residential</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 99% of Jackson residential will be private entry, but in mixed-use cases- this should be flexible in design.</li> <li>• I like the notion of build the form that is desired and with less focus on the use.</li> <li>• Design the regulation to have the structure and appearance meeting the character goals and allow for uses to evolve over time. In residential character zones, there may be some potential for use of the more transparent appearance at more busy corners (such as Gill and Millward) with other more private appearances used in mid-block.</li> <li>• Allows for landscaping, porches, with alleys so there are no curb cuts.</li> <li>• Signage?</li> <li>• Include access for non-motorized vehicles.</li> <li>• We need rules applied consistently throughout the downtown core.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lodging shouldn't be in residential</li> <li>• Lodging should have its own frontage type</li> <li>• Corner lodging facilities should have two primary frontages</li> </ul>		
<b>Public Frontage General</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should the width requirement be determined in the zone not by public frontage?</li> <li>• Should include an entire street cross section</li> <li>• What happens when the curb moves?</li> <li>• Need to define where each is allowed</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If we can't have columns how do we maintain the character of the covered walkway</li> <li>• We should clearly define where we will have a covered element and where columns go</li> <li>• Broadway Shops not 15' curb to building</li> <li>• Leary of all street frontage looking the same. Differences in the street frontage is part of the character</li> <li>• 15' seems aggressive</li> <li>• Minimum frontage requirement should be a standard sidewalk width and the rest of the frontage width should be up to building/prop owner</li> <li>• The minimum should be less than 15' but a minimum should be set</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are we trying to get out of the public realm requirement?</li> <li>• 15' is a good place to start</li> <li>• 15' is a quality public space</li> <li>• Might be excessive in some areas, but good place to start</li> </ul>
<b>Public Frontage Covered walkway</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To increase pedestrian activity, yes most downtown buildings should be covered, however-if possible redeveloped at-grade walkways for streetscape flexibility with future development.</li> <li>• It is important that we keep a "look" that strengthens the Jackson Hole image. Visitors come here expecting to see the West and we should keep that in mind with building, signs, walkways, etc.</li> <li>• An important character element, particularly in the retail areas.</li> <li>• Appropriate around and near the square. Prevents landscaping (trees in grates)</li> <li>• Careful of over use, this element may generally reduce the use of other amenities such as street trees. Concerned that the 15 ft. number may be too large, this is</li> </ul>			

<p><i>Public Frontage Covered walkway continued...</i></p>	<p>larger than we have historically seen (up to 10 or, maybe,12) and what we have with newer development such as 185 Glenwood (10+). Additional width could be considered an amenity space.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The concept is an iconic one for JH and is very appropriate. They also present an opportunity for public art displays at another level.</li> <li>• Identified Areas of continuity and high pedestrian traffic this is a great opportunity for the integration of Public art?</li> <li>• I think this concept should only be applied to the Town Square or buildings within one block of the Town Square. Covered walkways do not necessarily encourage people to gather and do not appear to increase pedestrian activity. That 15 feet could be activated with much more interesting features. Maybe there are pedestrian warming stations around the Town Square that are open (not covered) but provide heat from October 15 - April 15 and are creatively designed to integrate into the fabric of the downtown experience.</li> <li>• Important for tourists/retail when winter is 5 months. More safe, preventing ice mounds.</li> <li>• I believe this is an outdated idea and does not promote the building of world-class public spaces. We can address our unique culture by adding public art instead of mandating the inclusion of an outdated building style.</li> <li>• We should make walking as aesthetically pleasing and friendly as possible</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Public Frontage Trees in grates</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Depends on locations &amp; context, but more trees equal better public realm.</li> <li>• The raised boardwalks in the town square make it difficult to achieve tree-lined streetscapes</li> <li>• An important character element, particularly in the retail areas.</li> <li>• I feel this should be the main element in downtown outside of core retail or smaller scale office. Concerned that the 15 ft. number may be too large, this is larger than we have historically seen (up to 10 or, maybe,12) and what we have with newer development such as 185 Glenwood (10+). Additional width could be considered an amenity space.</li> <li>• The more landscaping the better. Trees block the public from seeing into stores in the retail area but all other zones there should be more landscaping.</li> <li>• The Town should have a standard grate design and but also use tree grates as a type of public art display. A variety of grate designs could be developed for use throughout the town- functional but artistic in nature.</li> <li>• This concept can be improved if the Town makes custom Jackson Hole tree grates that are unique to our community but still meet ADA requirements</li> <li>• Trees in gates are not enough.</li> </ul>			

<p><i>Public Frontage Trees in grates continued...</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not sure why trees need to be in grates at all?</li> <li>• We need rules applied consistently throughout the downtown core. Maintaining and/or increasing the use of living landscapes is important</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Public Frontage Trees in lawn</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Depends on locations &amp; context, but more trees equal better public realm.</li> <li>• The raised boardwalks in the town square make it difficult to achieve tree-lined streetscapes</li> <li>• An important character element, particularly in the retail areas.</li> <li>• Appropriate for residential and office zones.</li> <li>• The parking requirements for this area must be reviewed. I do believe that every property in every zone needs to have on-site parking requirements by one of the strategies listed below, except on-street parking.</li> <li>• I think this concept can be improved by including lighting and seating, as the community grows and density is increased more people will be living and walking at all hours in and around town</li> <li>• We need rules applied consistently throughout the downtown core. Maintaining and/or increasing the use of living landscapes is important. Trees in Lawn and rain gardens improve/reduce run-off and pollution.</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Parking General</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need allowance for managed parking</li> <li>• Should incorporate a residential and lodging reduction in all zones</li> <li>• Need to reduce parking now otherwise site program will still be dictated by parking</li> <li>• Prohibit standalone parking lots</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What do lodge owners say? Too much required?</li> <li>• Less is more</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking reductions good by whatever factor can be accomplished</li> <li>• Should parking standards be more particular to our community</li> <li>• Parking requirements should not drive development – how can we incentivize non-surface parking solutions or parking reductions?</li> <li>• Parking allotments/credits should be evaluated</li> <li>• Need to re-visit parking requirements generally</li> <li>• Stand-alone private surface parking lots in downtown parking district should be prohibited</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Look at overall parking requirements now</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>Surface parking</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Surface parking is inevitable, but should be significantly reduced for development requirements.</li> <li>• Allow on-street parking to count towards parking requirements.</li> <li>• Some reduction in requirements would be helpful but we need to make certain there is enough to cover realistic needs.</li> <li>• Designed to have active and non-parking uses at street levels</li> <li>• Every building in every zone must have a parking</li> </ul>			

<p><i>Surface parking continued...</i></p>	<p>requirement to be met in one of the ways listed here.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I think we need to think of alleys as alternative pedestrian corridors that walkers and cyclists use. Developers should be encouraged to treat these areas with creativity. They are great places for pocket parks and public art, this will also decrease graffiti and other vandalism. Imagine if every dumpster was behind a painted or laser cut metal screen filled with wonderful images. I think the Town could introduce the concept of "public art units" or a percent for art ordinance that would support the design of creative public spaces.</li> <li>• Limited to areas or lower design density</li> <li>• We need rules applied consistently throughout the downtown core to affirm our community character and maintain pedestrian-friendly access.</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Tuck-under parking</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When the site is large enough, sure, this works, but building heights need to increase to allow cantilever buildings to pencil out (they are more \$ to build)</li> <li>• May want to limit to mid-blocks to limit impacts on pedestrian experience on side streets.</li> <li>• Tuck under parking can be improved by having screened parking areas that include landscaping to soften the screen and views of cars, while also keeping safety in mind.</li> <li>• As long as it doesn't impede the available space that could be used for actual office space.</li> <li>• We need rules applied consistently throughout the downtown core to affirm our community character and maintain pedestrian-friendly access.</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Underground parking</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very expensive to build- especially if building heights are less than 4 stories</li> <li>• If the FAR is increased. Underground parking is ideal in most ways except that it is very expensive.</li> <li>• We need rules applied consistently throughout the downtown core to affirm our community character and maintain pedestrian-friendly access.</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Structured parking</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very expensive to build- especially if building heights are less than 4 stories</li> <li>• Designed to have active and non-parking uses at street levels</li> <li>• Structured parking garages must include public art on the facades to screen them. Public art can be in the form of living wall, creative lighting, custom concrete form liners, installations that move in the wind etc.</li> <li>• We need rules applied consistently throughout the downtown core to affirm our community character and maintain pedestrian-friendly access.</li> <li>• We need rules applied consistently throughout the downtown core</li> </ul>			

<b>On-street parking</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Absolutely need more on-street parking. Parking/snow plowing program surely needed. TOJ has huge ROW's-ripe for striping new spaces.</li> <li>• Some but again not so it takes over the parking. Think major cities where cars wait for someone to leave, we do not want to create that</li> <li>• At some point, we should be exploring alternate street side overnight parking.</li> <li>• Mark parking spots; be sure to include spaces for handicap parking.</li> <li>• Specification of diagonal, parallel, perpendicular is needed and should be looked at with regards to vehicular circulation and the impact on traffic flow.</li> <li>• On street parking year round but only on one side of street would be a huge improvement.</li> <li>• We need rules applied consistently throughout the downtown core</li> </ul>			
<b>Remote parking</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In some cases, yes.</li> <li>• Increase "Fee In-Lieu Eligibility Area" and allow lodging.</li> <li>• We need rules applied consistently throughout the downtown core to affirm our community character and maintain pedestrian-friendly access</li> <li>• If this doesn't mean another parking garage downtown. Or at least one more aesthetically pleasing rather than a cement block.</li> <li>• We need rules applied consistently throughout the downtown core</li> </ul>			

**District #2: Public Studio Summary and Recommendations**

**Character Zones**

**Pages 15-25**

	<b>Public</b>	<b>Design Review Committee</b>	<b>Planning Commission</b>	<b>Town Council</b>
<b>Character Zone: Retail</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to define public frontage type</li> <li>• Need to define a primary and/or secondary street requirement</li> <li>• Need a greater parking reduction for 2.0 FAR</li> <li>• FAR needs to be 2.0</li> <li>• Front setback and build to should be 10' not 5'</li> <li>• Need to create vibrant tourist area to compete with Village</li> <li>• Retail should also accommodate full-time residents, allowing for top stories to be residential-need 4 stories allowable.</li> <li>• Need four stories- at least allow the option for three + loft/flat</li> <li>• Residential should not be lodging only. Need all year round vibrant downtown.</li> <li>• Looks reasonable</li> <li>• Ground floor activities and uses related to lodging uses should be acknowledged as also able to add to the vitality of the public realm.</li> <li>• Consider acknowledging that getting residential use, both lodging and permanent, sooner rather than later will result in more activation of the public realm, be sensitive to discouraging these uses, particularly over the next 5 years or so.</li> <li>• The third floor step back could be relaxed at areas that are across the street from open space such as St. John's or Miller Park.</li> <li>• Depending on the type of amenity space, 30% of frontage is a large number and could adversely impact the goal of activating the street level and reducing the economic vitality of the adjoining spaces.</li> <li>• FAR feels right.</li> <li>• Consider 'free' FAR for restricted community housing as long as it is stepped back and not adding to the street wall.</li> <li>• Clarify that 'lodging only' note refers to character of frontage, not actual use</li> <li>• Overall I like the boundaries but we need a larger map and a thinner line</li> <li>• Residential okay, I would like to see the Lodging Overlay on this map.</li> <li>• Upper story setback is very important in the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maybe 2.5 FAR to allow use of all three levels</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Institutional?</li> <li>• Use can be more open, including office, if shopfront frontage is provided</li> <li>• Use table is important in retail zone – avoid all real estate offices on first floor</li> <li>• Offices can bring in some vitality and activity</li> </ul>	

<p><i>Character Zone: Retail continued...</i></p>	<p>required zones</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In this zone, the integration of public art, street furniture, and the concept of creating pocket parks or small but unique areas for congregation should be addressed/encouraged.</li> <li>• Engaging ground floors and active streetscapes should be required for all developers, not just retail, in order to maintain continuity of public spaces. Requiring public art and pedestrian amenities will contribute to creating a world-class downtown and succeed in increasing vitality.</li> <li>• On street parking is not viable in a town where on street parking is restricted throughout the winter months. More people need winter parking and on-street parking does not satisfy that need.</li> <li>• Amenity spaces will not increase vitality and demonstrate excellence in design without a percent for art or other mandated and reviewed process. Perhaps a developer can gain certain bonuses for a comprehensive amenity and streetscape design. To achieve excellence, the planning process could require a public artist as part of the design team.</li> <li>• Public lots should carefully consider hours of operation and whether overnight parking is allowed.</li> <li>• Build-to zone: 0 min/ 5 foot max or 15 feet from back of curb whichever is more.</li> <li>• Minimum 10 foot set-back.</li> <li>• Be sure not to limit size of building by square footage or ownership as is in the existing code.</li> <li>• Landscape surface ratio should be required. Hardscaping should be in character with the rest of town.</li> <li>• Allow lodging on the first floor, particularly along secondary streets. Include in the "Fee In-Lieu Eligibility Area for parking and allow lodging.</li> <li>• Office is more likely to crowd out retail than the other way around</li> <li>• Highly likely that office will dominate second floor in retail zone</li> <li>• Residential on second floor problematic on single lot</li> <li>• Limit reliance on on-street parking because it's not allowed overnight most of the year.</li> </ul>			
---	---	--	--	--

<p><b>Character Zone: Truck Route/Gateway</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Zone should be eliminated and combined with Retail zone</li> <li>• Ensure that it accommodates pedestrians</li> <li>• Needs to address Flat Creek</li> <li>• Need to identify primary corridor and secondary street requirements</li> <li>• Needs wider public frontage than retail</li> <li>• More Gateway features, public realm and streetscape improvements. Mores design, create sense of arrival.</li> <li>• Three story with 4 story upper setback in area close to downtown.</li> <li>• I believe that the use of 'truck route' is a bit misleading given that it does not follow the truck route once it leaves Cache/Broadway. Gateway sounds like a better fit.</li> <li>• Ground floor activities and uses related to lodging uses should be acknowledged as also able to add to the vitality of the public realm</li> <li>• Consider acknowledging that getting residential use, both lodging and permanent, sooner rather than later will result in more activation of the public realm, be sensitive to discouraging these uses, particularly over the next 5 years or so.</li> <li>• Having some amenity space makes sense given above comments about too much of a requirement.</li> <li>• FAR feels right.</li> <li>• Consider 'free' FAR for restricted community housing as long as it is stepped back and not adding to the street wall.</li> <li>• Clarify that 'lodging only' note refers to character of frontage, not actual use.</li> <li>• There must be some variety in the allowable setbacks so all the buildings do not line up. I do not know how to control this concern.</li> <li>• Residential okay</li> <li>• No upper story setback in this zone.</li> <li>• This should be the same as retail.</li> <li>• Need green space. There is no less pedestrian activity along current truck-routes; we should NOT plan for having less pedestrian traffic.</li> <li>• I would also allow upper story setbacks, more pleasant for residents of the buildings.</li> <li>• Build-to zone should have a minimum 3 foot set-back.</li> <li>• Landscaping and amenity space should be required.</li> <li>• No link between zoning and wildlife vehicle collisions – traffic issue, fencing and crossings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gateways need to be transitioned sooner than later</li> <li>• Need to make connections between gateways to downtown with pedestrian friendly design</li> <li>• No 3<sup>rd</sup> floor step back is good because of street width</li> <li>• Public space might be needed, why not have people linger?</li> <li>• North Cache is an opportunity</li> <li>• Streets are more important than building</li> <li>• Currently feels automotive</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amenity space would still be welcomed – its walkable. Maybe stepback not necessary</li> <li>• Based upon definition and number of lots</li> <li>• Keep gateway concept all the way through. Landscape or amenity space is important.</li> <li>• Define the street standard</li> <li>• Taller better - 46' rather than 42'</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large properties Rustic/Staples are outliers</li> <li>• Have to think about all the potentialities on large properties</li> <li>• Large properties look inward</li> <li>• Rustic Inn <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ West side of Flat Creek isn't currently commercial</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Need 3<sup>rd</sup> story step-back incorporate with Retail Zone</b></li> <li>• Like step-back in Gateway</li> <li>• Without redevelopment of 5-way never going to get green space on Flat Creek</li> <li>• 5-way in Lodging Overlay will be required to get redevelopment</li> <li>• Where do you park between street and creek?</li> <li>• Need incentives to get redevelopment</li> <li>• Flat Creek greenway is a good goal</li> <li>• Do we need gateway district? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If amenity space moves to design guidelines only difference from Retail is 3<sup>rd</sup> floor</li> <li>○ Build to is also 10' rather than 5'</li> <li>○ Incorporate into retail</li> <li>○ <b>Incorporate into Retail Zone, use step back, maybe larger flexibility in build-to</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Larger front setback <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 15 foot setback</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
---	---	--	---	--

<p>Character Zone: Truck Route/Gateway continued...</p>	<p>are solution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restaurant etc. essential to first class lodging property</li> <li>• Rustic have been good stewards of land an Flat Creek</li> <li>• West Broadway very different from other gateways</li> <li>• Curve leads to long walk</li> <li>• Parking ends up next to Flat Creek or Residential on W. Broadway</li> <li>• Enhance bridges as gateway into Town</li> <li>• No use for Gateway zone</li> <li>• Third floor setback even in Gateway</li> </ul>			
<p>Character Zone: Resort Connector</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No 3<sup>rd</sup> story on the corner of S Cache and Snow King</li> <li>• No reduction in parking for non-residential uses</li> <li>• Residential/nonresidential buffer important</li> <li>• New public frontage should not affect existing on-street parking and old trees</li> <li>• Allow restaurants</li> <li>• Exclusion of restaurants is good</li> <li>• Town fund sidewalks to catalyze development interest in redevelopment.</li> <li>• Three stories are okay when close to downtown transition area.</li> <li>• A good new concept</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could handle taller than 35' height buildings maybe</li> <li>• Buildup at Cache/Snow King corner good</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned with height limitations – 14' on 1st floor isn't really achievable with the 30' height limit</li> <li>• Set height limitations based upon roof treatments</li> <li>• Speak to residential architectural scheme</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South Cache allow commercial that blends well</li> <li>• Don't incentivize large development</li> <li>• <b>Future zoning should be 2 lots deep on South Cache</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Have to park it</li> <li>○ 1 lot deep</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Snow King Ave <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Include all of Harrison Ford's lots in zone</li> <li>○ Different from S. Cache</li> <li>○ Consider 3 stories with step back – i.e. Friess building</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<p>Character Zone: Resort Connector continued...</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FAR feels right.</li> <li>• Consider 'free' FAR for restricted community housing as long as it is stepped back and not adding to the street wall.</li> <li>• Not sure the notion of residential transition is required with this zone as it is already structured as a transition with the FAR of 1.0 or less.</li> <li>• Residential okay</li> <li>• I would push for no parking on S. Cache as it creates congestion and that space would be better utilized for increased lane size of the idea of a boulevard median or a better bike lane.</li> <li>• Need to increase the boundary to three lots deep on South Cache. Three 50x150 lots provide for a zone that is 150'x150' and makes for a more economical development with rear yard setback and residential transition.</li> <li>• Reduce the boundaries of this zone.</li> <li>• Build to zone: 0 min / 10 foot max or 15 feet from back of curb whichever is more.</li> <li>• increase floor area ratio; require amenity space</li> <li>• Include in the "Fee In-Lieu Eligibility Area for parking.</li> <li>• Mixed uses along south cache, Needs vibrant commercial uses blended well with residential uses,</li> <li>• Coal Depot property key is three lot depth, don't split zone the parcel, Allow flexibility, Parking requirements need to be reasonable</li> <li>• Consider some short-term rental on south cache</li> <li>• Restaurant needed across from Art Center</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ideal for 15' sidewalk</li> <li>○ Leave at 2 stories for residences behind</li> <li>○ Flexibility of height</li> <li>○ Restaurants, boutique, b&amp;b, retail, commercial</li> </ul>
<p>Character Zone: Office</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further parking reduction parking</li> <li>• FAR of 1.00 is too low</li> <li>• Define neighborhood commercial</li> <li>• Makes no sense to allow office on Willow with overall goal of wanting residential why add commercial potential</li> <li>• Local convenience commercial should be allowed to serve residential</li> <li>• Looks good</li> <li>• As it goes east on Broadway should it stay there rather than going to Deloney?</li> <li>• The current mapping along south willow does not include existing office use in the current office overlay area along East Simpson east of the County building. The exiting office structures, both old and more recent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reality of office is you have to do tuck under to park it</li> <li>• Reduce parking requirement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Height limit is low if want 14' floor to floor on first floor</li> <li>• Height too low especially for the corner treatments</li> <li>• Buds is anchor already – corner treatments are interesting concept</li> <li>• Cache/ Snow King corner so residential – do you want to allow a really high density there?</li> <li>• Leave corner treatments up to designers to do something creative</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Be sensitive to office/commercial creep down Willow</li> <li>• Leave resident zoned properties on South Willow out of Office Zone <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Do we need creep down Willow</li> <li>○ Small office ok</li> <li>○ Jim Wallace only office Kelly to Snow King</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Don't incentivize large development</li> </ul>

<p>Character Zone: Office continued...</p>	<p>redevelopment, are respectful of the residential character to the east. It would be appropriate to include this block, particularly if we are expanding office use into areas where it does not currently exist.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not sure the notion of residential transition is required with this zone as it is already structured as a transition with the FAR of 1.0 or less.</li> <li>• FAR feels right.</li> <li>• LSR of 20% makes more sense than the current requirement in the office overlay and OP where there is a conflict with current LSRs that are structured for residential use but do not acknowledge the office parking requirement.</li> <li>• Consider 'free' FAR for restricted community housing as long as it is stepped back and not adding to the street wall.</li> <li>• Residential okay</li> <li>• Allow three stories for office use.</li> <li>• Include minimum 5 foot build-to zone</li> <li>• Allow 3 story buildings with step back</li> <li>• Balance good and consistent with existing character</li> <li>• Like mixture</li> <li>• Unintended consequence might be tip of balance that only allows large projects</li> <li>• Don't give benefits of reductions in parking only to large projects</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Character Zone: Residential</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LO potential will suppress residential redevelopment</li> <li>• Allow nonconformities to expand to allowed FAR</li> <li>• Address Flat Creek</li> <li>• Maintain low cost retail</li> <li>• Why require side setbacks</li> <li>• 2.00 FAR res/LO = 0.40 FAR AC/LO</li> <li>• Retail doesn't work/make sense here anyway</li> <li>• Prohibit condominiumization</li> <li>• If it's going to be rental, exempt housing requirements</li> <li>• Define neighborhood commercial</li> <li>• Fear of visitor commercial versus the benefit of local commercial a consideration</li> <li>• Retail will never work in these areas anyways</li> <li>• Allow office use on first floor only</li> <li>• Emphasis on housing in downtown is needed</li> <li>• What is the buildout impact?</li> <li>• 46 feet is/is not needed for residential</li> <li>• Allowing retail and office uses would drive out</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would live/work be allowed?</li> <li>• What about a daycare or architecture office type local business</li> <li>• Works well as drawn – not large, not a lot of access/through traffic, nice location</li> <li>• Like concentration of retail in one area</li> <li>• Creek is edge condition – works well for residential, mixed use wouldn't work as well next to creek. Residential use helps stabilize it.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Combine residential and office zone into one?</li> <li>• Can you remove the use from the zone (office/res/retail) but keep the frontage type</li> <li>• Residential neighborhoods need to be protected – office leads to degradation of that</li> <li>• Concern that residential is displaced if office/retail use allowed</li> <li>• Potential FAR solution may work</li> <li>• Is full service hotel allowed in residential in the LO?</li> <li>• Residential will likely be constructed in upper stories if retail/office allowed</li> <li>• Flat creek area has historic commercial uses in that area. Residential in the south side of district is needing revitalization rather than preservation but two zones labeled residential are misleading in residential zone – additional</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flat Creek greenway is a good goal</li> <li>• How do we address existing businesses becoming nonconforming <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Incentives for residential rather than nonconformities</li> <li>○ Avoid disenfranchisement of existing uses</li> <li>○ A lot of businesses in north end</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Allow first floor nonresidential uses</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Only allow first floor nonresidential uses in the northern area</li> <li>○ Staff proposal supports housing and economic goals</li> <li>○ Allow not require residential uses</li> <li>○ Consider removing Meadowbrook and North Glenwood cabins/condos</li> <li>○ Zone out the uses we do not want</li> <li>○ Non-residential uses/lodging</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<p>Character Zone: Residential continued...</p>	<p>residential uses because retail and office are considered highest and best use in comparison by appraisers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow first floor mixed use</li> <li>• Take out of Lodging Overlay and allow mixed use on first floor</li> <li>• Should be smaller buildings</li> <li>• Where are people going to work if it is all housing</li> <li>• Lodging uses need to have supporting uses, restaurants, etc.</li> <li>• Live/Work should be allowed</li> <li>• Truck Route too noisy for residential/lodging uses on first floor</li> <li>• Vertical mixed use</li> <li>• Residential on flat creek worse than commercial</li> <li>• Please be flexible. We need to catalyze every opportunity possible for residential development within TOJ.</li> <li>• Four stories with upper setbacks</li> <li>• Reduce 20% LSR to 15% in this District if developer provides nice streetscape frontage area.</li> <li>• Like the expanded areas. Wonder if there should be more, such as the south side of Broadway, east of Willow.</li> <li>• Consider grandfathering existing lodging uses and permit them to develop to new intensity. Then require new development to be permanent residential.</li> <li>• Consider acknowledging that getting residential use, both lodging and permanent, sooner rather than later will result in more activation of the public realm, be sensitive to discouraging these uses, particularly over the next 5 years or so.</li> <li>• Ground floor non-residential use ok (office and local retail), particularly at more busy corners such as Millward/Gill.</li> <li>• FAR feels right.</li> <li>• Consider 'free' FAR for restricted community housing as long as it is stepped back and not adding to the street wall.</li> <li>• Ground floor can be commercial. Lodging can have restaurants. Hopefully the commercial will not be tourist orientated.</li> <li>• I would encourage the use of step back here as well the image above is an example of an unsuccessful interaction with the street scape I would say.</li> </ul>		<p>frontage types (residential vs retail zone forms and frontages)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is res. zone appropriate for destination retail?</li> <li>• Neighborhood amenities welcomed in area. Lodging amenities needed.</li> <li>• Pros and Cons each way</li> <li>• Small amounts of appropriately scaled retail uses would be ok</li> <li>• Any type of store that doesn't need storefront would be ok there</li> <li>• Protecting the residential neighborhoods is important and adding retail uses would hasten their conversion to other uses.</li> <li>• Residential area to south – weird to include brew pub uses or staples building</li> <li>• Are there creative ways to address buildings/properties made nonconforming by the new regulations? For example, could the Brew Pub be exempted from nonconformity requirements so it could operate without major barriers as an existing use but no other similar uses allowed in that area? Need to be careful about spot zoning.</li> <li>• Holding pattern at Sports Authority if made non-conforming in residential zone?</li> </ul>	<p>Increase demand for workforce housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Will get housing mitigation from nonresidential uses</li> <li>○ Residential needed to meet 65% workforce housing goals of Comp Plan</li> <li>○ Office live/work is desirable</li> <li>○ If 3<sup>rd</sup> story is for housing, we better get housing</li> <li>○ Residential only will lead to lodging uses inside the Lodging Overlay</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community is against sprawling out must meet workforce housing goal in Town</li> </ul>
---	---	--	--	---

<p>Character Zone: Residential continued...</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require step-backs.</li> <li>• Include minimum build-to zone greater than 0</li> <li>• Investing in Brew Pub over past 7 years, Purchased hole to enhance Pub product and service, Plan to green front and move parking to back, Planning now on hold, Move from commercial to residential is a concern, Another 20 years requires certainty of commercial zoning</li> <li>• Short-term, Long-term flexibility works well with limited parking i.e. Brookside</li> <li>• Residential should allow mixed uses and not regulate uses</li> <li>• Residential limitations on use are a departure from the idea of form over use</li> <li>• 75-80% of Residential will be nonconforming</li> <li>• Departure from vision in first step, not allowing commercial in the core</li> <li>• Consider density bonuses or other alternatives to limiting use where they have always been allowed</li> <li>• More time to consider impact of residential zoning</li> <li>• Residential zone allows design flexibility, anchors District 2, and protects Flat Creek</li> <li>• Avoid office and commercial creep</li> <li>• Organic growth has not achieved all goals</li> <li>• Community needs to reflect fact that it is a very big small Town</li> <li>• Allow office in Residential for some diversity and home office of a little larger</li> <li>• Don't know advantage of residential on Rustic in future</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Boundaries</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simpson to Retail Zone</li> <li>• Simpson out of any of the proposed zones</li> <li>• Include Hanson in Office</li> <li>• Put Staples site in Truck Route</li> <li>• Don't split ownership</li> <li>• Include Brew Pub in Retail zone</li> <li>• Rustic Inn completely into Truck Route</li> <li>• Should combine Retail, Truck Route, Residential into one zone with unlimited uses and same building size</li> <li>• This looks pretty good. one thing to not would be the idea of a mixed use work live at the intersections of the identified zones. Also it seems that a Corner Treatment could be established at the Intersection of S. Cache and Pearl the intersection of 3 zones and a major Node for activity that is underutilized. And</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should the Truck Route/Gateway zone and Retail zone be merged or are they different enough in intended character and appearance to have moderately different standards?</li> <li>• Should the Residential zone and Retail zone be merged or are they different enough in intended character and appearance to have moderately different standards?</li> <li>• How wide (e.g., 100' or 150') along South Cache should the Resort Connector zone be drawn? Same question for the Office zone along S. Willow.</li> <li>• Should Brew Pub be part of Residential zone?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Add Rustic West of Flat Creek into Lodging Overlay</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Is a request for an up zone</li> <li>○ Is constrained, less concern about intense use</li> <li>○ Access is from Rustic Inn</li> <li>○ Additional access exists from separate bridge to north</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Leave Sagebrush property in Lodging Overlay <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Take it out, is not lodging now, nor is lodging allowed</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Take Lutheran Church out of Lodging Overlay</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Leave in, prime lodging opportunity</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Leave Flat Creek properties in</li> </ul>

<p><i>Boundaries continued...</i></p>	<p>potentially a great place for the integration of public art.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I think the Truck Route should be classified as retail, what if we don't have cars and trucks in the future, or many fewer? We want those routes to vibrant and attractive to pedestrians. Including public art in the retail zone will help slow traffic by increasing the visual interest and amount of pedestrians. The North Cache Gateway is a vitally important entrance to the Town and should be a very unique and memorable experience. Artist live-work spaces should be included in all of these locations. Resort Connector: arts related activity needs to be inspired by a creative built environment, access to art, integrated public art in the form of way funding, seating, visually interesting crosswalks and other pedestrian amenities.</li> <li>We don't need more lodging. The resort connection makes me nervous that there will be vastly increased space for short-term rentals and the like.</li> <li>Rustic Inn is one piece of property has always been a lodging property, Put all of Rustic in LO, All Rustic property as Gateway</li> <li>Regulations are more complicated by putting a zoning line through a single property</li> <li>Doesn't make sense to split zone the Rustic property</li> <li>Jackson is nonconforming and always has been – don't be worried about variety in uses - Whole town mixed use, whole town in LO</li> <li>Western property partly excluded from Residential</li> <li>Would like ancillary Lodging uses</li> <li>Lodging should have a 50% lodging reduction</li> <li>Current OP-2 to be residential or office only, property should be zoned Retail</li> <li>Split zoning is difficult from a financing standpoint</li> </ul>			<p><b>Lodging Overlay</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Take out blocks that have no lodging</li> <li>● Split zoning is ok where it makes sense</li> </ul>
<p><b>General Comments</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need expert to discuss pro-formas with owners</li> <li>What is adoption strategy?</li> <li>Adopt as new zones or overlays?</li> <li>Will new regulations eliminate PUDs?</li> <li>Can you condominiumize the allowed buildings?</li> <li>Allow off-site housing?</li> <li>Parking and housing requirements are development costs controlled by government</li> <li>Will housing FAR exemptions continue to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include images in regulations, help people see best practices</li> </ul>		

General  
Comments  
continued...

apply?

- Do not limit use in any zone let the market decide, free it up to opportunity
- Overall, I like the diagrams, vision statements and organization. The distinctions between retail, residential, and truck route may be too small to warrant separate zones. These zones are also relatively small areas. Is there a way to structure the regulations so that the larger picture components are the same (FAR, build to, amenity space, etc) and smaller details are tied to a particular street? It seems that a main concern is the use, or type of building frontage, at the ground level as all of the zones permit and encourage residential uses (permanent and lodging) at the second and third floors. For example, the only differences between Retail and Gateway is a minor difference in the build to dimensions, upper story step back, private frontage and amenity space. Much of the focus is on providing tools to reduce the appearance of massing. Although I agree with this direction, we may want to have tools that would permit something like the Wort. I do not believe that the current building mass would comply (height of 49 ft, essentially one mass without much articulation that breaks up the elevations). This is being said with a caveat that the pedestrian realms at the west and north sides of the Wort do not work and should not serve as a model. The south elevation could be considered as a type of amenity space.
- Public Art is an essential component in the planning of town development. I feel that strong guidelines in the land Development Regulations must be developed for developers to include design professionals and dedicated funding for public art and pedestrian amenities.
- I believe it is important for there to be strong guidelines in the Land Development Regulations ensuring developers dedicate adequate funding for public art and pedestrian amenities. Public art has proven to play a critical role in building world-class downtown cores by creating engaging and meaningful civic spaces. We need regulations that support the integration of design professionals and public artists at the design phase of projects.
- Regarding the recommendation for allowing three story multi use buildings within this zone is of some concern. I feel that the regulations

General  
Comments  
continued...

for allowing these should be rather extensive in regards to their locations. The pedestrian experience should be seriously considered when identifying locations for three story units. Not only should the street side elevation of the proposed buildings be reviewed for scale, proportion and character but all exposed elevations should be as well. The design recommendations for a three story building on a primary street frontage should be different than the requirements for an elevation on a street corner location vs. on a secondary street location vs. adjacent to a public space. The design and location of any proposed three story unit should also be evaluated on their potential impact on essential vistas out to the surrounding natural environment as well as their impact on view corridors that display the towns environs. Mandatory public spaces should also be required on these projects as well to ensure that the project's emphasis is on maintaining a comfortable human scale at street level, which is a very important element in making our current downtown area successful. Accompanying the requirement for dedicated public spaces there should be recommendations attached that would describe what type of public space would be the greatest benefit to the community for that particular site (small open space plaza, green space, opportunity for public art display, pedestrian connector, etc.). The mandate to require that development budgets include a portion for public art will certainly help with creating planning concepts that focus on a pedestrian oriented community. The pedestrian experience should weigh heavily in the design of any future planning requirements.

- We should build up, but we don't want to feel like we're driving through a canyon of buildings. Buildings should include step-backs and pedestrian-friendly sidewalks.
- I think you have Dist. 2.6 pretty well defined for us. E. Pearl beyond Willow is a good place for offices and residential, but not storefront retail. The same is true of other cross streets, as walking access to public offices and bldgs. is good.
- Consider what you may be forcing a business owner to do
- Flexibility for owner if it meets form

General  
Comments  
continued...

- Move process forward to provide certainty
- Like it, done well
- How will split zoning work?
- LO should not be expanded
- Parking review is needed, mass transit will never be reality
- Increase in commercial FAR will increase deficit of workforce housing, high rises needed to house over entitled commercial
- Worried about fast pace, slow down
- Oppose expansion of LO, especially at congested 5-way, will increase wildlife conflict
- Flat Creek is an eye sore in District 2 – turning back with intensive uses is not environmental stewardship
- Plenty of LO capacity outside of 2 months
- Vibrancy comes from permanent housing not lodging
- Alliance will support height in trade for long-range housing and quality design
- Sagebrush lot, something will be built that will impact wildlife
- Intensive survey with consultants has yielded need for more lodging
- Format easier
- Missing 3 elements, 1 – doesn't show rough doubling compliance, 2 – unknown decrease in county, unknown increase in town, 3 – how going to accommodate density in terms of traffic, parking, density
- Needs to be an iterative process where we analyze
- PMUD with new name and no 4<sup>th</sup> floor
- Never showed we could accommodate PMUD
- 75% of PMUD never got built, rewarding speculation with no benefit to community
- If you really want the average person to understand a self-guided walking tour showing people what numbers look like
- Look at LO in terms of supply and demand – no one is expecting an increase in tourism
- Don't need more hotels, expanding LO spreads tourists out
- More Lodging facilities does increase employees
- Reduce LO, consolidate around square
- More workforce housing downtown
- In District 2 – Flat Creek is junk, a wasted public resource
- Ideally Flat Creek would be a public greenway

<p><i>General Comments continued...</i></p>	<p>and entrance into Karns Meadow</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How do nonconforming uses continue to be vibrant, what can they redevelop or partially redevelop, Don't create decrepit uses</li> <li>• Like urban renewal better than "last of the old west"</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Public Comment at TC Meeting</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gail Jensen</li> <li>• Zia Yasrobi – Rustic Inn</li> <li>• Brenda Wiley</li> <li>• Noah Stark – Brew Pub owner</li> <li>• Audrey Hagan</li> <li>• Melissa Wittstruck – Conservation Alliance</li> <li>• Nicole Krieger – Terry Winchill – Fighting Bear</li> <li>• Joe Rice</li> <li>• Jay Varley</li> <li>• James Croley</li> <li>• Harry Statter</li> <li>• Armond Acri - SHJH</li> <li>• Phil Cusea</li> <li>• Trevor Stevenson – Conservation Alliance</li> <li>• Scott Pierson</li> <li>• Charlie Sands</li> <li>• Pete Lawton</li> </ul>			