



Sharon Fox &lt;sfox@tetoncountyidaho.gov&gt;

## February 11th PZC Information Packet

Tom Braun &lt;tbraun@tetoncountyidaho.gov&gt;

Tue, May 6, 2025 at 9:59 AM

To: Sharon Fox &lt;sfox@tetoncountyidaho.gov&gt;

Cc: Wyatt Penfold <wpenfold@tetoncountyidaho.gov>, Wade Kaufman <wkaufman@tetoncountyidaho.gov>, Tyler Wertenbruch <twertenbruch@tetoncountyidaho.gov>, James Weber <jweber@tetoncountyidaho.gov>, Rebeca Ann Baker <rabaker@tetoncountyidaho.gov>, Carl Kohut <ckohut@tetoncountyidaho.gov>, Jade Krueger <jkrueger@tetoncountyidaho.gov>, Torin Bjorklund <tbjorklund@tetoncountyidaho.gov>

Hello Sharon and PZ members,

My apologies for missing the April meeting. FWIW, I thought your comments/discussion of the Concept Plan for the project up near Felt was spot on. I did speak with Sharon about your discussion of refinements to the code and spent time watching the video of the meeting. The best way to identify how a code is working, whether refinements are needed or not, etc., is to work with it. Most of you have had a couple of years with the new code. While I am pretty familiar with development codes, the Teton County Land Development Code is new to me. As we go through the process of refinements, I will review the code to see what I think may need attention, but that type of review cannot replace what can be learned about a code when using it to review projects. Your collective experiences will be invaluable to this effort.

Over the years I've been involved in preparing amendments to development codes, have served on committees doing the same, and have monitored code amendment processes for clients. One thing I've learned is that in virtually every case, a learning process will follow adoption of a new code and the need for refinements, clarifications, clean up is always needed. What we are doing with this effort is very common.

A few thoughts:

- Comment was made that the refinements we propose should not delve into policy, that they should stick to making clarifications, correcting inconsistencies, adding clarity where needed, etc.. I very much agree. Going into policy changes would totally change the nature of this effort and is not something we should be doing. I think it was Josh who mentioned there may be an effort to update to the County comprehensive plan. If or when that occurs, upon completion of a new plan would be the time to revisit the development code to ensure it is aligned with the goals and vision of the master plan.
- I think Josh mentioned an approach to this effort of taking a "bite of the apple at a time". Totally agree. What is key to this approach is to always be mindful of the inter-relationships between various code sections. A change to a development standard may prompt the need to change a definition, or visa versa.
- On a related note, comment was made about initiating some initial fixes, maybe hitting some low hanging fruit. This is fine to do, but I'd say the same point above applies - that we need to be cognizant of any trickle down effect of the initial fix so as to not create conflicts within the code.
- I appreciated Wade's comments about how a "cheat sheet" could be helpful in reviewing/digesting project info and if or how an application conforms with applicable review criteria. I also agreed with Josh's response that a staff memo should do just that . . . lay out the pertinent facts or considerations so the PZ, the applicant, and the public know where staff stands on an application. We all may not agree on how staff thinks a project conforms or does not conform to review criteria, but that's OK, that is part of the process and the purpose of the public meetings is for this to "come out in the wash" so to speak.
- I forget who made the comment about procedures/steps in the various county review processes and presenting these graphically, but this sounds like a very good idea. Sometimes it can be hard to read a page or two of single space text that outlines the review process. Expressing this graphically can help applicant's better understand the process they are involved in and what lies ahead. The better expectations can be defined, the better for all of us.
- Wetlands criteria. This was only briefly discussed, but this will be an interesting discussion. Particularly with respect to the criteria: "The variance requested is the minimum variance that will make possible the proposed use of the land, building, or structure". Comment was made that this process should be "more black and white". Given all that is involved in a variance, that may be tough.
- Thresholds for GEC's, traffic reports, etc. It is very important for the code to be clear on these types of things. Expectations should be defined in the code, not made by staff or PZ on a case by case basis. Just after the new code was adopted we built a porch, it involved three 36" x 36" concrete pads. We learned after we submitted for building permit that this triggered a GEC. I thought it was overkill, but I "get" the need for regulations. This raised havoc with scheduling our subs, but staff was great getting the permit pushed out. I told them when picking up the permit that I was going to be planting 20 trees and would be disturbing far more area than for the porch, I jokingly

5/9/25, 10:44 AM

Teton County Mail - February 11th PZC Information Packet

asked if that required a GEC. After a long pause the response was something to the effect of "I'll just forget I heard that". Thresholds matter!

Look forward to this process. Sharon I don't have Josh's email, can you pass this along to him please. See you next week.

Tom Braun

On Thu, Feb 6, 2025 at 3:48 PM Sharon Fox <[sfox@tetoncountyidaho.gov](mailto:sfox@tetoncountyidaho.gov)> wrote:

[Quoted text hidden]