A=Approval | D=Denial | T=Table | M=Alternate Modification | NA=Not Applicable

Proposed Modification		BCC Direction		Revision Notes	PC Recommendation		Staff Recommendation	
Sec.	Modification		Discussion			Discussion		Discussion
Key Issue 1: How Many Rural Zones Should There Be?								
map	Generally speaking, properties over 35 acres should be zoned R1	D	The BCC directed staff to use a 70 acre site as the basic criteria for determining a "large site" in creation of the zoning map. The BCC agreed with staff that the purpose of "large site" zoning is to promote coordinated use and development of sites that could be divided to do "better than 1 per 35".	No revision required	A	The Planning Commission believes that because the County is already largely divided into 35 acre tracts, acknowledging zoning based on 35 acre character is more appropriate.	D	Staff continues to recommend that the R1 district be based on the general idea of a 70 acre site. The Comprehensive Plan acknowledges a base allowance of one unit per 35 acres or existing lot. As a result, Staff believe the threshold for "large site" zoning should correspond roughly to the threshold for base allowance subdivision, which is 70 acres. (A 70 acre site can be divided into 2 - 35 acre parcels) Staff also believes a larger threshold for the R1 better facilitates the Comp Plan goal to do better than 1 per 35 where possible.
map	Split the R1 into two zones based on a primary characteristic of wildlife or scenic/agricultural	D	The BCC initially directed staff to look at two zones of "large sites" based on the character district distinction of a habitat or scenic focus. However after reviewing the standards that might be applied in two separate zones, the BCC directed staff to consolidate back into a single "large site" zone that relies on the NRO and SRO to specify wildlife and scenic protection.	No revision required	NA	Modification proposed at BCC hearing.	NA	Modification proposed at BCC hearing.
map	Properties under 35 acres should be zoned according to their proximity to areas of existing density. Within 1/4 mile of a complete neighborhood or development of Rafter J level density should be R3, other areas should be R2.	D	The BCC originally directed staff to build on the PC concept of location to include acknowledgment of existing character to try to avoid nonconformities. However, in the end they focused primarily on existing character and density to draw the zoning map, directing staff to identify R1 based on 70+ acre holdings, R2 based on parcels of 3-6 acres or larger which are generally not platted, and R3 based on parcel 3-6 acres or smaller which are generally platted.	Map revisions reflect BCC direction and primarily relate to specific direction or refinement of R2/R3 properties in the 3-6 acre range.	A	The Planning Commission believes the location of a parcel under 35 acres should be an important factor in the allowed use and therefore the zoning distinction.	A	Staff supports the Planning Commission's recommended focus on location for parcels that do not meet the "large site" criteria discussed above. Generally, Staff would take a less rigid approach to identifying the appropriate R3 areas, but the walkability/bikeability and existing density criteria established by the Planning Commission are generally consistent with the character defining features discussed in the Comprehensive Plan.

A=Approval | D=Denial | T=Table | M=Alternate Modification | NA=Not Applicable

Proposed Modification		BCC Direction		Revision Notes	PC Recommendation		Staff Recommendation	
Sec.	Modification		Discussion			Discussion		Discussion
Key Issue 2: How Should Use Be Regulated?								
3.2	CUP standards should be zone specific and define impacts to be mitigated; while an applicant should have flexibility in how to mitigate.	A	The BCC agrees with Staff and the PC. In addition, the BCC directed staff to include minimum thresholds to define the impacts to be mitigated.	Standards added to 3.2.2.E and 3.2.3.E	A	The Planning Commission believes that identifying the impacts to be mitigated should be the role of the CUP standards, with flexibility for the landowner in designing the mitigation.	A	Staff supports this Planning Commission recommendation. It supports the Comprehensive Plan goals of predictability by focusing on identifying the side boards we care about so that no matter what the use the landowner and neighbor can anticipate the level of intensity. This was the approach taken by Staff in the March 6, 2015 draft, and based on this recommendation will continue to be the approach as Staff implements other recommendations.
3.2	CUP standards should address hours of operation, frequency of use, occupancy, employees, traffic, noise, setbacks, and visual concerns.	A	The BCC supports the PC list of impacts and further directed staff to consider general impacts. The BCC further directed Staff to limit use based on location in the NRO and SRO.	Standards added to 3.2.2.E and 3.2.3.E. Hours of operation and setbacks were addressed in the draft. Noise is handled by other sections of the LDRs. Staff added standards to address intensity of use by using occupancy or frequency as proxies for traffic. Specific thresholds were taken from the reception/event standards where possible. Prohibited certain uses in the NRO. SRO adequately regulates visual impacts of all allowed uses.	A	The Planning Commission identified these impacts as the key, but acknowledged that there may be some consolidation possible for impacts that are essentially proxies for one another.	A	Staff supports this Planning Commission recommendation. These uses seem to be the most commonly discussed in protecting community and neighborhood character and defining what we are looking for in terms of each will provide predictability to all involved, regardless of the use.
3.2.2.C	Allow commercial uses in the R1 as a CUP on properties greater than 35 acres.	D	The BCC agrees with Staff that the threshold needs to be higher than 35 acres to do "better than 1 per 35", and after discussion of 140 versus 70 acres concluded that 140 acres represents the proper balance between increased intensity and maintained open space.	No revision required	A	The Planning Commission believes that these commercial and institutional uses are consistent with rural character and provide business opportunities in the County for businesses that require larger sites.	D	Staff continues to believe that commercial and institutional uses are only appropriate in rural areas if they achieve the Comp Plan goal of doing better than 1 per 35. Staff does not believe that a business on 35 is better than a residence on 35 in terms of the impacts to rural character. Staff continues to recommend a 140 acre site area to provide unused open space in conjunction with the commercial use, balance Comp Plan goals with increased impact.

A=Approval | D=Denial | T=Table | M=Alternate Modification | NA=Not Applicable

Proposed Modification		BCC Direction		Revision Notes	PC Recommendation		Staff Recommendation	
Sec.	Modification		Discussion			Discussion		Discussion
[3.2.5.C]	Allow commercial uses in the [R4] on properties 10 acres or greater	D	The BCC supports the March Draft of the regulations prohibiting commercial uses in any zones other than R1.	No revision required	A	The Planning Commission believes that in areas nearer complete neighborhoods and existing density institutional and commercial uses should be allowed if they are on larger parcels that help to mitigate impacts.	A	Staff supports this Planning Commission recommendation as a larger site will mitigate some of the impacts to neighbors from these more intense uses. Staff notes that based on the proposed zoning of the Planning Commission there are a limited number of sites (about 30 parcels) that can take advantage of this allowance and that 10 acres is not an acreage or threshold that relates to any historic development pattern or allowance. The BCC might consider changing this allowance to 6 acres or some other threshold with more relevance to our past development patterns.
3.2	Prohibit events in all rural area zones	D	The BCC directed staff to allow events, reliant on the CUP standards created pursuant to the other modifications of this key issue.	No revision required	D	Based on general direction regarding use and zoning, the Planning Commission believes commercial and institutional uses should be permitted on parcels greater than 35 acres, with CUP standards that vary by zone to ensure that impacts are adequately mitigated. CUP standards should address hours of operation, frequency of use, occupancy, employees, traffic, noise, setbacks, and visual concerns.	D	Staff continues to believe in the value of allowing events on large sites as an economically viable alternative to subdivision. However, as stated above, Staff believes the threshold should be greater than the 35 acres recommended by the Planning Commission. That said, staff does believe that prohibition is the appropriate course of action if it is the belief that receptions are generally incompatible with neighboring uses.
3.2	Prohibit golf courses in all rural area zones	D	The BCC directed staff to allow golf courses reliant on the CUP standards created pursuant to the other modifications of this key issue.	No revision required	D	Based on general direction regarding use and zoning, the Planning Commission believes commercial and institutional uses should be permitted on parcels greater than 35 acres, with CUP standards that vary by zone to ensure that impacts are adequately mitigated. CUP standards should address hours of operation, frequency of use, occupancy, employees, traffic, noise, setbacks, and visual concerns.	D	Staff continues to support the combination of golf courses with other outdoor recreation uses and continues to believe in the value of allowing outdoor recreation on large sites as an economically viable alternative to subdivision. However, as stated above, Staff believes the threshold should be greater than the 35 acres recommended by the Planning Commission.

A=Approval | D=Denial | T=Table | M=Alternate Modification | NA=Not Applicable

Proposed Modification		BCC Direction		Revision Notes	PC Recommendation		Staff Recommendation	
Sec.	Modification		Discussion			Discussion		Discussion
3.2.2.C	Allow institutional uses in the R1 on properties of 35 acres or greater with a CUP.	A	The BCC discussed the importance of developing specific thresholds within the CUP standards to ensure these uses are consistent with the existing and desired character. The BCC agreed with the modification to allow assembly uses in the R1, but only in areas outside of the NRO, in keeping with their general decision to have one large-lot rural zone, but to use the NRO and SRO to ensure uses are compatible with environmental and scenic resources.	6.1.1 revised, 3.2.2.C.1 revised	A	Planning Commission recommends approval of this modification on lots or parcels with a minimum of 35 acres, instead of the 140 acres proposed. Planning Commission was amenable to removing the consideration of "heritage and environment" language, per the recommendation of staff and legal review that character standards should be applicable to all and focus on impacts not applicants.	A	Staff can support these type of uses as a economically viable alternative to subdivision that maintains rural character similar to other allowances, but not at 35 acres. Staff continues to recommend a 140 acre threshold for such uses. Staff recommends elimination of the originally proposed "heritage and environment" standard, which is subjective and based on the applicant, and instead focusing on CUP standards that minimize or mitigate potential impacts.
3.2.3.C	Allow institutional uses in the R2 as a CUP with a minimum of 35 acres.	A	The BCC direction was to allow assembly and daycare/ education uses on parcels of 35 acres or more with the CUP thresholds and standards developed for the R1 zone.	6.1.1 revised, 3.2.3.C.1 revised	NA	The Planning Commission's modifications to R1 and allowance of such uses on 35 acre sites in R1 render this modification moot.	A	Staff can support this modification even if the threshold between R1 and R2 is increased because of the need for sites for institutional uses. Similar standards to those applied to institutional uses in the R1 should be applied to ensure R2 institutional uses remain consistent with rural character and the standards apply equally to all applicants.
3.2.4.C	Limit principle nonresidential uses in the R3 to ag, utilities, and wireless facilities; and prohibit dormitories and group homes.	A	As the BCC direction on the zoning map evolved, the effect was essentially direction to prohibit most nonresidential uses as well as dormitory and group home use in the R3.	6.1.1 revised, 3.2.4.C.1 revised	NA	Modification proposed at BCC hearing.	NA	Modification proposed at BCC hearing.
[3.2.5.C]	Allow institutional uses in the [R4] on properties of 10 acres or greater	D	In the end, the BCC directed staff to remove the Bar J and Mad Dog Ranch from this zoning effort, but was not comfortable with institutional uses in existing rural neighborhoods.	No revision required	A	The Planning Commission believes that in areas nearer complete neighborhoods and existing density institutional and commercial uses should be allowed if they are on larger parcels that help to mitigate impacts.	A	Staff supports this Planning Commission recommendation as a larger site will mitigate some of the impacts to neighbors from these more intense uses. In conjunction with use standards limiting impacts to neighborhood scale this allowance will permit some additional opportunities for institutional uses, near Complete Neighborhoods, while protecting neighborhood character. Staff notes that based on the proposed zoning of the Planning Commission there are a limited number of sites (about 30 parcels) that can take advantage of this allowance and that 10 acres is not an acreage or threshold that relates to any historic development pattern or allowance. The BCC might consider changing this allowance to 6 acres or some other threshold with more relevance to our past development patterns.

A=Approval | D=Denial | T=Table | M=Alternate Modification | NA=Not Applicable

Proposed Modification		BCC Direction		Revision Notes	PC Recommendation		Staff Recommendation	
Sec.	Modification		Discussion			Discussion		Discussion
[3.2.5.E]	CUPs for business and institutional uses in the [R4] should have a greater mitigation burden than similar uses in the R1.	D	In the end, the BCC directed staff to remove the Bar J and Mad Dog Ranch from this zoning effort, but was not comfortable with institutional or nonresidential uses in existing rural neighborhoods.	No revision required	A	The Planning Commission believes that the same impacts affect rural character in the R3 as in the R1, but believes the standard for mitigation of those impacts should be higher in the R3 due to the greater density. Generally speaking the level of intensity the Planning Commission found appropriate was consistent with that of a home business.	A	Staff supports this Planning Commission recommendation. This was the approach taken by Staff in the March 6, 2015 draft, and based on this recommendation will continue to be the approach as Staff implements other recommendations.
[3.2.5.E]	Limit uses in [R4] and keep them to existing neighborhood scale, narrow assembly allowance and provide better definition	D	In the end, the BCC directed staff to remove the Bar J and Mad Dog Ranch from this zoning effort, but was not comfortable with institutional or nonresidential uses in existing rural neighborhoods.	No revision required	A	Planning Commission is supportive of allowing institutional and commercial uses in the R3 on lots or parcels of 10 acres or more, as a larger lot size will help minimize impacts. Planning Commission is also supportive of home uses in the R3 on any size property, except that Home Daycare Centers should require a site of at least 10 acres.	A	Staff supports the Planning Commissions identification of home use intensity, site minimums and CUP considerations in regulating commercial and institutional uses in the R3.
3.2.2.E	Home business in the R1 should be allowed to have up to 4 employees	D	The BCC did not support the PC recommendation to increase the intensity of home business uses by allowing more employees.	No revision required	A	The Planning Commission believes that the impacts of a home business are mitigated by lot size and that there should be more opportunities for small businesses.	D	Staff does not support adding additional impacts into home uses in the rural areas unless there is a benefit to open space. Staff believes that the commercial allowance in the R1 should address the issue.
3.2.3.E	Home business in the R2 should be allowed up to 3 employees with 10 acres	D	The BCC did not support the PC recommendation to increase the intensity of home business uses by allowing more employees.	No revision required	A	The Planning Commission believes that the impacts of a home business are mitigated by lot size and that there should be more opportunities for small businesses.	D	Staff does not support adding additional impacts into home uses in the rural areas unless there is a benefit to open space. Given that principle commercial and institutional uses are prohibited in the R2, Staff believes it is consistent to maintain the established home use limits.
3.2.4.C	Require a 6 acre minimum site for Home Daycare Center in the [R4]	M	The BCC discussed home uses and moved away from a minimum lot size requirement for lots near Complete Neighborhoods and toward development of a set of CUP standards and thresholds that ensures compatibility with neighborhood character. The BCC further directed that Home Daycare Center also be allowed in the R3-Small Rural Lots subject to the same neighborhood protections.	Standards added to 3.2.4.E to address access and proximity to roads.	A	The Planning Commission originally considered a 10 acre requirement consistent with the requirement for principle commercial and institutional uses in the R3, but ultimately settled on 6 acres to allow more opportunities while still providing neighborhood protection through larger lot size. The Planning Commission also believes that 6 acres is a more logical standard given its historical relevance as a minimum lot size in past regulations.	D	Staff believes that the standards for Home Daycare Center and Home Business should be consistent to provide predictability to the neighborhood. Staff believes the most predictable approach is to apply the same impact mitigation requirements to all home uses.

A=Approval | D=Denial | T=Table | M=Alternate Modification | NA=Not Applicable

Proposed Modification		BCC Direction		Revision Notes	PC Recommendation		Staff Recommendation	
Sec.	Modification		Discussion			Discussion		Discussion
Key Issue 3: Can Existing PRD Tools Be Kept In Place While Adding New Conservation Development Tools? AND Key Issue 5: Is A Subdivision Development Option Needed on Small Lots?								
7.1	Keep the 3x PRD, but apply the allowances to Gross Site Area.	D	The BCC does not support retaining the existing PRD, however they did provide direction to modify the Rural-PRD.	No revision required	A	The Planning Commission feels strongly that the 3x PRD has been an effective tool and that it should be kept until we find out that the new tools are preferred. The Planning Commission does think the change to Gross Site Area should apply to the existing PRD.	D	Staff does not support keeping the 3x PRD while applying the multipliers to Gross Site Area. The 3x PRD has produced conservation in its nonsubdivision application - which Staff believes the Floor Area Option improves. Staff does not believe that the increased density of a subdivision application of the existing PRD provides the conservation benefit necessary to balance the additional impacts to wildlife and open space of the increased density. Keeping the existing subdivision 3x PRD would also reduce the amount of density transferred out of the rural areas of the community from 3,150 units to 2,460 units. While the community could still meet its 60/40 goal, it would lose 700 units that could be allocated for workforce housing. Because Staff does not think these units will produce much conservation, and does not believe the conservation produced will balance the impacts, Staff continues to recommend that a threshold greater than 23 acres be required in order to use the density bonus.
7.1	Add 3x nonsubdivision PRD back as an option. It's a proven and successful tool to gain critical conservation easements. The 3x are needed as a tax incentive and when working with adjusted site areas with levee, water, or roadway easements.	D	The BCC supports the move to the Floor Area Option	No revision required	A	The Planning Commission is supportive of retaining the existing PRD with a 3x multiplier to provide another incentive for conservation.	D	Staff does not believe that the 3x nonsubdivision PRD creates a tax incentive. It has been used in the past to entitle larger guesthouses and family compounds as a quid-pro-quo conservation tool. As a result, staff proposed the Floor Area Option as a way to achieve the same result while streamlining the process by entitling accessory units rather than primary units and therefore reducing affordable housing and access considerations.

A=Approval | D=Denial | T=Table | M=Alternate Modification | NA=Not Applicable

Proposed Modification		BCC Direction		Revision Notes	PC Recommendation		Staff Recommendation	
Sec.	Modification		Discussion			Discussion		Discussion
7.1.2	Keep the Rural PRD as an alternative to the 3x PRD, but change the threshold to allow on 23 acres.	M	The BCC did not keep the 3x PRD. The BCC directed staff to modify the Rural PRD to a 3x multiplier and minimum 70 acres of conserved area. The BCC supports the Jackson Hole Land Trust's position that this density and open space balance represents "better than 1 per 35".	7.1.2.B.1 revised, 7.1.2.C.1 revised, 3.2.2.D.1 revised	A	The Planning Commission discussed moving the Rural PRD threshold to match the thresholds for the existing 3x PRD. Despite their similarity, the Planning Commission was hesitant to replace the existing 3x PRD with the modified Rural PRD until we are sure the modified Rural PRD is an improvement and landowners wouldn't rather use the existing 3x PRD.	D	Staff does not find any substantive difference between the existing 3x PRD and proposed Rural PRD if the Rural PRD is modified to have the same threshold and density bonus. Staff recommends that if the goal is to have the Rural PRD more closely approximate existing 3x PRD that the standards be modified accordingly, but does not recommend that two tools that are so similar be retained.
7.1.5	Keep the Floor Area Option as an alternative to the 3x PRD.	M	The BCC directed staff to keep the floor area option, but not the existing 3x PRD.	No revision required	A	The Planning Commission wants to keep the Floor Area Option in addition to the existing 3x PRD to make sure the Floor Area Option is an improvement before removing the existing option that has worked in the past.	D	As discussed above, Staff does not recommend keeping the existing 3x PRD. The intent of the Floor Area Option was to separate the nonsubdivision application of the PRD from the subdivision application. Keeping the existing 3x PRD retains all of the issues of applying subdivision standards to a nonsubdivision tool. If the goal is to limit the differences between the existing 3x PRD and the proposed Floor Area Option, Staff would instead recommend that the Floor Area Option be amended to more closely approximate current allowances under the nonsubdivision 3x PRD.
Key Issue 4: Can More Receiving Areas Be Identified for the CN-PRD?								
7.1.6.B	Prioritize certain high conservation value areas for sending associated with the CN-PRD.	A	The BCC directed staff to look into tying the CN-PRD conservation area to the new, tiered NRO although there was concern about reducing the likelihood of a CN-PRD.	7.1.6.B.3 revised, standard cannot be based on NRO tiers as they do not currently exist, that direction has been added to list of future consideration	D	Planning Commission asked for clarification from staff on how prioritization might work logistically, but ultimately agreed with staff's recommendation that the extra complexity might limit the use of the CN-PRD tool.	D	While staff recognizes the intent of trying to maximize the value of the conservation achieved through the CN-PRD, staff believes that additional requirements will limit the use of the tool. Staff recommends that the tool be kept as simple as possible to encourage its use as an incentive.

A=Approval | D=Denial | T=Table | M=Alternate Modification | NA=Not Applicable

Proposed Modification		BCC Direction		Revision Notes	PC Recommendation		Staff Recommendation	
Sec.	Modification		Discussion			Discussion		Discussion
7.1.6.B	Increase CN-PRD conservation area minimum to 140 acres	D	The BCC discussed the implications of this modification, but agreed with staff and the PC that leaving the threshold at 70 acres would incentivize use of the tool.	No revision required	D	Planning Commission supports leaving the minimum conservation area at 70 acres, to encourage conservation and for consistency with other use and development option thresholds.	D	The reason to support this modification is if you think a higher threshold is needed for the CN-PRD to result in a better development pattern than 1 unit per 35 acres. However, staff notes that the higher the threshold, the more the option is an allowance that may get used rather than an incentive to the landowner. Landowners have expressed a desire for an option that allows to make decisions in smaller pieces rather than having to decide on the whole property at once. Staff supports keeping the CN-PRD as user friendly as possible to incentivize its use.
7.1.6.D	Allow CN-PRD receiving areas near areas of existing density instead of limiting them to Complete Neighborhoods.	M	The BCC did not direct staff to identify additional receiving areas, however the BCC did direct staff to ensure that that the noncontiguous application of the Rural PRD is available, especially the ability for multiple development areas if the noncontiguous was used.	7.1.2.B.1 revised	D	The Planning Commission did not see any purpose in discussing the location of density again, when it is clear in the Comp Plan. However, two of five Planning Commissioners felt strongly such an allowance would provide more opportunity for quality conservation.	D	Staff believes that identification of additional receiving areas would require amendment of the Comprehensive Plan. Much of the focus of the Comp Plan process was on identifying the proper locations for increased density and the appropriate linkages tied to that density. Much was made of whether the conservation tied to density could come from other areas of the community, and so Staff believes the Comp Plan's discussion on the issue is explicit.
Other Modifications								
general	Make necessary edits for clarity and consistency that do not effect content.	A	None	Revisions made throughout for clarity and consistency.	A	None	A	Staff proposes this modification to clarify any clerical oversights in the draft.
general	Add more explanation to standards to make them more explicit and detailed to so questions are answered in the text before they have to be asked.	A	None	Revisions made throughout to add clarity while avoiding repeating other LDR standards.	A	None	A	Staff will clarify standards where possible and provide examples where appropriate and will look for such opportunities. However, staff purposefully shifted the style of the LDRs toward a simpler more concise set of sideboards. Also, staff notes that while a number of people have commented they find the new LDRs more confusing most of those same people have exhibited a clear understanding of the allowances. Staff also notes that we spent more time explaining current LDR allowances than proposed LDR allowances.

A=Approval | D=Denial | T=Table | M=Alternate Modification | NA=Not Applicable

Proposed Modification		BCC Direction		Revision Notes	PC Recommendation		Staff Recommendation	
Sec.	Modification		Discussion			Discussion		Discussion
1.9.3.B	Change nonconforming use limitation to 10% instead of 20% but remove "only" from phase.	T	The BCC discussed this modification in conjunction with the modification below, and concurred with staff's recommendation that changes to the nonconforming standard that will apply to all zones should be tabled for later discussion.	No revision required, added to list for future consideration.	T	None	T	Staff does not recommend changing the nonconforming standard through this process as it would apply to all zones, not just rural zones. Also, the more appropriate process through which to revisit the nonconforming standards is the upcoming 6-month check-in on the LDR restructure.
1.9.3.B	Nonconforming uses created by this zone change should not be subject to 20% maximum expansion.	D	The BCC discussed this modification in the context of having different nonconformity standards on expansion in the different zones, depending on the character of the zone. While some commissioners saw the advantages of this type of flexibility by zone, the BCC ultimately concluded with staff's recommendation to keep the standard 20% expansion across all zones.	No revision required	A	Planning Commission believes that the rights of existing uses should be prioritized and that uses that become nonconforming as a result of the proposed Rural LDRs should be exempt from the 20% limitation on expansion that applies to nonconforming uses more generally. Planning Commission believes that the physical development standards are adequate to regulate expansion of existing uses.	D	Staff does not believe that uses that become nonconforming as a result of this amendment should be exempt from the nonconforming use standards on expansion. If a use becomes nonconforming as a result of this amendment it is because that use is found to be incompatible with the zone in which it is located and should be subject to the same expansion restrictions as any other use that is incompatible with the zone.
3.2	Consider using volume calculation for building limitations instead of floor area	D	None	No revision required	D	Planning Commission discussed the purpose of regulating floor area and its relationship to bulk and scale. Although the Planning Commission believes volume would be a more accurate means of regulating bulk and scale, they agreed with Staff's recommendation that the complexity of the volume calculation would exceed the benefits achieved.	D	While staff understands the logic behind the proposal, Staff does not believe the complexity in regulating volume is worth the benefit achieved.
3.2	Allow for driveway exemption from the street yard site development setback.	A	None	Revised 3.2.2.B.1, 3.2.3.B.1, and 3.2.4.B.1	A	None	A	Staff proposes this modification to clarify an oversight in the draft.
3.2	Allow setback encroachments for eaves, decks, etc. as is allowed in current regulations.	A	None	Revised 3.2.2.B.2, 3.2.3.B.2, 3.2.4.B.2, to make encroachment allowance same as side/rear yard site development setback	A	None	A	Staff agrees with this recommendation as does the legal review.
3.2	Clarify purpose statements to discuss density, location, and property rights when discussing preserving the desired rural character and what use and development is appropriate. Purpose is to get the desired development and use, not prohibit development and use.	A	None	Revised 3.2.2.A, 3.2.3.A, and 3.2.4.A as directed and to reflect the general direction provided on the basis for zone mapping	A	Planning Commission clarified that property rights should also be mentioned in the purpose statements in order to address public comment.	A	This modification was proposed as a result of legal review and is supported by staff.

A=Approval | D=Denial | T=Table | M=Alternate Modification | NA=Not Applicable

Proposed Modification		BCC Direction		Revision Notes	PC Recommendation		Staff Recommendation	
Sec.	Modification		Discussion			Discussion		Discussion
3.2	Clarify development option allowances as much as possible in subsection D.1 allowance summary, maybe add examples.	A	None	3.2.2.D.1 and 3.2.3.D.1 revised to remove abbreviations, examples are more appropriate in Division 7.1.	A	None	A	This modification was proposed as a result of legal review and is supported by staff.
3.2	Rural properties smaller than 35 need certainty of use.	NA	None	No revision required	NA	None	NA	Staff does not see the need for any modification as Section 1.9.4.B allows for the use of any lot of record that is nonconforming with regard to lot size.
3.2.1	Insert discussion of relation between the rural area character zones and overall concept of how zoning implements Comp Plan.	A	None	revised 3.1.1	A	None	A	This modification was proposed as a result of legal review and is supported by staff.
3.2.1	Allow nonconforming uses an ARU	T	The BCC discussed the implications of this modification and specific examples before agreeing with staff's recommendation to evaluate this modification as part of the 6-month check-in on the LDR restructure.	No revision required, added to list for future consideration.	A	Planning Commission is supportive of this modification to allow nonconforming uses an ARU, but requested that the modification be changed such that it applies only to the proposed rural zones, rather than all zones.	T	Staff does not recommend a modification that applies specifically to nonconforming uses in the rural area zones. A modification that would apply to all zones discussed as part of the upcoming 6-month check-in on the LDR restructure would be a more appropriate time to reevaluate the standard prohibiting accessory uses to a nonconforming use.
3.3.1	Incentivize the conversion of nonconforming nonresidential uses to residential uses in the BC by allowing subdivision of the residential use even if it is nonconforming, if the nonresidential use is eliminated.	A	The BCC discussed applying such an incentive throughout the rural zones, but ultimately directed staff only to apply the incentive to the BC zone and to leave all BC properties zoned BC for now.	Revised 6.1.1, Revised 3.3.1.C.1. In the BC zone there is not limitation on subdivision. Nor is there a limitation on intensity other than FAR for nonresidential uses. As a result, the revision allows residential uses if the entire site is converted to residential of equal or lesser intensity.	NA	Modification proposed at BCC hearing.	A	Staff supports an incentive to change from nonresidential use to residential use in the rural zones as consistent with the desired future character of such areas. Staff recommends that the appropriate incentive is to allow subdivision of the residential use once the BCC has determined that the residential use is less intense than the nonconforming nonresidential use through the established CUP process. This creates an incentive because a nonconforming nonresidential use cannot be subdivided. Staff finds it important that the allowance require full removal of the nonresidential use (as opposed to partial retention of the nonresidential use in addition to the residential subdivision) in order to achieve the community benefits of the incentive.

A=Approval | D=Denial | T=Table | M=Alternate Modification | NA=Not Applicable

Proposed Modification		BCC Direction		Revision Notes	PC Recommendation		Staff Recommendation	
Sec.	Modification		Discussion			Discussion		Discussion
3.2.2.B	Use of multiple parcels as a single site should require a restriction on the parcels from which the floor area is entitled.	A	BCC is in agreement with the PC recommendation and with the language suggested by the PC.	Added 3.2.1.B	A	The Planning Commission is concerned that the allowance will be taken advantage of as properties sell and resell and is interest in some type of restriction that is minimally invasive and as flexible as possible while still putting property owners and future buyers on notice.	D	Staff does not believe this allowance will be used very often as it is, but does support the idea that it may cluster development and preserve rural character in some cases. Staff is not worried about abuse of the allowance because it is the sale of the individual parcels that is detriment to rural character more than the nonconforming physical development on the site of the extra development. Staff believes that if additional restrictions are placed on the allowance it will not be used at all.
3.2.2.B	Remove R1 development area requirement for use of multiple parcels as a single site.	A	None	Revised 3.2.2.B.1	A	None	A	It is unnecessary because the applicant would only use the provision for the purpose of clustering so the requirement adds unneeded regulation. Legal review also identified this as an unnecessary confusion.
3.2.2.B	Create two site development standards in R1 so that lots less than 35 acres are subject to the same allowance as lots in the R2.	A	None	3.2.2.B.1 revised	A	None	A	Staff recommends approval because the modification addresses the concern that development potential on parcels smaller than 35 acres in the R-1 would be severely reduced by implementation of a 0.05 site development ratio. An alternative approach would be to zone such smaller lots R-2 or R-3, but staff recommends this approach to retain the purpose and options of the R-1 zone because the smaller parcels effected are typically part of larger holdings in remote areas and R-1 zoning provides the most flexibility for landowners and options for achieving Comp Plan goals.

A=Approval | D=Denial | T=Table | M=Alternate Modification | NA=Not Applicable

Proposed Modification		BCC Direction		Revision Notes	PC Recommendation		Staff Recommendation	
Sec.	Modification		Discussion			Discussion		Discussion
3.2.2.B	Allow a minimum floor area of 10,000 sf in R1 to accommodate smaller lots.	A	None	3.2.2.B.2 revised	A	None	A	Staff recommends approval because the modification addresses the concern that development potential on parcels smaller than 35 acres in the R-1 would be severely reduced by implementation of a 0.007 FAR. An alternative approach would be to zone such smaller lots R-2 or R-3, but staff recommends the proposed modification to retain the purpose and options of the R-1 zone because the smaller parcels effected are typically part of larger holdings in remote areas and R-1 zoning provides the most flexibility for landowners and options for achieving Comp Plan goals.
3.2.2.C	Change minimum site area for dude ranch in the R1 back to 70 acres from the 140 acres proposed.	A	The BCC agreed with staff and PC recommendations to keep the threshold for a dude ranch consistent with the current standards at 70 acres.	3.2.2.C.1 revised	A	Planning Commission supports this modification as 70 acres is consistent with both the current allowance for dude ranches and the campground discussion above.	A	Staff recommends approval of the modification due to the additional open space required for a dude ranch operation and the fact that very few dude ranches meet the current standard.
3.2.2.C	Allow multifamily housing in R1	D	None	No revision required	D	None	D	Staff does not believe that multifamily housing is consistent with the rural character goals of the R1.
3.2.2.C	Allow campgrounds in R1 on lots greater than 70 acres.	A	The BCC agreed with the PC recommendation, but with the addition of the specific thresholds within the CUP standards discussed above.	6.1.1 revised, 3.2.2.C.1 revised, standards added 3.2.2.E and 6.1.5.D	A	Planning Commission supports allowing this use on parcels of 70 acres or more with a CUP, rather than the 140 acres originally proposed.	A	Staff supports this modification if the minimum site area is set to be consistent with other uses allowed as economically viable options to subdivision so that the balance of rural character is kept in conjunction with the increased intensity.
3.2.2.C	Equestrian centers in the R1 should be exempt from the maximum size of a single building up to 50,000 square feet if they are open to the public.	A	The BCC discussed whether the allowance for a single building should be allowed in only the NRO or only the SRO, but ultimately directed staff to apply the modification to the entire R1 zone.	3.2.2.E.1 inserted	A	Planning Commission recommends approval of this modification, but requested that "open to the public" be defined.	A	Staff agrees that such a use would be consistent with rural character and provide an economically viable alternative to subdivision. Staff's concerns about the minimum site area for a commercial use do not apply in this instance because of the site area needed to achieve 50,000 sf of floor area.

A=Approval | D=Denial | T=Table | M=Alternate Modification | NA=Not Applicable

Proposed Modification		BCC Direction		Revision Notes	PC Recommendation		Staff Recommendation	
Sec.	Modification		Discussion			Discussion		Discussion
3.2.2.E	Establish specific guidelines and standard conditions for outdoor receptions, utilizing current reception/event site guidelines for approval and conditions.	A	The BCC was supportive of the development of CUP thresholds and standards, using the existing reception/event site standards as guidelines.	3.2.2.E.1 revised and standards added	A	None	A	Staff can support reinstituting outdoor reception specific provisions given their recent development and current frequency of uses. Staff especially supports the modification as proposed, retaining the general standards that will inform the next rural use that is profitable and preserves rural character but that we have not thought of yet.
3.2.2.E	Conditional uses allowed in R1 need more vetting and protection and must expire at some point.	M	The BCC was in general agreement with staff's recommendation, but requested that the LDRs be clarified to specify that site area necessary to allow a particular use cannot also be used to entitle another use or a development option (i.e. no "double dipping")	3.2.1.A.2 added	D	Planning Commission discussed the balance between predictability and certainty for commercial businesses and approval of a potentially impactful use in perpetuity. Staff reminded the Commission that the current LDRs allow an applicant to request that a CUP be granted on a temporary basis to evaluate impacts. Planning Commissioners discussed the addition of a CUP standard related to timing or expiration, but ultimately concurred with staff's recommendation that if compatibility is a concern, it may be best to deny an application or prohibit a use, rather than to create separate expiration standards.	D	Conditional use permits expire after a year of non-use and/or if the characteristics presented in the application (such as site area) change. As a result staff does not believe the CUP standards need modification. If a Commissioner is worried about the compatibility of certain use, it may be best to prohibit that use or deny the CUP. Section 8.4.2 of the current LDRs also allows for temporary issuance of a CUP to evaluate mitigation of impacts.
3.2.2.E	Remove the 5,000 square foot limit on commercial uses in the R1	A	The BCC asked for clarification regarding staff's proposal in the draft for a 5,000 square foot limit. The BCC discussed the differences between accessory and principle uses, and the impacts of bulk and scale if floor area is consolidated on one parcel versus scattered across several parcels. The potential use of the Floor Area Option in the non-residential context was also discussed. The BCC ultimately agreed that the limitations on uses permitted in the R1, combined with the CUP process, would help ensure compatibility of the use without the floor area limitation.	3.2.2.E.2 revised to delete floor area limit	A	Planning Commission concurred with staff's recommendation to eliminate the 5,000 square foot limit on commercial uses. Planning Commission also discussed the overall Floor Area Ratio and how the Floor Area Option could be used to obtain additional floor area for a commercial use in exchange for a conservation easement in the event the FAR was too limiting (see below).	A	Staff recommends approval of this modification as it applies to all of the commercial uses allowed as an alternative to subdivision. However, Staff notes that it does not agree with the 35 acre threshold recommended by the Planning Commission for such uses. The allowed physical development should not be tied to the use. The question of whether a restriction should be placed on the site area used to entitle the floor area is discussed above and the direction on that modification should be applied to this modification as well.

A=Approval | D=Denial | T=Table | M=Alternate Modification | NA=Not Applicable

Proposed Modification		BCC Direction		Revision Notes	PC Recommendation		Staff Recommendation	
Sec.	Modification		Discussion			Discussion		Discussion
3.2.3.B	Reinstate the Peet Amendment (extra 100 sq ft of non-habitable floor area for every acre over 10 acres) in the R2.	D	The BCC agreed with staff's recommendation to omit the "Peet Amendment" in order to encourage more use of the Floor Area Option.	No revision required	A	The Planning Commission discussed the original purpose of this allowance and believes the Floor Area Option requires too many hurdles. This extra non-habitable floor area should be by-right.	D	The Planning Commission proposal only really applies in the R2 because on properties over 35 acres in the R1 the FAR allowance of .007 allows more floor area than the "Peet Amendment" on properties greater than 44 acres. Similarly in the R3 there are very few properties greater than 10 acres that would benefit from the "Peet Amendment" and given the commercial and institutional use recommended for such properties by the Planning Commission, Staff believes a 10,000 sf limit is appropriate to preserve character. Staff continues to recommend denial of the proposal to encourage the use of the floor area option and decrease the amount of development allowed in Rural areas.
3.2.3.C	Allow campgrounds in R2 as a CUP.	D	The BCC deferred to their broad direction to prohibit commercial uses in the R2.	No revision required	D	The Planning Commission's recommendation was the result of their broad discussion of commercial and institutional use prohibition in the R2.	D	Staff does not recommend allowing campgrounds in the R2 because attracting visitors to the R2 is contrary to the rural character of R2 and the intent of the Lodging Overlay to consolidate visitors in complete neighborhoods and even more so in areas with visitor services.
3.2.3.C	Allow equestrian facilities in R2 with exemptions from building size limits equivalent to the exemptions for outdoor arenas.	D	The BCC deferred to their broad direction to prohibit commercial uses in the R2.	No revision required	D	The Planning Commission's recommendation was the result of their broad discussion of commercial and institutional use prohibition in the R2.	D	Staff does not recommend allowing equestrian facilities in R2 because there is not a rural character benefit to offset the impact of attracting nonresidential intensity into rural areas.
3.2.3.D	Retain existing NC subdivision potential in the R2.	D	The BCC discussed the implications of this modification and the lack of public comment on this issue, but ultimately agreed with staff's and the PC's recommendations to move away from subdivision standards based on the 1978 Comp Plan and toward standards consistent with the current community vision.	No revision required	D	None	D	Staff continues to recommend moving away from a subdivision standard based on the 1978 Comp Plan toward a minimum lot size based on the current community Vision. Throughout the process, we have not heard from NC landowners that would be affected who oppose the change.
3.2.3.D	Allow the CN-PRD in the R2 as an incentive for lot consolidation.	A	None	7.1.1 revised, 3.2.3.D.1 revised	A	None	A	Staff does not believe that the standards of the CN-PRD should be different in the R2 than the R1 but does not see any harm in allowing it as a possible consolidation incentive even if it unlikely to be used.

A=Approval | D=Denial | T=Table | M=Alternate Modification | NA=Not Applicable

Proposed Modification		BCC Direction		Revision Notes	PC Recommendation		Staff Recommendation	
Sec.	Modification		Discussion			Discussion		Discussion
3.2.3.E	Tighten standards for nonresidential uses in R2	M	The BCC direction on CUP thresholds and standards for institutional uses on lots greater than 35 acres are above. The only other nonresidential uses allowed are utility uses.	3.2.3.E.1 Revised and Standards Added to address intensity of use via frequency or occupancy, which serve as proxies for traffic. Added standard for access. Hours of operation, setbacks, compatibility and parking already addressed.	NA	None	NA	The only nonresidential uses allowed in the R2 are utility uses. Staff recommends this modification be addressed if individual uses are added to the R2.
3.2.4.B	Establish a not to exceed for site development in the R3 to ensure an entire site cannot be developed	A	None	3.2.4.B.1 revised to retain existing sliding scale site development calculation	A	None	A	Staff proposed this modification to clarify an oversight in the draft.
3.2.4.D	Institute a minimum lot size in R3 rather than simply prohibiting subdivision.	A	The BCC discussed the legal and practical implications of this modification and ultimately agreed with staff's recommendation to institute a minimum lot size.	3.2.4.D.1 revised	D	Planning Commission discussed the differences between a minimum lot size versus an outright prohibition of subdivision. The Planning Commission believes that prohibition of subdivision will result in fewer nonconformities than establishing a minimum lot size.	A	This modification was proposed as a result of legal review and is supported by staff. Staff believes the minimum lot size should be 35 acres as subdivision into lots of less than 35 acres is not envisioned in the Comp Plan for any rural areas.
3.2.4.E	Exempt children living in the home of a family home daycare from the limit of 3-6 children.	T	The BCC discussed the family home daycare standards as well as the State regulations, and ultimately decided that the County would benefit from tabling this discussion until the 6-month check-in, at which point the daycare regulations can be amended to match State requirements more generally, rather than specifically in the rural context.	No revision required, added to list for future consideration.	A	Planning Commission believes that the family supplementing their income by caring for children in addition to their own, should be provided more flexibility at the low end of the impact spectrum. This exemption is not appropriate for the more intense home daycare center that allows 7-11 children.	T	Staff does not believe that there are unique circumstances in the R3 that would warrant a different standard in that zone from other zones. Staff thinks a more appropriate time to discuss this issue would be in consideration of all of the home use thresholds and standards. Which could occur as part of the 6-month check-in on the restructured LDRS.
5.1.2	Allow appropriate fencing for agriculture for example sheep require different fencing than cattle.	T	None	No revision required, added to list for future consideration.	T	None	T	Staff believes that the current fencing allowances provide for a consideration of special fencing circumstances. Also, staff has recommended that wildlife friendly fencing be addressed along with the update to the natural resource standards
5.1.2	Allow flexibility in wildlife fencing standards for pastures under active grazing (non-wildlife friendly fencing but require gate every x ft to be opened when pasture not in use)	D	None	No revision required.	D	None	D	Staff believes that the current fencing allowances provide for a fair amount of flexibility for agricultural operations. Staff is hesitant to adopt any regulation that would require active monitoring such as gate open provision.

A=Approval | D=Denial | T=Table | M=Alternate Modification | NA=Not Applicable

Proposed Modification		BCC Direction		Revision Notes	PC Recommendation		Staff Recommendation	
Sec.	Modification		Discussion			Discussion		Discussion
5.1.2.B	Remove allowance for repair and replacement of existing non-wildlife-friendly fence.	T	None	No revision required, added to list for future consideration.	T	None	T	Staff believes that the current fencing allowance from maintenance of existing non-wildlife friendly fencing is an appropriate agriculture exemption. Also, staff has recommended that wildlife friendly fencing be addressed along with the update to the natural resource standards.
5.3.2	Exempt parcels that are less than or equal to six acres or in a platted subdivision from the SRO	D	The BCC agrees with staff's recommended approach.	No revision required.	A	The Planning Commission discussed the potential impacts of SRO restrictions on the location of development and a landowner's ability to use property. The Planning Commission envisions the R2 zone consisting only of properties of less than 35 acres, and felt the SRO was too restrictive on smaller lots. Planning Commission originally recommended exempting the R2 from SRO standards, but revised its recommendation to be consistent with their lots size and platted subdivision criteria established for NRO exemptions.	D	If an exemption is granted, Staff believes it should be limited to an exemption from the foregrounding standards only, consistent with the current NC-TC exemption. The foregrounding standards already include a provision that would allow a small site the intensity permitted by the zone but ensure it was mitigated to the extent possible to preserve scenic vistas. Staff believes this is the best balance of the Comp Plan vision to preserve property rights while trying to improve our scenic vistas, and recommends utilizing that language rather than applying an exemption.
6.1.3.C	Separate event sites back out from outdoor recreation due to greater impacts from event sites than from other outdoor recreation uses	D	The BCC's discussion of defining thresholds based on character for a CUP and on using the existing reception/event site standards as guidelines for those thresholds will address this modification.	No revision required.	D	Based on general direction regarding use and zoning, the Planning Commission believes commercial and institutional uses should be permitted on parcels greater than 35 acres with a set of CUP standards that mitigate impacts according to the zone. The CUP standards discussed by the Planning Commission preserve many of the standards currently applied to outdoor reception/event sites, and apply those concepts to all commercial or institutional uses.	D	As detailed above, staff supports modifications to the event site standards, but still supports the organizational goal of the restructured LDRs to consolidate use definition and use zone-specific rather than use-specific standards. Staff recommends addressing event site concerns (which are all in an R1 context anyway) through R1 standards rather than use standards. As discussed above, while Staff and the Planning Commission agree in principle, Staff differs from the Planning Commission on the site area threshold needed for the use.
6.1.1.E	Require after the fact use permits and mitigation as applicable for emergency response work	D	None	No revision required.	D	None	D	Staff does not see any utility in requiring an after the fact use permit. After the fact physical development permits, including appropriate mitigation are addressed in other section of the LDRs.
6.1.3.B	Ag exemption from 10,000 sf single building	NA	None	No revision required.	NA	None	NA	Agricultural buildings are already exempt from the maximum scale of a single building.

A=Approval | D=Denial | T=Table | M=Alternate Modification | NA=Not Applicable

Proposed Modification		BCC Direction		Revision Notes	PC Recommendation		Staff Recommendation	
Sec.	Modification		Discussion			Discussion		Discussion
6.1.3.B	Change back to 70 acre ag exemption threshold	D	Some commissioners were interested in seeing an analysis of how many properties would be impacted by this change, but the BCC was generally supportive of the proposed threshold for agricultural exemptions of 140 acres.	No revision required.	A	Planning Commission is supportive of a 70 acre threshold for agricultural exemptions to encourage and promote agriculture and for consistency with other use thresholds recommended by the Planning Commission.	D	While the Comp Plan clearly supports provisions that allow for the continuation of agriculture, staff believes that the site area kept open by agricultural use is the same concept as the site area kept open by another rural use and recommends that the ag exemption threshold be set at the same 140 acre level as the allowance for nonresidential uses in the R1. Ag use would continue to be allowed on a site of any size, but the exemptions would only be granted in the instance of a significant amount of open space.
6.1.5.D	Add campground requirements for mix of tents and RVs, limitation for seasonal use, and family friendliness.	A	Some commissioners expressed a hesitation to limit flexibility in campground design, but the BCC was generally in agreement that the standards regulating campground intensity should be evaluated and potentially amended.	Standards added to 3.2.2.E and 6.1.5.D. Added outdoor or developed recreation as ancillary uses to allow for amenities that increase family friendliness. Added ratio of tent sites to RV sites for campgrounds in the R-1 based on Board direction. Based ratio on a campground study prepared for Washington State Parks.	D	The Planning Commission believes that any additional standards would impose unnecessary barriers to the creation of new campgrounds.	A	Staff can support this modification, but notes that such additional requirements will make it less likely that a new campground will be proposed especially in light of past discussion about the dying demand for campgrounds.
6.1.9.F	Composting should be allowed as incidental use in approved gravel pits	T	None	No revision required, added to list for future consideration.	T	Planning Commission sought clarification from staff regarding the timing of future discussions about gravel extraction standards, and ultimately agreed with staff's recommendation to table this modification, with a desire that the issue be discussed as a part of Character District 7 LDR updates.	T	Staff does not believe this process is the proper time to amend the gravel pit standards in part. The gravel extraction standards need updating, but should be looked at in their totality.
7.1	Clarify that references to certain subarea types are referring to the Character District map in the Comp Plan.	A	None	7.1.2.A.2 revised, 7.1.2.B.2 deleted, 7.1.6.B.2.a revised, 7.1.6.D.2 revised	A	The Planning Commission was not sure clarification was needed, but agreed with Staff.	A	This modification was proposed as a result of legal review and is supported by staff.
7.1	Clarify parameters of development options as much as possible, maybe using examples.	A	None	7.1.2.C revised, 7.1.5.C revised, 7.1.6.C revised, 7.1.6.D revised	A	None	A	This modification was proposed as a result of legal review and is supported by staff.

A=Approval | D=Denial | T=Table | M=Alternate Modification | NA=Not Applicable

Proposed Modification		BCC Direction		Revision Notes	PC Recommendation		Staff Recommendation	
Sec.	Modification		Discussion			Discussion		Discussion
7.1	Clarify that land in conservation easement for which the landowner has already received a quid-pro-quo cannot be used for another development option	A	None	7.1.2.B.4 revised, 7.1.5.B.4 revised, 7.1.6.B.4 revised	A	Planning Commission is supportive of this modification but asked staff to ensure that the modification does not prohibit amendments to existing conservation easements or extinguishment of development rights reserved in a previous approval that would serve to decrease density and better achieve open space goals.	A	Staff proposes this modification to clarify an oversight in the draft. Staff agrees with the Planning Commission's caution.
7.1.2.B	Do not require conservation area to be a separate lot in a Rural PRD	A	The BCC directed staff to allow for the conservation area to be included in the lots of the subdivision and otherwise address concerns about "backyard" easements.	7.1.2.B.2 revised, 7.3.2.B revised	NA	Modification proposed at BCC hearing.	NA	Modification proposed at BCC hearing.
7.1.2.C	Allow the Rural PRD without requiring subdivision	A	None	7.1.2.C.5 revised, 3.2.2.D.4 revised	A	By virtue of their recommendation to retain the 3x PRD, the Planning Commission recommended allowing for a Rural PRD without requiring subdivision	A	Staff supports the proposed modification as an option to provide flexibility for the landowner within the desired character outlined in the Rural PRD. However, Staff does not support the Planning Commission's recommended retention of the existing 3x PRD. The proposed modification does not undermine the intent of the Floor Area Option to streamline the process for most family compound type applications. It creates another option in the case where a family has a desire to permit multiple dwelling units but cannot subdivide for one reason or another.
7.1.5.C	Development area allowances in the Floor Area Option should scale with project size similar to intensity allowance	A	None	7.1.5.C.1 revised	A	None	A	Staff proposes this modification to clarify an oversight in the draft.
7.1.5.C	The Floor Area Option should be available for nonresidential uses.	A	The BCC discussed bulk and scale concerns and the potential increases in intensity of use that could be associated with large structures, but were generally agreement with staff's recommendation to make the Floor Area Option available for nonresidential uses. The BCC also supported varying the bonus available based on the use proposed and tying the bonus available to the NRO and SRO.	7.1.5.C.3 revised, use of additional floor area tied to CUP because intensity is concern and intensity should be regulated through CUP, NRO/SRO and other concerns are addressed in CUP standards	A	The Planning Commission discussed the overall Floor Area Ratio and how the Floor Area Option could be used to obtain additional floor area for a commercial use in exchange for a conservation easement in the event the FAR was too limiting. The Planning Commission agreed that additional floor area should be granted only in exchange for open space, and not as an exemption, and asked staff to clarify that the Floor Area Option could be used for non-residential floor area.	A	Staff agrees that the exchange of floor area for conservation should be independent of use. Regulation of the impacts of use is the purpose of the use standards. In the case of commercial use in rural zones the impacts are regulated by the minimum site area and CUP standards. If an applicant can mitigate their impacts in larger buildings, Staff is supportive of encouraging conservation by allowing larger buildings.
7.1.6.C	Exempt rural lots in CN-PRD from minimum lot size	A	None	no revision required, covered by 3.2.2.D.1 and 3.2.3.D.1	A	None	A	Staff proposes this modification to clarify an oversight in the draft.

A=Approval | D=Denial | T=Table | M=Alternate Modification | NA=Not Applicable

Proposed Modification		BCC Direction		Revision Notes	PC Recommendation		Staff Recommendation	
Sec.	Modification		Discussion			Discussion		Discussion
7.1.6.C	Clarify that you can have more than one clustered development area within the sending (rural) area.	A	None	7.1.6.C.2 revised	A	Planning Commissioners agreed that clustered development areas should not be limited to one in a sending area.	A	Staff supports this modification as it is the intent and meaning of the proposed regulation.
7.1.6.C	Exempt CN-PRD receiving areas from housing	M	The BCC concluded that the appropriate time to discuss possible exemptions to affordable housing standards for CN-PRD receiving areas was during the update of the housing regulations. The BCC does recommend that staff clarify that the affordable housing mitigation will be required at the time of development of the receiving area, and not at the time the conservation easement is recorded.	7.1.6.C.7 revised	A	Planning Commission recommends exempting CN-PRD receiving areas from housing requirements, in order to avoid placing too much burden on the density obtained with this tool, which is already being used to incentivize conservation.	D	Staff does not support an exemption of receiving areas from housing. Meeting workforce housing goals is going to be difficult and unless we are confident that receiving area market units will provide workforce housing, exemptions probably need to be more targeted. Staff cannot support conservation on the back of workforce housing goals. That said, if the Commission believes that the units created by the CN-PRD will be more affordable because of their size exempting them from the affordable housing requirements will create a greater incentive for use of the CN-PRD.
7.1.6.D	Create a mechanism to convert Town residential units to short term rentals in exchange for extinguishing units in the County.	T	None	No revision required, added to list for future consideration.	T	Planning Commission agreed that this modification is appropriate for discussion by the Town, but asked staff to clarify for the Town that the proposed modification is intended to encourage Town to serve as a receiving area for density, regardless of the incentive mechanism, which might be short term rental, a floor area increase, or something else.	T	Staff will propose this concept to the Town, but implementation is largely in the Town's hands. Modifying the CN-PRD to implement this concept would be relatively easy, but is not necessary until the Town desires to do so and right now the Town is not talking about tying any of its redevelopment allowances directly to conservation in the County.
7.1.6.D	Encourage receiving areas to be identified and explored as a transfer development tool with ToJ. Like the initial suggestions from the Alliance asking for ToJ provide density incentives and other encouragement tools.	T	None	No revision required, added to list for future consideration.	T	Planning Commission agreed with staff's recommendation that this modification is best discussed by Town.	T	There may be a time when it is appropriate to use the density increases envisioned for Town to encourage conservation, but the Comp Plan purposefully avoids linking Town density increased to County conservation, because there are other goals such as workforce housing and vibrancy that are the purpose of Town density increases and which may not be achievable if they also have to provide County conservation.

A=Approval | D=Denial | T=Table | M=Alternate Modification | NA=Not Applicable

Proposed Modification		BCC Direction		Revision Notes	PC Recommendation		Staff Recommendation	
Sec.	Modification		Discussion			Discussion		Discussion
7.1.6.D	Exempt CN-PRD receiving areas from schools and parks exactions	D	None	No revisions required.	D	The Planning Commission does not recommend exempting CN-PRD receiving areas from exactions, as those units will still generate demand for parks, schools and other community services.	D	Staff does not support an exemption of receiving areas from exactions. Parks and schools impacts will come with the housing and in balancing community goals staff cannot support conservation on the back of level of service goals.
7.1.6.D	As an alternative CN-PRD option to encourage more conservation: allow 1 dwelling in the CN development area per 3.5 (instead of 4) acres of conservation area if the conservation area is greater than 140 acres and only 2 (instead of 4) dwelling units are retained in the rural development area.	D	The BCC agreed with staff's recommendation to keep the tool simple in order to better incentivize conservation.	No revisions required.	A	Planning Commission is supportive of any incentive to reduce density in rural areas and believes the additional units in complete neighborhood receiving areas are more likely to be attainable and help meet housing goals.	D	Staff does not believe there is value in the CN-PRD without leaving 1 per 35. If the landowner decides to extinguish additional units for tax reasons that is good for the community's conservation goals, but staff does not believe the value is there to provide that incentive in a manner that preserves the desired character of receiving areas.
7.1.6.D	Reduce lot size from 7,500 sf minimum to 3,750 sf minimum - in CN-PRD receiving area (looking at AR-TC as a receiving zone)	D	The BCC agreed with staff's and the PC's recommendations but expressed hope that the Town would be open to discussing development options and zones that would enhance the use of this tool.	No revisions required.	D	Planning Commission asked for clarification on this modification and whether it was intended to apply to existing zones or zones developed in the future, but ultimately agreed with staff's recommendation that the appropriate time to design the receiving area is when smaller lot zones are developed. Planning Commission also noted that the CN-PRD tool allows a landowner or developer to propose a new zone for the receiving area, which preserves flexibility in use of the tool.	D	Staff purposefully avoided trying to write a receiving zone and instead recommends using an existing zone or allowing the developer to write a new zone. Nothing in the CN-PRD prohibits smaller lots and staff recommends that a small lot zone be developed in the context of a complete neighborhood LDR update process in the future. As new complete neighborhood zones are developed they will become available for use with the CN-PRD.
7.3.3	Clarify that required conservation areas do not have to grant public access.	A	None	7.3.2.A.1.d revised	A	None	A	The modification is proposed based on legal review and supported by staff.
7.6.4	Allow relief valve for private road statutes to allow 30' access where 60' is required	T	The BCC agreed with staff's recommendation.	No revision required, added to list for future consideration.	A	Planning Commission recommends accepting this modification now, rather than tabling the discussion for the update of the road standards, but clarifying the modification such that it applies only to base zoning, not to additional subdivision that may be proposed.	T	The statutory granting of a 30 foot access has to do with ensuring access, the County's 60 foot easement requirement is triggered when subdividing. The two provisions have different purposes and are only in conflict in that the State's relief does not entitle subdivision under the County's regulations. The proper time to address the issue is when the road standards are updated.

A=Approval | D=Denial | T=Table | M=Alternate Modification | NA=Not Applicable

Proposed Modification		BCC Direction		Revision Notes	PC Recommendation		Staff Recommendation	
Sec.	Modification		Discussion			Discussion		Discussion
8.2.2	Exempt lots less than or equal to 6 acres or previously platted from the same EA/NRO requirements as NC-TC lots	A	The BCC asked some questions for clarification of the current exemptions, but was generally in agreement with the PC's recommendation regarding EA exemptions.	8.2.2.B.1.c and 5.2.1.D revised	A	Planning Commission recommends an exemption from EA/NRO requirements for lots less than or equal to 6 acres, as well as for any previously platted lots.	A	Staff is supportive of this modification as an interim measure until a new EA and NRO paradigm is established. This modification would essentially carry forward the status quo for the time being until the EA and NRO standards are updated because 6 acres represents the high end of the range of lots typically created under NC zoning. Staff would recommend this modification replace any reference to zone and apply to all lots in R zones.
8.7.2	Clarify the process for landowners to apply to shift between zones	T	None	No revision required, added to list for future consideration.	T	None	T	Staff believes that the process to apply for a zoning map amendment is clearly established in Section 8.7.2 and would further recommend that the appropriate process for evaluating such a concern is through the 6-month check-in on the LDR restructure that is upcoming this summer.
9.5	Update definitions to reflect use amendments.	A	None	3.2.1.A added. Revised 9.3.2 and 9.4.6. Added definitions to Division 9.5.	A	None	A	Staff proposes this modification to clarify an oversight in the draft.
9.5	Define the term development area.	A	None	Added definition to 9.5.	A	None	A	Staff proposes this modification to clarify an oversight in the draft.
map	Omit BC properties from this rezoning effort	A	The BCC directed staff to omit BC parcels from this process.	Map revised to leave areas currently zoned BC as BC. Parcels that currently have split zoning were assigned the appropriate rural zoning district on the remainder of the property.	D	None	D	The Comprehensive Plan is clear in Policy 3.1.d that nonresidential uses not associated with open space preservation should be encouraged to redevelop in a more rural character. While there has not been a lot of focus on BC properties in this process, Staff believes it is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan direction for rural areas to rezone them to the appropriate R zone at this time and treat them as nonconformities.
map	Determine Hardeman Barn zoning as part of Wilson Character District	A	None	Map revised to propose no change to Hardeman Barn zoning.	A	None	A	Staff supports this modification the Hardeman Barns site is located within the Wilson character district because it a part of the Wilson character and the appropriate zone to achieve the desired future character can be determined with the rest of the Wilson zoning.

A=Approval | D=Denial | T=Table | M=Alternate Modification | NA=Not Applicable

Proposed Modification		BCC Direction		Revision Notes	PC Recommendation		Staff Recommendation	
Sec.	Modification		Discussion			Discussion		Discussion
map	Remove the 2 Walton properties on the eastern edge of the Iron Rock PUD from the PUD as they were not part of the approval	A	None	Map revised to remove PUD designation.	NA	Modification proposed at BCC hearing.	A	Staff proposes this modification to clarify an oversight in the draft.
map	Look at smaller R1 parcels generally that are part of larger holdings, to determine if those parcels should be zoned R2 instead of R1.	A	None	Map revisions made as appropriate on noncontiguous small R1 parcels and small R1 parcels in subdivisions	A	Planning Commission recommends that staff look at smaller R1 parcels generally that are part of larger holdings, to determine if those parcels should be zoned R2 instead of R1.	A	Staff supports another look at small R1 parcels to make sure there are not any that should be in another zoning district based on isolation or other factors.
map	Rezone all Highway Commission parcels (specifically 22-40-16-28-1-00-001) to P/SP	A	None	Map revised for Highway Commission parcels	A	None	A	Staff proposes this modification to clarify an oversight in the draft.
map	Rezone Coyote Loop area from R3 to R2	M	Based on the BCC's general zoning map and use standards direction, this area remained zoned R3	No revision required.	D	Based on the Planning Commission's general direction regarding the R2 and R3 zones, the Planning Commission recommends that R3 zoning be applied north of Nethercott around Coyote Loop and that R2 zoning be applied south of Nethercott.	D	Staff agrees with this application of the Planning Commission's general direction on zoning.
map	Rezone area south of Nethercott from R3 to R2	M	Based on the BCC's general zoning map and use standards direction, this area remained zoned R3	No revision required.	A	Based on the Planning Commission's general direction regarding the R2 and R3 zones, the Planning Commission recommends that R3 zoning be applied north of Nethercott around Coyote Loop and that R2 zoning be applied south of Nethercott.	A	Staff agrees with this application of the Planning Commission's general direction on zoning. However, this will allow for more physical development on these smaller lots than would be allowed today.
map	Rezone area north of Aspens within a 1/4 mile of the Aspens Character District from R3 to R2	M	Based on the BCC's general zoning map and use standards direction, this area remained zoned R3.	No revision required. Instead it was the John Dodge and Wilderness area south of Moose-Wilson Road that was rezoned from R2 to R3.	D	Based on the Planning Commission's general direction regarding the R2 and R3 zones, the Planning Commission recommends R3 zoning for those properties in this area immediately adjacent to the Aspens and R2 zoning for those properties further north and east, using the LVE substation or Raintree Road as a boundary.	D	Staff agrees with this application of the Planning Commission's general direction on zoning.
map	Rezone area north of Aspens further than a 1/4 mile of the Aspens Character District from R3 to R2	M	Based on the BCC's general zoning map and use standards direction, this area remained zoned R3.	No revision required. Instead it was the John Dodge and Wilderness area south of Moose-Wilson Road that was rezoned from R2 to R3.	A	Based on the Planning Commission's general direction regarding the R2 and R3 zones, the Planning Commission recommends R3 zoning for those properties in this area immediately adjacent to the Aspens and R2 zoning for those properties further north and east, using the LVE substation or Raintree Road as a boundary.	A	Staff agrees with this application of the Planning Commission's general direction on zoning. However, this will allow for more physical development on these smaller lots than would be allowed today.
map	Rezone area west of the Airport from R3 to R2	M	Based on the BCC's general zoning map direction, this area was zoned a mix of R2: Large Rural Parcel and R3: Small Rural Lot	Based on the BCC's general zoning map and use standards direction, more of this area (platted lots in the 3-6 acre range) was actually zoned R3.	A	Based on the Planning Commission's general direction regarding the R2 and R3 zones, the Planning Commission recommends R2 zoning for this area.	A	Staff agrees with this application of the Planning Commission's general direction on zoning. However, this will allow for more physical development on these smaller lots than would be allowed today.

A=Approval | D=Denial | T=Table | M=Alternate Modification | NA=Not Applicable

Proposed Modification		BCC Direction		Revision Notes	PC Recommendation		Staff Recommendation	
Sec.	Modification		Discussion			Discussion		Discussion
map	Rezone Willowbrook area south of the Pines from R3 to R2	M	Based on the BCC's general zoning map and use standards direction, this area remained zoned R3.	No revision required.	D	Based on the Planning Commission's general direction regarding the R2 and R3 zones, the Planning Commission recommends R3 zoning for this area.	D	Staff agrees with this application of the Planning Commission's general direction on zoning.
map	Rezone area west of Wenzel Lane from R3 to R2	M	Based on the BCC's general zoning map and use standards direction, this area remained zoned R3.	No revision required.	A	Based on the Planning Commission's general direction regarding the R2 and R3 zones, the Planning Commission recommends R2 zoning for the area west of Wenzel Lane.	A	Staff agrees with this application of the Planning Commission's general direction on zoning. However, this will allow for more physical development on these smaller lots than would be allowed today.
map	Rezone area east of Wenzel Lane from R3 to R2	M	Based on the BCC's general zoning map and use standards direction, this area remained zoned R3.	No revision required.	D	Based on the Planning Commission's general direction regarding the R2 and R3 zones, the Planning Commission recommends R3 zoning for the area east of Wenzel Lane to Green Lane.	D	Staff agrees with this application of the Planning Commission's general direction on zoning.
map	Rezone Indian Paintbrush from R3 to R2	M	Based on the BCC's general zoning map and use standards direction, this area remained zoned R3.	No revision required.	A	Based on the Planning Commission's general direction regarding the R2 and R3 zones, the Planning Commission recommends R2 zoning for this area.	A	Staff agrees with this application of the Planning Commission's general direction on zoning. However, this will allow for more physical development on these smaller lots than would be allowed today.
map	Rezone areas south of South Park with larger lots from R2 to R1.	D	Based on the BCC's general zoning map direction this area was zoned a mix of R2: Large Rural Parcel and R3: Small Rural Lot	No revision required.	D	Planning Commission recommends retaining R2 zoning in this area.	D	Staff cannot find areas south of South Park with large enough parcels to be consistent with the R1 character and benefit from R1 allowances and options.
map	Include Craig Green in the rural area rezoning effort rather than the Alta core zoning effort and zone him R2	A	The BCC agreed to include the site in this effort. Based on the BCC's general zoning map direction this area was zoned R2: Large Rural Parcel	Parcel rezoned to R2.	A	None	A	This was a request of the property owner and is consistent with density resulting from the overall family use of the site.
map	Rename R4	NA	The BCC originally directed staff to rename R4 to avoid the misperception that R4 is an expansion of the complete neighborhoods; however, ultimately the BCC eliminated the R4 zone.	No revision required.	NA	Modification proposed at BCC hearing.	NA	Modification proposed at BCC hearing.
map	Zone area south of Wilson R3: Small Rural Lot, instead of R4: Near Complete Neighborhood	A	The BCC directed staff that R4 uses are not appropriate in this area	No revision required.	NA	Modification proposed at BCC hearing.	NA	Modification proposed at BCC hearing.
map	Zone area north of Wilson R3: Small Rural Lot, instead of R4: Near Complete Neighborhood	A	The BCC directed staff that R4 uses are not appropriate in this area	No revision required.	NA	Modification proposed at BCC hearing.	NA	Modification proposed at BCC hearing.
map	Zone lot northeast of Teton Village R3: Small Rural Lot, instead of R4: Near Complete Neighborhood	A	The BCC directed staff that R4 uses are not appropriate in this area	No revision required.	NA	Modification proposed at BCC hearing.	NA	Modification proposed at BCC hearing.

A=Approval | D=Denial | T=Table | M=Alternate Modification | NA=Not Applicable

Proposed Modification		BCC Direction		Revision Notes	PC Recommendation		Staff Recommendation	
Sec.	Modification		Discussion			Discussion		Discussion
map	Zone area south of the Aspens R3: Small Rural Lot, instead of R4: Near Complete Neighborhood except for properties along Moose-Wilson Road	A	The BCC directed staff that properties along Moose-Wilson Road in this area should generally be zoned R3, but that uses such as the Bar J Chuckwagon and Mad Dog Ranch should be pulled out of this effort and addressed at a later date when more focus can be placed on their nonconforming status.	Bar J and Mad Dog Ranch are no longer proposed to be rezoned. Otherwise no map revision required.	NA	Modification proposed at BCC hearing.	NA	Modification proposed at BCC hearing.
map	Remove the R4 zone and rezone all properties in Hi-Country, Melody, Big Trails, Little Horsetheif, and Alta to R3 or R2 as appropriate based on general direction.	A	After originally directing staff to keep these areas as R4, the BCC directed staff to remove the R4 zone and place these properties into R3 or R2.	No revision required except that the parcel adjacent to Hi-Country was zoned R3 for consistency and due to its slopes and constrained buildability.	NA	Modification proposed at BCC hearing.	NA	Modification proposed at BCC hearing.
TCSPT	Revise the proposed TCSPT resolution based on County Attorney recommendations to ensure consistency with State Statute and ensure the continued validity of existing easements.	A	None	Revised to incorporate all changes recommended by County Attorney.	A	None	A	This modification was proposed as a result of legal review and is supported by staff.
TCSPT	Explore expanding TCSPT programming	A	The BCC is interested in expanding TCSPT programming but does not want to compete with private land trusts or become an recipient of lower quality easements.	No revision required. Resolution incorporates placeholders in the event the BCC chooses to expand programming in the future.	NA	Modification proposed at BCC hearing.	NA	Modification proposed at BCC hearing.