

I am strongly against the rezoning of Ketchum as it is proposed!!! As a 27 year resident of Ketchum, a husband and father, a business owner, and someone who grew up in Park City, UT as well as someone who has spent substantial time in many western ski towns (also living in Bend and Jackson), I confidently believe that the proposed zoning would completely change the character of our town from a unique, charming, and relatively rural mountain town into a zoo of constant construction, terrible traffic, and property value politics (even worse than they are now). PLEASE understand that there is more to learn what not to do than what to do from our other western mountain town friends! Developers ran them over and are trying to do the same here. I have been paying attention and am yet to hear a good explanation of why this is necessary. I can only conclude it is driven by developers and the real estate machine's interests. We do not have the infrastructure to support such density. And it will be terrible for the wildlife and environmental elements of our valley as well. Finally, this comment box is ridiculously small and only helps the theory we should not trust the city! Please share. Olin Glenne, 208-720-6754, og@sturtevants-sv.com

2/5/2025 16:06 2/5/2025 16:25 anonymous

Overall, I see the plan to be very comprehensive and well thought out. With that said, it looks like this plan will lead to more development of high-end luxury apartments, townhouses and condos, leaving the locals and workers out in the cold. I say this as there is no developer who is going to make the investment to build a housing development and accept anything less than market rate returns. We know this means that the people who are the lifeblood of our community will not be able to afford to live in Ketchum. As it is, most full-time residents can hardly afford to live in Hailey or Bellevue. This plan needs to put the needs of full-time residents above those of tourists and second and third homeowners. The plan should also consider the impacts on the WRV as a whole, as this proposed scale of development will put more pressure on the towns to the south. Michael Swan, Hailey, ID. mswanasia@gmail.com

2/9/2025 8:58 2/9/2025 9:10 anonymous

Need to immediately address the sleight of hand used to address the definition on "Medium Density" on page 99. At no time have residents agreed to or even entertained the possibility of a change to the definition. The fact that you changed the definition without changing the designation speaks to the problems with this effort. Please immediately change the definition back to the 2014 plan. If you want to discuss the definition then let's do it with representation.

2/26/2025 11:04 2/27/2025 13:36 anonymous

3/5/2025 14:18 3/5/2025 14:19 anonymous

how is this any different than version 1 of the plan?

Thank you for giving us all the opportunity to provide feedback. I wish you would consider having the next public comment session when we aren't in the middle of World Cup. I question our "forecast growth". I think it is time we took a comprehensive look at just how much growth we are willing to build and plan for because of our aging infrastructure, water needs, capacity to ensure solid, safe construction, and location (both for flood plains and fire resistance). I am also concerned by the notion that density must continue to increase throughout the valley floor if we don't want it on the mountain overlay. As a community, I think we have the right to choose thoughtful growth within town without sacrificing or being threatened by construction on higher elevations. I think the comparison map is very helpful. I object to high density residential from 2nd street to 6th street between 2nd avenue and 3rd avenue, primarily because of the massive buildings like Bluebird (that was built) and the building at 1st and Washington (that eventually was defeated). I don't think buildings with that density and height belong in a residential transition area and that stretch of 2nd avenue is already hugely congested. I am opposed to permitting 4 story buildings for any reason in the CMU. I am especially opposed to any 4 story building in either the CMU or MUAC that is allowed that height through payment of an in lieu housing fee. I feel that allowing height beyond 3 stories just to get additional in lieu housing revenue will cause a penthouse height frenzy of buildings that grow taller and taller just so penthouse owners can see over each other. I support the 2 story limit in the downtown core and thank you for including it. I strongly support the relationship of uses described for the retail core. I support increased density along Saddle and Warms Springs roads if the increased density provides additional funding for workforce housing or a local deed restriction. I do not see why we should burden our infrastructure otherwise. I am comfortable increasing density in the mixed-use activity center areas. I think we have pulled together as a community to support workforce housing through both permitting additional density and voting for a LOT. I would like to see us strike a balance in the use of these funds that provides workforce housing in a manner that better integrates the housing into our community; whether that is through individual unit purchases or constructing workforce housing that is better integrated into its surroundings. I feel strongly that we should focus more on workforce housing that addresses our housing challenges and less on housing where the income levels are controlled by tax incentive requirements (workforce housing vs affordable housing). I am strongly opposed to any parking waivers for units less than 750 square feet that are not deed restricted. I would like to see 1st and Washington permanently remain parking. Lastly, and most importantly, I would like to see less flexibility in our codes moving forward. The notion of "may be allowed" has been interpreted by our P&Z and developers as must be allowed. I will no longer support codes that provide flexibility since they have been applied as a right to. Thank you again.

3/5/2025 14:27 3/5/2025 15:35 anonymous

Hello, Thank you for allowing everyone the opportunity to respond. It troubles me that this survey cannot distinguish between registered voters (those who live in Ketchum) and other stakeholders. These issues are important to me and will strongly impact how I vote in future local elections. I support the two-story height restrictions and the need for first-level active businesses proposed for the downtown core. I oppose any increase in density, particularly any height increase that is proposed unless it is to offset the reduction of height in the commercial core or it provides additional workforce housing. I oppose any height increase beyond 3-stories regardless of purpose. I oppose increased density along second avenues between 1st and 6th street, particularly with regards to increased height. I oppose any parking waivers for under 750 square feet unless they are deed restricted for workforce housing. I would like to see workforce housing that is better integrated into the buildings around it and better focused on the income levels associated with our workforce, particularly teachers, medical staff, snowplow operators, police, and first responders. I do not support additional affordable housing that focuses on tax incentivized income levels and does not meet town needs. I understand that this will reduce our "bang for the buck" but it is worth it to strike the balance between workforce housing, our actual workforce needs, and town character. I interpret 3-story to mean @32' tall and hope that the new code will specify exact heights. I no longer support any use of the word "may" since that seems to put the power to choose in the hands of the developer not the town. I would like to see 1st and Washington remain a parking lot and consider that a viable infrastructure use for KURA funds. I would like to see KURA funds used for infrastructure and in-lieu and LOT funds used for housing. I would like the town to pursue some reimbursement mechanism for increased density's impact on our infrastructure, particularly our water supply. I am opposed to any construction along the mountainside and would support reduced density within the flood plain.

3/10/2025 8:25 3/10/2025 8:59 anonymous

In the 2014 Ketchum Comp Plan one of the prominent Community Core Values as Working as a Region. I would like to have this added to the new plan as many of the decisions we make will require coordination from a County wide perspective. Why did this drop from the new plan? Working as a Region The Wood River Valley functions best when its needs are addressed regionally. This is because of its geographic layout, economic drivers, environmental attributes, and locations where people live and work. We care about the impact that our communities have on the entire valley and we strive to communicate and solve problems across political boundaries. We want a well-planned and connected valley, avoiding sprawl and focusing on creating high-quality, well-planned places. We want to minimize the negative effects of development such as car pollution, roadway congestion and undesirable environmental impacts. Multi-jurisdictional solutions are the only effective approach to many of most significant problems and opportunities faced by Ketchum and other towns in the Wood River Valley. Ketchum will work with all entities to address issues of mutual concern, take advantage of opportunities, and reach mutually beneficial regional solutions.

3/11/2025 17:40 3/11/2025 17:45 anonymous

			I find it very disheartening that the city of Ketchum has scheduled this very important topic during the World Cup events, which has been on the schedule for at least two years. Over 300 volunteers are participating in this event. Neil Morrow's comment in the mountain express that not everybody cares about it really is a low blow. who do you represent your own self interest or the residents of Ketchum?
3/16/2025 9:03	3/16/2025 9:05	anonymous	
3/21/2025 8:15	3/21/2025 8:20	anonymous	I am opposed to 3 stories, lot line to lot line in Warm Springs Low Density to medium or high density.