

| ID | Completion time   | Share your thoughts or questions on the project below. Your input is anonymous. Please add your contact information if you would like a response.<br>You are also welcome to submit your comment via p...  |
|----|-------------------|--|
| 1  | 12/30/24 14:02:28 | Testing - Genoa  |
| 2  | 12/30/24 15:01:52 | Stop the demolition of existing buildings and permitting new, giant boxes. Really take a look at what is actually happening at Blue Bird and who the tenants end up being...review the project in one year before proceeding with more. Is it working? Did it solve some of the housing issues? Are the tenants essential workers? Are they actually part of Ketchum's work force? Did the parking design work? 44 spots for 51 units and half of those spots are tandem parking. How is that working? 30 Million dollars for the project.....seems like 60 smart homes could have been built south of town for that amount of money. Be smarter!  |
| 3  | 12/31/24 22:31:27 | This Plan is an outrage, constructed by mentally stumbled, usurping predator-tyrants who thrill at plundering the city treasury all for the ruination of the wonderful mountain western culture and lifestyle of Ketchum for their own personal illicit power and financial gain. This Plan must be shredded in its entirety and in full accordance with law, it is time to run the Stench Sisters and Sycophants off the stage, to fire and shut down all city housing administration; to collapse KURA as an fouled and illicit entity ripping off taxpayers and denying residents their constitutional rights to determine and control major capital projects of the city. Is there a pressing need for criminal investigations against the sneaky perpetrators of this hack amateur fondle? eg, fraud, theft, racketeering, unconstitutional shenanigans, and the like? If lawsuits are filed againts te city and its officious and mangling pretender-intermeddlers, will the Stench Sisters attempt to avoid liability by cowardly claiming government?                                  |
| 4  | 12/31/24 22:32:42 | Everything woke - including this Plan - reeks and turns to shit.   |
| 5  | 1/1/25 16:39:37   | How do you people even look at yourselves in the mirror? You have and continue destroying Ketchum! Why are you against small businesses? They are the backbone of the USA! Do you really think bringing in chain stores ( that have no parking) is your answer to a healthy business economy I Ketchum? I live in Hailey but do most of my "shop local" shopping in Ketchum. Why are o.k with killing the small business owner? You obviously don't care and are just concerned with your personal agenda! You should be ashamed of yourselves!  |
| 6  | 1/3/25 11:22:36   | Our roads are so degraded that if you don't steer around the potholes, you can rip the front wheel off your car. What you've done to Ketchum with the horrible mismanagement of resources borders on criminal.   |
| 7  | 1/10/25 12:37:46  | It is conspicuous that the pictures provided in the propaganda for the draft plan do not display the tremendously out of scale structures such as the Lime Lite, Blue Bird, the proposed Marriott, and the massive First and Washington proposed project. Instead, the propaganda generally displays buildings at human scale. Let's depict the truth. Let's display the empty penthouses, the blocked views; let's juxtapose the massive new buildings and historic Ketchum. Let's see how these pictures align with community values. Let's show some elderly individuals struggling to get to a restaurant since parking spaces have been removed.  |
| 8  | 1/10/25 15:12:32  | Thank you for all of your hard work on the Ketchum Comp Plan! Providing a comment period around the holidays - the busy time is (likely) everyone's lives is not sufficient time to allow for the public to read and respond to the draft comprehensive plan. Please extend this time period an additional four weeks, and please allow for additional public hearings when the P&Z and Council consider any changes after the comment period ends. Thank you for truly making sure that the comp plan reflects the community's wishes.  |
| 9  | 1/10/25 18:00:54  | We are loosing our small town feel. By overcrowding us with more housing. Our infrastructure can not handle it. We don't have enough water for what you are proposing. Our roads are inadequate. Our Post Office in Ketchum can barely handle what we have for population.Our schools are at capacity.   |
| 10 | 1/13/25 8:31:26   | This document of 151 pages is incomprehensible. I assume that is exactly what the city council intended. No one has the time or focus to really analyze what is being presented and certainly not in the month and a half over the holidays. Whether or not it is true, it does seem like it is being jammed in because you don't want too much scrutiny? There obviously is too much here to address so I will choose the most obvious, that affects every resident and that is parking. Driving around for 20 minutes to find a parking place in freezing, snowy weather is not good. Walking blocks with a 30 lb bag of dog food is not good. Trying to go out to dinner and circling town to find a parking place is not good. Our town feels is being destroyed by big soul-less boxes replacing older but distinctive buildings. The high quality of life for the local population is quickly diminishing and we have no choice in the matter. Stop, slow down, make this a community decision because what I hear and see does not have widespread support. Why can't you all see that? |

|    |                  |  |
|----|------------------|--|
| 11 | 1/13/25 13:04:36 | Please do not remove any more parking. Add parking, we need more parking, not less. If a project is going to reduce parking, then there has to be a solution to add/replace that parking. No More Bluebirds for NON-Ketchum workers. We do not need two-way bike paths, we need parking.   |
| 12 | 1/13/25 15:11:23 | As a 28-year resident of Ketchum I object to the substantial overhaul of Warm Springs 2024 Proposed Land Use for a variety of reasons. First, Warm Springs has an amazing character that the density increases would ruin. Additionally, the new density's would make Warm Springs Road an extremely busy and even more dangerous road. Finally, Warm Springs is home to substantial wildlife and is also a delicate watershed. Potentially increasing the population with the density's proposed would seriously impact wildlife and the watershed. A big NO to the proposed density increases!   |
| 13 | 1/14/25 12:44:52 | we have owned a home in ketchum for more than 20 years and for the first time, i am feeling concerned about its direction and this 'path for progress". it appears that despite most citizens wanting controlled progress , while maintaining the authentic character of the city, the mayor and city council are determined to modernize and expand!! building lot line to lot line, minimizing parking, huge hotels at the entrance to town, bicycle priority over cars (what % of the population ride bikes ? and for how many months of the year?), 3 story height limit now has become 5, affordable housing in the town center, rather than in the areas workers would actually prefer to live, new zoning laws. Please listen to the community and the business owners !! Please preserve ketchum's charm, livability and natural attraction. Ketchum is special, let's not try to be like other 'glam' ski resorts. we came here for that. We support, love and participate in this communit. thank you JN.  |
| 14 | 1/14/25 14:24:48 | Understand the goals and need for the update. I have been developing larger mixed use projects in the downtown core since 1998 including The Shops and Residences at the Colonnade; the Christiania Building (Residences, Retail and Offices); First & Fourth Building (offices, residences and 15 workforce housing apartments); and 600 Second Street East Town Homes. These projects vary in overall gross square foot size but are in order 45,000, 55,000, 38,000 and 37,000 square feet in size) and all developed and constructed from 1999 to 2023. These projects have all gone through extensive planning and City Council review during this period and involved myriad administrative changes and ordinance updates or changes as well as changes in appointed persons on the Planning & Zoning Commission, the KURA and City Council. Any update should lead to efficiency and consistency in entitlement processing. Time and availability of capital to execute projects of this scope should be recognized by the City in any applicant pursuing a new project to see to its fruition once fully approved.   |
| 15 | 1/15/25 12:21:16 | I believe that it is imperative that the new comprehensive plan should state that there shall be no net loss of parking spaces in the downtown business core. This is vital to the business community. The plan as written is quite weak on parking. The business community needs parking to operate and stay open. We are ready losing businesses.d stay in business.   |
| 16 | 1/15/25 15:34:55 | I own a lot that is zoned GR-L but would be converted to Medium-Density in this new plan. Can you be more specific about what zoning would change for these properties? This excerpt from the plan: "minimum densities and minimum/ maximum unit sizes will be required moving forward" is very worrying because it is so vague. Please provide specifics, thanks.   |
| 17 | 1/15/25 23:03:17 |  |
| 18 | 1/16/25 7:32:29  | Too much density, no one in our valley wants any of this. I have attended as many meetings and walks as I possibly can could. At these meetings the citizens of Ketchum have expressed these feelings , I would like to know what is the benefit to our quality of life if you are squeezing as many people as possible in Ketchum? We do not have the room for everyone who wants to live in Ketchum. Ketchum is expensive to live in, food, gas , etc. is the highest in Idaho, with Sun Valley a close 2nd.The Ketchum Post Office can't keep up with what we have, as seen from the past couple of years.I disagree that we have enough water and that we are using less. Why are you creating more density and removing all the parking , this doesn't make sense. After witnessing what has happened in L.A. the people evacuating, had to leave their vehicles on the road and escape with their life, Their roads are bigger than ours .Warm Springs Road is our only way out , if we had an emergency and all needed to get out at the same time , it would be a catastrophe with all the density you are proposing . I understand some growth is inevitable. I live in a duplex zone on a 10,000 square foot lot. Your proposal is allowing 6 units, 3 stories high on my lot! This is absurd and unconscionable |
| 19 | 1/16/25 11:47:09 | <a href="https://www.mtexpress.com/news/recreation/valley-underserved-by-existing-sports-facilities-bcrd-says/article_efd2ca4a-da67-11ee-97e5-e38016439b46.html#comments">https://www.mtexpress.com/news/recreation/valley-underserved-by-existing-sports-facilities-bcrd-says/article_efd2ca4a-da67-11ee-97e5-e38016439b46.html#comments</a> Have you read this article in the mountain express from November?  |

|    |                  |  |
|----|------------------|--|
| 20 | 1/16/25 16:49:25 | Generally I like the proposed changes. Is it fair to assume the land use categories don't change the zoning and therefore each building permit application for a higher density than the zoning allows will be looked at regarding the land use classification for a variance to the zoning?   |
| 21 | 1/17/25 10:50:15 | I feel this is being rushed, more time is needed for everyone to understand the pros & cons of this proposal.  |
| 22 | 1/17/25 14:34:25 | I am not at all please with your idea of a comp plan. If you could just let all the fishbowl buildings be completed so we can see what you all have allowed to come into our sweet town. By the way I am totally against more taxes on Ketchum residence and business. The city seems to have plenty of money, use that money and KURA money to build a garage and resident building. Keep taxing and you will drive all business to Hailey and elsewhere.   |
| 23 | 1/17/25 18:10:57 |  |
| 24 | 1/19/25 11:15:00 | Public Comment from Michelle Stennett (220 Sabala Street, Ketchum) First, my thanks to everyone at the City of Ketchum, city council and planning & zoning, who work diligently to make city government function. Please know that I am grateful for your difficult work. Second, it is paramount to protect our neighborhoods, keep them safe and functional, and remember that many local people and families are the workforce and the fabric, the quality, of our communities. Blended with these long-time locals and businesses are new homeowners in west Ketchum who have paid millions of dollars for homes, townhouses, duplexes, and condominiums. Our neighborhoods are already "mixed-use". This has created diverse neighborhoods, but has diminished affordability already for the workforce. In addition, traffic has increased on narrow roads, first responders struggle to gain emergency access, water and sewer infrastructure has not been enhanced in decades, and excess parking will further exacerbate mobility. Has the city budgeted for improving water, sewer, and roads to support this proposed density? As an analogy, a faster, heavier, longer train on an old track is unsustainable and unsafe. I have fought for workforce housing for years as a state senator, but I also can see when well-intended proposals need clearer sideboards, restrictions, and direction so as not to be misinterpreted now or by future administrations. No one wants to inadvertently miss an important concept or overlook a misguided piece that cannot be unwound. The proposed comprehensive plan gives equal status to visitors as it does to residents. Residents pay the majority of taxes that provide emergency services, hard infrastructure, and run government. That formula includes second home owners, but not visitors. The proposed changes appear to allow for more units, bigger buildings, higher density, possibly increased heights all without solid restrictions. There is no mention of limiting these new developments for full-time residents or workforce. Is there a cap on rentals that realistically consider workforce wages? If not, more Airbnbs and short-term rentals are likely which would diminish local property values, keep housing costs out of reach, increases pressure on infrastructure, encourages more traffic and street parking with renters and property managers. Once built, who will regularly enforce the requirements? Some zones in the Comprehensive Plan propose more habitation in avalanche areas, with limited road access, and in wildlife corridors. Bordeaux, Sabala, Williams Street, Busse Elle streets, as examples, should be in the lower density residential land use designation, not medium density because of the aging infrastructure. The language of the medium density land use designation does not clearly include single family and duplex opportunities. Language should consider building heights of two stories and direct the city to consider prohibiting lot line removals to make bigger lots; <del>make a maximum building size per unit to keep with the neighborhood scale and subsequently help keep the</del> |
| 25 | 1/19/25 16:18:53 | Quite a good tasking. However are we just filling idealized spacespace?> Candidly, a single element examining capacity to carry is essential. We simply must declare forecast waterneeds/sewers/underground utilities, and commuter space planning (parking) along with mandates about height restrictions to not compromise the viewscape . The "plan" must start with capacity constraints and unfold the dream only after we all agree to nature's ability to accommodate growth. Further, given Los Angeles's unfavorable experience we simply must have disaster recovery plans and spaces in the event of first fires, earthquakes and floods. People as well as livestock /animals are equally at risk.   |
| 26 | 1/19/25 19:12:41 | I strongly oppose the development of Warm Springs with such density. This is a major concern for safety, traffic, as well as the many locals that this will negatively impact. Please do not move forward with this plan.  |
| 27 | 1/20/25 8:17:06  | I am opposed to the high density zone north of WS road. Ketchum/Sun Valley has a charm and small town feel that makes it different from other resorts, which is why this place is special. Changing neighborhoods like WS change the feeling of this town. If we lose the charm of this town, we will never get it back. This will make WS feel congested and WS road cannot support this.   |
| 28 | 1/20/25 20:32:43 | Debbiebacca@yahoo.com  |
| 29 | 1/20/25 20:35:52 | More time needs to be spent on the Land Use and changes to current zoning and those definitions. You dropped a bomb on the community at the Open House last week and the time needs to be taken to get this right. I would like this to be entered into public comment. Thank you.   |

|    |                  |   |
|----|------------------|---|
| 30 | 1/21/25 8:41:49  | don't make some of the streets in Ketchum to one way access. the "4th street corridor" should have had less planter boxes and the set of stairs on the NE side of main street make it nearly impossible for a child to ride a bike on or a stroller to navigate. The bike lanes in Hailey honestly seem more confusing than anything. The problem with biking around ketchum is the massive trucks that can barely see over the hood. Maybe the speed limit should be reduced to 20 to make it safer for bikes. I don't see where it's possible to put in more bike paths and people aren't going to follow a certain route, they will ride where they need to go. Also, the extra sign and curbs in the middle of the road on the path from Hemingway to the Y-whose idea was that? Talk about a confusing situation for a child on a bike, this was a waste of money and probably a nightmare for snow plows.   |
| 31 | 1/21/25 9:35:03  | I've lived here for 32 years and I don't have a background in development and I didn't move here seeking more than the town had to offer. I have seen the push to bring more people to the valley and to create more infrastructure to accommodate them. You see these people with their higher incomes and remote jobs as vital to Ketchum. I see more rude people who are running away from their urban life and who didn't sacrifice careers to move here. They have brought with them their angst and rudeness. You see money, I see dog shit and traffic. They want a city. We want a community. I oppose poorly thought out development such as this comp plan. Slow down. Let's see how bluebird works out before moving to project after project. Btw. None of these statements are hyperbole. Just stop for a moment and look around if you can. It's funny. Last time I saw the mayor was on a carton of milk. Not exactly a man about town.  |
| 32 | 1/21/25 11:01:11 | This is the most disgusting land grab I have ever seen, and I want to remind you that you are supposed to represent the residents, not the developers and not the city as some separate and greedy financial entity. What the hell people!  |
| 33 | 1/21/25 12:07:16 | I am NOT in favor of increasing density from its current status in the Warm Springs area. These density figures were put in place to maintain quality of life for residents. Yes, things have changed over the last 10 years. That doesn't mean we have to give up on limits that were placed to protect what many of us came here for. I believe increasing density will increase our problems not solve them. PLEASE PROTECT OUR QUALITY OF LIFE!!!!  |
| 34 | 1/21/25 15:42:57 | This project is a bold project that is lacking vision beyond becoming a Park City, Aspen or Vail cramped living environment. With a high density designation on all open property area, the city government is not doing anyone any favors. A High Density Land Use Designation is inappropriate for any area inside the limits of the City of Ketchum. City Government - Rethink the land use options even if this limits the amount of money into the Urban Renewal Fund. The high density will NOT help with future housing for work force. What the City of Ketchum needs to address is functional housing ideas, charge a higher tax for short-term rentals and use existing workforce housing to accurately benefit local workers. High density land use designation will not help the future of community in Ketchum.  |
| 35 | 1/21/25 16:00:30 | I moved to Ketchum in the 80s after college to enjoy the mountain lifestyle and the community vibe of Ketchum. My parents brought the family here for ski vacations when there were single lifts on dollar, loved everything about this place. So I have seen a lot of change, most of it has been positive. But recently with construction on every corner (which creates congestion & noise, not mention land fill waste). We need a vital downtown which has businesses, yes those businesses need parking. Workforce housing is important, but it does not need to be in the city proper. What about the old Anderson building....Or why not a parcel in the county and housing on it, there is a free bus service. Place an additional tax on VRBOs to contribute to funding for work force housing. Encourage long term rentals by giving some sort of kick back. Please do not hand out building permits like they are candy, there needs to be a limit on the number of permits issued a year, with spec building projects taking a 2nd place position to owner occupied. Spec builders are making millions, they should pay more of permit. We need responsible growth!! Accountability, the city budget and expenses should be available on a quarterly basis - income generated and expenses incurred....How much money came in from building permits and how is it being used. People used to move to Hailey because it was affordable, now it's because Hailey has the community, it is the new Ketchum. |
| 36 | 1/21/25 16:34:55 | I don't believe this is what the city of Ketchum really wants it seems to be back doored to a certain extent the fact that several of the meetings were limited as to who could attend I am very disappointed with what is being planned this needs more time and public input  |
| 37 | 1/23/25 9:10:47  | The increase in density outside the core is too much and unnecessary. Mainly in west Ketchum and south of the core area. This will cause congestion and parking issues along streets and destroy the building landscape and views from town and the bike trail.   |

|    |                  |  |
|----|------------------|--|
| 38 | 2/5/25 16:25:46  | <p>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</p>  |
| 39 | 2/9/25 9:10:08   | <p>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</p>   |
| 40 | 2/27/25 13:36:56 | <p>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.</p>  |
| 41 | 3/5/25 14:19:48  | <p>how is this any different than version 1 of the plan?</p>   |
| 42 | 3/5/25 15:35:58  | <p>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&amp;Z</p> |

|    |                  |   |
|----|------------------|---|
| 43 | 3/10/25 8:59:55  | <p>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.</p> |
| 44 | 3/11/25 17:45:08 | <p>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.</p>   |
| 45 | 3/16/25 9:05:41  | <p>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?</p>  |
| 46 | 3/21/25 8:20:11  | <p>I am opposed to 3 stories, lot line to lot line in Warm Springs Low Density to medium or high density.</p>   |
| 47 | 3/28/25 15:08:25 | <p>your plan is inconsistent with your vision You are NOT listening to your West Ketchum constituency. You have not answered the why. Putting a restriction on upzoning as "Community Housing" has a direct impact on our property value. We did not buy our home 3 years ago to have a community housing complex with 8 units behind out home. You have no plan to keep out of towners from buying and increasing Airbnb ownership. Renters in our neighborhood increase noise, reckless driving and poor dog owners. You need to pause and listen.</p>  |
| 48 | 3/30/25 13:04:55 | <p>We strongly oppose the new proposed zoning restrictions. These are in direct violation of Idaho state law. The city of Ketchum cannot tell landowners how to use their private property. Implementation of these zoning restrictions does just that. This is nothing but more DEI nonsense. You cannot penalize landowners for your nonsensical and nonexistent "housing shortage " with your fantasy plan to address it. ns</p>   |

|    |                  |   |
|----|------------------|---|
| 49 | 3/31/25 11:27:28 | <p>We own and live on East River Street. We think you have made a mistake in zoning our street as Community Mixed Use (CMU) in the proposed plan. This designation does not fit with the existing residences and seems inappropriate. Our small street is totally residential (all single family with only 2 townhomes/duplexes). Also, River Street is at a different elevation to the city center. East River Street is a good 30 feet lower than downtown and reads much more like the gem streets on the opposite side of Trail Creek to us than it does to the city center. The CMU existing context is stated as "the transition between the vibrant downtown and surrounding residential areas. Like the Retail Core, the CMU also has a wide variety of building types, sizes, and character that house a variety of uses." This does not represent East River Street. It does not have a variety of building types and sizes; it is all residential, single family with only two duplexes. The future vision of the CMU mix of uses is not appropriate for East River St (Multi-family residential and a wide range of commercial uses, including hotels, offices, medical facilities, health/wellness-related services, recreation, and institutional uses as well as retail and restaurants). The Low-Density Residential (LDR) is a much more appropriate designation for East River St. The mix of uses being single-family detached homes and duplexes. We respectfully ask that you change E River St to LDR zoning in the proposed plan. Sincerely, Carolyn and Chuck Coiner 400 E River Street Ketchum</p> |
| 50 | 4/9/25 10:32:46  | <p>As a business owner operator in the Light Industrial area, as we move into the next phase of city code, it's so critical to maintain as much use for actual LIGHT INDUSTRIAL business as possible. Light manufacturing cannot be in the commercial core, yet many businesses that SHOULD be in the CC end up allowed in the LI. Additionally, unit after unit conversions are happening for residential (on first floors) or "storage units" for high value car storage. Slowly but surely, the availability of space for actual light industrial business is being squeezed out of the LI and thus out of Ketchum entirely. It's important to keep an eye on the actual use/abuse as we move forward. Additionally, uses with much higher demand parking (fitness or offices) put an undo burden on the extremely limited parking in all three LI zones. Thank you for the opportunity to express views.</p>  |