

Robert Korb
P.O. Box 249
Ketchum, ID 83340

March 7, 2022

Sent by email: participate@ketchumidaho.org

Re: 460 N Main

Dear Mayor, City Council and P&Z Members,

I am the managing member of Yacho, LLC, the owner of Lot 8, Block 5, Ketchum Townsite, ("Lot 8"), located across the alley from the proposed 460 N Main project.

I welcome the project but I am concerned regarding any change, enlargement or additional screening of the utility boxes blocking the north end of the alley that may further restrict access to Lot 8.

It is requested that any required changes to the utility boxes and enclosure do not further impede vehicular ingress and egress to Lot 8 and enable the full use of the alley to back and turn a vehicle in order to access 4th Street going forward.

If 460 N Main is permitted to place additional utility boxes in the alley for its benefit it is requested that Lot 8 be entitled to do the same when it is developed.

Further, it is requested that the public be entitled to access the alley by the proposed 5th Street stairs. Access is difficult at this time due to the alley slope and utilities encroachment.

Due to the short time period to review the application which was first available online last Thursday afternoon, I reserve further comment at this time.

Please include this letter as part of the file for this project.

Thank you,



Robert Korb

From: [PATRICIA DAVIES](#)
To: [Participate](#)
Cc: karknot@cox.net; fishms01@gmail.com; bluebirdfarm@live.com
Subject: Proposed house on 6th and Spruce Sts.
Date: Friday, March 04, 2022 12:29:31 PM

Dear P and Z Commissioners/City Council;

As a 54 year Resident of Blaine County, I just read the Mt. Express article on line, since I'm away from home in Hulen Meadows.

The article w/photo,of possible design for a house on 6th and Spruce Sts, HORRIFIES ME!! My mother owned the old house on that lot in the early 70's and we lived there, before it was sold and ultimately demolished.

It would be a travesty for Ketchum to allow this, as it would set a precedent for ALL to see, as one of the HIGHEST HILLSIDE lots in town!!

PLEASE take into consideration OUR town doesn't need to make the cover of Architectural Digest just to please some Billionaire Newbie!!

Respectively,

Patricia Davies

edppd@cox.net

March 8th, 2022

To the Mayor, City of Ketchum, City Council, and Ketchum Planning & Zoning Commission:

I moved here 5 years ago with my wife and 3 young children. We've been visiting Sun Valley our entire lives and could not have picked a better place to plant our roots and raise the kids. We're proud to be stakeholders in the Wood River Valley community and to call this place our home.

We never expected to see the immense wave of demand that overtook our market the past 2 years – we knew this place might one day be 'discovered', but this is beyond our wildest imagination. Restaurants often times have lines out the door. We now see small lift lines on Bald Mountain on the weekends. We sit through a couple minutes of traffic on Highway 75 going to or from work, and the shoulder seasons have all but disappeared - it's a very different situation from the past luxuries we've all enjoyed while living in this small mountain town.

Change is strange and uncomfortable for many, but we cannot stop it without perpetuating the issues at hand. We need to acknowledge the 'new world' and accommodate the skyrocketing demand as intelligently as possible by focusing on smart policy. I applaud the City of Ketchum for focusing on affordability and overall smart growth, and I want to provide suggestions for consideration through my lens as a local renter, a local small business owner, a local commercial property owner, and experienced real estate developer and finance professional.

I can put up with the impacts I noted above, but I will not put up with the affordability issues we're seeing in our valley. I know several people who have either exited the Wood River Valley completely, or plan to leave soon if they cannot locate attainable housing arrangements. Fortunately, the City of Ketchum has some great incentives within the zoning code to create more work force housing product. For instance, my business partner and I are proud that approximately 5,000 SF of on-site deed restricted housing will be available in a proposed project in the Community Core. There are other projects, like ours, that are delivering a great mix of commercial and residential space, including deed restricted units for local workers. But in order to deliver these housing units, we need to emphasize an efficient, objective entitlement process so that developers can put shovels in the ground as soon as possible and start building! If demand grows, but supply remains flat, prices go up – this is economics 101. Sprinkle in the Airbnb conundrum, which effectively reduces local housing supply, and prices go cataclysmic. Nobody knew that the Ketchum population would rocket up 25% between 2019 and 2020, and therefore the market did not build enough product to satisfy the demand.

In order to encourage the efficient supply of additional residential space in downtown Ketchum, I want to offer a few suggestions based on my experience:

CUP REQUIREMENT – SUBJECTIVE PROCESS IS NOT THE WAY:

An objective, quantifiable code and entitlement process is essential. It provides developers with enough clarity to take the risk of buying a site, hiring an architect, and spending additional time, money, and resources to assemble a team and design a building to present to the Planning & Zoning Commission (“KPZ”). To the layperson this process looks easy, but I can assure you that developing a high-quality mixed-use building is already complicated and inherently risky. I am therefore concerned with the proposed creation of a subjective programmatic approval process via the proposed CUP. Can we really expect developers to spend millions of dollars to purchase a piece of property, then spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on architects, structural engineers, and civil engineers...only to go in front of KPZ and find out that the programmatic characteristics of the project don’t align with their current subjective desire? This subjective process would add additional risk and additional project cost, which translates into slower product delivery and more expensive sale/lease prices. I believe the market will build what the market needs, however if consensus from stakeholders is that we want to further regulate the programmatic nature of a development, we need to codify it objectively so that developers and architects can plan for it early in the process.

SHORT TERM RENTALS:

According to AirDNA.com, there are over 525 short term rentals in Ketchum, and 380 short term rentals in Sun Valley alone – these were residences available for long term rental or purchase by locals. The removal of these units essentially reduced our supply of housing in a time of insatiable demand. As part of the “emergency” process, please focus more energy on the short-term rental issue as opposed to more regulation of development – **I’m more convinced than ever that this is the single biggest problem impacting our housing stock in the Wood River Valley.** By the way, the State of Idaho apparently prohibits the city from directly regulating the short-term rental pool – we can tax them to make long term rental more attractive though, correct?

REQUIRE MINIMUM RESIDENTIAL DENSITIES:

The new ordinance proposes minimum residential densities in the CC, T and GR-H zones. While I agree we need more housing, we need to think about the repercussions of programmatic regulation. Do we really create more “affordable units” by requiring a developer to build four 1,000 SF homes rather than two 2,000 SF homes – they may still cost upwards of \$1,000,000 given construction costs. And, as noted above, the State of Idaho prohibits the direct regulation of short term rental units – are we thinking about the fact that short term rental investors will buy up these smaller units we’d force developers to build (*smaller units are extremely profitable and more attractive than larger units*) to purchase these units and rent them out on Airbnb? A possible solution for that concern is listed below, but the point is we need to slow down and think about all of the unintended outcomes.

“INDUSTRIAL” DISTRICT:

As part of this declared emergency, consider reviewing current permitted uses in the LI zones (1, 2, and 3). This huge swath of land is by name an industrial district, but by use its a mishmash of industrial and non-industrial businesses in the heart of downtown Ketchum. I absolutely recognize the economic significance of industry; however, I believe the city needs to look at opening up the available uses within the district. As part of the “emergency”, this would provide some immediate relief for many commercial and retail users seeking space in downtown Ketchum, and could provide much needed housing for future redevelopment.

WORK TOGETHER AS A “REGION”:

I support the construction of work force housing in Ketchum, but we simply do not have enough affordable land to satisfy demand. I therefore encourage our leaders to think regionally, and work together with Hailey and Bellevue in planning for additional work force housing. Land is far cheaper and more plentiful in Hailey and Bellevue, which means developers can construct more work force housing product for the same amount of money, and the end user will pay less. If we think about this issue from a regional perspective, we may discover more solutions and more ways to supply additional product.

PENTHOUSES:

The narrative right now is that greedy developers are destroying the existing housing stock, replacing it with scarcely occupied penthouses, and killing the vibrancy of downtown Ketchum. Yes, there are instances of affordable, local homes being demolished for giant McMansions within single family zones. But the rhetoric around Penthouses in downtown Ketchum is interesting...

- By my count, there were only ~10 new Penthouses constructed in downtown Ketchum over the past few years.
- Counter to the narrative that no one lives in these Penthouses, many are or will be occupied by full time residents.
- We need to remember that these Penthouses occupy air space that was previously empty – we have a lot of airspace, but a finite amount of land. So back to supply and demand, let’s celebrate building up rather than out into the mountains.
- Most importantly, the development and sale of these Penthouses funds the construction of commercial and residential units for varying businesses and income brackets, including our lower income work force. It is very expensive to build in Ketchum. If we want high quality product in the downtown, then the penthouse is a means to an end. Please realize that the focus on Penthouse units as this evil destruction of Ketchum is unproductive and in fact foolish if we want to increase the supply of attainable housing and retail units. Penthouses subsidize the construction of local housing we so desperately need.

INCENTIVES:

I believe incentives are the best mechanism to provide strong outcomes. The bonus 2.25 FAR incentive, for example, is a great way to incentivize developers to construction attainable housing

in our community. I personally do not support building higher than the currently codified zoning heights, but are there other incentives that we should review such as property tax abatements, reduced permitting fees, streamlined zoning review timelines etc.?

To counteract the possibility that Short Term Rental investors might buy up our existing condo product, developers can choose to restrict short term rentals as declarant for the CC&Rs – can we incentivize or reward this developer behavior?

SUMMARY:

In summary, thanks again for focusing on these issues, and please consider this constructive feedback as you look to frame development policy. We need more housing in Ketchum, and we need to build it now. I believe some of the proposed policy will slow the delivery of housing in the Ketchum core. Let's take our time, conduct sufficient analysis, and consider all stakeholders in the matter. Thus far, the ordinances have come at us quickly, and it's been challenging for the community to digest the consequences. I'd look forward to additional workshops where the community has time to provide input and study supply/demand impacts.

Thank you,
Broderick Smith

From: [Jennifer Hoey-Smith](#)
To: [Participate](#)
Subject: Emergency CUP
Date: Monday, March 07, 2022 6:36:54 PM

Hello Commissioners,

I am writing to let you know as a Ketchum business owner of 20 years and property owner, I strongly disagree with this CUP. I believe it is possible to allow Ketchum to grow and support our businesses without so much limitation. In my opinion, the city should be incentivizing developers and land owners to build the mix and density desired, not making it harder to build. My business is depends on growth as well as new families moving here and personally I appreciate new people and fresh perspectives. Telling owners what to build infringes on property rights given to owners through the city's current municipal code. If you are looking for a safe way forward, I suggest the city planners and/or commissioners should be doing workshops with stakeholders (builders, developers, architects, land owners, etc) to find a better path forward and develop what they are looking for.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Hoey Smith

Jennifer Hoey Smith, ASID
Jennifer Hoey Interior Design



Studio 208.726.1561

Fax 208.726.1861

Mail PO Box 6409 • Ketchum, ID 83340

Ship 300 North Main Street, Suite 202 • Ketchum, ID 83340

Website jenniferhoey.com



From: [bb3b](#)
To: [Participate](#)
Subject: Emergency ordinance feedback
Date: Monday, March 07, 2022 7:49:26 PM

Hello - I am a Ketchum business operator and property owner. I strongly disagree with the ordinance as drafted for the reasons stated below:

- 1) The city planners and/or commissioners should conduct workshops with stakeholders (builders, developers, architects, land owners, etc) to develop a robust, long term plan, that aligns with what they are looking for in the city core.
- 2) The city should be incentivizing developers and owners to build the mix and density desired, not making it harder and more costly to build.
- 3) More hurdles and increased project costs add to the housing and commercial unit inventory shortages.

Thank you for your consideration.

Bill

From: [Jeff Smull](#)
To: [Participate](#)
Cc: [Neil Bradshaw](#)
Subject: Ketchum Emergency Ordinance
Date: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 9:56:30 AM

To all,

I support the upcoming Emergency Ordinance. Now is the time to put on the brakes, before it's too late, and assess if the current ordinances are advancing or deteriorating the long term viability of our economy and community.

Thank you for your service to the community,

Jeff Smull
Ketchum Resident

From: [Jay Emmer](#)
To: [Amanda Breen](#); [Neil Bradshaw](#); [Michael David](#); [Jim Slanetz](#); [Courtney Hamilton](#); [Brenda Moczygemba](#); [Matthew Mead](#); [Tim Carter](#); [Spencer Cordovano External](#); [Neil Morrow](#); [Participate](#)
Subject: Ketchum Proposed Interim Emergency Ordinance 1234
Date: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 11:15:57 AM

Commissioners, Council and Mayor;

I am writing as a Ketchum resident (for almost 30 years), a property owner (for just as long), taxpayer, voter, former manager of local businesses, and business owner to voice my strong opposition to the [proposed] Interim/Emergency Ordinance 1234 referenced as item 2 on the agenda packet, which starts on page 122.

This proposed ordinance is full of conjecture and arbitrary statements that are unacceptable when considering such significant changes to the well-established rules that are currently in place to guide development in the City and Community of Ketchum. Changes to existing zoning and ordinance in the manner being proposed in the "Interim"/"Emergency" ordinance is unacceptable and beyond the purview of the Commissioners and the City Staff. There is a process in place for re-codification and re-zoning, and attempting to make any changes in any manner other than within the established protocols is uncalled for and a violation of property owners' rights.

The recommended changes as referenced on page 2 starting with item 3, sub-points a(i-iv), b, c, d and e are:

- 1) Not provided for in the current codes and zoning at this time.
- 2) Are unfounded/supported with regard to their potential benefits.
- 3) Have not been presented or opened up to public evaluation, comment, or discussion in a timely or acceptable manner.
- 4) Ignore property owners' rights as they currently exist.
- 5) Disregard property owners' investments (current and proposed) into Ketchum that were made and founded on the promises made in current zoning and ordinances.
- 6) The language stating that "*Pursuant to the affirmative vote of one-half (1/2) plus one (1) of the 137 members of the City Council, the rule requiring two (2) separate readings by title and one (1) reading in full be waived, and the same is hereby dispensed with, and accordingly, this emergency ordinance shall be in full force and effect immediately upon its passage and approval.*" is unacceptable and usurps the public's right to evaluate, question and comment on the proposed interim/emergency ordinance and strips away due process.
- 7) The language in section 6 stating that, "*There shall now be standards for the consolidation of lots. Additionally, there shall be a specific application type, process, and additional standards for the review and approval of the consolidation*" and the language, "Permitted subject to additional standards" and "subject to waiver", is too subjective and gives the Planning and Zoning Commission, and City Staff, excessive discretion which creates uncertainty for property owners, disincentivizes investment into the City and Community of Ketchum, makes unfeasible certain types of development that accomplish the goals stated by the City Staff and ignores basic economic principles. The stipulation could prevent the development of projects that achieve the goals of the Community as set forth in the existing Comprehensive Plan.

Additionally the examples provided as supporting exhibits to the Interim Emergency Ordinance proposed are unrealistic, unachievable, and the Love Shack example is specific to that site and disregards the unique nature of many sites within the City.

8) The proposed requirement that a property that has multiple contiguous properties that they own and that wants/needs to shift lot lines on their properties owner have to go through the subdivision process as described in 6c strips away the property rights of a property owner and potentially prevents beneficial development.

9) Section 7 begs the question of "Why doesn't the restriction on demolition apply to commercial square footage as well as residential?" given that one of the stated goals is to increase and incentivise the development of commercial square footage?

In Closing:

- Claims are made in the attempted rationalization of the proposed Interim/Emergency Ordinance 1234 for which there are no supporting examples.

- The given rationale of, *"An emergency interim ordinance addressing the short-term changes would minimize continued degradation of the issues and provide time for development of long-term regulatory changes. An emergency ordinance can be in effect for up to 182 days and is adopted by the City Council. After that an interim ordinance can be adopted for up to one year. During this time, staff can proceed with the preparation of a long term ordinance addressing the short term changes; however, the long term changes will take more time to implement, and the immediate impact of the changes will be diminished."*

for the circumvention of due process and the accepted, approved, appropriate, ethical and legal process for re-codification and re-zoning is unacceptable and puts the cart before the horse. The City Staff has not looked into or evaluated the potential economic impact of taking such action, nor has the feasibility of the possible "solutions" presented in their "supporting" exhibits been evaluated by experts in the respective areas that this proposal addresses.

An "emergency" does not exist. The challenges facing Ketchum are nothing new, they have existed for longer than the almost 30 years I have been here. The ordinances and zoning that have been blatantly and selectively ignored by Planning and Zoning and City Staff were created through years of study, data collection, public feedback and an established process of codification and zone identification. While not perfect, they do establish a framework that will support the needs of the City and Community as well as those individuals willing to and capable of making beneficial investments into the City and Community of Ketchum. This proposed Interim/Emergency Ordinance 1234 egregiously disregards the historical investments made by those of us that have been stakeholders in this City and Community for decades. It ignores due process, property owners' rights and the existing code and zoning upon which many stakeholders in the City and Community of Ketchum have founded their current and potential investments.

As a full-time Ketchum resident, property owner and tax-payer I strongly object to Interim/Emergency Ordinance 1234 that is being proposed.

Thank You,

Jay R. Emmer

Ketchum Planning and Zoning Commission,

Firstly, thank you for your hard work and time commitment to our city through these times. As a member of Ketchum's building and real estate community I am putting forth this letter in response to the P and Z meeting held on February 15, 2022 and in coincidence with the next meeting on March 8, 2022, with some proposals to consider as you weigh the many options in front of you. One constant you will find throughout this letter is the opposition to any emergency CUP ordinance, as this is an ineffectual way to go about getting what you believe our city needs. The first step is clearly laying out to the Planning Department your mission and having them work with developers to accomplish these goals. Below are some ideas to consider that incentivize rather than punish developers to bring these builds to fruition.

1. Currently, overreach by the city to force developers to build a specific unit type or mix would infringe on owners property rights. The code was developed to create the design rules for developing properties as a right not a privilege. Instead of making this a "punishment" with an extra layer of oversight, incentivizing developers to build what you believe our town needs is a more effective approach.
 - The commission and/or city council should publish a quarterly memorandum stating what they would like to see built into the programming model of a developer. A great way to introduce and design this would be with a workshop like the one held last summer with all the stakeholders.
 - The Planning Department should work with developers to incentivize and clear obstacles to do so.
 - One example of an incentive could be a fast track or priority through the application and design review process if they program one or more of your requests into the project.
2. Developers meet with city planners in advance of any applications, often multiple times before submission- the commission should be aware of what the city planners are asking of developers. The initial meeting is a great time to discuss the priorities of the commission as they kick-off the design process before spending hundreds of thousands of dollars.
 - Is the commission aware of what these meetings entail and what is expressed? The commission needs to be aware of what the city planners are

communicating to developers in these meetings and be able to highlight what the city planners are telling developers to do.

3. The commission stated they would like to see more and smaller units in new developments. With the current parking code, this is unattainable on a 5,500 sqft Ketchum lot and pushes development towards larger and higher end penthouse type units. With Idaho Power's transformers easements, waste disposal, ADA parking spots, and walkways this only allows for at most 5 spots across a standard lot. While underground parking on a 5,500 sqft lot actually reduces your parking spaces and adds a considerable amount to the cost and time of construction.
 - The commission needs to find a solution to waive parking requirements or change the code if developers propose to build more and smaller units at your request. Right now it is impossible with the proposed density minimums even with the retail exemption proposed in the draft CUP.
 - Two solutions we propose are allowing for tandem parking and on street year-round parking (with a permit) if the developer offers to snow melt the on-street parking spaces in front of the property.
4. Consolidation and merging of multiple lots, if the city is requesting more underground parking than it cannot deny consolidation of lots. A minimum of two standard Ketchum city lots is needed to equal the parking above ground parking.
 - Do not take away the ability to consolidate the lots in Ketchum, if you want more and smaller units with underground parking
5. Financial feasibility in the current Ketchum development environment has become an issue of increasing instability. The current situation has project costs (not building cost which includes the land, design, engineering, construction, permitting, fees, impact fees, housing fees, etc) on new developments at around \$800-1,000 per sqft. This prices a 700 sqft unit at \$560,000-\$700,000 just to break even. Investors and the bank financiers simply won't participate and projects won't move forward if the projects don't pencil. If the city and commission want to see the proforma programming changed, find a way to supplement the developers to bring the cost down and make these units affordable.

- One solution would be to decrease the housing in lieu of fee square foot requirement by a percentage commensurate with the more affordable units added to the project. We developers would build more affordable units if they could sell them to locals only, and not have to deed restrict them or pay the in lieu of fees.

- The tool you have to execute these options would be a development agreement with the developer.

6. It's understood you want to see a mix of units in each project. Depending on what that mix is, it will dictate another set of issues conforming with building codes, construction methods, and financing costs.

- The commission should begin tackling this issue by looking at the map in the CC District and proposing areas where they would like to see different types of buildings. For example, areas of high traffic and vibrancy could have more commercial than residential, and quieter areas would have more residential.

- As an example, there is a 100% commercial project in the design/application process that will house five local businesses that have outgrown their current space. These five businesses provide vibrancy and good paying jobs to many tenured locals. If they can finish the project and take occupancy, it will open up smaller commercial spaces to other smaller or newer businesses. To get the density bonus to create the space required, they still have to pay the density bonus fees for in lieu of housing.

- An exception should be made by decreasing a percentage of the gross square footage for commercial spaces against the in lieu of housing fees. Commercial spaces are still costly to build, provide important space for businesses, yet trade at a much lower value to the projects with high end residential and penthouse units. If you want more retail, office, and commercial space in town to keep vibrancy, then incentivize developers to add this to their model.

7. The CC District is the space where denser projects should be constructed. Density should be a right per the code and dimensional standards, not a discretionary bonus, especially if the city is going to require this long term and add more oversight, density minimums, and cost to get it.

- The additional oversight of emergency ordinance where no emergency exists is a step backwards towards creating more commercial spaces and housing in the CC District and should not be enacted.
8. Design, building, and fire codes also become a factor when you build smaller units, as you lose space in the interior of a building. Each unit needs to have a fire partition or party walls between units. These walls are about double the width of a normal wall and reduce the interior square footage and cost more to build. The city calculates FAR on gross square footage, or the total space of the building.
- A revision to the code to only calculate FAR on rentable/marketable interior square footage would be a solution to promote more and smaller units without the financial impact and loss of leasable or sellable volume.

An emergency CUP is NOT the answer to this solution. Working with developers during the planning process should be the first step while the commission looks at revisions to the municipal code with incentives that will contribute to our town's vibrancy, better commercial spaces for businesses, and affordable (not just deed restricted) housing for locals.

Sincerely,

Reid Sanborn

From: [Andrew Castellano](#)
To: [Participate](#)
Subject: Ordinance 1234
Date: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 3:29:03 AM

Dear Council Members and Commissioners,

I am writing regarding the proposed Emergency Ordinance 1234, which proposes to modify the zoning regulations in the City of Ketchum. I am vehemently opposed to passing this emergency ordinance. While I do believe that there is a problem due to a shortage of workforce housing, and I do support the City's goals for higher density, this problem has been decades in the making (as you have demonstrated in your own staff report). The problem will take many years to resolve. This is not an "emergency" that is causing "imminent peril to the public health, safety, or welfare" of the residents of Ketchum. This is an extremely important issue that needs to be thoughtfully addressed and given due process, and not hurried through before citizens can respond and give input. If this is rushed through, there will be unintended consequences which will actually threaten the welfare of some citizens of Ketchum (as opposed to protecting them), whether they be newcomers or long term residents. The rules which govern City Council are there for a reason, to give the citizens of Ketchum a fair chance to shape the debate, and give valuable input that will prevent unintended harm. Please do the right thing, and take your time and get it right.

Respectfully,
Andy Castellano

From: [Harry Griffith](#)
To: [Participate](#)
Subject: P&Z - SVED Comments on Emergency Ordinance 1234
Date: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 11:56:12 AM

SVED has concerns about the proposed Emergency Ordinance 1234. As drafted, it is complicated, allows for subjective interpretations, will be a detriment to commercial development in the affected zoning areas, and not achieve the objective of creating more housing stock.

We would ask P&Z to consider the following questions:

1. Is this really an emergency. It seems to us that a housing emergency does not translate to a zoning emergency.
2. Is this legal. Is this process of introducing an emergency ordinance in accordance with proper procedure. It also seems to us that this ordinance may give more powers to P&Z then allowed by LUPA and may infringe on property owner's rights from the perspective of the State of Idaho. There is also a risk that this approach will be consider a tax on developers to create affordable housing and over turned if challenged.
3. Does this consider the risks and economics of the development community. It seems to us that this will discourage development of mixed-use buildings with affordable units. We are aware of 4 projects with a total value of \$50+ million that are being put on hold or parcels that will be left vacant because of this ordinance.
4. How do 5,500 sf parcels provide for parking. With prohibition on consolidation, underground parking is economically impossible. Parking is also a problem with sub 5500 sf parcels.
5. What do the fixed commercial mixed-use development cutoff %'s achieve. Anyone can jump to the next category with a 1% commercial add on above the table limits.
6. How does this ordinance interface with ADU policy and ordinances.
7. How do the 14+ SF Residential structures in the CC get dealt with. Can they remodel or be redeveloped as SFR, or are they prohibited.
8. What does deemed complete mean. If this means projects currently under construction is impacted, this damages the affected party
9. Have you considered allowing below-grade residential as part of this solution.
10. Have you considered tangibly incentivizing restaurants, and possibly restaurants on a second or third floor. Soft statements of interest are insufficient to encourage new restaurants given the difficult economics of this sector.

These are a few of the more obvious questions that need to be considered. I am sure there may be other unintended (negative) consequences that will surface during the course of discussions.

We would encourage P&Z to ask staff to review and respond to these and any other questions

which may arise in today's discussion.

Respectfully,

Harry Griffith

Executive Director, Sun Valley Economic Development

www.SunValleyEconomy.org

From: [Steve Kearns](#)
To: [Participate](#)
Cc: [Robin Kearns](#); [Victor](#); [Sanborn, Reid](#); [Bill Banta](#); [Jennifer Hoey Smith](#); [Scott Payne](#); [Aaron Belzer](#)
Subject: proposed emergency ordinance
Date: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 10:41:38 AM
Attachments: [PastedGraphic-1.png](#)

Dear Mayor Bradshaw, Members of the City Council and Members of the Planning and Zoning Commission:

I am writing to comment on the proposed emergency ordinance regarding development in the Community Core. I think the emergency ordinance is a bad idea.

KMV Builders has built or is building five multi-family, mixed-use or commercial projects in Ketchum's core. Rather than decreasing housing stock or commercial space as staff identified as a trend, our projects will have demolished four old, dilapidated houses and replaced them with 19 residential units and 9 commercial office units. These projects are also being built at close to maximum density - again contrary to staff cited trends.

Giving the P&Z authority over the mix of a development is a terrible idea. Developers, builders and architects put a huge amount of time, effort and money into designing a project based on current ordinances to make sure it can be viable, and they should not be subject to the commission arbitrarily deciding to change the mix. Furthermore, adding a CUP requirement to any project over 1.0 FAR (any viable project will be over 1.0) will add even more time to an approval process that is already unacceptably long. I have more comments about many of the staff's analysis - too long for this letter.

I suggest you approach this issue in a way that doesn't disrupt peoples livelihoods. Have meetings with stakeholders, P&Z members and city council members to identify and address perceived issues. Draft an ordinance and have public hearings about it. Revise the ordinance based on public input. Go through the normal process to approve the ordinance. Don't add uncertainty and further delay into the Ketchum development process.

Respectfully,

Steve Kearns



Kearns, McGinnis, & Vandenberg, Inc.
131 W 6th Street
P.O. Box 3233
Ketchum, ID 83340

Office: 208.726.4843

Cell: 208.720.0732