

Ketchum Business Advisory Coalition Public Comment  
on Proposed Zoning Updates in Comp Plan  
January 28<sup>th</sup>, 2025

The KBAC group appreciates the opportunity to provide constructive feedback on the proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan. We have concerns about two significant zoning aspects of the draft Comprehensive Plan and feel it is impossible to provide accurate comments without examining the new Planning and Zoning changes side-by-side.

**Residential** - The residential changes propose increasing density in established neighborhoods without adequate infrastructure planning, particularly in West Ketchum and Warm Springs, which already face capacity constraints. The current water, sewer, and road infrastructure needs significant upgrades before supporting increased density. Emergency access is already constrained on narrow streets, with no transparent budgeting outlined for these necessary improvements. The proposal lacks specific building height, size, and density restrictions, with no clear caps on rental rates aligned with workforce wages or language preserving single-family and duplex opportunities in medium-density zones.

Additional planning is needed for wildfire and flood risks, particularly in forest-adjacent developments, and the insurance coverage implications have not been adequately addressed.

Instead of sweeping density increases in well-established neighborhoods, incentives to incorporate affordable housing into new property developments should be considered. There is a more holistic way to address these needs without penalizing neighborhoods with established families and residents.

**Commercial** - The commercial changes suggest potential downzoning in the expanded Retail Core area while maintaining current allowances in Community Mixed-Use zones. However, the full impact cannot be assessed without seeing the new zoning code. While Community Mixed-Use areas appear to maintain current height and density allowances except for hotels, the language suggests reductions in the expanded Retail Core area. KBAC supports a mix of commercial spaces, including smaller retail spaces for local businesses, restaurant spaces, and residential spaces interspersed. KBAC supports economic diversity and all property types in the RC except oversized full lot-line to lot-line developments like Bluebird, which do not meet Ketchum's character goals or provide adequate parking for residents, employees, or customers. We realize developers are maximizing FAR, yet continuing to do that directly conflicts with the goals stated in the Comprehensive Plan and what the community has voiced. KBAC supports affordable housing outside of the Retail Core and supports clear design guidelines in the Retail Core that promote the character and integrity of Ketchum.

Overall, we are concerned about the implied zoning changes mentioned in the Comprehensive Plan and the lack of input from businesses and residents. We recommend removing all references to any zoning and density changes from the Comprehensive Plan and moving this work to the Planning & Zoning team, which will develop a complete plan with input from key stakeholders.

Thank you,  
KBAC Board of Directors  
Bronwyn Nickel  
Holly Mora  
Pete Prekeges  
Scott Curtis  
Amy Weyler  
Roger Roland  
Duffy Wimper  
Jed Grey  
Tom Nickel  
Cindy Forgeon  
Dillon Witmer  
Julie Johnson

## Cyndy King

---

**From:** Shell Brust <shellbrust@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 29, 2025 11:35 AM  
**To:** Participate  
**Subject:** Ketchum Comp plan comment

I am strongly against increasing density for two reasons:

1. I spoke to a water expert in Blaine Co and believe we do not have enough water to justify increasing density.

2. The traffic is already beyond capacity for our existing roads on a daily basis.

When it's high tourist season it becomes gridlocked and dangerous with road rage. Never thought I would see that day come to our sweet little town of Ketchum.

Shelley Brust

## Cyndy King

---

**From:** Amanda Breen  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 30, 2025 7:36 AM  
**To:** Cyndy King  
**Subject:** Fw: Courtney's email

Public comment.

---

**From:** Mark Maykranz <mmaykranz@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 30, 2025 4:15 AM  
**To:** Courtney Hamilton <CHamilton@ketchumidaho.org>; Amanda Breen <ABreen@ketchumidaho.org>; Tripp Hutchinson <thutchinson@ketchumidaho.org>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Courtney's email

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Mark Maykranz <mmaykranz@hotmail.com>  
**Date:** January 30, 2025 at 3:58:37 AM MST  
**To:** Spencer Cordovano <scordovano@ketchumidaho.org>  
**Subject: Re: Courtney's email**

Thanks for getting back with me. Several comments:

All building construction generates workforce housing needs. No buildings, then no additional workforce. Some new buildings, then some workforce needs, Many buildings (and big ones), then lots of work force needs. You cannot balance workforce housing needs without controlling the pace of growth. Economists generally agree that 1 per cent population growth is a healthy target and should generate a 3 per cent economic growth rate. For a city like Denver metro, 1 per cent growth is equivalent to adding 1/3 of a city of Boulder every year. For a town like Ketchum, 1 per cent is net pop. Growth of 40 people! In 10 years, that turns a 4000 population into 4,420. It took Ketchum 144 years to become 4000 people. When you incentivize FAR, you are shooting yourself in the foot. Thought exercise: medium building perhaps 14 full time employees. Incentivized big building, perhaps 22 f. Time employees. Developer pays for 2 units- houses 4 people, net workforce needs are now 18, 4 more than the smaller building ( and a lot more infrastructure costs later).

It is hard for me to see a successful workforce outcome without slowing the construction boom, passing a housing bond issue, and having nonprofit involvement. At the moment, you stand no chance of a bond issue because the Mayor has lost the trust with bad locations, oversized buildings, and very poor tenant preferences, particularly not prioritizing Ketchum residents.

The massive hotels on the books will bury Ketchum with workforce needs. Jackson Hole used this formula after the Great Recession and it buried the town. They have workers living in the forest now, while the large hotels bring in cheap help with special Visas and live 5 people to a unit.

Since adding houses adds workforce needs, you could limit home size to 2500 sq. Foot, and then charge x per square foot for increasing the size of the home.

When you increase density it is absolutely wrong to turn existing homes into non conforming uses. They should be entitled to keep the single family zoning within the new zone district. Having the existing single family provides relief to the street scape and is more in keeping with the character of Ketchum.

Ketchum is bearing the brunt of the construction activity, while the income earned is being returned to the economies of Hailey, Bellevue, Boise, and now even San Francisco. You should figure out a way to charge hefty license fees for contractors working in Ketchum, but not located in Ketchum.

Do the right thing!

Best,  
Mark  
Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 27, 2025, at 11:31 AM, Spencer Cordovano  
<[scordovano@ketchumidaho.org](mailto:scordovano@ketchumidaho.org)> wrote:

[CHamilton@ketchumidaho.org](mailto:CHamilton@ketchumidaho.org)

Look out for the Feb 3<sup>rd</sup> joint meeting, we should get some specifics on density and ability to intersperse deed restrictions. Maybe you can still do single family but must pay an in lieu fee or provide a unit elsewhere? I think they went too far on density indeed, we need some buffer zones from single family. Would love to influence more condos and apartment building if possible, but super clear community character extends through the neighborhoods.

Interesting conversations, to be a part. the whole thing is consuming though. Is there any answer? You can only combat the world so much. The way single family is being built, we gotta find some balance, maybe simply height and space maximums, but nobody wants more dog park style single family.

It's interesting to zone for what will be a 2+ million dollar duplex/fourplex, maybe that is the new Ketchum family, IDK.

Happy to chat prior to the meeting,

Spencer  
208 720 9663

---

**From:** Mark Maykranz <mmaykranz@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 26, 2025 8:18 AM  
**To:** Spencer Cordovano <SCordovano@ketchumidaho.org>  
**Subject:** Courtney's email

Hi Spencer,  
You guys are going to bury Ketchum with density. Don't do it. Don't trash the town. Reality: not everyone gets to live here. Go the deed restricted route! I like the deed restricted route for locals who work- not for retirees. As your workforce in deed restricted housing ages, they become your retirees, because you are not going to make them leave, nor should you.

Get pumped for the World Cup!

What is Courtney H's email address?

Thanks,  
Mark  
Sent from my iPhone

## Cyndy King

---

**From:** Janet Nathanail <jnathanail@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 3, 2025 7:43 AM  
**To:** Participate  
**Subject:** Comprehensive plan draft public comment  
  
**Importance:** High

To Members of the Ketchum City Council,

We are increasingly concerned about the direction the Council is taking Ketchum. We do not agree with the already increased density of the business and residential areas. New construction is everywhere. We have 2 new large multi story buildings going up on Main Street and many others within the main city limits. We have a massive, out of character, hotel at the entrance of our town. We do not have enough parking in the center of town. Even now, during slow season it is difficult to find a space to park to shop or dine.... with many spaces lost and too many others being taken up by workers trucks.

The proposed low income housing unit on Washington Street not only is in the wrong part of town, but it will eliminate one of the few parking lots in town. Even with underground parking it will not be enough. The idea of encouraging the use of bicycles by providing dedicated lanes is misguided. What percentage of the population ride bikes to town and for how many months a year ??

New plans to increase residential density zoning will not only dramatically change the character of Ketchum but it will cause a further burden on the infrastructure and streets. This increase will certainly not provide more needed affordable housing for workers. Single family homes changed to multi family = more people, more cars, loss of ketchum character. Will all this multifamily building change ketchum into a seasonal town catering to tourists at the expense of full time residents. If so, how will this affect our small businesses? Our once charming area of the Gem streets has new buildings going up ...lot line to lot line with no space in between.

What is the hurry to approve building so rapidly and indiscriminately? Why aren't we taking more time to consider how these changes will impact the quality of life of our citizens? We all want considered, sensitive and respectful progress, but not changes that we will all someday regret.

Ketchum is a gem...that is what draws people to move here, to live here and to enjoy the amazing natural surroundings. Please do not destroy that.

Thank you  
Janet Nathanail and Bill Flanz

201 Emerald Street



## Cyndy King

---

**From:** Kerrin McCall <kerrinmac@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 3, 2025 11:15 AM  
**To:** Participate  
**Subject:** Stop density plan

Attention: Ketchum City Council and Mayor Bradshaw

I am a resident of Warm Springs and more so along time resident of Ketchum. I have just finished reading about your outrageous plan to increase density in West Ketchum and Warm Springs and prohibiting single family homes while encouraging massive housing projects. You are hellbent to destroy the unique character of our town. WE DO NOT WANT YOUR AGREGIOUS PLAN!!!!

We have had enough and look forward to voting you out of office in the next election cycle.

Sincerely,  
Kerrin McCall