## **Participate**

From: HP Boyle <boylehp@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 4, 2024 4:22 PM

**To:** Participate

Cc: Andrew Guckes; publisher@mtexpress.com; gfoley@mtexpress.com

Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT on City of Ketchum purchase of Pinewood Unit C16

## To the Council,

Councilmembers Hutchinson and Cordovano may not be aware that at the last meeting of the Ketchum Council for 2023, the Council to purchased Pinewood Unit C16 from Mr. Drew and is offering it as deed-restricted housing in Category L to any purchaser who meets the BCHA conditions for eligibility.

The City is currently marketing that property to people who have been on the BCHA list, plus non-BCHA list people, via Anna Matheu of Windermere.

This is not the right path for affordable housing for Ketchum for multiple reasons.

- 1. Per BCHA eligibility requirements, there is no requirement for the buyer to work in Ketchum. Yet this unit was purchased with Ketchum taxpayer money. The Ketchum Housing Action Plan is supposed to address the Ketchum workforce shortage.
- 2. This transaction was done in secret, as the very last act of an outgoing City Council. Why? At the first Council meeting of 2024, Mayor Bradshaw extolled the transparency of the Council. Asserting the Council is transparent does not make you transparent—especially when it acts in secret. Ms. Connelly ran this by BCHA in secret in its October 6 meeting.
- 3. Why was this particular unit purchased? Available units are supposed to go to the first eligible purchaser on the BCHA waitlist. However, there do not seem to be any such people on that waitlist, given that the unit is being marketed more broadly by a real estate agent, including to people who have not applied to BCHA.. <a href="https://5b-realestate.com/225pinewoodc16">https://5b-realestate.com/225pinewoodc16</a>
- 4. Why is a non-Ketchum real estate agent doing this sale? Are there not enough real estate agents resident in Ketchum? There was no competitive bidding process for this assignment disclosed in any City of Ketchum information.

The biggest issue, however, is that while the Council has bailed Mr. Drew out of potentially tens of thousands of dollars in capital assessments for the rebuilding of the complex, it will saddle the buyer of a supposedly "affordable" unit with a potentially uncapped liability for future assessments. This condo complex has reached the end of its life (see HOA minutes 2/23/22) and requires substantial capital investment. The 2/23/23 minutes suggest that the HOA typically operates at a deficit and does not have the credit required for such a loan. The \$30k buyer concession offered by the City is just for the roof—and may not cover the full expense. Indeed, the roof is so bad that one board member said there was potential for "injury or death" and the potential for the City to deem the complex "uninhabitable and condemn" it. Yet the roof is only one area requiring investment: the siding needs replacement, and the parking lot needs repaving. The HOA has explored getting bank financing, as the requirements appear to be beyond the residents' current means. Indeed, there was a substantial balance of uncollected HOA fees. This is an HOA that struggles to fill its board positions; indeed, in the last two annual meetings, there was no President present.

That is for the common elements. The unit itself is not up to the current code. The inspection report cites the need for substantial investment in the unit itself: <a href="https://5b-realestate.com/files/2023/12/225-Pinewood-C16-Inspection-Report.pdf">https://5b-realestate.com/files/2023/12/225-Pinewood-C16-Inspection-Report.pdf</a>, with no cost estimate provided. The inspection was a visual one. It noted excessive moisture from leaks, but is silent on mold potential (it refers to "microbial growth"). There was no lead test done, despite that this is a pre-1978 unit. The seller will address many of the deficiencies, but one can expect a unit like this, especially one that has apparently been poorly maintained, to be a constant battle,

Selling an end-of-life unit to an unsophisticated buyer is not the right way to do workforce housing for Ketchum workers using Ketchum taxpayer funds. A better way would be an InDEED type program that keeps the City out of the real estate speculation business and lets the buyer choose their home.

I hope the new Council (and the Mountain Express) will investigate this situation, make all the facts public, reform the Housing Action Plan to focus on housing the Ketchum workforce, and remove the unreconcilable conflicts of interest that Ms.Connelly has by working for both the taxpayers of Ketchum and BCHA.

Thank you,

Perry Boyle Ketchum

## **Participate**

From: Pat Higgins <pathiggins@cox.net>
Sent: Tuesday, January 9, 2024 4:03 PM

**To:** Participate

**Subject:** Main Street concerns

Hi, I would like my concern added to public comments.

#1

Besides the loss of parking which we are in short supply of... where will the spaces lost on Main Street go? In the winter the roads are icy much of the time. Older residents have a hard enough time walking to businesses and restaurants when parking is 2 blocks away. What is this going to do to the business owners where parking is removed in front of their business?

#2

I am having second thoughts on the "bulb-outs", I have lived in Ketchum since 1979 and feel that I am very familiar with our streets. Today was a very snowy day, when the snow is covering the roads and the sidewalks it is very difficult to predict where a 'Bulbout" may be hiding and how far out it actually is. I turned on 2 different roads today and ran over a "bulbout". What kind of damage will happen to city snowplow?

Like I said, I am very familiar with with the roads here but when there is snow covering it is very difficult to to predict and there is a bounce in the car and I am sure not good for the car. I understand the reasoning for them but Main Street is a actually a highway that goes thru our town, it is not a walkway. I have lived here long enough to see the wasteful spending of planters on hwy 75 aka Main St, that in the long run have been removed because they cause obstruction of vision, etc.

Please consider these comments when making your final decisions.

Sincerely,

Pat Higgins

Sent from my iPad