

From: [Participate](#)
To: [Suzanne Frick](#); [Suzanne McCollum](#)
Subject: FW: Comments on Policy Plan for Tonight's Meeting
Date: Tuesday, April 12, 2022 3:25:03 PM

FYI

LISA ENOURATO | CITY OF KETCHUM

Public Affairs & Administrative Services Manager

P.O. Box 2315 | 191 Fifth St. W. | Ketchum, ID 83340

o: 208.726.7803 | f: 208.726.7812

lenourato@ketchumidaho.org | www.ketchumidaho.org

From: Broderick Smith <broderick@silentwater.com>

Sent: Tuesday, April 12, 2022 11:46 AM

To: Participate <participate@ketchumidaho.org>; Neil Morrow <nmorrow@ketchumidaho.org>; Tim Carter <tcarter@ketchumidaho.org>; Brenda Moczygemba <BMoczygemba@ketchumidaho.org>; Matthew Mead <mmead@ketchumidaho.org>; Spencer Cordovano External <scpowexplorer@gmail.com>

Cc: Neil Bradshaw <NBradshaw@ketchumidaho.org>

Subject: Comments on Policy Plan for Tonight's Meeting

Good Morning -

I am unable to join tonight's meeting, however I had a very brief chance to quickly review the latest proposed Policy Statement this morning. I appreciate everyone's work on creating a set of policy guidelines to keep our City Vibrant - a great amount of time and work has gone into this so thanks again for committing your time to this issue. I wanted to provide some brief comments for your consideration. In my review, these are noted as "Goals" - are these "Goals" going to be "Requirements", or are they truly goals? I want to point out some fast thoughts relative to these goals as if the idea is to apply them in a blanket/prescriptive method:

- **OFFICE/COMMERCIAL:** A blanket requirement for retail fronting the Street on every project may yield some negative consequences. Commercial uses can serve a great purpose in certain locations. Seattle (and other cities) had this same idea long ago and forced developers to build only retail on the ground floor fronting the streets...due to this policy (even prior to Covid), we began to see an abundance of Vacant Retail Storefronts as the zoning code forced an oversupply of retail - the goal was vibrancy but it created the antithesis of activation/vibrancy. I would recommend Consulting with someone who understands the retail market here well - I am thinking of Paul Kenny, Matt Bogue and Matt Gelso for instance. Retail is all about LOCATION LOCATION LOCATION and its sensitive to supply/demand. We can't just require it throughout the town in a blanket fashion...some Commercial/Office or Residential fronting the street may be the best ground floor use in certain areas. If we force Developers to build too much retail, we may also see a landlord capitulate and decide to fill it with T-Shirt/Trinket Shops, Banks, and other lifeless/soulless uses that can pay high rent...
- **UNDERGROUND PARKING:** Underground parking is EXTREMELY expensive to construct when

your height is limited to 3 stories on market rate projects. This requirement will cause developers to construct more inefficient 1 lot developments where they don't have to excavate below grade. So, if more housing and commercial/retail is our goal, this requirement would lead to LESS commercial/retail. Why? Each development needs back of house space, utility room(s), an elevator etc. These back of house areas will be very similar for a 1 lot or 2 lot development...so the efficiency, or amount of actual usable/rentable area you'll see per total gross area, will be lower on the 1 lot development (*which would become many developer's preferred option*). If we want more housing/retail/commercial, we should really understand the parking requirement and how it impacts development. We can share some recent underground parking costs with the Committee and City to show this point. How about an incentive in place for below grade parking...as I believe parking is important but again it is EXTREMELY expensive to construct.

- COMMUNITY HOUSING: The Community Housing language was redlined to now call out on-site community housing on the upper floors. The sale of market rate units on the upper floors is what funds the construction of the Community Housing on L1. The financial impacts of this would be huge and it would disincentivize development. Living in downtown Ketchum on Level 1 is fantastic! Why does the developer now need to subsidize L2 and L3 as well?

I am out of my twenty minutes to provide some fast thoughts. But in summary, remember that housing downtown is the most efficient type of housing we can create per land SF (when compared to single family homes). We don't want to make it too challenging to the point where development stops occurring downtown and we keep seeing Single family sprawl further out into the hills...we need to hold some work sessions with the Community to think further about these issues.

Thank you.

Broderick Smith