

Dawn Hofheimer

From: HP Boyle <boylehp@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 11, 2026 3:05 PM
To: Participate
Subject: Public Comment for P&Z Commission

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

A zoning code that encourages lot subdivision without deed restriction in residential neighborhoods is inherently bad for Ketchum residents. It results in what you see in the application for 310 Georgia Rd.

Given the unlimited demand for tourism condos, more subdivisions mean more short-term rentals. That these will become short-term rentals is indicated by the proposed structure and the name the developer has chosen for the three-story monochromatic box.

The choice we have for development in Warm Springs is clear. Do we want increased density of short-term rentals, or more luxury second homes? Neither is good for the community. Which is the lesser evil? The choice comes down to more tourists or more second-home owners. At least second homeowners contribute to the community through their philanthropy, and they have a lower environmental impact.

Ketchum's empirical experience over more than 40 years shows that encouraging higher density does not improve housing affordability. Given unaffordable construction costs and tourism demand, it is not possible to build affordable market-rate homes in Ketchum.

The only path to affordability is through deed restrictions and subsidies (either private or taxpayer). Every other approach is a scam to build more tourism condos, increase transiency, and destroy what is left of our residential neighborhoods.

We should limit subdivision, FAR, and height in residential neighborhoods if we want to have any neighborhoods left in 10 years. Any FAR bonus for new builds should be subject to deed restrictions on the entire building to ensure they remain out of the short-term rental market.

Perry Boyle
Ketchum

Dawn Hofheimer

From: Warren Taylor <warren.jt.96@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 14, 2026 8:31 PM
To: Participate
Cc: nicole roos
Subject: Comments on Design Review for 310 Georgia Road (April 15 Meeting)
Attachments: 310 Georgia Questions_Concerns.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi all - the attached word document includes comments from Warren and Nicole Taylor regarding the Design Review application for 310 Georgia Road (meeting to take place tomorrow, April 15).

Thank you!
Warren and Nicole

Dawn Hofheimer

From: Hollyberry <wc@hollyberrynursery.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 14, 2026 4:46 PM
To: Participate
Subject: 310 PZ meeting

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Comments by Walt and Holly Coiner

Planning and zoning chairman and committee members,

While the application drawings have changed ever so slightly since they were sent back to the drawing board, we feel this revision represents a very weak attempt to revise them adequately and not enough changes have been made.

We feel our prior concerns are still valid. Possibly even more valid since they did not make many of the major meaningful changes requested.

The design is still bad for all the same reasons noted in our previous report.

Overall, the proposed structure will be out of place with our community character. It's a large massive, top heavy box building.

Existing and proposed grade still not noted on the sides and back elevations.

The roof drainage does not work. Downspouts are not shown for all conditions where needed. The roof downspouts shown do not connect to the dry well system.

There are no trees planned between our property and the 310 project. There are plants that are planned for the Landscape that will not survive our climate. We have 32 years in the Nursery business and know this fact to be true. The existing trees located east of project are failing due to excavation. There is no supplemental irrigation system included in the drawings.

These and all former issues noted in staff reports are important to us and our neighbors.

Thank you for allowing us to voice our concerns.

Walt & Holly Coiner

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on this design review – we are the next-door neighbors to this property and want to say that we do appreciate the applicant making some revisions since the last meeting. That said, we've had some time to review the proposed changes and continue to have important questions that don't feel like they've been addressed by the new design plans in a meaningful way.

Capacity and Safety:

This is our biggest concern. This is listed as a two-unit, three-bedroom duplex, but each side actually has four functional primary bedrooms. At full occupancy, that's potentially 16+ people staying in this building at one time - with only four parking spots.

At the last meeting, it was suggested that overflow parking could go on the street. But overnight street parking isn't allowed here during winter months. We can tell you from experience - two properties across the street have short-term rentals, and we've already seen what happens: cars park illegally overnight, which creates real problems for snow removal, blocks emergency vehicle access, and often completely obstructs use of the culdesac (which is necessary for turning around on this dead-end street).

It's also worth noting that this building is roughly double the density recommended in the Comprehensive Plan, which calls for an average of no more than about five units per acre in this category.

The question we'd ask the Commission to consider is: if this building is at full occupancy on a winter night, will it operate safely? If we're not confident in that answer, that's a real problem - because the people most affected are those of us who live here year-round. If we are unsure that the proposed building would reliably be safe under those conditions, then it does jeopardize the health, safety, and welfare of our neighborhood.

Mass and Scale

In addition to safety, we don't believe the design concerns from the last meeting have been resolved. The building is still nearly 33 feet tall, with over 4,200 square feet per unit on lots of around 5,000 square feet. The third-floor adjustment that was made after the first meeting is about two feet - on a building this size, that's not a meaningful change. As noted in the Staff Report, the building still presents a top-heavy appearance that continues to overwhelm the site and the surrounding homes. The other homes in this neighborhood have more variation and significantly less visual presence. The updates that were made simply don't change the actual size or footprint of the building.

Landscaping and Side Entrance:

As the immediately adjacent neighbor, the entrance walkway on our side sits just over two feet from our property line, leaving no room for a meaningful landscaping buffer. As the commission noted in the last meeting, *"If there's not space in the side yards, than we need to make space in the side yards."* Without trees along the sides of the building, we're looking at constant ambient light and direct sightlines into numerous mid and upper-level windows (even looking directly into a bedroom through a mattress sized window). Moving the left entrance to the front - as was done on the right side - and adding trees along the sides of the building would go a long way toward resolving this, rather than leaving the burden entirely on us.

Thank you for your time, and we hope these concerns help inform the conversation about additional changes we'd like to be made before approving this design.

Nicole and Warren Taylor

**PETER ROSS
311 GEORGINIA, UNIT A
KETCHUM, ID 83340**

April 14, 2026

Re: 310 Georgia

My name is Peter Ross. My wife and I have owned the town home at 311 Georgia Unit A, which is directly across the street from the proposed duplex at 310 Georgia. We were fortunate to acquire our home in October 2020 and love the neighborhood and the sense of community that exists there.

I tried to submit written comments with respect to the proposed plans that were considered at the February 18th meeting. Unfortunately, as my email address was not recognized by the City's server, those comments were trapped in the City's spam filter. I understand that technical problem has now been addressed.

Our main concerns related to the mass and boxiness of the proposed duplex, color scheme, the landscaping (or lack thereof) and the optional ADUs. We did not think that the proposed structure was compatible with the other homes in the neighborhood. It also seemed that duplex units were designed with an eye towards short-term rentals – a use that is inconsistent with the rest of the neighborhood and a potential health and safety concern.

While the revised scheme is arguably an improvement over the initial one, the structure remains massive and highly boxy, and the color scheme drab. The series of 4 metal garage doors and a narrow front door for Unit B presents a stark and unappealing street presence. Adding more stone would help – as would a grander front door entrance.

The new landscaping scheme is appreciated, but we think more work is needed to soften the appearance of the structure. We can see the side landscaping being a problem for the homes on either side of 310 Georgia.

We remain concerned by the potential that both units of 310 Georgia will be used for short-term rentals – given its interior design and proximity to Warm Springs lodge. If so used, it could disrupt the family feel that otherwise exists in the community.

We respectfully request that the Planning Commission direct the owner to continue working with Planning staff to refine the proposed project to address these concerns and to make the final project more compatible with the other homes on this wonderful street.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter Ross