

**ATTACHMENT H: Comments from the Public**

August 25, 2011

TO: Ketchum PZ Commission

I am John H. McDermott from Winnetka, Illinois. My wife, Ann, and I attended your meeting Monday, August 22 regarding changes to the proposed Warm Springs Ranch hotel development. Together with other family members, we own five condominiums on Townhouse Lane immediately east of the proposed development. We have been coming to Sun Valley and owned property in Ketchum for over thirty years. Last week we had eighteen family members here and this week we expect another twenty or so. We come in the summer and winter and spend a lot of money here. We have also paid a lot of taxes over a long period of time. Since we first heard about the proposed Warm Springs hotel project several of us have talked about the possibility of selling. That is not what Ketchum needs now...more real estate on the market.

A major attraction in our purchase of the Townhouse Lane condos was the Warm Springs nine-hole golf course and the eight tennis courts on the property. The hotel developer's plan proposes to eliminate or substantially reduce these attractions. There has been no replacement available in the Ketchum community for the kind of entry-level, economical golf and tennis that existed previously. That is a real disadvantage to the children and young people who want to learn and play these sports. The Dave Pelz short golf game school is no substitute (as said at the meeting, "it could be done in my backyard"). There is no guarantee that more than two tennis courts will ever be built since they come with phases 2 and 3 of the developer's plan. Both proposed golf and tennis facilities will mainly benefit hotel guests, not the community. The original nine-hole golf course and eight tennis courts are still there and could be refurbished or replaced but for the developer's plan.

In my opinion, the proposed Warm Springs hotel will not be successful. That is why the developer couldn't get financing for the original project. I can understand his desire to recover at least part of his investment by downsizing the project but his potential losses should not be Ketchum's concern. The downsized project is also likely to fail because (1) Ketchum doesn't need a new convention hotel at this location, which is not within walking distance of any other attractions, and (2) it will not have attractive recreational facilities of its own. Can you imagine how successful Sun Valley Lodge would be if it had no golf course, tennis courts or ice skating rink and was in an isolated location? If the Warm Springs hotel project ultimately fails, the developer's estimates of revenue to the City of Ketchum and new jobs created by the project will clearly be fantasy.

To: Ms. Lisa Horowitz  
Director of Community and Economic Development  
Ketchum, Idaho  
83340  
August 25, 2011

Subject: WARM SPRINGS RANCH RESORT  
Addressing the "no loss of recreation" requirement  
Quotes are from the Ketchum Comprehensive Plan, March 1, 2001, Chapter 2.9

Dear Lisa,  
According to the Ketchum Parks Department the "no loss of recreation" requirement for the Warm Springs Ranch Resort proposed development is NOT being met. The following plan could have the potential of meeting this requirement or even surpassing it. This plan would also serve young and old alike, those of all economic situations, and visitors as well as locals:

One of the initial proposals for the future Warm Springs development was a park. The Ketchum Parks Department was in favor of this and suggested a recreational information and display center. Depending on its size it could also include environmental, wildlife, and historical information. Some other considerations for the area could be a fishing pond, picnic grounds, a putting green, a walking path and other appropriate amenities.

A park could also be designed to limit water consumption and contamination of the near by Warm Springs River.

Chapter 2.9

Natural Resources and Environmental Quality

Water Quality, Ground:

"... the local aquifer is classified as having higher to very high vulnerability on the Idaho Division of Environmental Quality relative ground water vulnerability of South Idaho".

I think the Ketchum Comprehensive Plan says it all: Chapter 2.9 Policy 4.12.17: "Work in cooperation with landowners of the Warm Springs Golf Course to preserve the community's recreational values".

I appreciate your consideration of this proposal,

Jack Williams  
250 Bald Mountain Road  
P.O. Box 505  
Ketchum, Idaho  
83340  
208-720-4687



## Rebecca Bundy

---

**From:** Rachel Martin on behalf of PZ Comments  
**Sent:** Monday, October 31, 2011 8:57 AM  
**To:** Rebecca Bundy; Lisa Horowitz  
**Subject:** FW: Warm Springs Ranch Resort Development Changes

**From:** John & Janet Crews [mailto:jjcrews@me.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, October 28, 2011 2:56 PM  
**To:** PZ Comments  
**Subject:** Warm Springs Ranch Resort Development Changes

To members of the Ketchum City Council, and other interested parties,

As close neighbors of this proposed development, we continue to follow it with great interest. Below are some of our thoughts on the recent proposed changes.

1. We agree that when taking into account the current market conditions, including the large number of available rental units in the Ketchum area, it is a good idea to waive the onsite workforce housing requirements, and replace it with some sort of subsidized housing program as outlined in the P&Z response.
2. We believe that the proposed practice course is an acceptable part of phase one, but strongly believe that the remaining open space that was included in the 9 hole golf course should remain in some form as open space for the public. This could take the form of additional golf facilities to be developed during phases 2 and 3, or as open park space in phases 2 and 3 with public access as is currently the case. Our concern is that phases 2 and 3 may use this land for the newly proposed 74 residences, which would lead to a very negative change in balance between density and open space available to the public. We strongly feel that the new golf course facility should not be approved, unless the balance of the land originally dedicated to the golf course is accounted for at this time as open space with public access. As I understand it, this concept of maintaining and protecting open space in this area of Warm Springs is a prime directive, and leaving the balance of the originally proposed 9 hole golf course in limbo at this stage, would seriously jeopardize the future uses of that land. The need for this concern is highlighted by the large increase in the number of Residences shown in the new proposal.
3. We think that it would be reasonable to give the developer the option of building a total of six tennis courts onsite as part of phase 1, as an option to the \$300,000. Like the golf course, there would need to be written assurance of public access, along with some parking.
4. We are concerned about sufficient onsite parking. The number of hotel rooms and associated residences in the main structure appears to be nearly unchanged. In addition, all employees will now be living offsite, meaning additional commuter cars. However, the number of parking stalls has dropped from 369 (+35?), down to 152. With a guess on our part that the number of employees could be over 175, I foresee a problem here. I remember previous discussions indicating that the 369 number was a minimum to be adequate, which leaves room for a lot of concern with this number being cut to less than half. Employee and visitor parking overflowing into adjacent neighborhoods must be a real concern to be addressed. Any claims by the developer that workers will use public transportation should be totally discounted, unless something is put in writing now, that will require the operator of the hotel to make using public transportation a requirement for employment. If this is not in writing, all claims should be seriously discounted.
5. One of our main concerns continues to be access to Warm Springs road for residents of the Bald Mt Rd area. We are strongly opposed to the removal of the current Bald Mt Rd connection, since this would route the majority of this community through the hotel entrance. I see that the traffic situation is to be reevaluated, and we continue to feel that combining the traffic load from this neighborhood with the hotel traffic through a single connection to Warm Springs Road is not a safe and viable solution, especially in winter traffic. We do not

believe that a stop sign at this intersection would allow for sufficient traffic flow. At the same time, we do not believe that a roundabout would provide any level of safety in icy winter conditions. A busy roundabout requires quick and precise maneuvering in close proximity to other vehicles with differing intentions. I cannot imagine this being a safe or successful solution during icy winter travel. If a high volume of traffic is to be forced through this intersection, we believe that a stoplight is the only safe answer for winter driving conditions. We realize that a stoplight is not particularly desirable for the aesthetics of Warm Springs Road, and therefore feel that the only safe and aesthetic solution to this whole issue is to retain the existing Bald Mt Rd connector. We realize that there are issues with the current Bald Mt Rd connector, but would strongly suggest that solutions be sought that would allow this access route to continue, rather than being rerouted and combined with the hotel traffic.

Also for safety reasons, such as emergency services, all efforts should be made during construction to maintain two routes of access to and from the Bald Mt community.

We submit this for your consideration in the decision making process, and would welcome any response you may wish to make.

Sincerely,

*John & Janet Crews*

## Rebecca Bundy

---

**From:** Rachel Martin on behalf of PZ Comments  
**Sent:** Monday, October 31, 2011 8:57 AM  
**To:** Rebecca Bundy; Lisa Horowitz  
**Subject:** FW: Nov 7 City Council Meeting-PLEASE READ

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Judy Gantz [mailto:jgantzz@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 29, 2011 5:13 PM  
**To:** PZ Comments  
**Subject:** Nov 7 City Council Meeting-PLEASE READ

We have lived across from Warm Springs Ranch for over a decade. At this hearing, please read our views:

If Helios Develop. Company is making an amendment to employee housing and active recreation mitigation:

- 1) WE DO NOT want reduction or removal of public recreation use, e.g. tennis, cross country ski, golf, etc
- 2) We want the building heights of the entire project kept low
- 3) We want a reduced foot print of the project

DO NOT let them take away tennis courts and community use space.

Please edit the height and width of the project.

Judy Gantz  
The Fields