

**From:** [Rich Boltizar](#)  
**To:** [planning](#)  
**Subject:** DSRFY2021-0010 Brick West: written comments in opposition  
**Date:** Monday, May 10, 2021 4:35:36 PM

---

Please accept this email as my written objections to the project DSRFY2021-0010. I am the owner of 204 E 34th Street, the property next door. My father lives on the property.

I am very concerned about the proposed parking requirements for this project. The 34th Street corridor already suffers from significant parking shortages prior to development of the three projects currently seeking approval. When people can't find parking, they regularly park in front of our property, blocking the driveway or at times even parking in our driveway. This happens regularly during the Farmers' Market. I am concerned that if the new development has insufficient parking, this will become an everyday issue.

Specifically, I don't think this plan meets the minimum required parking. I understand that the developer has presented its plans as "1-bedroom apartments" with work space "offices." I think that others have pushed back on this characterization earlier in the review, and I agree with those concerns. These workspaces will clearly be used as second bedrooms (no matter what the CC&Rs nominally says) since they are fully enclosed with four walls, but there is no parking to account for the fact that these are functionally 2-bedroom units with additional residents. Manipulating the code to pretend these are not "bedrooms" does not solve the actual problem for the neighborhood--the added residents who will have nowhere to park. And, were the private garages sufficient for the apartments, there would still be the brewery to contend with. The developers propose to build only 7 parking spaces for the entire brewery, including its employees and customers. Surely it will contain seating for far in excess of 7 parties! And how many people will work there? The vast majority of brewery customers and employees will likely be driving. It simply does not make sense where they are expected to park without overwhelming the street.

Even if this somehow meets the letter of the code, I urge the city to consider this project in the context of the rapid development of the entire neighborhood and its role in giving people access to the Greenbelt and Whitewater Park. In a matter of months, people have proposed a radical reimagining of 34th street, including this project, a series of condos on the other side of our lot (covering more than half the block), and a hotel down the street. While I support the development of the neighborhood, the city needs to ensure it happens responsibly and does not overwhelm the infrastructure. 34th street is a narrow street with limited street parking because of people's driveways. There is little public transportation. And because of the close proximity to the Greenbelt, bridge, and whitewater park, our neighborhood street parking is already being used to accommodate people using the region's park services (which I support! It is important for residents and visitors to be able to access these parks, which I see as one of the Treasure Valley's best assets). In short, I fear the street will quickly be overwhelmed by this rapid development, without proper guardrails.

Lastly, I want to mention the proposed setback on the East side of the lot. The proposed corner of the brewery and apartment building is only set back 5 feet from the property line abutting my property. The two-story building will tower over our lot. There is a much larger setback from the other adjoining property on the North end of the lot; I do not think 5 feet is sufficient along this one side.

Thank you for your consideration of my concerns.

Best,

Rich Boltizar

---

**Total Control Panel**

[Login](#)

To: [planning@gardencityidaho.org](mailto:planning@gardencityidaho.org)  
From: boltizar@gmail.com

Message Score: 1  
My Spam Blocking Level: High

High (60): **Pass**  
Medium (75): **Pass**  
Low (90): **Pass**

[Block](#) this sender  
[Block](#) gmail.com

*This message was delivered because the content filter score did not exceed your filter level.*