



Thomas Baskin

2088902430 Tombaskin3@gmail.com 3688 N. Willowbar way, Garden City, Idaho, 83714

September 25, 2026

City Council  
City of Garden City  
6015 N Glenwood  
Garden City, Idaho 83714

Dear Mr. Mayor and members of the City Council;

I write to suggest that SAPFY2026-0001 lacks a provision necessary to implement one of the stated goals of the ordinance.

The ordinance calls for the establishment of a linear park (as opposed to a limited corridor) in the vicinity of the greenbelt. See 8-8B-3(d).

At page 32 on "public open space-future park" the ordinance calls for publicly accessible open space in accordance with the comprehensive plan. The Comp plan calls for providing additional river frontage on the ACHD property.

Finally, the proposed ordinance discourages the satisfaction of the open space requirements of the ordinance by reliance on residual or fragmented areas lacking functional benefit. See draft 5 at 59.

All landowners in the SAP shall contribute qualifying open space equal to 25% of their total acreage. See 8-8B-5(I)(4) at page 59. But there will be some parcels, likely interior parcels, that turn out to be unsuitable for the preservation of any open space. The ordinance recognizes this, and allows a particular landowner's open space obligation to be satisfied by "contributing toward public open space located elsewhere within the SAP district..." See 8-8B-5(I)(12)C, at page 63. This is the kernel of a great idea. It is a means of implementing the ordinance's stated goal of gaining open space of meaningful size in the Boise river corridor. The problem with this good idea, however, is that it fails to recognize that the parcels subject to the SAP will not develop simultaneously. They will likely develop over a period of five to thirty years.

Let us say that the new owner of the ACHD "boneyard" moves to develop the parcel immediately. He is willing to contribute 25% of the parcel towards a linear park in the greenbelt corridor. The property is developed pursuant to an RMP and open space

commensurate with the landowners obligation is preserved along the river. The preserved open space is better than nothing, but results in more of a corridor than a linear park.

Ten years later, an interior landowner wants to develop. Everyone agrees that his property is not suitable for siting of public open space. The landowner wishes to satisfy his open space obligation by contributing towards open space located somewhere else in the SAP district. The problem is that there is no way to satisfy that obligation in the boneyard since it is already built out. So, the best place to use the contribution is unavailable, and fragmented open space, a thing that is to be avoided, may be the only path forward.

The ordinance needs some mechanism to make this contribution idea workable in a 30+ acre area that may support 6-10 separate developments over a 30 year timeframe. A way to combine open space obligations of the several landowners to create a great park in the best place must be set forth in the ordinance. I don't know how to do it, but without that additional method, the contribution idea of 8-8B-5(I)(12)C is meaningless, or, at best, wholly dependent on the vagaries of the development timeline. Possibly, public financing of some sort could be used as a bridge during the long development horizon. However, that would require the identification of the future park site before the first shovel of dirt flies anywhere on the SAP.

Its a tough issue, but one that deserves a thoughtful solution.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "T. Baskin", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Thomas Baskin