



Annapolis Transportation Board

To: Annapolis City Council
Cc: Hilary Raftovich, Cynthia Reuter, Jessica Corace, Michael Lyles, Markus Moore, Michael Mallinoff
From: Kurt Riegel, Chairman, Annapolis Transportation Board
Date: 2 October 2024

Addendum to Annapolis Transportation Board Comments on Parking Districts

On 29 November 2023 we provided comments and recommendations regarding this ordinance, copied below as Attachment A.

We thank the City Council for considering our recommendations, some of which may be incorporated in the final ordinance.

However, no action has yet been taken regarding our core recommendation to ***abolish Parking District 5***. We repeat that recommendation, and provide additional supporting data and analysis here.

It supports a view that

1. The condition of ***need*** specified as required in enabling ordinance **12.32.010** is not satisfied
2. The present boundaries of the parking district fail to conform to requirements of the enabling ordinance
3. Demand among residents is small, insufficient to justify the permit system
4. Some holders of permits that have been issued appear not even to meet the legal requirements for applying and receiving those permits
5. Parking district revenues from fees and fines do not justify the expense, complexity, and inconvenience to a general public denied public street parking for no valid reason.

Data and analysis on permits presently active appear below.

1. The conditions of ***need*** specified in parking district enabling ordinance 12.32.010 are not satisfied

Ordinance **12.32.010** specifies: *“The purpose of the parking district ordinances is to promote health, safety and welfare of residents affected adversely ... “ arising from “the inability of*

residents of certain areas to obtain adequate parking adjacent to or close by their places of residence and to secure ease of access to their places of residence. “

The *sine qua non* of this ordinance is rooted in the fundamental requirement “*inability of residents of certain areas to obtain adequate parking adjacent to or close by their places of residence.*” Whether or not this basic requirement was ever met, it is clearly not met now. Data and analysis below elaborate on this point.

As recounted in Attachment A below, nearly every residence in Parking District 5 already has available parking in a private garage, a private driveway, or an attached private parking lot. On-street parking is redundant to private parking space already available to almost every resident and is merely a convenience, not a necessity. Furthermore, on-street parking is ample and is almost always instantly available nearby. All but one permit address has adjacent private or non-District 5 parking.

As a matter of public policy, amenities that are paid for and accessible to the public must be usable on the same basis by all members of the public unless there are powerful special circumstances. There are no circumstances that we are aware of in this instance that justify deviation from this public policy, and none that conform to the core requirement of need.

To be clear, mere preference by individual residents for on-street parking in front of their residence is not a valid reason for invoking powers that this ordinance provides for creating a special parking district. Demonstrated need is the necessary factor.

2. The present boundaries of the parking district fail to conform to requirements of the enabling ordinance

One the four street segments are included in Parking District 5, *Forbes Street, between Monterey Avenue and Giddings Avenue*, lacks even a single resident. It must be excluded for this reason alone.

Giddings Avenue between Forbes Street and Tucker Street is almost entirely commercial, and has only 7 registered voters all of whom have available private parking.

Other streets also are well-endowed with private parking space, as detailed in Attachment A.

3. Demand among residents is small, insufficient to justify the permit system

Table 1 lists all 13 holders of Parking District 5 permits. This number is small, indicating scant overall demand among residents. More concerning is the suggestion that four permits may not be validly issued, if true reducing that number to 9.

The holder of one Monterey permit expressed a strong desire that the Parking District be abolished, and a permit is held by one saying she would not object to its going since overflow demand from restaurants has not materialized and her visitors are inconvenienced by fear of citations.

TABLE 1

1st Name	Last Name	Address	MD Plate	Car Make	Car Model	Voting Address	Commercial?
Lisa	Hering Groves	100 Annapolis St	24520CL	Kia	Sportage	same	Annapolis private vet parking lot
Lenore	Carbone	112 Annapolis St	9DJ8122	Cadillac	CT5	50525 Scotland Beach Rd	Scotland Bean Rush Café
John	Carbone	112 Annapolis St	A086230	Ford	F-250	50525 Scotland Beach Rd	Scotland Bean Rush Café
John	Carbone	112 Annapolis St	4DH7344	Mercedes	SLK-Class	3678 7th Ave	Edgewater Bean Rush Café
David	Franklin	15 Annapolis St B	13271CL	Jeep	Wrangler	same	Annapolis driveway
Cynthia	Franklin	15 Annapolis St B	13273CL	Acura	MDX	same	Annapolis driveway
Lillian	Berry	15 Annapolis St A	1CNZ18	Saturn	Astra	same	Annapolis driveway
Ernest	Skoch	16 Annapolis St	4Z2482	Jeep	Cherokee	Not MD voter	AA county no driveway
DENNIS	LAM	16 Annapolis St	4DE8669	Toyota	Prius	same	Annapolis no driveway
Joy	Bless	503 Monterey Av	602M614	Honda	Other	same	Annapolis adjacent st avail
Patricia	Meinhold	505 Monterey Av	76227CB	Toyota	Sienna	same	Annapolis driveway
Patricia	Meinhold	505 Monterey Av	58592CF	Lexus	RX 350	same	Annapolis driveway
Diane	Croghan	703 Monterey Av	18794CK	Lexus	GX 460	same	Annapolis driveway
Brady	Walker	703 Monterey Av	83866CK	BMW	5 Series	same	Annapolis driveway

Highlighted names are not listed as registered voters at city of Annapolis addresses.

4. Some holders of permits that have been issued appear not even to meet the legal requirements for applying and receiving those permits

The first 3 **highlighted names** have principal residences listed outside of the city of Annapolis and have voting addresses outside the city. The listed permit address is a business, not a residence, and has a number of private parking spaces behind the building.

One resident of 16 Annapolis St is not a registered Maryland voter, and has an additional property outside the city of Annapolis listed in SDAT at 200 Dubois Rd # B as his primary address.

5. Parking district revenues from fees and fines do not justify the expense, complexity, and inconvenience to a public that finds public street parking closed for no valid reason.

Assuming the non-highlighted permits are validly issued, total revenue to the city was \$495 for a full year.

Revenue from fines collected for violations of Parking District 5 specific regulations amounted to only \$50. Other fines were collected, but for violations that had nothing to do with the Parking District e.g. (handicapped zone, fire hydrant, etc.)

Thus, total revenue of \$545 is small and is not a significant offset to the cost of administering the program. The Parking District erects a barrier of inconvenience for citizens denied parking in West Annapolis where there is ample on-street parking. Loss of convenient parking is not helpful to businesses that contribute to the vitality and attractiveness of West Annapolis to its residents.

In summary, the Annapolis Transportation Board continues to recommend that Parking District 5 be abolished as soon as possible.

References:

1. [Residential Parking Permit Program](#)
2. Attachment A below, prior ATB review and recommendations
3. Maryland [SDAT](#) property dataset, and MD voter lists

Attachment A: Excerpt from Prior ATB Comments and Recommendations

Parking District 5

A concise statement of parking district purpose, from [12.32.010](#), is:

“The purpose of the parking district ordinances is to promote “health, safety and welfare of residents affected adversely ... “ arising from “the inability of residents of certain areas to obtain adequate parking adjacent to or close by their places of residence and to secure ease of access to their places of residence. “

Parking District 5 no longer serves the fundamental purpose that its enabling legislation requires.

We recommend that Parking District 5 be abolished.

Here are our reasons:

1. West Annapolis has none of the parking constraints found in some other parts of Annapolis, like downtown Annapolis and Eastport. It has ample parking space, both private and public.
2. Easy parking in West Annapolis supports business, enlivens the community, and gives it a character that attracts and retains happy residents.
3. Nearly every residence in Parking District 5 has a private driveway, a private garage, or a private parking lot. Public on-street parking is surplus to that which already exists privately for residents. There is no parking problem that can only be addressed by operating a special parking district.
4. Residents have reported that Parking District 5 enforcement is so weak and so random that it is essentially moot for practical purposes.
5. The administration of parking districts is costly, requires city and contractor employees to operate, and causes both complexity and expense for residents. It should be undertaken only if a need is firmly established. A need must be supported by objective data, not merely by a minority of residents’ personal preferences.
6. On-street parking spaces are the property of the general public and are available to all unless special circumstances apply. No such special circumstances apply in either the present or proposed Parking District 5.
7. Most businesses in West Annapolis have dedicated parking serving employees, patrons, and in a few cases residents of their buildings. Abundant on-street parking is also

available.

8. Here are comments specific to each of the four Parking District 5 zones:

A. *Annapolis Street between Taylor Avenue and Melvin Avenue.*

Many businesses have abundant parking. A parking district sign is posted erroneously between Melvin and Monterey, outside the defined parking district, and should be removed. There are 26 registered voters in this zone, all of whom have on-site parking and must not rely upon street parking.

B. *Forbes Street, between Monterey Avenue and Giddings Avenue*

There is not a single registered voter living in this zone. It is not a residential street and should be excluded for this reason alone.

C. *Giddings Avenue between Forbes Street and Tucker Street*

This is almost entirely a commercial street with plentiful business parking. There are only 7 registered voters in this zone, and all but one has off street parking.

D. *Monterey Avenue, between Forbes Street and Tucker Street.*

Businesses on the opposite side of the street from residences have abundant parking for their employees and patrons. There is no need for a residential parking district there. There are 38 registered voters in this zone, and all have off street parking and/or parking on an adjacent street.

The elementary school creates traffic congestion at pick-up and drop-off times when school is in session, narrowing the street to the point that passage is blocked. Parking District rules do nothing to address this problem. However, prohibiting parking on one side of the street during those busy times might.