

CITY OF ANNAPOLIS
160 DUKE OF GLOUCESTER STREET
ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401
410-263-7997



TRANSPORTATION BOARD
CHAIRMAN: ALEX PLINE
VICE CHAIRMAN: CHRISTOPHER P. AIKEN
SECRETARY: AMY JONES

Mayor and City Council
City of Annapolis
160 Duke of Gloucester St.
Annapolis, MD 21401

Re: Recommendation for O-47-16 Extended Hours in Parking District 3

Dear Mr. Mayor and Members of the Council:

The Transportation Board met on October 26, 2016 to discuss O-47-16 Extended Hours in Parking District 3. The board continues to support the extended hours in District 3 per our opinion on O-26-16. We support the wording changes proposed in paragraph (2)(i), but *do not* support the addition of paragraph (2)(ii) of the “Mayor Pantelides Proposed Amendment” which states:

RESIDENTS OF SINGLE FAMILY DWELLINGS OR SINGLE FAMILY ATTACHED DWELLINGS THAT WERE CONSTRUCTED PRIOR TO NOVEMBER 14, 2016 ARE ELIGIBLE FOR PERMITS.

The Board voted 6-1 against this amendment.

Rationale:

The Board continues to oppose allowing new developments in the MX zone to participate in the Special Residential Parking District Program as it is philosophically inconsistent with the goals of an urban mixed use zone as envisioned by the City when the zone was created and sets a bad precedent for subsequent development in the MX zone as stated in our prior recommendation for a similar amendment in O-26-16. While we recognize the efforts by the residents of Uptown at Murray Hill to show there is ample parking supply *at this time*, we believe the pressure on this area – the reason for the legislation in the first place – will only continue to increase as more development occurs along inner West Street.

As to the precedent, one argument made by the supporters of this amendment at our board meetings is that access to the Special Residential Parking Program is a fairness issue with other Murray Hill residents, regardless of zoning and associated parking rules. While this amendment is written in such a way as to include only the Uptown at Murray Hill development, if this amendment is passed it only logically follows that the residents of subsequent MX zone developments will make similar requests with similar justification. As an example, the project under review at 141 West Street several blocks away (SDP2016-032) is a very similar to Uptown at Murray Hill by the same developer with 39 included parking spots for 24 units. The same arguments could be made that this is not enough parking and it is unfair to exclude this development from the Special Residential Parking District Program. If the precedent set it by passing this amendment in O-47-16, there would be no justification for declining such a request.

Furthermore, any amendment that is fundamentally different than the original petition – namely extending the hours of this district – should be brought to the Transportation Board as a separate request. The amendments to the original legislation that allow MX zone residents to obtain permits were initiated because the Transportation Board in the past refused to support stand-alone petitions by Uptown at Murray Hill to participate in the Program.

If you have any questions, concerns, or comments, you can reach me at alex@teampline.org or 443-510-7297.

Respectfully submitted,



Alex Pline
Chair, Transportation Board