



Annapolis Transportation Board

To: Annapolis City Council
Cc: Hilary Raftovich, Cynthia Reuter, Tripp Fulton, Markus Moore, Michael Mallinoff
From: Annapolis Transportation Board
Date: 29 November 2023

Thank you for referring these two proposed ordinances to the Board for review and comment. We have completed our review and offer the following comments for your consideration as you move toward perfecting final ordinances.

Annapolis Transportation Board Comments on proposed [Ordinance 30-23](#)

Parking District 1 No comment, apart from the item immediately below.

Parking District 2 No comment, apart from the item immediately below.

Parking District 3 No comment, apart from the item immediately below.

Parking District 4 No comment, apart from the item immediately below.

Comment on the four items above

We concur with the approach which gives authority to the city manager to promulgate parking rules and regulations. However, an important item is missing from paragraph B of each parking district ordinance, namely an explicit provision for seeking public input prior to their final promulgation, except for brief alterations or for emergencies.

We recommend that explicit language be inserted providing for public comment prior to promulgation of final parking rules and regulations.

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.

Annapolis Transportation Board Comments on proposed Ordinance 31-23

The ATB has reviewed the proposed ordinance and generally approves of the approach and the draft ordinance language, with the following recommendations for revisions:

1. We concur with the approach in 12.20.180, 12.20.185, 12.20.190 which gives authority to the city manager to promulgate parking rules and regulations. An important item is missing from the ordinance, namely an explicit provision for seeking public input prior to their final promulgation, except for brief alterations or for emergencies.

We recommend that explicit language be inserted providing for public comment prior to final promulgation.

2. While 12.32.020 gives the order of precedence for which data sources should prevail between parking map, and parking district street lists in the city code, an important item is missing.

Notwithstanding rules defined by those data sources, parked vehicles must never be penalized for obeying whatever rule is stated visibly on street signage, even if it is incorrect.

We recommend that language be inserted into the code clarifying that enforcement must yield to the advantage of the driver whenever posted signage, and the rule from prevailing data sources, contradict each other.

The old requirement for permit holders to display a parking permit is eliminated.

We recommend that the city consider whether the lack of a visible display will degrade neighbor awareness of compliance, and thereby degrade enforcement.

3. While 12.32.060 references a ‘public hearing,’ the ordinance does not define it prior to the first use of this term. Who calls and conducts such a public hearing, under what circumstances shall it be convened, and what notice requirements pertain to such a hearing?

We recommend that clarifying language be inserted prior to first use of this term.

4. 12.32.070 covering the residential parking permit program is clear and complete.

We approve this section but suggest the addition of a time period for the notice (B.) in advance of a public hearing.

5. 12.32.090 A. The word “any” is incompatible with the word “and” in A.1.

We recommend resolving this incompatibility.

6. The ATB has no comment on provisions extending from 12.32.100 to the end of the proposed ordinance revision.



Kurt Riegel
Chairman, Annapolis Transportation Board

Annapolis Transportation Board Members:

Beth Dolezal
Kurt Riegel (Chairman)
Tom Shock (Vice Chair)
John Giannetti, Jr.
Charles Brooks
David M. DiQuinzio
Vince Harriman
Tara Ashmore
Edward Bergman
Hugh Hayes
Zoë Johnson
Taylor Walters