

Ward One Residents Association

3 Church Circle, PMB 150
Annapolis, MD 21401

July 25, 2013

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

Proposed City Dock Master Plan Ward One Residents Association Position

Mayor Cohen and members of the City Council:

The Ward One Residents Association members and Board respectfully provide the following comments and suggestions:

There are some portions of the City Dock Master Plan that Ward One feels would be positive changes to the downtown. However, if we lose the historic character of downtown, if we drive more businesses into failure, by lack of parking or some other unanticipated consequence, the negative impact will have a direct effect on our home values, business environment, and quality of life.

Changes to City Dock, positive or negative, will most certainly affect Ward One more than any other part of the city. In a broader sense, downtown Annapolis is a treasure for all residents in all Wards. If we take actions that detract from our downtown, this will hurt all Annapolitans. The historic seaport is the single-most valuable asset that differentiates us from the surrounding malls and land-locked areas.

Preserve Annapolis' Historic Seaport

“Annapolis enjoys a national reputation as a desirable place both to live and to visit, based primarily on its history and access to the Chesapeake Bay. These same factors are cited as key advantages for downtown businesses as they compete on both a local and regional basis.” (Orlando Ridout V)

The proposed master plan contains the greatest threat to the preservation of the historic downtown that we've seen in three decades. Specifically, the Plan recommends buildings that are from three to five stories in height on City Dock. Such a drastic change necessarily affects zoning by raising the long-standing height and bulk restrictions. The original intent to place the height and bulk overlay onto our downtown area was triggered by the construction of the Hilton Hotel (now the Marriott), which dwarfs other City Dock buildings and scars the view of the City from the water. There was wide spread agreement then that the building is not a positive asset for the District. That is equally

true today. Why would we want to encourage more, over-sized construction? City Hall is already drafting legislation to allow buildings on Dock Street that rise more than 70 feet above street level – ten feet taller than the Marriott. The combined mass of the new buildings would be 2.3 times the bulk of the Marriott.

The views of Annapolis and City Dock, from the water and across Ego Alley, are our City's multi-million-dollar views. These views are the postcards that attract tourists and new residents. Visitors come to Annapolis because we are “*this captivating city by the Chesapeake Bay that has changed very little since it was founded over 350 years ago*” (Marriott Website). They come here because of Annapolis' unique historic harbor. We are not Baltimore's Inner Harbor, DC, Alexandria, or National Harbor. Our city cannot afford to destroy our heritage and our economy with 70-foot buildings on Dock Street.

Ward One Residents also believe the proposed City Dock Master Plan violates the requirements established in the City's 2009 Comprehensive Plan, which says, in part, “The plan shall deem the public property from the Dock to and including the Market House to be Civic Space for residents of the city.” (p.35). Instead of creating civic space on Dock Street, the proposed Plan calls for the conversion of public property to commercial buildings. This is contrary to the stated goals of the Comprehensive Plan as adopted by the City Council.

We strongly oppose the idea of rezoning this area. As it stands, The City Dock Plan would become an amendment to our Comprehensive Plan. The legislative response to Maryland's *Terrapin Run* decision (2008) established that zoning and development must follow the Comprehensive Plan. If adopted, the change in zoning would not be optional. It would be permanent. Indeed, City Hall is already drafting the new zoning legislation to implement it. If the Plan is adopted, the massive buildings will go up and our City will have to live with the mistake for generations.

Parking

Our second concern is the Plan's elimination of 225 public and private parking spots in the City Dock area without demonstrating an effective parking plan. The City needs to be sure it does not kill downtown businesses or drive more visitor parking into local neighborhoods. Parking is critical to downtown business survival. Main Street and City Dock shops are in competition with Towne Center, Westfield Mall and potentially a new shopping area at Crystal Springs. The business community has reacted loudly to the potential loss of parking for their customers, and their subsequent loss of business. Ward One residents share their concern.

Loading areas are an integral part of the City Dock area as well. Businesses rely on loading areas for commerce; residents wait in them for children after school. The City Dock Plan would remove 42% of total loading area available now. Of the remaining

Ward One Residents Association

space 59% would be flex space – only available as loading area from 7am to 11am. For most of the day the Plan would cut loading area down to 22% of its current maximum value. Ward One Residents believes this would seriously hamper the City Dock economy.

Implementation of the Plan as written would have a catastrophic effect on the economic heart of our City and cause parking mayhem in our neighborhoods. The Ward One Residents Association strongly supports the development of a comprehensive parking and transportation program for downtown. We believe that it is an essential precondition to the implementation of the changes recommended for the City Dock area. The City Dock Plan must include a requirement for a demonstrated, working parking plan to mitigate the parking losses envisioned by this Plan.

Save the Circle

The proposed plan suggests a ‘T’ intersection and a larger Market Plaza adjacent to Market House. The plan also claims an improved flow of pedestrians and traffic through the area.

The T intersection necessarily requires stoplights, however. Ward One Residents object to the introduction of stoplights and the associated pedestrian signals anywhere within the viewshed of Annapolis’ City Dock. As we discussed above, the views of Annapolis are our historic and commercial treasure. The plan, even with underground utilities and pivoting Fawcett’s, clutters the view. Adding stoplights and pedestrian signals will require six to eight stoplights along Randall Street. People do not visit Annapolis for its stoplights.

We believe the traffic studies of the ‘T’ intersection are flawed. Memorial Circle becomes congested for several reasons: traffic backs up on Main St., Randall St. at the light, traffic stops on Compromise St. because the Spa Creek bridge is up; drivers stop at Dock St. look for parking; and pedestrians cross where ever they want to. The traffic studies applied to Memorial Circle and the ‘T’ only considered the effect of the designs on interactions between pedestrians and vehicles within the Randall Street intersections – they did not consider the effects of external congestion. The traffic studies were superficial and do not, in fact, provide realistic solutions to our traffic problems.

The traffic circle has been a prominent feature of that space since 1885. We are especially reluctant to discard a historic element of our landscape because a new configuration “might” be better. The circle was dedicated as a memorial in memory and honor of area military veterans in 1977.

Ward One Residents Association

For all these reasons Ward One Residents oppose adopting the ‘T’ intersection as part of the Master Plan at this time. Rather we should concentrate our efforts on removing or relocating structural obstacles within Hopkins Plaza.

Enhancements

There are a number of elements of the Plan that will help residents and visitors to enjoy our city. We support the widening of sidewalks; pivoting of the old Fawcett’s building out of the Main St. view cone; enhanced waterfront promenade; additional crosswalks; and parks at the Donner Lot and Newman Street. All of these enhancements will serve to make the City Dock area more attractive to residents, visitors, and business customers. A low seawall, sensitively implemented, can protect our low-lying properties without harming the beautiful Historic Seaport brand. And the bike lane on Compromise Street is sorely needed for the safety of our bikers.

In short form, our positions are these: (Detailed analysis follows.)

Support:

- Gradual implementation of the plan enhancements
- Widening sidewalks
- Creating a grand Promenade
- Pivot Fawcett’s and to restore historic viewshed
- Convert Donner surface lot to a park
- Create a park at the bottom of Newman (but not into water)
- Add crosswalks to Compromise Street
- Create a Bike Lane on Compromise Street
- Create a protective Seawall – but lower and more narrow
- Enlarge Hopkins Plaza to make it a more effective gathering space
- Bring back the former crosswalk in front of Market House

Oppose:

- Oppose large, 3-5 story buildings on Dock Street
- Oppose removal of parking without a proven and tested parking plan
- Oppose unbroken, straight lines of sidewalk and seawall along Dock St extending from Randall all the way out to Susan Campbell Park
- Oppose grassy areas around City Dock
- Oppose stoplights
- Oppose T Intersection
- Omission of crosswalk in front of Market House
- Oppose creation of a new management entity with over-reaching powers
- Oppose selling city property
- Oppose the City taking ownership interest in Boat Shows
- Elimination of special exceptions in any of what’s current C2 zone

Community Consensus

In 2011 the City Dock Advisory Committee unanimously adopted its “Visions and Guiding Principles” for the City Dock plan; however, the Advisory Committee was deeply divided over certain aspects of the proposed City Dock Plan. The late Gilbert Renault wrote:

“I have a lot of respect for citizen volunteer committees, so long as they are fairly put together, and I am always reluctant to second-guess them. There were several people on this committee I have nothing but respect for. However, where I think the process may have gone wrong is that the consultants put together a plan without getting consensus or even a majority vote on most of the recommendations.”

As submitted and as approved by the Planning Commission, the Plan does not represent community consensus for a path forward. There are elements of the Plan that did receive support and elements that are intensely controversial. Many of the controversial elements were approved by the Planning Commission despite staunch opposition from the majority of stakeholders representing residents, businesses, historic preservation and maritime. It is now the City Council’s challenge to tease these elements apart and move forward with a City Dock Plan that our whole community can embrace.

We suggest a series of smaller, focused sections that can be considered individually, while in the context of the larger plan. By getting agreement on individual segments of the plan, and by refining those areas that need more discussion and evaluation of alternatives, we believe we can make progress on those areas where there is general agreement.

Sincerely,

Bevin Buchheister, President,
Ward One Residents Association
president@wardone.org

**Ward One Residents Association Analysis and Position
on City Dock Master Plan**

The following comments track with the corresponding pages of the proposed plan:

p. 2: “We embrace the outcome of our efforts yet we note that we are not unanimous...”

In 2011 the City Dock Advisory Committee unanimously adopted its “Visions and Guiding Principles” for the City Dock plan. However the Committee was deeply divided over certain aspects of the final plan. As submitted, and as approved by the Planning Commission, the Plan does not represent community consensus for a path forward. There are elements of the Plan that did receive widespread support. The City Council’s challenge is to tease these elements apart and move forward with a City Dock Plan that our whole community can embrace.

p. 8: “Gradual Improvement with Emphasis on Historic Layout, Scale, Vistas”

The opening phrase of Vision 1 (“Improvements should be made gradually...”) was a temporal statement, not an architectural one. The intent of the committee was that we don’t do everything in the plan all at once, we ease our way into it. Only the last sentence on the page (“*Improvements such as the above should be made gradually in time so that the City can assess how they are working before making the next improvement.*”) has any relation to the heading. The majority of the existing page describes how the Dock Street sidewalk gradually gets wider as you walk along it. The sidewalk should be addressed under its own heading elsewhere. This page needs to lay down the marker that the Master Plan is a 20-year vision; that different parts will be implemented at different times; and that as we implement portions we need to test them for effectiveness and course-correct as necessary. A central element of this concept is sequencing: for example one must reposition the old Fawcett’s building before building seawall in that area and one must identify a home for the Harbormaster before blowing up his building. The plan should explicitly address what sequencing is envisioned.

p. 8: Dock Street Sidewalk

“Widening the sidewalk while holding its new edge parallel to the bulkhead rather than to the buildings has the effect of creating an increasingly wider pedestrian zone along the building frontage as the sidewalk extends eastward to Craig Street.”

Ward One Residents agrees that the sidewalk out past Storm Bros. should be wide enough to accommodate pedestrians, café tables, and small shade trees. We disagree, however, with “holding the new edge parallel to the bulkhead.” This creates a hard, straight line that looks like it belongs in a mall. It is out of character with its surroundings. The

Ward One Residents Association

facades of the buildings in the City Dock area reflect the early shoreline.¹ Their irregularity imparts a unique character that is part of what Annapolis is all about. Rather than ignoring that character we should emphasize it. We believe the sidewalk should follow the building frontage, growing wider by replacing the parallel parking spots in that area with sidewalk.

p. 10 & 11: Viewshed and Old Fawcett's Building

Ward One Residents endorses the plan's vision to restore the historic viewshed from the bottom of Main Street by repositioning the old Fawcett's building.

p. 11: Scale and New Buildings

Ward One Residents hastens to add, however, that more than one viewshed is important. The views of Annapolis and City Dock, from the water and across Ego Alley, are our City's multi-million-dollar views. **These views are the postcards that attract tourists and new residents.** Visitors come to Annapolis because we are "*this captivating city by the Chesapeake Bay that has changed very little since it was founded over 350 years ago*" (Marriott Website). They come here because **of Annapolis' unique** historic harbor. We **are not** Baltimore's Inner Harbor, D.C. , Alexandria , or National Harbor. The views of Historic Annapolis are an integral part of the City's "Beautiful Historic Seaport" brand. We must protect our brand, not compromise it.

The importance of the views of Historic Annapolis is already recognized by City Law ("*21.62.060: Scenic, historical, archaeological and landmark sites and features that are located on or adjacent to the proposed development shall be preserved and protected to the maximum extent as practicable through site design, building location, and parking layout. Special consideration shall be given to the impact of projects on views of the Annapolis historic district from the following points: 1. From Eastport and the City dock; ...*"). The suggestion of large buildings on Dock Street is contrary to law.

These proposed large buildings would dwarf any structures presently around City Dock with the exception of the Halsey Field House. Planning & Zoning testified to the Historic Preservation Commission they were preparing legislation which would permit these buildings to rise up seventy one feet above street level. That is ten feet taller than the sixty-one foot Marriott Hotel on the other side of Ego Alley. To determine bulk we measured the Marriott and the proposed buildings on Google Maps and multiplied by

¹ See: "The Shorelines of Annapolis Market Slip" on Planning & Zoning's City Dock website: <http://www.ci.annapolis.md.us/Government/Departments/PlZon/CDAC/Images/Shorelines%20of%20Annapolis%20Market%20Slip%20v2.pdf>

Ward One Residents Association

height². In aggregate the proposed buildings would have 2.3 times the bulk of the Marriott. Imagine two and a third Marriott's on Dock Street, while remembering that the Marriott (then Hilton) building itself was the impetus to create the City's existing height and bulk laws. The current zoning proposal in 0-7-13, which would govern the Compromise St. side of City Dock would change the height district from 32 feet to 38 feet but would also add about 5-7 feet for the newly required FEMA flood protection elevation measurement. This increase in height district along with the FEMA requirements would actually allow for buildings that are 45 feet high. Going from 32 feet to 45 feet results in a 13 foot increase. While the FEMA requirement is non negotiable, we do not believe it automatically requires the loss of useable building space to be compensated for by adding to the overall height of a building, especially when there is a height limit that serves a well established and important public purpose like historic preservation.

Ward One Residents are acutely aware that the proposed City Dock Master Plan would amend the City's Comprehensive Plan. When that occurs, then according to the Terrapin Run case decided by the MD Court of Appeals, the zoning in any areas identified in the plan would have to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. As mentioned above, Planning & Zoning was already preparing legislation to change the zoning, height, and bulk regulations before public input on the final plan was even heard. Once started, this process cannot be stopped – and it will be permanent. If our community makes a mistake on the Circle vs. Tee decision, we can move the curbs around and fix it. But once 70-foot buildings are constructed on Dock Street they will be there for generations.

Accordingly, Ward One Residents strongly objects to rezoning which would allow the introduction of three to five story buildings on any portion of Dock Street. The buildings would be completely out of scale and mass with the rest of City Dock. We should not repeat the mistakes of the past and allow Ego Alley to be framed on both sides by buildings that damage the viewshed, are out of scale, and detract from our historic City. Introduction of these tall buildings on City Dock would damage Annapolis's brand, lessen tourism, and thereby damage our entire City's economy.

Further, as described earlier, the location of the façades of the existing buildings describe the historic shoreline and give the area character. One characteristic of the Dock Street layout is that as one proceeds out the street the space opens up, becoming wider and wider, until finally, one comes to the water's edge. Expanding the footprint of the buildings would cramp this sense of expansion and bury the lines of the old shoreline.

² The footprint of the Marriott tower is 222' x 72'. Times 61' high = 975,024 cubic feet. The proposed buildings have a combined frontage on Dock St. of 305'. (This includes the Guzzi Building and excludes Craig Street.) The block is 105' deep times 71' high = 2,273,775 cubic feet.

Ward One Residents Association

Ward One Residents also believe the proposed City Dock Master Plan violates the requirements established in the City's 2009 Comprehensive Plan, which says, in part, "The plan shall deem the public property from the Dock to and including the Market House to be Civic Space for residents of the city." (p.35) Instead of creating civic space on Dock Street, the proposed Plan calls for the conversion of public property to commercial buildings. This is contrary to the stated goals of the Comprehensive Plan as adopted by the City Council.

Ward One Residents endorses removing the Dockmaster building provided that an alternate location is available to provide the Dockmaster and our waterborne guests the equivalent functionality. The Dockmaster building provides a visual wall and intrudes on the open space of outer Dock Street. However, the visual wall now serves to camouflage parked cars, and since the proposed plan also calls for cars to park in the area adjacent to Susan Campbell Park, the City must seriously consider whether it's removal would be an improvement of the view. The City also has a fiduciary duty to ensure that if the current dockmaster's building is abandoned, that the new dockmaster's home is owned by the City and not leased.

p. 12: Parks and Open Spaces

Ward One Residents endorses the conversion of the Donner Parking Lot into public park space provided that mitigation is available to address the parking spaces lost. If mitigation is not available in the vicinity then this area should be designed as flex space that can accommodate parking and open space at different times according to need.

Ward One Residents endorses the conversion of Newman Street between Compromise and Ego Alley into a public park. This park could lead visitors and pedestrians from the waterfront promenade up to one of the cherished downtown areas, especially for those with kids in tow, the Newman Street playground. We have a great opportunity to use this public space to connect the special areas of downtown that are currently disconnected or hidden from visitors. However we do not believe the park should descend into the water on Dock Street because the water quality is so bad in this area of limited flushing and dense waterfowl that results in unhealthy bacteria levels. We believe this could serve as an "attractive nuisance" and expose the City to liability.

Ward One Residents opposes the creation of a grassy area on Susan Campbell Park. The area would attract dog walkers, as the goose park now does, and become unsanitary. Its close proximity to the shoreline would promote rapid stormwater runoff of fertilizers, pesticides and soil into Spa Creek and the already nutrient impaired Bay.

Ward One Residents endorses the "Public/Private Spaces" recommended by the Plan. We believe sidewalk seating for our restaurants has enhanced the quality of our downtown.

p. 13: Market Square

Ward One Residents Association

In the proposed Market Square area we believe the City should remove the structures that render Hopkins Plaza ineffective as a Plaza – the walls and memorials. The signage for the Kunta Kinte Memorial should be moved closer to the Alex Haley statue and should not be separated by a street to effectively tell the whole story. The City should work with the existing footprint of the plaza and put their efforts into making Hopkins Plaza into an effective and attractive plaza before we put significant effort into making it a bigger one.

Ward One Residents endorses the widening of sidewalks in Market Space by conversion of diagonal parking to parallel parking. This, too, can improve the effectiveness of Hopkins Plaza.

p. 14: Promenade

Ward One Residents endorses the promenade along the water proposed in the Plan. However, in outer Dock Street we believe the back of the Promenade (and the seawall) should jog towards the water, following the line of the bulkhead. The Plan should not create a straight-line element that extends all the way from Randall St. out to Susan Campbell Park. This is Annapolis's waterfront, not someplace else's, and the irregularities give it character. A straight-line element of the proposed length is out of scale in Annapolis.

p. 16: Circle vs. Tee Intersection

As mentioned in the Plan, the Citizen's Committee was divided over the replacement of Memorial Circle with a Tee intersection. The Plan *"features a T intersection ... while recognizing that more community discussion will need to be devoted to this question."* Ward One Residents couldn't agree more that more community discussion is needed. While the Tee intersection has certain benefits, it is problematic in areas as well. And it's design is actually to slow the flow of cars through the already congested City Dock area.

Ward One Residents strongly opposes the introduction of traffic signals on Randall Street – both at the foot of Main and the intersection of Dock and Randall. The Tee intersection would require six to eight traffic lights and poles as well as poles for pedestrian control signals. The signals would add prominent visual clutter to Annapolis's most precious viewscape. Who wants to look at Annapolis and see stoplights? We think this would be ill advised and runs contrary to the plan to restore the historic viewshed by moving the old Fawcetts building from the viewshed.

Second, we believe the traffic simulations used to study the Circle vs. Tee question were flawed in that they excluded the effects of traffic congestion outside the City Dock study area. Any resident will tell you that one of the key contributors to congestion at Memorial Circle is traffic backing up on Main Street and into the Circle. The Tee vs. Circle traffic simulations omitted this important factor. Hence the claim that the Tee

Ward One Residents Association

improves the flow of traffic and pedestrians through the area is invalid. Additional simulations would be required to determine what is valid.

Third, we are concerned about the abandonment of the Circle in light of the fact that a traffic circle has been a prominent feature of that space since 1885. Considering the time, effort and monetary investment each property owner in the historic district has devoted to preserving the historic elements of our downtown, we especially reluctant to discard a historic element of our landscape because a new configuration “might” be better.

Finally, the circle was dedicated as a memorial in memory and honor of area military veterans in 1977. Ward One Residents objects to simply removing the memorial without a plan to replace it.

For all these reasons Ward One Residents strongly opposes adopting the Tee intersection as part of the Master Plan at this time. Rather we should concentrate our efforts on removing or relocating structural obstacles within Hopkins Plaza to make that area more effective for congregation than it is now.

p. 18 Pedestrian-ization

Ward One Residents supports the improved “pedestrian-ization” of the City Dock area described in the Plan. The third element of the Advisory Committee’s vision was a “... high quality pedestrian-oriented and walkable public open space...”. Many elements of the Plan support this vision.

In particular Ward One Residents supports the crosswalks introduced across Compromise Street at Newman and St. Mary’s Streets and across Dock Street at Craig Street. (We have our doubts about the value of the crosswalks spanning Dock Street in the middle of both blocks, however.)

Ward One Residents call on the City to bring back the crosswalk in front of the Market House and reconnect Market House with the water. We notice on a daily basis pedestrians who step over the chain link fence in front of the Market house to forge their own “goat path” to the water. This is the natural flow to walk to the water and should be restored.

p. 19: Bike Lane on Compromise Street

If there’s only room for one bike lane it should be on the Southbound (single lane) side of the street. Cars can swerve around bikes on the two-lane side but there isn’t room to do so on the one-lane side. We would prefer to give up some of the sidewalk to support bike lanes going in both directions.

p. 20 Parking

Ward One Residents Association

The proposed plan calls for the replacement of parking space with buildings, seawall, and pedestrian space. As a result 225 automobile parking spaces, both public and private, will be lost. The Plan also removes 365 linear feet of commercial loading area. (See Appendix.) This is not surprising – since most of the area is parking now, one can't change much of anything at City Dock without having an effect on parking. The business community has reacted loudly to the potential loss of parking for their customers, and their subsequent loss of business. Ward One residents share their concern, for we believe that a vibrant business community is vital to the downtown. Further, we know where those cars are going to go looking for parking spaces – into our residential areas that already have inadequate parking. Implementation of the Plan as written would have a catastrophic effect on the economic heart of our City.

Loading areas are also an integral part of commerce in the City Dock area. Without the ability to bring in truckloads of product, retailers and restaurants in the area could not survive. Residents use the loading areas as well, waiting for their children in the afternoons when school lets out. The official loading areas (on Prince George and in Market Space) are demonstrably inadequate: one need not spend much time at City Dock to see a variety of creative ad hoc solutions by truck and bus drivers. The City Dock Plan would remove 365 linear feet of ad hoc loading area – 42% of total loading area available now. Of the remaining space 59% would be flex space – only available as loading area from 7am to 11am. For most of the day the Plan would cut loading area down to 22% of its current value. Ward One Residents believes this would seriously hamper the City Dock economy.

In its *Visions and Guiding Principles*, the Advisory Committee recommended:

“Develop a comprehensive parking program for downtown. Such a program would ameliorate losses in parking by including better wayfinding signage and smart technologies (such as flexible pricing for parking), a greater mix of transportation modes (bikes, shuttles, water taxis, and public transit), an emphasis on expanding off-street capacity and maximizing the use of garages, and “cheap and experimental” ways to study and implement innovative parking ideas. A parking program would also be coordinated with local businesses to provide support to them and take into account the seasonality of uses and parking needs and to further study a host of additional parking options.” (p. 23)

Instead of a comprehensive program, the City Dock Plan presents a simplistic outline – one paragraph – of seven steps the City might take to address automobile parking and presents it as “The Parking Plan”. The Plan does not address commercial loading areas at all. In no way is this paragraph a plan for parking management. Neither the Transportation Department nor anyone else has developed a plan for managing parking in City Dock or elsewhere in downtown. Because of this, the proposals outlined in the City Dock Master Plan lack credibility.

Ward One Residents Association

The Ward One Residents Association strongly supports the development of a comprehensive parking program for downtown. We believe that it is an essential precondition to the implementation of most changes recommended for the City Dock area. Not only must the City develop a plan, it must implement the plan and demonstrate that it can manage parking for the benefit of our businesses and residents before it will have the credibility to remove 225 parking spaces and forty percent of the loading zones. The City Dock Plan must include a requirement for a demonstrated, working parking plan to mitigate the parking losses envisioned by this Plan. Ward One has an active and dedicated Parking Committee that is currently working on recommendations for both the residential area and the business areas.

p. 23, Flood Control

Ward One Residents endorses the installation of back-flow preventers and eventual pumping station to prevent ordinary tidal and storm flooding of City Dock. Such “nuisance” flooding occurs several times a year. Future projects to overhaul bulkheads, seawalls, and street ends should include mitigation of nuisance flooding.

Ward One Residents supports the long-term idea of installing measures to address flood and sea-level rise. If no other less intrusive option is available, we support a partial seawall, disguised as planter and benches, and other flood control measures described in the plan. But it is critically important to both the pedestrian experience and to the viewsheds of Annapolis that the wall be low. We believe it should be restricted to a maximum of three feet above grade and that other, deployable means be explored to protect the flood plain from higher water.

The plan should be amended to make Annapolis’s creation of a seawall explicitly contingent on the United States Naval Academy’s commitment to build a connecting seawall or equivalent structure on their property. If our seawall is open at one end flooding will simply go around it.

The graphics on pp. 14 and 15 shows the seawall as ten feet wide. Barring an unstated engineering reason we think this is excessive. Its mass would become a dominant feature of the City Dock landscape. Half that width should be sufficient.

The Master Plan fails to address storm water retention other than to mention in passing that the concept exists (p.24). Stormwater retention is a critical element for flood control and for improving the safety and quality of the water in Spa Creeek and the Chesapeake Bay. Forward thinking cities like the District of Columbia and Lancaster City Pa. have utilized public spaces to collect stormwater in underground cisterns and then either slowly release the water when flooding is not a concern, or they treat it and reuse it to create a public amenity like fountains and ices skating rinks. (see Canal Park in D.C). With stormwater causing much of the downtown flooding, Annapolis should consider using our public space on City Dock more creatively and effectively.

Ward One Residents Association

p. 25: Public Art

Ward One Residents endorses public art in the City Dock environment.

p. 28: Management Entity

Ward One Residents endorses the concept of a small management entity to look after and promote downtown and the City Dock area. While the concept of a Business Improvement District may have merit, it requires approval from a supermajority of properties in the area. This is unlikely so we suggest the City have realistic expectations and find funding from other sources.

Ward One Residents objects to the management entity having any interest in the sale of City Property. None of City Dock is for sale. Were anything to come up for sale, the decisions and the disposition of funds should be reserved to the City Council.

Ward One Residents objects to the suggestion that the City take an ownership interest in the Boat Shows. The City has no business inserting itself into a private enterprise. Further, the Boat Shows actually work for the benefit of our City. We cannot afford to have the City run the Boat Shows the way they've run Market House.

p. 30: Land Use

Graphic: The graphic shows that the buildings in the first block of Dock Street just below Randall and on the south side of Prince George, are in the C1A zone. The existing zoning map on the P&Z website shows the entire first block of Dock Street as C2. The Citizen's Committee did not discuss rezoning this block at all. We believe this is the graphical equivalent of a typo that must be fixed before the Plan becomes adopted as policy.

Ward One Residents objects to the recommendation that all permitted uses in the "Development Areas" should be "by right" uses not subject to special exception. We believe that where a use mirrors an identical use in the adjacent C2 zone, the allowed use should be identical. To do otherwise will set up inequities between one set of properties and others nearby – some sharing common property lines. We'll never hear the end of it.

Ward One Residents objects to the call to remove the billboard on Dock Street. Whether one likes it or not, the billboard is part of what gives Annapolis its character as an authentic town and makes this a real City, not Disneyland. If the Plan is successful in reinvigorating the City Dock area, the billboard will fall to new development in due course. The City Dock Plan doesn't need to pick this fight.

Appendix A: Automobile Parking Spaces

In the study area (Dock St around to Newman St) there are 345 existing automobile parking spaces:



(Source: City of Annapolis)

Outer Dock St	130
Inner Dock St	68
Market Space	41
Memorial Circle	16
Donner Lot	24
City's Newman St. Lot (a.k.a. "Fleet Lot")	28
Fawcett's (provided by owner)	38

Total	345

Ward One Residents Association

In the Proposed City Dock Plan there are 120 spaces:



(Source: Annapolis City Dock Master Plan, p.20)

Outer Dock St	54
Inner Dock St	35
Market Space	18
Tee Intersection	13

Total	120

$345-120 = 225$ Automobile parking spaces removed (65%)

The Plan shows 27 spaces on lower Main St. We've omitted those from our calculation as Main St. isn't part of City Dock and doesn't appear to change from the present. We counted 25 cars parked in that block of Main on Google Maps, with the view of several spaces obscured by trees.

Appendix B: Loading Areas

There are two official loading zones in the City Dock study area: Thirty feet of curb on Prince George behind the Phillip’s building and the entire curb of Market Space which lies alongside Market House and Hopkins Plaza. The Market Space loading zone is “Flex space” – it is only a Loading Zone from 7am to 11am. The rest of the day the space is devoted to automobile parking.

There are other areas around City Dock that are consistently used as ad hoc loading zones. Busses line the edges of Susan Campbell Park waiting for their passengers to return from the harbor tour. Trucks park alongside the traffic islands in Memorial Circle and on the painted traffic island in Inner Dock Street. These ad hoc loading areas are in daily use and are an accepted part of commerce at City Dock.



(Source: Ward One Residents Association)

For this analysis we assume the “official” loading zones remain intact – both flex and permanent. The proposed plan doesn’t substantially change their locations. The plan has a large effect on ad hoc loading areas, however. We identified and measured these spaces.

Ward One Residents Association

Ward One Residents Association

Current Loading Areas:

	Linear Feet
<u>Permanent Loading Zones</u>	
Prince George St (behind Phillip's)	30
 <u>Flex Loading Zone (7-11am only)</u>	
Market Space behind MH & Plaza	260
 <u>Ad Hoc Loading Zones</u>	
Outer Dock St (busses - along SC Park)	205
Inner Dock Street	80
Beside Market House	65
Memorial Circle	165

Total	805

Proposed Loading Areas:

	Linear Feet
<u>Permanent Loading Zones</u>	
Prince George St (behind Phillip's)	30
 <u>Flex Loading Zone (7-11am only)</u>	
Market Space behind MH & Plaza	260
 <u>Ad Hoc Loading Zones</u>	
Outer Dock St (busses - along SC Park)	150

Ward One Residents Association

Inner Dock Street (street too narrow)	0
Beside Market House (converted to traffic lane)	0
Tee Intersection	0

Total	440

805-440 = 365 Linear feet of loading area removed (42%). Of the remaining loading area 59% would only be effective from 7am to 11am.