

SPECIAL MEETING  
September 30, 2013

The Special Meeting of the Annapolis City Council was held on September 30, 2013 in the Council Chamber. Mayor Cohen called the meeting to order at 7:06 p.m.

Present on Roll Call: Mayor Cohen, Aldermen Budge, Paone, Alderwomen Hoyle, Finlayson, Aldermen Kirby, Arnett

Absent on Roll Call: Alderman Littmann arrived at 8:35 p.m., and Alderman Pfeiffer arrived at 7:10 p.m.

Staff Present: Assistant City Manager Burke, City Attorney Hardwick, Planning Zoning Director Arason, Chief of Comprehensive Planning Nash

PETITIONS, REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Comments by the General Public

Grant Dehart, 138 Lafayette Avenue, Annapolis, Maryland 21401 spoke on the City Dock Master Plan Draft, and on Alderman Budge's proposed amendments.

Denise Worthen, 65 Southgate Avenue, Annapolis, Maryland 21401 representing Murray Hill Residents Association spoke on Alderman Budge's proposed amendments and the City Dock Master Plan Draft.

Lew Bearden 1301 Tar Cove Road, Pasadena, Maryland 21122 representing the Fleet Reserve Club spoke in favor of Alderman Budge's Amendments.

Dick Damato, 6 E. Lake Drive, Annapolis, Maryland 21403 representing Mr. Gary Jobson spoke on the City Dock Master Plan Draft and sea level rise. Alderman Budge's proposed amendments.

Bill Kardash, 1 Acton Place, Annapolis, Maryland 21401 spoke on budget issues and Mary O'Brien's report on workers' compensation.

Elly Tierney, 85 East Street, Annapolis, Maryland 21401 spoke on the Flood Mitigation Plan included in the City Dock Master Plan Draft and in favor of Alderman Budge's amendments.

Chip Johnson, 2020 12<sup>th</sup> Street, NW Washington, DC 20009 representing Annapolis Business Association spoke in favor of Alderman Budge's Amendments.

Ann Fligsten, 1337 Kin Loch Circle, Arnold, Maryland 21012 spoke on the City Dock Master Plan Draft and O-7-13.

Bevin Buchheister, 5 Wagner Street, Annapolis, Maryland 21401 spoke on the City Dock Master Plan Draft, Alderman Budge's amendments and requested the City Council include the public's input in the decision making process.

Michael Pantelides, 128 S. Southwood Avenue, Annapolis, Maryland 21401 spoke in opposition to the City Dock Master Plan Draft, and spoke on O-7-13.

Debbie Gosslin, 980 Awald Road, Annapolis, Maryland 21403 spoke on Alderman Budge's amendments and in opposition to the "T" Intersection proposed in the City Dock Master Plan Draft.

- Mayor Cohen declared petitions, reports and communications closed.

LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS on RESOLUTION – 2<sup>ND</sup> READER

**R-49-12**            **2012 City Dock Master Plan - For the purpose of adopting the Draft City Dock Master Plan as an addendum to the 2009 Annapolis Comprehensive Plan. *"For the purpose of considering amendments"***

Planning and Zoning Director Arason and Chief of Comprehensive Planning Nash were present and answered questions from Council.

Chris Jakubiak, 222 Courthouse Court, Suite 1 C, Towson, Maryland 21204 representing Jakubiak Town & City Planning was present and answered questions from Council.

Development Consultant Caroline Moore, 3430 2nd Street, Suite 320 Baltimore, MD 21225 representing Ekistics, LLC was present and answered questions from Council.

- Alderman Budge moved to adopt R-49-12 on second reading. Seconded.
- Alderman Arnett moved to amend R-49-12 as follows:

City Dock Master Plan Major Consideration Areas: DRAFT dated September 23, 2013, Staff Recommendation # 2 Management Entity on page 28, to delete Staff Amendment #2 as follows:

On page 28, strike

“A. Management Entity on City Dock

The creation of a management entity on City Dock was one of the six principles agreed to by the City Dock Advisory Committee and is therefore listed as the first supporting strategy. This Plan recommends that the Mayor and City Council create by ordinance a City Dock Management District and a Management Authority. The Authority should be run as a public-private organization authorized to raise and expend revenues within a City Dock Management District. A Board of governance should be composed of Annapolis citizens who share a commitment to the broad principles laid out by the City Dock Advisory Committee and are committed to implementing the City Dock Master Plan including representation of businesses on Dock and Market Streets. The Authority should work to promote the economic vitality and revitalization of City Dock.

The responsibilities of the Authority should include managing supplemental upkeep on City Dock. The Authority would not have primary responsibility for maintaining City Dock, which is a function of the City of Annapolis. However, some upkeep, such as seasonal planting or cleanup after special events, might readily be undertaken by the Authority. Second, the Authority could provide supplemental security of public and/or public-private spaces. Third, the Authority should manage and license events on City Dock. Fourth, the Authority should facilitate the installation of public art and arts programming in the public spaces on City Dock, along with others qualified to decide what public art should go where and when. Fifth, the Authority should have a voice in the management of parking on City Dock, being an advocate for the transition contemplated in this Plan toward parking management and public spaces. Lastly, the Authority should advocate for and educate the public about the City Dock Master Plan in support of its implementation and updating over time.

Possible sources of funding for the Authority, in support of a full time Executive Director and small staff, should include City and County general funds, the sale and lease of city owned properties on City Dock, a portion of Boat Show license fees, mooring and docking fees, license fees for events on City Dock, and approved commercial use or concessions on public spaces. The Authority should also raise revenues through a tax on property located within the District and through contributions, donations, grants and revenues from Authority sponsored special events. If the Authority, acting in concert with the City, were to acquire an interest in the Annapolis Boat Show, annual revenues could accrue to the public for ongoing improvements on City Dock. The full potential of this should be explored in the near term.”

And replace with Alderman Budge’s Amendment 9:

“The management of City Dock should be coordinated year-round. The purview of any management function or entity should include the programming of public space, ensuring trash pick-up and cleanliness, reducing clutter, monitoring the progress of implementing visions for City Dock, collecting data, incorporating feedback, coordinating marketing, and supervising Market House operations. This

management should support local businesses as well and help them to thrive. Furthermore, the management should advocate for City Dock and protect the historic core. The management of City Dock should receive input from and be responsive to the key stakeholder organizations in the City representing the business community, residents, visitors, and major property owners within the City Dock area.” Seconded. CARRIED on voice vote.

- Alderman Arnett moved to amend R-49-12 as follows:

City Dock Master Plan Major Consideration Areas: DRAFT dated September 23, 2013, Staff Recommendation #5 Amortizing nonconforming billboards, on page 30, in the Annapolis City Dock Master Plan, A Framework to Guide Improvements & Redevelopment DRAFT dated December 2012, strike the last paragraph on page 30 as follows:

“The aim of one of the first zoning amendments for City Dock should be a provision that requires the removal of the non-conforming billboard sign on Dock Street after a reasonable amortization period, for instance, five years.”

And replace with the following text:

"The plan recommends a provision that requires the removal of the non-conforming billboard signs on Dock Street by appropriate legislation, as provided for under state law". Seconded. CARRIED on voice vote.

Actions beginning 9/30/13:

- Alderman Budge moved to amend R-49-12 as follows with Alderman Budge's Amendment #6. Seconded.

On page 9, modify last sentence as follows:

This potential is particularly achievable, if the ~~opportunity to convert Memorial Circle to a more space efficient T intersection is taken~~, as streetscape is modified by either the T intersection or the shift-circle option that are discussed later in the Plan.

On page 13, delete last sentence of second paragraph:

Presently Market House and Hopkins Plaza together comprise 16,000 square feet. As proposed in this Plan, the total space would approximate 22,800 square feet. The square in front of market house could extend 150 feet from the edge of Market House toward Main Street and 100 feet across from Market Place to Randall Street. Businesses with sidewalk frontage could extend out into Market Space or at least onto the proposed wider sidewalks which would extend 24 to 30 feet from the building's edge. ~~Beginning at the approaches from all directions, the intersection would become a slow moving environment through the use of textured pavement and other means to calm traffic.~~

On page 16, amend first paragraph:

The most prominent example of transition toward balance can be found in the Plan's approach to the intersection of Compromise, Main, and Randall. While the City Dock Advisory Committee could not find consensus on how best to address this intersection, the Plan does recognize that ~~converting~~ shifting Memorial Circle or converting the Circle to a "T" intersection is an are opportunityies to improve the pedestrian experience and create useable public spaces. Therefore the Plan features a "T" intersection with Randall Street intersecting Compromise and Main at a right angle, while recognizing that more community discussion will need to be devoted to this question. ~~This adjustment to the physical layout of City Dock would reduce weekend traffic delays and back-ups during the spring and summer months when traffic is heaviest and have other traffic flow benefits. More~~

detail regarding how the “T” intersection operates is provided in Section F. Improving traffic flow at City Dock remains a challenge due to its dual nature: During the week cars drive through City Dock. On weekends visitors coming to City Dock are added to that traffic, creating a more congested environment. Changes that may improve one will impact the other. Improved traffic operations are not the only benefit of a new intersection; the main public benefit is the balance it brings to the flow of cars and pedestrians year round while allowing useable public space at Market House and the Alex Haley Memorial.

On page 16, append after the last paragraph:

However, several concerns have been cited regarding the “T” intersection. These include the increased automotive transit times through the intersection during normal operation, the elimination of most of the “ad hoc” loading zones in the Study Area, the elimination of a historical element of the streetscape, the introduction of traffic signals into the City’s most prominent viewshed, the elimination of the Veteran’s Memorial, and that the intersection and numerous traffic signals are out of character with the existing urban design of our baroque city plan. Some of these concerns might be addressed by the inclusion of a circular element in the design of the new Market Square.

On page 17, amend as follows:

As mentioned earlier, CDAC has not found consensus on how best to address the intersection. Other options were designed and studied, including a modification to the current roundabout. If the City adopted a Modified Circle option (shown on this page), the lanes entering and within the circle would be narrowed and the circle would be shifted northward on Main Street. This would free up space that could be added to Hopkins Plaza and along the water (shown in orange in the large exhibit below). The Circle has been proven as safe, as there have been no accidents during the study period. Most of the time traffic flows well and without delay. Backups can be addressed by improved crossings leading up to the circle. In addition the Modified Circle option recognizes that a circle at the intersection has been an element of the landscape for over 125 years and currently serves as a Memorial to our City’s military veterans. Traffic engineering evaluations of this option revealed it offered no improvements to existing traffic operations, ~~largely because a roundabout in an urban context like City Dock cannot account for the conflicting movements of pedestrians and vehicles and the variety of offsetting intersection approaches. As cars yield to pedestrians, traffic inevitably backs up into the circle.~~ Further, access to the parking along the buildings at the intersection ~~would~~ might have to be limited to right-hand turns from Green Street - this requires additional study.

The other option considered was a traditional traffic circle enclosing pedestrian space similar to Church Circle and State Circle. This option had the advantage of enclosing a large amount of public open space but was judged impractical because pedestrians would have to cross multiple lanes of traffic to enter the encircled public space. The option of doing nothing is also an option that the City may wish to take. The drawbacks of making no changes to the intersection are that there can be no gains in public space or improvements to the pedestrian environment. ~~New pedestrian crossings cannot be introduced under the currently configured circle without risking pedestrian safety.~~

In sum, because the main transition envisioned by the community is one toward balance and away from car dominance, the intersection of Compromise, Main, and Randall demands much attention. Getting to a balance does require physical changes to the intersection that must be evaluated further. ~~The most frequently cited concern about the “T” intersection is that it might create new or increased traffic congestion. The City’s consulting engineer Sabra Wang Associates, Inc. evaluated this and determined that a “T” intersection improves overall traffic conditions as discussed previously. The other concern raised about the “T” intersection speaks to aesthetics, viewsheds, and historic context. These too are~~

~~important concerns to embrace and, in so doing, one must recall how the current context in which a raised traffic island in the center of the intersection, planted with 14 foot tall trees, impedes views to and from the water. The current circle is a “within living memory” feature of City Dock.~~

The City will prepare, for Council approval, a plan for the two Randall Street intersections and crosswalks in the Study Area which considers the area’s dual role as both a destination and a throughway, gathering space for pedestrians, pedestrian and bicycle access to and through City Dock, wayfinding, bus and truck access, loading, and unloading, and the constraints of the historical context. This plan will include factors both inside and outside the Study Area that contribute to the congestion at City Dock such as the existing stoplights on Main and Randall Streets and the Spa Creek Drawbridge, and the potential impact of the plan’s implementation on routes outside the study area. This transportation plan is inextricably linked to “the parking plan described on page 20.”. Seconded. CARRIED on voice vote.

On page 13, of the City Dock Master Plan DRAFT, un-strike the last sentence of the second paragraph:

"Beginning at the approaches from all directions, the intersection would become a slow moving environment through the use of textured pavement and other means to clam traffic. Seconded. CARRIED on voice vote.

On page 13, of the City Dock Master Plan DRAFT, in the last sentence of the second paragraph strike "would" and insert the word "can." Seconded. CARRIED on voice vote.

On page 16, amend first paragraph of the City Dock Master Plan DRAFT amend as follows:

After the word “intersection” strike "operates" and insert "options” Seconded. CARRIED on voice vote.

- Alderman Arnett moved to amend Alderman Budge Amendment #6 as follows:

On page 16, amend first paragraph of the City Dock Master Plan DRAFT after the word “discussion” insert “, informed with the benefit of research,” Seconded. CARRIED on voice vote.

On page 13, of the City Dock Master Plan DRAFT in last sentence of the second paragraph delete the word “would” and insert “can” Seconded. CARRIED on voice vote.

- Alderman Budge moved his amendment #6 as follows:

On page 16, append after the last paragraph:

However, several concerns have been cited regarding the “T” intersection. These include the increased automotive transit times through the intersection during normal operation, the elimination of most of the “ad hoc” loading zones in the Study Area, the elimination of a historical element of the streetscape, the introduction of traffic signals into the City’s most prominent view shed, the elimination of the Veteran’s Memorial, and that the intersection and numerous traffic signals are out of character with the existing urban design of our baroque city plan. Some of these concerns might be addressed by the inclusion of a circular element in the design of the new Market Square. Seconded. CARRIED on voice vote.

- Alderman Budge moved his amendment #6, on page 16, amend the last paragraph as follows:

On page 16, amend the last paragraph, to strike “by the inclusion of a circular element” Seconded. CARRIED on voice vote.

- Alderman Budge moved his amendment #6, on page 16, amend the last paragraph as follows:

After the word “concerns” strike “might” and insert “must”. Seconded. CARRIED on voice vote.

On page 17, top of the page, amend as follows:

In the first sentence strike after the word address “the”

To delete “The Circle has been proven as safe, as there have been no accidents during the study period. Most of the time traffic flows well and without delay. Backups can be addressed by improved crossings leading up to the circle. In addition the Modified Circle option recognizes that a circle at the intersection has been an element of the landscape for over 125 years and currently serves as a Memorial to our City’s military veterans.”

To strike the following language “, largely because a roundabout in an urban context like City Dock cannot account for the conflicting movements of pedestrians and vehicles and the variety of offsetting intersection approaches. As cars yield to pedestrians, traffic inevitably backs up into the circle.”

To strike after the word intersection “would”

To insert after the word Street “;” and delete “-” Seconded. CARRIED on voice vote.

- Alderman Budge moved his amendment #8.

To delete the last 2 paragraphs on page 23, and replace with:

The entire City Dock Study Area lies within an identified floodplain area. FEMA rules no longer allow for either major renovations or construction of ~~new buildings~~ habitable space within a floodplain. Although FEMA does not have jurisdiction over construction at City Dock, their rules mean habitable space built below the 100-year flood plain will be uninsured and ineligible for disaster assistance in future flood events. In order to allow rehabilitation of existing buildings and the creation of new ones, the Historic District’s height regulations should be modified to begin height measurement at grade or at the flood protection elevation, whichever is greater, and could allow a small ~~variance~~ tolerance for hazard mitigation within the floodplain. As now, the HPC should retain the authority to judge the height and bulk of individual proposals on a project-by-project basis in a fashion consistent with the Historic District Ordinance and the HPC’s Design Guidelines. Seconded. CARRIED on voice vote.

Over the long term however, the historic built environment of City Dock and the City’s infrastructure under Dock, Compromise and Randall Streets, and Market Space are threatened by sea level rise. The City will explore and present to the City Council for consideration several strategies for addressing the 100-year flood and sea level rise, including:

- Building a low, configurable seawall as depicted here,
- Building a seawall at the water’s edge or at the sidewalk’s edge,
- Raising buildings subject to the 100-year flood above the flood line,
- Other strategies which may be identified in the course of the study, and
- Allowing buildings to flood.

- “Avoid redevelopment and new building construction within the 100 year flood plane, and improve City Dock with larger pedestrian walkways, plazas, green space, and temporary events, including boat shows, concerts, farmers markets and parking, that can be relocated in advance of flooding and do not need flood insurance.”

The study of strategies for addressing sea level rise will include impacts on the historic fabric and infrastructure, visual impact, economic impact, engineering feasibility, insurability of structures, cost/benefit analysis, impact on the use of space in the City Dock area for other purposes, and relationship to the flood control measures and plans of the United States Naval Academy. Seconded.

CARRIED on voice vote.

- Alderman Budge moved his amendment #7.

Append to page 20:

There needs to be a comprehensive parking plan that addresses the current and future parking needs for the area. Before removing a significant number of parking spaces or formal or informal loading zone spaces in the City Dock study area, the City of Annapolis will develop and present to City Council for approval a Parking Management Relocation Plan which identifies and considers:

- The inventory of parking spaces and loading zones both within the Study Area and within walking distance.
- The parking spaces, loading zones, and parking management practices necessary to support a vibrant economy in the City Dock Study Area,
- Specific programs for relocating parking from within the Study Area to locations outside the Study Area. The parking relocation programs must meet the needs for success of existing and new businesses.
- The economic impacts of those relocation programs,
- The impacts of those relocation programs on parking elsewhere in the City, at other parking facilities and on-street in both business and residential areas,
- Alternatives to parking that will help City residents and visitors access City Dock without the need for a car,
- The costs and expected benefits of those programs,
- The provision of periodic evaluation of parking supply and demand in the study area, and;
- ~~And t~~ “T” he timing of those programs with respect to the anticipated reconstruction of the Hillman Garage. Seconded. CARRIED on voice vote.

- Alderman Budge moved his amendment #5.

To delete on page 14, paragraph 3, and; to remove the arrows from the graphic on page 14. Seconded. CARRIED on voice vote.

- Alderwoman Finlayson on page 19, of the City Dock Master Plan DRAFT as follows:

To delete in 1st paragraph, in 4th line delete sentence “The intersection of St. Mary’s Street should define the point of entry or gateway into the City Dock Area”. Seconded. CARRIED on voice vote.

Upon motion duly made, seconded and adopted, the meeting was adjourned at 11:24 p.m.