

# CITY OF BALTIMORE MAYOR BRANDON M. SCOTT

TO	The Honorable President and Members of the Baltimore City Council
FROM	Peter Little, Executive Director, Parking Authority of Baltimore City
CC	Mayor's Office of Government Relations
DATE	September 22, 2025
SUBJECT	25-0083 RPP Area 30 – Exception – 15 E West Street

**Position: Favorable with Amendment** 

#### **BILL SYNOPSIS**

City Council Bill 25-0083 is for the purpose of amending the Parking Management Plan for RPP Area 30 (South Baltimore East) to add an exception to the Plan's general permit allotments for two dwelling units on one parcel in Area 30.

## **SUMMARY OF POSITION**

The Parking Authority of Baltimore City (PABC) has reviewed the proposed legislation. PABC staff conducted a site visit in September 2025. Councilmember Blanchard brought forth the bill based on community feedback, in accordance with Baltimore City Code Article 31, section 10-19(a).

The intent of the Residential Permit Parking (RPP) Program, as stated in Article 31, section 10-2(a) of City Code, is to protect the RPP areas from hazards and adverse conditions resulting from nonresidents parking in the area, including pollution, traffic, noise, trash, and unreasonable burdens in gaining access to their residences. In addition, various sections of Article 31 require community-based decision-making. For example, RPP participants from across the city serve on the RPP Advisory Board that seeks to ensure the RPP program "is effective and responsive to those it serves."

The Parking Management Plan for Area 30 states that all dwelling units included in the plan are eligible for up to four residential parking permits. This bill's intended exception makes one parcel within Area 30, 15 E West St, subject to a different restriction, by allowing only up to two residential parking permits per dwelling unit on that specific parcel because of a planned conversion from one dwelling unit to two, effectively increasing the density of the neighborhood by one dwelling unit.

There is precedent for addressing increases in density through RPP regulations:

• Article 31 section 10-20(b)(3) sets limits for eligibility in the case of new development or redevelopment within an existing RPP area (5 or fewer new units in a multi-family

building would be eligible by right, but the inclusion of a parcel with more than 5 new units would require a major change approved by a majority of households in the program).

- Council has approved bills excluding multi-family conversions that add fewer than 5 dwelling units from the RPP area encompassing the converted properties.
- A few RPP areas require households with an existing parking pad or garage to use that off-street space for their first vehicle; such households are only able to purchase vehicle permits for additional vehicle registrations beyond their first vehicle.

In locations like Area 30, which has one of the highest population densities in the city, new development or redevelopment that adds density and additional housing types is in accordance with the recently updated Comprehensive Plan. At the same time, one of the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan is fostering livable places *without reliance on automobiles*. Adjusting RPP regulations, based on input from an RPP area's residents, to address increased density, while allowing new residents to participate at some level, may be an appropriate strategy for protecting the livability of an already dense neighborhood.

However, the proposed sharing of one visitor permit between two dwelling units creates challenges which make it unrealistic to administer. This provision would be impractical for PABC to implement because it would require significant coordination between two unrelated households, and might lead to permit abuse. PABC must issue a permit to an eligible party, and in this case, it is unclear which dwelling would receive the permit. If the households from the two dwelling units disagree about which household should be issued the visitor pass, PABC might be expected to determine how much each household could use the permit — and we cannot.

## FISCAL IMPACT

The passage of the bill would have little to no fiscal impact as it relates to parking.

#### **AMENDMENTS**

Based on the comments above, the PABC respectfully requests a favorable report with the following recommended amendment: Amend page 2, lines 10-11 to read: "EACH OF THE 2 DWELLING UNITS MAY BE ISSUED 1 VISITOR PERMIT" for City Council Bill 25-0083.