

Encroachment on the Public Right-of-Way in Alexandria, Virginia

What an ordinary resident faces when a household object crosses the sidewalk, why there is presently no lawful pathway to compliance, and what such a pathway would look like

Prepared for: attorneys advising Alexandria residents on right-of-way exposure

Date: 11 September 2026

Primary example: a temporary EV charging cable under a rated pedestrian protector

Prepared by: Jordan Eccles, Alexandria resident (not an attorney)

Status: reference document; positions herein are the resident's proposals

Companion site: curbsidealx.com (research pages cited throughout)

NOT LEGAL ADVICE — READ THIS FIRST

This document was prepared by a resident who is not a lawyer, to help counsel understand a recurring situation from the resident's side. It is not legal advice, states no legal conclusions, and creates no attorney–client relationship. Two City Code sections central to the analysis, §§ 5-2-16 and 5-2-29, could not be retrieved verbatim from the City's code host at the time of writing; where they are described below they are *characterized* from their titles, from the City's own summaries, and from prior published research, and are so marked. Counsel should confirm current text before reliance. Every factual figure is dated and sourced in Part 10.

1. Questions presented and short answers

1. When an Alexandria resident temporarily places an object across the public sidewalk for an ordinary household purpose — a charging cable in a protector, a garden hose, a moving-day ramp, a discharge hose during a storm — is there a lawful way to do it?

Short answer: no. The City Code treats the sidewalk as public right-of-way in which private encroachments and obstructions are unlawful unless authorized. Authorization runs through roughly twenty administrative permit categories and, failing those, a special ordinance of City Council. Every administrative category is built for construction, commerce, or organized events. None describes a temporary, recurring residential use by a homeowner. The special-ordinance route is built for permanent structures such as porches and stoops. A resident who wishes to comply has nothing to apply for; the only compliant option is abstention.

2. What is the resident's exposure if they proceed anyway?

Short answer: real but widely misunderstood. Under current law the general penalty provision, § 1-1-7, authorizes up to \$2,500 and/or twelve months per *proven* offense, with each day a violation continues potentially a separate offense — enforced judicially, “as if” a misdemeanor, not by administrative citation. There is no automatic daily accrual and no escalation schedule. A proposed administrative civil-penalty ladder (warning, \$200, \$200, \$500, \$1,000) would change that, but Council **deferred** the vote and it is not law. In practice the resident encounters neither track. What they encounter is an open-ended loop of complaints closed without findings, described in Part 6.

3. Does good-faith mitigation help?

Short answer: not legally. Because no published standard exists, a rated pedestrian cable protector, retroreflective marking, lighting, and removal after every use have no legal significance. On the text of the code, the careful resident and the careless one are in the same position. That is the structural problem this document describes, and it is not specific to electric vehicles.

2. The legal framework

2.1 State law

Code of Virginia § 15.2-1429. Local ordinance penalties of the kind at issue are enforced through proceedings “as if such violations were misdemeanors.” This is the hinge for everything that follows about enforcement: a monetary penalty under the City's general penalty provision requires a judicial proceeding and a finding, not a staff assessment.

2.2 City Code — the general penalty

§ 1-1-7. The City's fallback penalty, applying where a Code provision prohibits or requires conduct but supplies no penalty of its own. If it applies, the authorized punishment is a fine of up to **\$2,500, imprisonment for up to twelve months, or both**, and, unless otherwise provided, **each day that a violation continues constitutes a separate violation**. Three cautions follow directly from the text and are developed in Part 6: the figure is a judicial ceiling, not a fixed or accruing fine; each charged offense must be proven; and an *intermittent* condition that is wholly removed after each use has a strong textual argument for having ceased rather than continued.

2.3 City Code — the right-of-way provisions CHARACTERIZED

§ 5-2-16, “Placing merchandise on or otherwise obstructing sidewalks and other public rights-of-way.” The general obstruction prohibition. It carries no penalty schedule of its own, which is what brings § 1-1-7 into play. The title's pairing of “merchandise” with “otherwise obstructing” is itself informative: the provision was drafted with commercial display in mind and reaches residential conduct by its general clause.

§ 5-2-29, “Street encroachments.” As summarized by public code indexes and the City’s permit pages, any encroachment into a public street, alley, sidewalk or other right-of-way may be authorized only by a **special ordinance adopted by City Council**, unless it falls within enumerated exceptions or is otherwise permitted under an administrative permit. Permitted encroachments carry an insurance requirement, stated at \$1,000,000 in the summaries reviewed, naming the City as an additional insured. Enumerated exceptions reviewed include certain front fences and low retaining walls in the Parker-Gray Historic District, and street furniture such as signs, awnings, planters and benches that comply with encroachment requirements. Nothing reviewed describes a temporary residential crossing.

2.4 The 2023 administrative encroachment permit

On 25 April 2023 Council amended the encroachment provisions to fold the King Street outdoor dining permit, the parklet permit, and other administrative encroachments into a single **Right-of-Way Administrative Encroachment Permit**. Its covered types, as published by the City, are: annual and short-term commercial parklets; annual public parklets; outdoor dining in the right-of-way; and planters, benches, street furniture, rental bicycles, retail displays, steps, stoops, ramps, Parker-Gray front fences, and architectural projections. Applicants are described as restaurants, retail establishments, businesses, property owners and other entities. Fees are a \$100 processing charge plus annual charges by type (outdoor dining \$1.50 per square foot; commercial parklets \$14–\$21 per square foot; short-term parklets \$30–\$40 per space per day). Insurance is set by Risk Management and a lapse ends the permit. Permits run one year and renew annually.

The significant feature for present purposes is what the list does *not* contain. A resident may obtain an administrative permit for a permanent stoop or a set of steps projecting into the right-of-way. There is no type under which the same resident may place a cord, hose, or ramp across the sidewalk for three hours.

2.5 The City’s insurance tiers

The City’s *Insurance Requirements for Encroachment Permits* (2023) are tiered by risk: **\$500,000** per occurrence for residential encroachments, nonpermanent planters, benches and street furniture, and steps, stoops and ramps; **\$1,000,000** for parklets, outdoor dining and outdoor retail displays. The City therefore already distinguishes residential from commercial risk, which matters for what a lawful pathway would cost (Part 8).

2.6 The proposed civil-penalty ladder DEFERRED, NOT LAW

Amendments to §§ 5-2-16 and 5-2-29 debated by Council would attach an administrative civil-penalty schedule to these sections for the first time: a warning for a first occurrence, then \$200, \$200, \$500, and \$1,000. Under the draft the second penalty is waived if the resident meets City staff to discuss correcting the condition, and each day a violation “exists or persists” may count separately. The draft states no evidentiary standard, so it is unclear whether a 311 report alone could ground a violation or

whether an inspection would be required. **Council postponed the vote.** The ladder is described throughout this document as proposed, and nothing here should be read as saying it is in force.

2.7 The accessibility overlay

Because the sidewalk is a pedestrian access route, accessibility law shapes what a lawful temporary crossing must look like. Two points prevent overstatement. First, under the 2010 ADA Standards, § 303 governs changes in level: up to ¼ inch may be vertical, ¼ to ½ inch must be beveled at 1:2, and above ½ inch § 303.4 requires a ramp complying with § 405 *in full*, including 60-inch landings — a test no device placed on a sidewalk can meet. The Public Right-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines (PROWAG, 2023 final rule), R302.6.2, instead allow changes above ½ inch up to 6 inches at a 1:12 slope with no landings. Second, PROWAG is **guidance**, not binding law for an ordinary residential sidewalk: the Department of Transportation adopted it as an enforceable standard only for transit stops, effective 17 January 2025, and the Department of Justice has not adopted it. Alexandria's own practice for *temporary* pedestrian conditions, through its Maintenance-of-Traffic policy (Memorandum to Industry 04-18) and its permit guideline that “a minimum of 4 feet of sidewalk must remain open,” evaluates temporary facilities on practicability rather than permanent-construction geometry. That framework exists for contractors. It has never been extended to residents.

3. The permit landscape: twenty doors, none for a household

The Department of Transportation and Environmental Services publishes guidelines for permits to use or occupy the public right-of-way. The table lists every category on that page as of September 2026, with who it is written for. The point is not that the City lacks a permit system; it is that the system is comprehensive for every user except a resident acting as a resident.

T&ES public right-of-way permit categories (City permit guidelines page, September 2026)

CATEGORY	WRITTEN FOR	FEE AND CONDITIONS AS PUBLISHED	FITS A TEMPORARY HOUSEHOLD USE?
Close sidewalk	Construction	\$125; barricades and signage; general liability insurance	NO
Crossing curb, gutter and sidewalk with heavy equipment	Construction	\$125; major crossings need insurance and a \$500+ bond	NO
Dumpster in right-of-way	Construction, renovation	\$125; insurance; 20 ft from stop bars and crosswalks	NO
Crane or manlift	Construction	\$125; insurance; 1–30 days	NO
Ladder or scaffolding on right-of-way	Construction, maintenance	\$125; insurance; “a minimum of 4 feet of sidewalk must remain open”	NO

CATEGORY	WRITTEN FOR	FEE AND CONDITIONS AS PUBLISHED	FITS A TEMPORARY HOUSEHOLD USE?
Packing crates, PODs or trailers for moving	Moving companies, movers	\$125; insurance; 20 ft from stop bars and crosswalks	PARTIAL — the container, not the dolly or ramp
Lane closure; street closure for construction; ingress and egress; stockpiling; construction trailer; temporary fence	Construction	\$125 each; insurance; bonds for some	NO
Hauling; excavation; sewer lateral connections	Contractors, utilities	Excavation \$250 per block plus \$1,000+ bonds	NO
Solicitation of funds; special events; parades and races	Organizations	Insurance; committee approval; advance notice	NO
Residential block party or street closure	Homeowners, as a block	\$125; \$1,000,000 insurance unless no alcohol; petition signed by every resident and business on the block; no intersecting streets	EVENT ONLY
Nonpermanent planters	Anyone placing a planter	\$125 per month; \$1,000,000 insurance; up to one year (the administrative encroachment page lists planters at a \$100 processing fee with no annual charge — the two City pages disagree)	OBJECT ONLY — and priced for a business
Horse and carriage; pedicab	Operators	\$125 per month; insurance; veterinary certificates	NO
Right-of-way administrative encroachment permit	Restaurants, retailers, property owners	See Part 2.4: parklets, dining, street furniture, steps, stoops, ramps, projections	NO TEMPORARY TYPE

Two categories nominally admit residents: a block party, which is a one-off event requiring a petition of the entire block, and a planter, which is an object left in place and is priced and insured as a commercial encroachment. Neither is a pathway for a cord, a hose, or a ramp that appears for a few hours and is removed.

4. The special-ordinance door, illustrated: Ordinance No. 5371

Where no administrative category fits, § 5-2-29 leaves one route: an ordinance of City Council specific to the encroachment. Ordinance No. 5371 is a representative example, chosen because its full text is public. It authorized the owners of 214 and 216 South Payne Street to maintain a porch encroaching 2.80 feet into the right-of-way for a length of 36.70 feet, 103 square feet in all.

What one residential encroachment ordinance required

ELEMENT	ORDINANCE NO. 5371 (PORCH, 103 SQ FT)
Process	Encroachment application No. 2021-00002; Planning Commission recommendation 24 June 2021; Council public hearing 6 July 2021; final passage 16 October 2021. Roughly four months from Commission to enactment; the application number suggests it was the second such request of that year.
Insurance	Bodily injury \$1,000,000 per occurrence and aggregate; property damage \$1,000,000 per occurrence and aggregate; the City named as insured; evidence filed with the City Attorney; on any lapse the authorization terminates “forthwith and without notice or demand.”
Indemnity	Owner “deemed to have promised and agreed to save harmless the City ... from any and all liability (including attorneys' fees and litigation expenses).”
Removal	Within 60 days on notice if the City needs the area; at any time “for any purpose whatsoever” on written demand; the City may remove at the owner's expense without liability for damage.
Maintenance	Area kept “unobstructed and free from accumulation of litter, snow, ice and other potentially dangerous matter.”
Other	No responsibility on the City or utilities for damage during their work; owner repairs adjacent right-of-way; no waiver of sovereign immunity; runs with successors.

None of these conditions is unreasonable for a permanent porch. The observation is different: this is the *only* door left open to a resident whose use fits no administrative category, and it was built for structures that will stand for decades. No one drafts, hears, and enacts an ordinance for a three-hour cord. The result is that the route which exists in law is unavailable in fact, which is what “no way out” means in this document.

5. Worked examples: the ordinary encroachments of residential life

The following are commonplace uses of the sidewalk by people who live beside it. For each, the table records what the code reaches on its text, whether a permit category exists, and what a resident who wishes to be lawful can actually do. The charging cable is included as the documented case; the others are offered because the legal position is the same and the argument should not rest on one technology.

Where ordinary residential uses of the sidewalk fall under the current code

ACTIVITY	WHAT THE CODE REACHES ON ITS TEXT	PERMIT CATEGORY?	WHAT A COMPLIANT RESIDENT CAN DO
EV charging cable under a rated pedestrian protector, a few hours per session, removed afterward	§ 5-2-16 obstruction; § 5-2-29 encroachment. The City's own EV guide states no program exists to allow it.	NONE	Abstain, or proceed and be a violator on complaint. Mitigation has no recognized status.

ACTIVITY	WHAT THE CODE REACHES ON ITS TEXT	PERMIT CATEGORY?	WHAT A COMPLIANT RESIDENT CAN DO
Garden hose across the sidewalk to water a tree or bed in the planting strip	Indistinguishable from the cable on the text: a cord-like object across the walking surface.	NONE	Same. Whether it is ever treated as a violation depends entirely on whether a neighbor files.
Moving day: dolly, ramp plates, and boxes staged on the sidewalk for an afternoon	§ 5-2-16 obstruction. A POD or trailer has a \$125 permit; the dolly, ramp and boxes do not.	CONTAINER ONLY	Permit the container; the rest is unaddressed.
Contractor's extension cord or pressure-washer hose from the house to the curb line	Obstruction and encroachment on the text. A contractor's scaffold has a permit and a 4-foot clear-width rule; the cord powering it does not.	NONE	Same as the cable.
Sump-pump or downspout discharge hose across the sidewalk during a storm	Same text; the alternative is discharging onto the neighbor or the foundation.	NONE	Same.
Portable generator cord during a power outage	Same text. The period of greatest need coincides with the period of greatest hazard, and no rule speaks to either.	NONE	Same.
Holiday-light extension cord to a tree in the planting strip	Same text, seasonally, in the dark, often for weeks.	NONE	Same.
Temporary portable wheelchair ramp for a visiting relative or a delivery	Obstruction on the text. A <i>permanent</i> ramp has an administrative permit type; a temporary one has none.	PERMANENT ONLY	Permit a permanent ramp with insurance, or place the temporary one and be exposed.
Portable basketball hoop at the curb	Obstruction and encroachment on the text, typically for a season.	NONE	Same.
Little Free Library, bench, or planter in the planting strip	Encroachment; this one has a category.	YES — planters and street furniture	Apply; pay \$125 per month or a \$100 fee depending on which City page governs; carry \$500,000–\$1,000,000 in insurance.

ACTIVITY	WHAT THE CODE REACHES ON ITS TEXT	PERMIT CATEGORY?	WHAT A COMPLIANT RESIDENT CAN DO
Trash and recycling carts at the curb on collection day	Physically an obstruction of the same walking surface, but placed at the City's direction under its solid-waste program.	AUTHORIZED BY PROGRAM	Nothing to do. The example shows the Code accommodates temporary residential objects in the right-of-way whenever the City has decided it wants them there.
For contrast: sidewalk café; dumpster; scaffolding	Commercial or construction occupancy of the same sidewalk, often for months.	YES	Apply, pay, insure, comply with a published clear-width rule, and operate lawfully.

THE PATTERN

The Code is not silent about temporary objects on the sidewalk. It has a vocabulary for them when a business, a contractor, an event organizer, or the City itself puts them there: a category, a fee, an insurance tier, sometimes a clear-width rule. What it lacks is any vocabulary for the resident. The consequence is not that residential uses are prohibited in practice — hoses and moving dollies appear on every block — but that their lawfulness is decided by complaint rather than by rule. A resident cannot find out in advance whether they are compliant, because the only thing that determines the answer is whether someone objects.

6. Enforcement from the resident's seat

6.1 The mechanism that actually operates

Neither penalty track described in Part 2 is what a resident meets. The operative mechanism is the City's Alex311 service-request system, which is public. A complaint is filed; it is routed to T&ES; it is closed, typically within days, with a status such as “Work is Complete” and no finding; and, because the underlying condition is a rule the resident cannot satisfy, it is filed again. The resident receives no notice of violation, no statement of what would constitute compliance, no hearing, and no route to appeal a closure or to obtain a determination that they are in compliance.

6.2 The documented case

Because Alex311 records are public, the charging-cable example can be described from the record rather than from recollection. Between 3 June and 8 September 2026, twenty-one service requests were filed concerning one cable crossing at one Rosemont address (twenty unique records; the City re-dated and re-filed one). Two were logged against the neighboring property. Every filing describes a cord across a sidewalk; **none mentions the pedestrian cable protector in use**, its removal after each session, or the retroreflective marking and lighting later added. Exactly one filing describes an

event of any kind: a report of tripping while walking dogs after dark, with no injury described. There is no injury, citation, inspection report, or finding of violation anywhere in the corpus. Eleven records were closed at a median of 5.6 days; nothing has been closed since 20 August; six recent filings carry the disposition “Work is On Hold,” for which the City gives no reason. Thirty photographs were submitted, of which twenty are distinct.

WHAT THE RECORD SHOWS ABOUT THE PROCESS, NOT THE RESIDENT

Twenty-one filings, eleven closures, no findings, and no change in the condition is what a rule without a compliance pathway looks like from inside. It consumes staff time, it gives complainants no mechanism that resolves their concern, and it leaves the resident with theoretical exposure to a judicial penalty for conduct that no published rule tells them how to perform lawfully. The volume of complaint is often mistaken for a measure of hazard; on this record it measures the absence of a standard.

6.3 The two penalty tracks, compared

Current law versus the deferred proposal

DIMENSION	CURRENT LAW: § 1-1-7, IF IT APPLIES	PROPOSED §§ 5-2-16 / 5-2-29 LADDER (DEFERRED)
Who decides	A court, after judicial proceedings (Va. Code § 15.2-1429)	Administrative assessment by the City
Maximum per offense	Up to \$2,500 and/or twelve months — a ceiling, not a schedule	Warning, \$200, \$200, \$500, \$1,000
Escalation	None	Built in, per occurrence
Daily treatment	Each day a violation “continues” potentially separate; no automatic accrual	Each day it “exists or persists” may be separate
Intermittent condition, removed after each use	Strong textual argument that the violation ceased rather than continued	Draft is silent
Evidentiary basis	Proof of the offense in court	Not stated; unclear whether a 311 report alone suffices
Enforcement friction	High; monetary punishment requires judicial proceedings per offense	Low; designed for routine use
Status	In force	Vote deferred by Council

6.4 The deferral cut both ways

Council's decision to postpone the penalty vote is sometimes read by residents as relief. From the resident's seat it is better understood as prolonging ambiguity. The proposed ladder would at least have attached an explicit, bounded, administrative consequence to a defined act; the deferral leaves the unbounded judicial ceiling in place with no published standard beneath it, and leaves the 311 loop as

the only process that runs. A penalty attached to a rule nobody can lawfully satisfy is enforcement without an exit. A penalty attached to a clear standard is simply enforcement, and this document does not object to it.

7. Why there is no way out: the structural reasons

1. **The only general authorization route is legislative.** § 5-2-29, as summarized, routes any encroachment not within an exception or administrative permit to a special ordinance of Council. Part 4 shows what that involves. It is not available, in any practical sense, for a household object that appears and disappears.
2. **The administrative categories are enumerated, and none fits.** Part 3 lists them. They were written for construction, commerce, and events, and the 2023 consolidation reaffirmed that scope. A resident cannot apply under a category that does not exist, and staff cannot issue a permit the Code does not describe.
3. **Insurance and fees are scaled to commercial risk.** The nearest object category, a planter, is priced at up to \$125 per month with \$1,000,000 in cover on one City page. The City's own tiered guidance recognizes a \$500,000 residential tier, so the scaling is a choice, not a necessity — but it is the choice presently in force.
4. **The City has said so.** Its *Guide to Installing EV Chargers in Alexandria* (v1.5, November 2023) answers the question directly: “At this time, the City does not have a program to allow for electric cables to run from private homes over the right-of-way to vehicles.” The curbside charging program Council approved on 21 February 2026 concerns City-sited public chargers, not resident cords, and does not change this.
5. **Mitigation is legally invisible.** Without a published standard there is nothing to comply *with*. A rated protector, a beveled profile, reflective edges, a light over the crossing, and removal after every session are exactly the measures a standard would require, and today they count for nothing.
6. **The process that runs produces no decisions.** A resident cannot obtain a “yes,” cannot obtain a reasoned “no,” and cannot appeal a closure. The only exit from the loop is to stop.

8. What a lawful pathway looks like

The resident's proposal, set out in full on the companion site, offers Council two drafted options. Both are noted here because they show the change required is small and has precedent.

OPTION A — PUBLISHED GUIDANCE, NO PERMIT PROGRAM

Council directs the City Manager to publish guidance under which a resident without usable off-street parking may route a charging cable across the sidewalk without an individual permit, conditioned on City-specified equipment, deployment only while charging, maintenance of an accessible route, no reservation of parking, and immediate removal on City direction or in snow, ice, construction, or emergency; and directs the City Attorney to prepare “a narrow exception clause in §§ 5-2-16 / 5-2-29 for temporary electric-vehicle charging cable crossings compliant with published City guidance,” parallel to how compliant construction traffic-control setups already operate under Memorandum 04-18. Noncompliant installations remain violations.

OPTION B — A REVOCABLE PERMIT PILOT

A Residential EV Charging Access Pilot administered as a revocable right-of-way permit, with eligibility standards, approved equipment, inspection, accessibility and electrical requirements, enforcement procedures, and an evaluation after 18 to 24 months. This is the model Fredericksburg adopted.

The technique in Option A — a narrow exception clause keyed to published performance guidance — is general. The same drafting would accommodate other temporary residential crossings identified in Part 5 without opening the right-of-way to anything the City does not choose to describe. That is the broader point of this document: the gap is a drafting gap, and it closes with a paragraph.

Jurisdictions that have already written the paragraph

JURISDICTION	INSTRUMENT	MECHANISM	NOTABLE TERMS
Fredericksburg, VA	Residential cross-sidewalk charging pilot, December 2025	Revocable permit administered by the City	Level 1 and Level 2; eligible single-family homes without off-street parking; approved full-width protector, interlocking sections permitted; removal when not charging. Roughly fifty miles from Alexandria on I-95.
Seattle, WA	SDOT Client Assistance Memo 2119	By right; no permit	Two tiers at ½ inch; cover the entire sidewalk width, minimum 4 feet; perpendicular; removal when not charging
Portland, OR	PBOT Administrative Rule TRN-8.08 § C.13	By right; adopted rule	Measurable performance terms: gaps ≤ ½ in, lip ≤ ¼ in, no fasteners, full through-zone width, 200-lb point load; the April 2026 rule dropped the earlier 1:12 and landing requirements
Washington, DC	DDOT administrative issuance	Guidance	Substantively Seattle's terms; current status of the document is unclear
Oakland, CA	OakDOT guidance, February 2025	Guidance	Full sidewalk width; 24-hour maximum; the only U.S. city permitting Level 2 apart from Fredericksburg

JURISDICTION	INSTRUMENT	MECHANISM	NOTABLE TERMS
Cambridge, MA	DPW pilot policy, 2023	Annual permit, \$200	Level 1; perpendicular ADA-type ramps; overhead option at 9-ft clearance

9. Questions counsel may wish to examine

These are posed, not answered. They are the points on which the resident's understanding is least certain and on which professional judgment would be most valuable.

1. Whether § 1-1-7 in fact attaches to §§ 5-2-16 and 5-2-29, which turns on whether those sections supply any penalty of their own, and whether § 5-2-16 reaches a non-commercial object at all given its “merchandise” framing.
2. Whether a condition that is wholly removed after each use “continues” for the purposes of the daily-offense clause, or whether each deployment is at most a discrete offense requiring separate proof.
3. What process, if any, must precede a judicial referral — whether a notice of violation or opportunity to correct is required by the Code or by practice — and whether an Alex311 report, uninspected, is a sufficient basis for any enforcement step.
4. Whether complaint-only enforcement of a facially general obstruction rule, under which hoses, cords, ramps, carts and hoops are treated differently in practice depending on who objects, raises any concern of selective enforcement or of vagueness as applied.
5. Whether the City's practicability treatment of temporary construction obstructions under Memorandum 04-18 supplies a principled analogy for temporary residential ones, and whether the City could adopt such guidance administratively or would require an ordinance.
6. Whether any state-law constraint prevents a Virginia locality from authorizing residential cable crossings. The resident has identified none; Fredericksburg proceeded under its existing authority.
7. Whether a standard homeowner's or renter's liability policy responds to a claim arising from a temporary sidewalk crossing, and whether the City's existing \$500,000 residential encroachment tier is the appropriate analog if a minimum is stated.

10. Sources

Items marked “characterized” were not retrieved verbatim at the time of writing. Prices, fees and program terms are as published on the dates given and change.

1. Code of Virginia § 15.2-1429 (local ordinance penalties enforced “as if such violations were misdemeanors”).
2. Alexandria City Code § 1-1-7 (general penalty; each day a continuing violation a separate offense). Characterization follows a resident legal-research summary of September 2026, including its hedges.

3. Alexandria City Code § 5-2-16 (placing merchandise on or otherwise obstructing sidewalks and other public rights-of-way) and § 5-2-29 (street encroachments). **Characterized** from section titles, public code indexes, and City permit pages; the City's code host did not respond to retrieval attempts on 11 September 2026.
4. Proposed amendments to §§ 5-2-16 / 5-2-29 (administrative civil-penalty schedule); vote deferred by City Council, 2026.
5. City of Alexandria, Ordinance No. 5371 (final passage 16 October 2021), authorizing a porch encroachment at 214–216 South Payne Street. Full text retrieved from pub.alexandriava.gov, 11 September 2026.
6. City of Alexandria, T&ES, *Permit Guidelines — Transportation & Environmental Services*, alexandriava.gov/permits/permit-guidelines-transportation-environmental-services, retrieved 11 September 2026.
7. City of Alexandria, *Right-of-Way Administrative Encroachment Permit*, alexandriava.gov/permits/right-of-way-administrative-encroachment-permit, retrieved 11 September 2026 (Council amendments of 25 April 2023).
8. City of Alexandria, *Insurance Requirements for Encroachment Permits* (2023), as tabulated at curbsidealx.com/research/insurance.html.
9. City of Alexandria, Memorandum to Industry No. 04-18, *Maintenance of Traffic Plans — Maintaining Access for Pedestrians and Bicyclists During Construction* (April 2018).
10. City of Alexandria, *Guide to Installing EV Chargers in Alexandria*, v1.5 (November 2023); *Electric Vehicles in Alexandria*, alexandriava.gov/energy/electric-vehicles-in-alexandria (Curbside EV Charging Program approved 21 February 2026).
11. Alex311 public service-request records concerning the W Oak Street crossing, 3 June – 8 September 2026 (21 filings, 20 unique records), analyzed at curbsidealx.com/research/the-311-record.html.
12. U.S. Access Board, 2010 ADA Standards for Accessible Design §§ 303, 405; Public Right-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines (2023 final rule) R302.2, R302.6.2, R302.6.3; U.S. Department of Transportation adoption for transit stops effective 17 January 2025.
13. City of Fredericksburg, VA, *Charging at Home*, fredericksburgva.gov/2179/Charging-At-Home, and program document DocumentCenter/View/31403 (pilot launched December 2025).
14. Seattle DOT, Client Assistance Memo 2119; Portland Bureau of Transportation, Administrative Rule TRN-8.08 § C.13 (adopted April 2026) and its 2021 text; Washington DC DDOT administrative issuance (archived); OakDOT guidance (February 2025); Cambridge DPW pilot policy (July 2023).
15. CurbsideALX proposal, standards, and research pages, curbsidealx.com (September 2026).

Prepared by an Alexandria resident for the assistance of counsel. Not legal advice. The resident is the subject of the Alex311 filings described in Part 6, which is disclosed rather than hidden; every figure drawn from that record is verifiable in the public portal.