

PROPOSED RECERTIFICATION OF RESIDENTIAL PERMIT PARKING PROGRAM
AREA G

1. INTRODUCTION

On May 25, 1993, Title 5 of the Pittsburgh City Code Chapter 549, of the Residential Permit Parking Program (R.P.P.P.), section 549.06 was amended so that the Parking Permit Officer (Planning Director) would verify to City Council every four years that the affected residents still need and desire the program. This ordinance currently reads that in determining to renew a designated area for the R.P.P.P., the Parking Permit Officer (Planning Director) shall certify the continued existence of the primary impactor on which official designation was based, and certify that seventy percent of households, by petition, survey, or combination thereof, still desire participation in the program. Part of this verification includes a briefing of the City Planning Commission prior to submitting verification to City Council.

2. R.P.P.P. DISTRICT

The area to be recertified is Area 'G', Allegheny West (see map on page 6). Ridge Avenue, Brighton Road, West North Avenue, and Allegheny Avenue generally bound this district.

3. BACKGROUND

The original reason for the lack of sufficient, legal on-street parking for residents in Allegheny West, Area 'G', was due to employees and students going to the Community College of Allegheny County, patrons attending stadium events, and commuters going into Downtown. The residents, with a desire to reduce this volume of non-residential parking on residential streets, desired the R.P.P.P. as a way to achieve this reduction.

The Residential Parking Permit Area 'G' was designated by City Council and the Planning Commission on July 23, 1986, and was most recently expanded on August 9, 2001.

4. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Recertification is based on the questionnaire results, parking survey, an analysis of primary impactors, and feedback from community leaders.

The following is a summary with key points highlighted:

a. QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

By sending out questionnaires, the R.P.P.P. was able to determine that residents still desire the program. Of the 227 questionnaires sent out, 71 (31%) were returned, showing that 66%

(4% less than the required criteria) are in favor of the program's continuation. While this does not meet the required 70% criteria, the results were analyzed and changes made to represent the actual wants of the community.

All responses from Western Avenue (7 total) were discounted the second time the results were analyzed, so to prevent any skewing in results from business owners who are not in favor of the program and not representing the needs of the majority of the residents. With Western Avenue excluded from the results the percentage was brought up to 69% from 66%, still 1% below the required criteria.

Further examination of the results revealed another possible contributor to the unmet criteria. Four residents living on Beech Avenue were found to be concerned with the boundaries of the program and are interested in an expansion of the program. As a result of this desired expansion, these four said that the program had created hardships on their household, thus contributing to the below 70% results. However, there is an expansion in progress and with the four Beech Avenue residents' results discounted also, the questionnaire results show that slightly more than 70%, the required criteria, are in favor of the programs continuation.

The questionnaire results also show that 73% of the residents, with an opinion, found parking near their homes to be "easier" or "about the same" since the start of the program; 27% have had a more difficult time finding a parking space.

- 86% of permit holders, with an opinion, are satisfied with the method of issuing permits.
- 85% of permit holders, with an opinion, are satisfied with the boundaries of the program.
- 93% of permit holders, with an opinion, are satisfied with public notification and information about the program.
- 45% of permit holders, with an opinion, are satisfied with the visitor's passes.

The major complaints regarding the program, expressed by those with an opinion, were: residents or visitor's receiving tickets despite having proper permits (15 complaints); residents who feel the visitor's passes are too restrictive (14 complaints); and those residents that are not satisfied with the new style of visitor's pass (14 complaints).

As for residents and visitors receiving tickets despite having proper permits it is important to remember that mistakes do happen. Currently, residents who have been issued tickets have three days to contact the Parking Authority to rectify the issue before the ticket is processed; however, this is subject to change. If residents still have questions after contacting the Parking Authority they are to feel free to contact the Permit Parking Senior Planner, Richard Meritzer at 412-255-2102 or richard.meritzer@city.pittsburgh.pa.us. As for visitors being issued tickets, it is simply something that cannot be proven. They have

the right to appeal the ticket in traffic court where it will be their word against the enforcement officer's.

As for the visitor's pass being too restrictive, increasing the number of visitor's passes per household would only create more parking problems on already congested streets; it would also require an amendment change.

The new style of the visitor's pass is actually an improvement from the older version. It is especially helpful for the enforcement officers because it is more noticeable and therefore allows them to be more efficient while patrolling the neighborhood.

b. PARKING SURVEY RESULTS

The Parking Survey Results showed that the program is still needed for Allegheny West.

The results of the on-street parking survey were collected in the summer of 1999. The table on page 5 shows the results calculated from the parking survey of Area 'G'.

The Parking Survey Results table gives the percentages of spaces occupied, spaces available, and of non-residential parkers in Area 'G' prior to the program start and at the time of the last parking survey (1999). The table also gives the percentage difference in each of these categories.

The chart illustrates that Area 'G' has 32% of its spaces occupied. Prior to the program start the area had a parking occupancy rate of 85%. **This is a 53% decrease in the number of spaces occupied as a result of the R.P.P.P. It can be deduced from these results that the program is working for Area 'G', Allegheny West.**

c. PRIMARY IMPACTORS

The ordinance requires us to identify that the primary impactors are still in existence. During the recertification process, survey responses by residents and/or concerns raised at community meetings, still identified patrons going to stadium events, students attending the Community College of Allegheny County, and commuters parking and walking to Downtown as the main contributors to the parking problem. We are in the process of expanding Area 'G' to protect additional residents from stadium parkers.

d. FEEDBACK FROM THE COMMUNITY

The Department of City Planning held a community meeting for Area 'G' permit holders on April 9, 2003. 7 permit holders from Area 'G' attended the meeting. All in attendance supported the continuation of the R.P.P.P. in their area.

All in attendance this evening were overwhelmingly in support of the continuation of the R.P.P.P. in their area.

At a subsequent meeting, held April 9, 2003 as well, to discuss the expansion of Area 'G', 8 residents were in attendance. The only concern of those in attendance regarded patrons of events taking place at Heinz Field. This issue will be resolved by including a portion of West North and Allegheny Avenues in the program.

e. RECERTIFICATION

In conclusion, as our analysis of the data shows, 70% of the residents, with an opinion, feel that the program has not created any hardships on their household, meeting the required criteria of 70%. In addition, 73% of residents, with an opinion, find the availability of parking spaces near their home "easier" or "about the same" since the program start. Secondly, the R.P.P.P. has allowed for a 53% decrease in the number of parking spaces occupied since the start of the program, as seen in the Parking Survey Results. Thirdly, as voiced through the residents themselves, the primary impactors, stadium events, the community college, and the proximity to Downtown are still in existence, which creates the most problems associated with parking. Finally, as brought to our attention during the community meeting, all of the residents in attendance were in support of the program's continuation in their area.

Based on this analysis, it is recommended that the R.P.P.P. Area 'G' (Allegheny West) be recertified.

AREA 'G' PARKING SURVEY RESULTS

	% SPACES OCCUPIED	% SPACES AVAILABLE	% NON-RESIDENTIAL PARKERS
PRIOR TO PROGRAM (Based on program-wide data)	85%	15%	85%
SUMMER 1999 (last survey taken)	32%	68%	40%
% DIFFERENCE	53% less	53% more	45% less