

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION BRIEFING

June 5, 2006

PROPOSED RECERTIFICATION OF RESIDENTIAL PERMIT PARKING PROGRAM AREA D

1. INTRODUCTION

On May 25, 1993 Title 5 of the Pittsburgh Code Chapter 549, of the Residential Parking Permit 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 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 "D", Central Oakland (see map on page 7). This district includes Sennott Street, Fresco Way and Iroquois Way on the north, the paper alley between McKee Street and Coltart Street and Bates Street on the west, The Boulevard of the Allies on the south and Parkview Avenue, Boundary Street, Joncaire Street and Bouquet Street on the east.

3. BACKGROUND

Originally, the reason for lack of sufficient legal on-street parking spaces for residents in Central Oakland, Area "D" was due to employees to the various Oakland Hospitals, commuters riding the Boulevard of the Allies busses to work and the students and employees going to the University of Pittsburgh which saturated this residential neighborhood with parked vehicles.

The Central Oakland residents desired to reduce this volume of non-residential parking on residential streets by establishing a residential parking program as a means of achieving this reduction. Area "D" R.P.P.P. was approved in July of 1984.

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 the key points highlighted:

a. QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

For this area, the R.P.P.P. contacted area “D” community groups and asked them to distribute questionnaires to their residents. 170 questionnaires were returned showing that 97.6% (27.6% more than the required criteria) were still in favor of the program. The questionnaires showed that only 35% of permit holders, with an opinion, believe the program had created hardships for them, 74% would like the program to continue on their street, 51.1% found it easier or the same to park near their homes in the last year, 48.7% found it more difficult

- 92.2% of the permit holders, with an opinion, found it difficult to park near their home prior to the implementation of the program.
- 61.9% of the permit holders, with an opinion, are satisfied with the boundaries of the program.
- 78.5% are satisfied with hours of the program.
- 52.2% are satisfied with enforcement of the program.

There were 79 comments on the questionnaires. The greatest number of comments were regarding the lack of enforcement (24 comments). The second greatest comment said that too many passes were being issued (19 comments). The third greatest comment was a desire to decrease the boundaries for this area (15 comments). The cost of maintaining the program (office staff, enforcement and supplies) is currently \$673,494. Enforcement costs alone are \$419,137.00. This far exceeds the \$240,000.00 that currently comes in from permit fees. Since the Residential Parking Program does not generate any additional revenue, an increase in enforcement would not be a viable option with the current budget constraints. Under city law every legal resident is entitled a parking permit for every vehicle they own. This law also restricts the numbers of passes that can be issued to a residence according to the unit’s occupancy. We are very concerned about this problem, and are working with the Pittsburgh Parking Authority to resolve it. The desire to decrease boundaries has been a topic for quite some time. A portion of the community wishes for the area to be sub-divided, however everyone else wants the area’s boundaries to stay as is. This will be addressed in the next public notification to the residents.

b. PARKING SURVEY RESULTS

The Parking Survey Results showed that the program is still needed for Central Oakland and was effective in providing 38% more spaces for these residents to park in on the streets surveyed.

The results of the on-street parking inventory and parking accumulation counts for the summer of 1995 and 1996 and prior to the program of each street is presented in Table A (pages 4 & 5). Area "D" was surveyed on July 11, 1995, July 17, 1995, July 19, 1995, July 16, 1996, and August 2, 1999. The information on the chart is the most current for each block.

The total spaces available in Area "D" is 1,181 with 2,111 permits in use during the 2005 - 2006 permit year. We are currently looking into this parking deficit situation with the Pittsburgh Parking Authority. Only the streets surveyed are included in the chart.

Table A presents for each block face and for area "D", the following information:

- Number of residential parkers on each street.
- Number of non-residential parkers (without permit or visitor pass) on each street
- Number of visitor pass parkers on each street.
- Total number of parkers.
- Total available spaces for each street.
- Percentage of resident parkers on each street.
- Percentage of non-resident parkers (without visitor pass or permit) on each street.
- Percent of spaces occupied on each street.
- Percent of spaces occupied on each street prior to the program.
- Difference between the percent of space occupied on each street prior to the program to the street surveys of the summer of 1999.

As shown on Table A, the total percent of spaces occupied in 2005 and 2006 was 66%, with 22% being non-resident vehicles. Approximately 34% of available spaces are still left for residents to park in when before the program over 100% of the spaces were utilized.

Prior to the program, 104% of the spaces were being utilized.

Due to the program, there has been a decrease of 38% spaces being occupied showing that the Residential Parking Permit Program has definitely worked for the Central Oakland, Area "D".

c. PRIMARY IMPACTORS

The ordinance requires us to identify that the primary impactors are still in existence. The University of Pittsburgh, Magee-Women's Hospital and the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center are primary impactors for the area. We contacted the City of Pittsburgh's Finance Office to verify the existence of the University of Pittsburgh, Magee-Women's Hospital and the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center's. The Finance Office pulled up the taxes filed under the University of Pittsburgh, Magee-Women's Hospital and the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center that showed that all three organizations paid all taxes for the most recent year.

d. FEEDBACK FROM THE COMMUNITY

At the Oakland Community Council meeting on September 12, 2005, the organization unanimously requested that R.P.P. Area "D" be recertified for an additional four years. They took responsibility for distributing the questionnaires to the residents.

STREET NAMES	RES. PARKERS	NON-RES. PARKERS	VISITORS' PASSES	TOTAL NO. PARKERS	TOTAL AVAILABLE SPACES
Atwood Street	103	19	16	13/8	150
Bates Street ³	31	11	3	45	43
Cable Place	7	3	10	20	15
Louisa Street	14	1	1	16	61
McKee Place	40	21	8	69	124
Melba Place	5	0	1	6	11
Meyran Avenue ¹	32	8	4	44	99
Oakland Avenue	73	25	7	105	116
Parkview Street	11	9	2	22	67
Pier Street	12	3	2	17	16
Semple Street ²	42	21	3	66	112
Wellsford Street	10	1	1	12	30
<i>Total</i>	<i>380</i>	<i>122</i>	<i>58</i>	<i>560</i>	<i>844</i>

1. Data excludes Meyran Ave. between Sennott St. and Bates Ave.
2. Data excludes Semple St. between Sennott St. and Cable Pl.
3. Data excludes Bates St. between Meyran and Semple

STREET NAMES	% RES PARKERS	% NON-RES PARKERS	% SPACES OCCUPIED	% SPACES OCCUPIED PRIOR TO PROGRAM	% DIFFERENCE
Atwood Street	75	14	92	112	+10
Bates Street ³	65	30	105	100	+5
Cable Place	35	15	133	126	+7
Louisa Street	88	13	26	93	-67
McKee Place	58	30	56	102	-46
Melba Place	83	0	55	109	-54
Meyran Avenue ¹	73	18	44	104	-60
Oakland Avenue	70	254	91	99	-8
Parkview Street	50	41	33	101	-68
Pier Street	71	18	106	81	+25
Semple Street ²	67	32	59	114	-55
Wellsford Street	83	8	40	100	-40
<i>Total</i>	68	22	66	104	-38

1. Data excludes Meyran Ave. between Sennott St. and Bates Ave.
2. Data excludes Semple St. between Sennott St. and Cable Pl.
3. Data excludes Bates St. between Meyran and Semple

5. RECERTIFICATION

As conclusion, our analysis has shown that, 97.6%, 27.6% more then the required criteria of 70% for inclusion into the program, are still in favor of the program. Second, the Residential Parking Permit for the Central Oakland, Area “D”, has freed-up 38% available spaces for the residents as reflected in 2005 – 2006 survey, compared with no spaces before implementation of the program. Third, the primary impactors of the University of Pittsburgh, the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, and Magee-Women’s Hospital still pose a danger of their employees, students and visitors using the residential streets for their parking. Lastly, the community meeting on September 12, 2005 showed unanimous support for the program, from the residents.

Because of this analysis, it is recommended that R.P.P.P. Area “D” (Central Oakland) be recertified.