

PROPOSED RECERTIFICATION OF RESIDENTIAL PERMIT PARKING PROGRAM
AREA Y

1. INTRODUCTION

On May 25, 1993 Title 5 of the Pittsburgh City 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 the 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 Council Commission prior to submitting verification to City Council.

2. R.P.P.P DISTRICT

The area to be recertified is Area 'Y', East Shadyside. This area is generally bounded by South Negley Avenue, Pierce Street, Spahr Street and Walnut Street.

3. BACKGROUND

The original reason for lack of insufficient legal on street parking for residents in the East Shadyside neighborhood, Area 'Y', was due to employees using the East Busway and business employees and customers to the Ellsworth and South Highland Business District. 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 'Y' was designated by City Council and the Planning Commission on April 11, 1996 and was expanded July 13, 1996, April 25, 1997, and December 30, 1998.

4. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

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

The following is a summary of the findings 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 343 questionnaires sent out, 46 (13%) were returned, showing that 73%

(3% more than the required criteria) with an opinion are in favor of the program's continuation, while 27% of those responding said the program has created hardships. The questionnaire results also shows that 65% of the residents, with an opinion, found parking near their homes to be easier or about the same, 35% have a more difficult time.

- 79% of permit holders, with an opinion, are satisfied with the operating hours of the program
- 50% of permit holders who lived in the permit area prior to the implementation of the Residential Parking Permit program stated the found parking to be very difficult of difficult prior to implementation of the program
- 63% with an opinion are satisfied with enforcement of the program
- 79% with an opinion are satisfied with the boundaries of the program
- 58% with an opinion are satisfied with the hour of the program

The major complaints were regarding the lack of enforcement particularly in the evening (17 complaints), desire to increase the hours of the permit restriction (11 complaints), trouble getting a permit (7 complaints), need for more visitors' passes in a household (5 complaints), and the need for more streets to be included in the permit district (5 complaints).

Increasing the number of visitors passes would only increase the lack of available spaces to permit holders and would also require a code amendment to change it. We will contact the Parking Authority regarding enforcement. Changes in Area 'X's management plan, immediately to the East of Area "Y" are under consideration. We will not address longer program hours in Area "Y" until we can gage the impact if any that the changes in Area "X" have on the district. Much of the comments regarding problems getting permits revolve around the need to go to the permit office. We will inform the permit holders that is not the case; they can get permits by mail. We have been working with the Shadyside Action Coalition to expand both Areas "X" and "Y".

b. PARKING SURVEY RESULTS

The parking survey Results showed that the program is still needed for Area 'Y'.

The results of the on-street parking were collected in the summer of 1999. Table A shows the number of vehicles that are residential and non-residential parked in Area 'Y'.

Table A identifies the streets surveyed and the information collected includes:

- Number of residential parkers
- Number of non-residential parkers
- Number of vehicles using visitor passes
- Total number of parkers
- Total available spaces

As Table B shows percentages of vehicles occupying the streets surveyed, the chart illustrates that Area 'Y' has 45% of spaces occupied. Prior to the implementation of R.P.P.P. 80% of the spaces were occupied. **There is a 35% decrease in spaces occupied as a result of the R.P.P.P. The program is working for the East Shadyside, Area 'Y'.**

TABLE A

STREET NAMES	RES. PARKERS	NON-RES. PARKERS	VISITORS' PASSES	TOTAL NO. PARKERS	TOTAL AVAILABLE SPACES
Alder Street	27	16	5	48	75
College Street	20	24	4	48	94
Elwood Street	4	5	1	10	19
Holden Street	14	5	1	20	50
Maryland Avenue	23	12	3	38	68
Pierce Street	11	5	-	16	57
Summerlea Street	3	1	-	4	41
Total	102	68	14	184	404

TABLE B

STREET NAMES	% RES PARKERS	% NON-RES PARKERS	% SPACES OCCUPIED	% SPACES OCCUPIED PRIOR TO PROGRAM	% DIFFERENCE
Alder Street	56	33	64	104	-40
College Street	42	50	51	70	-19
Elwood Street	40	50	52	105	-53
Holden Street	70	25	40	50	-10
Maryland Avenue	60	32	56	84	-28
Pierce Street	69	31	28	67	-39
Summerlea Street	75	25	10	98	-88
<i>Total</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>37</i>	<i>45</i>	<i>80</i>	<i>-35</i>

c. PRIMARY IMPACTORS

The ordinance requires us to identify that the primary impactors still exist. We continue to get requests from residents living on blocks just outside Area "Y" requesting inclusion in the program. This includes most recently Elmer Street, Ellsworth Avenue and College Street. Therefore the East Busway Station and the Businesses on Ellsworth Avenue are still having an impact on the parking in the area which includes Area "Y".

The impactors, identified above, therefore, cause a reduced number of spaces for residents.

d. FEEDBACK FROM THE COMMUNITY

The Department of City Planning staff held a community meeting for Area "Y" permit holders on September 15, 2002. During this meeting, there was unanimous agreement by the residents in attendance to continue the R.P.P.P. for Area "Y".

e. RECERTIFICATION

In conclusion, our analysis of the data shows, 73% of residents, with an opinion, are in favor of the R.P.P.P., 65% of residents, with an opinion, see availability of parking near their homes within the last year as about the same or easier. Secondly the R.P.P.P. created a decrease of at least 35% in occupied spaces as shown in the Parking Density Chart. Third, the existence of primary impactors continues to pose a threat as they use residential streets to park. Fourth, at a community meeting for Area "Y" permit holders on September 15, 2002, there was unanimous agreement by the residents in attendance to continue the R.P.P.P. for Area "Y".

Based on this analysis, it is recommended that the R.P.P.P Area "Y" be recertified.