

**PROPOSED RECERTIFICATION OF RESIDENTIAL PERMIT PARKING PROGRAM**  
**AREA F**

**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 'F', North Side and East Allegheny. This area is generally bounded by Cedar Avenue, Dunloe Street, East Street, and Pressley Street and also includes portions of Progress Street, South Canal Street, and Carpenter Way.

**3. BACKGROUND**

The original reason for lack of insufficient legal on street parking for residents in the North Side and East Allegheny, Area 'F', was due to employees and visitors of Allegheny General Hospital, business employees and customers, and stadium patrons. 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 'F' was designated by City Council and the Planning Commission on December 14, 1984 and was expanded March 28, 2002.

**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 627**

questionnaires sent out, 110 (18%) were returned, showing that 80% (10% more than the required criteria) are in favor of the program's continuation, while 20% of those responding said the program has created hardships. The questionnaire results also shows that 69% of the residents, with an opinion, found parking near their homes to be easier or about the same, 31% have a more difficult time.

- 67% of permit holders, with an opinion, are satisfied with the operating hours of the program
- 32% of permit holders, with an opinion, found parking to be very difficult prior to implementation of the program
- 52% are satisfied with enforcement of the program
- 80% are satisfied with the boundaries of the program

The major complaints were regarding the lack of enforcement (14 complaints), problems using the visitor pass (12 complaints), the need for multiple visitor passes in a household (8 complaints), and the need for longer program hours on game days at Heinz Field (6 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. Changes in Area 'F's management plan is under consideration to address longer program hours in association with game day problems and will inform residents of any changes.

#### b. PARKING SURVEY RESULTS

The parking survey Results showed that the program is still needed for North Side/East Allegheny.

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 'F'.

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 'F' has 69% of spaces occupied. As a contingency to be entered in to the program, the occupancy prior to implementation of R.P.P.P. was at least 75%. **There is at least a 6% decrease in spaces occupied as a result of the R.P.P.P. The program is working for the North Side/ East Allegheny, Area 'F'.**

#### c. PRIMARY IMPACTORS

The ordinance requires us to identify that the primary impactors still exist. During the recertification process, survey responses by residents in Area 'F' state that: Allegheny General Hospital's employees and visitors (7 residents identified this as an impactor), fans going to Heinz Field and PNC Park (31 residents identified this as an impactor), increased number of residents with multiple vehicles (12 residents identified this as an impactor), and business employees and customers (7 residents identified this an impactor) all contribute to a deficit in residential parking.

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 'F' permit holders on October 21, 2002. During this meeting, there was unanimous agreement by the residents in attendance to continue the R.P.P.P. for Area 'F'.

Changes to the management plan were also discussed in reference to increased hours of operation on Sunday.

e. RECERTIFICATION

In conclusion, our analysis of the data shows, 80% of residents, with an opinion, are in favor of the R.P.P.P., 69% 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 6% 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 'F' permit holders on October 21, 2002, there was unanimous agreement by the residents in attendance to continue the R.P.P.P. for Area 'F'.

**Based on this analysis, it is recommended that the R.P.P.P Area 'F' be recertified.**

TABLE A

STREET NAMES	RES. PARKERS	NON-RES. PARKERS	VISITORS' PASSES PARKERS	NO.	TOTAL SPACES	TOTAL AVAILABLE
Avery	39	4	6	49	71	
Lockhart	37	19	12	68	68	
Pressley	15	13	6	34	30	
Foreland	13	20	5	38	46	
James	17	18	10	45	78	
Suismon	13	23	4	40	65	
Middle	8	14	4	26	76	
<b>Total</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>434</b>	

TABLE B

STREET NAMES	% RES PARKERS	% NON-RES PARKERS	SPACES OCCUPIED	%
Avery	80	10	70	
Lockhart		54	28	100
Pressley	44	38	113	
Foreland	34	53	83	
James	38	40	58	
Suismon	33	58	62	
Middle	31	54	34	

---

Total	47	37	69
-------	----	----	----