

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION BRIEFING

PROPOSED RECERTIFICATION OF RESIDENTIAL PERMIT PARKING PROGRAM AREA "H"

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 "H", Bloomfield. The district is bounded by basically Penn Avenue (non-inclusive), Ambroy Way, Baum Boulevard (non-inclusive), Lorigan Street, Cedarville Street and Edmond Street.

3. BACKGROUND

Originally, the reason for lack of sufficient legal on-street parking spaces for residents in Bloomfield, Area "H" was due to employees and customers of the various businesses of the Bloomfield business district and The Western Pennsylvania and Shadyside Hospitals, which saturated this residential neighborhood with parked vehicles.

The Bloomfield 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 "H" of the R.P.P.P. was approved in October of 1985 and since then has had its boundaries expanded in 1986, 1989, 1993, and 1994.

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

By sending out questionnaires, the R.P.P.P. was able to determine that the majority of Bloomfield residents still desired the program. Of the 1465 questionnaires sent in 2002, 385 were returned (26%) showing that 73% (3% more than the required criteria) were still in favor of the program. The questionnaires showed that only 27% of permit holders, with an opinion, believe the program had created hardships for them, 73% found it easier or the same to park near their homes in the last year, 27% found it more difficult

- o 37% of the permit holders, with an opinion, found it very difficult to park near their home prior to the implementation of the program.
- o 84% of the permit holders, with an opinion, are satisfied with the boundaries of the program.
- o 77% are satisfied with hours of the program.
- o 63% are satisfied with the enforcement of the program.

The greatest number of complaints were regarding the lack of available parking, the issuance of only one visitors' pass per household, the lack of enforcement, cost of permits being too high and the hours of program operation being too short. The lack of available parking can only be lessened through greater enforcement. The enforcement office is now using handheld computers, which should make writing tickets more efficient. 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. While Enforcement is always an issue, the Parking Authority is aware of the issue and has been notified about a requested meeting concerning enforcement. The permits do not currently pay for the cost of the program. The program was designed to be self-sufficient. Any reduction in the fees would exacerbate this problem. We will investigate the request for extended hours of operation and inform the residents of any changes.

b. PARKING SURVEY RESULTS

The Parking Survey Results showed that the program is still needed for Bloomfield and was effective in providing 34% 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 1998 and prior to the program of each street are presented in Table A (page 5).

The total spaces available in Area "H" are 1449 with 1465 permits that were in use during the 2000-2001 permit year. While this implies a deficit in parking, there also exist a large number of off-street parking spaces. Due to the summer youth programs limited staff only a certain number of streets were surveyed. They are included in the chart.

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

- o Number of residential parkers on each street.
- o Number of non-residential parkers (without permit or visitor pass) on each street
- o Number of visitor pass parkers on each street.
- o Total number of parkers.
- o Total available spaces for each street.
- o Percentage of resident parkers on each street.
- o Percentage of non-resident parkers (without visitor pass or permit) on each street.
- o Percent of spaces occupied on each street.
- o Percent of spaces occupied on each street prior to the program.
- o Difference between the percent of space occupied on each street prior to the program to the street surveys of the summer of 1995.

As shown on Table A, the total percent of spaces occupied in 1998 was 46%, with 24% being non-resident vehicles. Approximately 54% of available spaces are still left for residents to park in when before the program 80% of the spaces were utilized. Attached on page 8 is a letter from a satisfied resident expressing the effectiveness of the Residential Parking Permit Program

Due to the program, there has been a decrease of 34% spaces being occupied showing that the Residential Parking Permit Program has definitely worked for Bloomfield, Area "H".

c. PRIMARY IMPACTORS

The ordinance requires us to identify that the primary impactors are still in existence. **Based on field investigation the Bloomfield business district and the Western Pennsylvania and Shadyside Hospitals are still in existence. There have also been pending request from Yew Street to be petitioned back into in area "H".**

d. FEEDBACK FROM THE COMMUNITY

The Department of City Planning staff Held two Meetings for Area "H". The first meeting was held on February 13, 2002 where the majority of residence in attendance supported continuation of the program. There was discussion regarding increasing the permit parking grace period and a concern for more enforcement. The second meeting, for businesses of area "H", was held on March 7, 2002. At that meeting there were no suggestions for changes or complaints about the operation of the program.

The first matter will require a change in the management plan. We will investigate pursuing this issue. For the second matter The Department of City Planning has contacted the Parking Authority about the requested meeting concerning enforcement.

5 RECERTIFICATION

As conclusion, our analysis has shown that, 73%, 3% more than the required criteria of 70% for inclusion into the program are still in favor of the program. Second, the Residential Parking Permit for the Bloomfield, Area "H", has freed-up 34% available spaces for the residents in 1998. Third, the primary impactors the Western Pennsylvania and Shadyside Hospitals and the Bloomfield business district still pose a threat of their employees and customers using the residential streets for their parking. Last, the permit holders are in favor of recertifying Area "H" (Bloomfield).

Because of this analysis, it is recommended that R.P.P.P. Area "H" (Bloomfield) be recertified.

TABLE A

STREET NAMES	RES. PARKERS	NON-RES. PARKERS	VISITORS' PASSES	TOTAL NO. PARKERS	TOTAL AVAILABLE SPACES
S. Evaline	55	5	11	60	190
S. Millvale Ave.	43	20	3	63	107
S. Mathilda	64	27	9	91	130
Cedarville	24	9	3	33	56
Lorigan.	7	0	1	7	21
State Way	19	16	2	35	26
Yew	6	4	1	10	36
Cypress	40	16	6	56	77
Sciota	39	20	2	59	81
Edmond	22	12	2	34	80
Gross	46	13	8	59	166
S. Winebiddle	29	5	3	34	200
Aspen	3	0	0	3	34
Osceola	10	0	1	10	24
Powhatten	4	1	0	5	15
Woodworth	1	2	0	3	15
Harriet	3	0	2	3	33
Friendship	12	3	2	15	91
<i>Total</i>	<i>427</i>	<i>153</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>580</i>	<i>1382</i>

TABLE B

STREET NAMES	% RES PARKERS	% NON-RES PARKERS	% SPACES OCCUPIED	% SPACES OCCUPIED PRIOR TO PROGRAM	% DIFFERENCE
S. Evaline	92	8	32	88	-56
S. Millvale Ave.	68	32	59	86	-27
S. Mathilda	70	30	88	95	-7
Cedarville	73	27	60	83	-23
Lorigan.	100	0	33	75	-42
State Way	54	46	73	73	0
Yew	60	40	28	58	-30
Cypress	71	29	73	88	-15
Sciota	66	34	73	96	-23
Edmond	65	35	43	85	-42
Gross	78	22	36	91	-55
S. Winebiddle	85	15	17	77	-60
Aspen	100	0	88	65	23
Osceola	100	0	42	96	-54
Powhatten	80	20	33	83	-50
Woodworth	33	67	20	93	-73
Harriet	100	0	10	39	-29
Friendship	80	20	17	64	-47
<i>Total</i>	<i>76</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>80</i>	<i>-34</i>

