

PROPOSED RECERTIFICATION OF RESIDENTIAL PERMIT PARKING PROGRAM AREA K1. 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 "K", North Squirrel Hill. This district includes most of the streets bounded by Devon Road, Wilkins Avenue, Beeler Street, and Northumberland Street.

3. BACKGROUND

Originally, the reason for lack of sufficient legal on-street parking spaces for residents in North Squirrel Hill, Area "K" was due to commuters to Carnegie Mellon University.

The North Squirrel Hill 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 "K" R.P.P.P. was approved August 29, 1988. This permit area was expanded to include additional streets in October 1991 and again in November 1996. It was last recertified on June 16, 1995.

4 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

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

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 North Squirrel Hill residents still desired the program. Of the 447 questionnaires sent this year, 168 were returned (38%) showing that 76% (6% more than the required criteria) were still in favor of the program. The questionnaires showed that only 19% of permit holders, with an opinion, believe the program had created hardships for them, 94% found it easier or the same to park near their homes in the last year, 6% found it more difficult

- o 23% of the permit holders, with an opinion, found it very difficult to park near their home prior to the implementation of the program.
- o 87% of the permit holders, with an opinion, are satisfied with the boundaries of the program.
- o 84% are satisfied with hours of the program.
- o 75% are satisfied with enforcement of the program.

The greatest number of complaints were regarding the need for more visitors' passes (22 comments), lack of enforcement (16 comments), problems with repair people parking (12 comments), students getting permits (11 comments), residents and their visitors being ticketed (11 comments), problems using the visitors' pass (9 comments), the cost of the permit or visitors' pass (8 comments), reducing the hours of the program (6 comments), visitors' pass abuse (5 comments) and difficulties in getting the permit (5 comments). The rest of the complaints were mentioned less than five times. While enforcement is always an issue, the Parking Authority is aware of this concern. The one visitors' pass per household limitation and the cost of the permits and visitors' passes are in the code and there are no plans to change either of these sections at this time. We have discussed the visitors' pass abuse problem with the parking authority. The visitors' pass usage problems, the problems getting permits, and the students getting permits are endemic in the system. We will communicate with the permit holders regarding these issues. Ticketing errors are just that, errors. We will investigate this request for shorter hours and will inform the residents of the pending ordinance change to implement home remodeling permits.

b. PARKING SURVEY RESULTS

The Parking Survey Results showed that the program is still needed for North Squirrel Hill and was effective in providing 41% 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 1999 and prior to the program of each street are presented in Table A (page 3). Area "K" was surveyed on July 23, 1999.

The total spaces available in Area "K" are 698 with 447 permits currently in use, leaving 251 more spaces available. Only those streets surveyed are included in the chart.

| STREET NAMES | RES. PARKERS | NON-RES. PARKERS | VISITORS' PASSES | TOTAL NO. PARKERS | TOTAL AVAILABLE SPACES |
|------------------------|--------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| Beeler Street | 23 | 9 | 5 | 37 | 171 |
| Bennington Street | 12 | -- | -- | 12 | 83 |
| Devon Road | 6 | 5 | -- | 11 | 39 |
| Fair Oaks Street* | 7 | 3 | -- | 10 | 37 |
| Inverness Street | 1 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 46 |
| Malvern Avenue | 4 | 4 | -- | 8 | 48 |
| Maynard Street | 1 | 2 | -- | 3 | 51 |
| Northumberland Street* | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 59 |
| Plainfield Street | 5 | -- | -- | 5 | 86 |
| Squirrel Hill Avenue | 1 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 111 |
| Wilkins Avenue* | 4 | -- | 3 | 7 | 23 |
| <i>Total</i> | <i>65</i> | <i>33</i> | <i>14</i> | <i>112</i> | <i>698</i> |

* Partial Street

| STREET NAMES | % RES PARKERS | % NON-RES PARKERS | % SPACES OCCUPIED | % SPACES OCCUPIED PRIOR TO PROGRAM | % DIFFERENCE |
|------------------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|
| Beeler Street | 62 | 24 | 22 | 83 | -61 |
| Bennington Street | 100 | 0 | 14 | 26 | -12 |
| Devon Road | 54 | 46 | 28 | 98 | -70 |
| Fair Oaks Street* | 70 | 30 | 27 | 43 | -16 |
| Inverness Street | 12 | 44 | 20 | 22 | -2 |
| Malvern Avenue | 50 | 50 | 17 | 59 | -42 |
| Maynard Street | 33 | 67 | 6 | 16 | -10 |
| Northumberland Street* | 25 | 50 | 7 | 75 | -68 |
| Plainfield Street | 100 | -- | 6 | 43 | -37 |
| Squirrel Hill Avenue | 17 | 67 | 5 | 38 | -33 |
| Wilkins Avenue* | 57 | -- | 30 | 52 | -22 |
| <i>Total</i> | 58 | 29 | 16 | 57 | -41 |

* Partial Street

Table A presents for each block face and for Area “K”, 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 1999.

As shown on Table A, the total percent of spaces occupied in 1999 was 16%, with 29% of these spaces being occupied by non-resident vehicles. Approximately 84% of available spaces are still left for residents to park in when before the program there were 43% of the spaces available.

Prior to the program, 57% of the spaces were being utilized.

Due to the program, there has been a decrease of 41% spaces being occupied showing that the Residential Parking Permit Program has definitely worked for the North Squirrel Hill, Area “K”.

c. PRIMARY IMPACTORS

The ordinance requires us to identify that the primary impactors are still in existence. In 1998 we expanded this RPPP district. The report identified Carnegie Mellon University as the primary impactor.

5 RECERTIFICATION

As conclusion, our analysis has shown that, 85%, 15% 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 North Squirrel Hill, Area “K”, has freed-up 69% available spaces for the residents in 1997, compared with 16% being available before implementation of the program. This is an increase of 53% more spaces available. Third, parking by commuters using the primary impactor, students and employees going to Carnegie Mellon University are still impacting residential streets in the area.

Because of this analysis, it is recommended that R.P.P.P. Area “K” (North Squirrel Hill) be recertified.