

PROPOSED RECERTIFICATION OF RESIDENTIAL PERMIT PARKING PROGRAM AREA U

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 "U", Shadyside. This district includes all public streets within the area bounded by Amberson Street from 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue to Bayard Street, Bayard Street from Amberson Street east to its end, the Martin Luther King Busway from near Colonial Place to Ivy Street. The boundary then continues along Ivy Street to Ellsworth Avenue to South Negley Avenue to Elmer Street to Rosary Way. The boundary then continues from Maryland at Elmer Street to Walnut Street, to (but not including) College Avenue to 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue to Amberson Street. It also includes Amberson Place, but does not include the A1 Zone.

3. BACKGROUND

Originally, the reason for lack of sufficient legal on-street parking spaces for residents in Shadyside, Area "U", was due to employees working in the portion of the commercial district zoned A-1 Commercial-Residential Associated District, commuters taking 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue busses or busses on the Martin Luther King Busway to Oakland or Downtown and students and employees going to the University of Pittsburgh and Carnegie Mellon University which saturated this residential neighborhood with parked vehicles.

The Shadyside 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 "U" R.P.P.P. was approved in June 1992. It was expanded in March of 1994 and again in April of 1996.

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 Shadyside residents still desired the program. Of the 1442 questionnaires sent out, 264 were returned (18%) showing that 84.25% (14.25% more than the required criteria) of those that had an opinion were still in favor of the program. The questionnaires showed that only 15.75% of permit holders, with an opinion, believe the program had created hardships for them, 69.29% found it easier or the same to park near their homes in the last year, 30.71% found it more difficult.**

- o 73.80% of the permit holders, with an opinion, found it difficult to very difficult to park near their home prior to the implementation of the program.
- o 87.04% of the permit holders, with an opinion, are satisfied with the boundaries of the program.
- o 77.73% are satisfied with the hours of the program.
- o 63.31% are satisfied with enforcement of the program.

There were **374 comments** on the questionnaires. The four greatest complaints focused on enforcement issues (**105 comments**). Either increasing enforcement (81 comments), reviewing parking authority officers' conduct and procedures (21 comments), and decreasing enforcement (3 comments). The second highest complaint dealt with the R.P.P.P. procedures (**99 comments**). More specifically monitoring or revising the visitor parking pass procedures (48 comments), revising residential parking pass procedures (31 comments), and limiting or increasing the fee for parking passes purchased by renters or students (20 comments). The third complaint dealt with the fee increase (**46 comments**). Some residents were opposed to any parking fee increase (26 comments), in favor of a parking fee increase (13 comments), wanted the city to look for alternate means of revenue (4 comments), and finally residents wanted a lower increase fee for visitor passes (3 comments). The final complaint focused on the hours of operation (**36 comments**), either increasing (34 comments) or decreasing the hours (2 comments). Residents wanted longer program enforcement hours during the weekdays and the program extended to the weekend. We will contact the Pittsburgh Parking Authority concerning the enforcement issues and the Department of City Planning will look into the issue of R.P.P.P. procedures further. The fee increase and the hours of operation are correlated, the City cannot extend the hours of operation without an increase in fees. The matter of the fee increase is currently in review by the Mayor's office.

b. PARKING SURVEY RESULTS

**The Parking Survey Results showed that the program is still needed for Shadyside and was effective in providing 64% 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 1997 and prior to the program of some of the streets in Area "U" are presented in Table A (page 3). The information on the chart was the more dense parking day for each block. Only those streets surveyed are included in the chart.

The total spaces available in Area "U" are 1524 with 1874 permits issued during the 1996 - 1997 permit year. This apparent parking deficit does not take into account alternatives that residents have. Based on the original survey we have performed in Area "U" 68% of the parking need is met by off street spaces.

Table A presents for each block face and for area "U", 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 1996.

As shown on Table A, the total percent of spaces occupied in 1997 was 48%, with 50% of these spaces occupied by non-resident vehicles. Approximately 52% of available spaces are still left for residents to park in when before the program there were 25% of the spaces available.

Prior to the program, 75% of the spaces were being utilized.

**Due to the program, there has been a decrease of 27% spaces being occupied showing that the Residential Parking Permit Program has definitely worked for Shadyside, Area "U".**

c. PRIMARY IMPACTORS

**The ordinance requires us to identify that the primary impactors are still in existence. An investigation was conducted to verify the existence of the Martin Luther King Busway, and the Ellsworth Avenue and Walnut Street business districts.**

We obtained a copy of 71A's bus schedule, effective from March 13, 2006, on the Port Authority's website. This particular bus does traverse through Shadyside, and the map found on the back of the schedule clearly indicates the location of the Busway and its stations. We visited the City of Pittsburgh's Finance Office to verify the existence of the Walnut Street and Ellsworth Avenue business districts. The Finance Office pulled up the taxes filed for the businesses on 5416-5512 Walnut Street and 5734-5883 Ellsworth Avenue. The records indicated that the businesses on Walnut and Ellsworth filed their EM-1, wage tax, emergency municipal tax, and the occupation tax for the most current year. The primary impactors are in existence and still attracting non-residential parkers.

d. FEEDBACK FROM THE COMMUNITY

**The Department of City Planning hosted a meeting of October 6, 2005. 20 people attended this meeting. There was general agreement for the continuation of R.P.P.P. Area "U".**

Two residents from the 5500 block of Kentucky expressed their opposition for the continuation of the program. There was discussion about changing the hours to have the program operate later in the day. Residents were appraised of this issue and given a chance to respond on the questionnaire. A majority of residents were happy with the hours. They also discussed subdividing Area "U" into smaller permit districts. Residents were appraised of this issue and given a chance to respond on the questionnaire. A majority of residents were happy with the current boundaries of Area "U".

They expressed their support for lowering the parking fees at night for garages and meters. They also requested that the permits be prorated. And they complained about the visitors' pass holder that they put the visitors' passes in when not in use. We will communicate all these issues to the Parking Authority.

There was a feeling that signage was inadequate or contradictory. We will get feedback from the residents on specific signage concerns and investigate those requests. There was also a discussion of visitors' pass restrictions. It was decided to keep the current five consecutive weekday restriction. Legislation is being drafted to codify that restriction. They also requested a clarification on what phone numbers and emails are for what activity. We will get them that information.

5. RECERTIFICATION

As conclusion, our analysis has shown that, 84.25% of the permit holders, 14.25% 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 Shadyside, Area "U", has freed-up 52% available spaces for the residents in 1997, compared with 25% being available before implementation of the program. This is an increase of 27% more spaces available. Third, the Martin Luther King Busway and the Ellsworth Avenue and Walnut Street business districts would impact any available parking. Last, those permit holders attending the community meeting to discuss this issue were in favor of recertifying Area "U" (Shadyside).

**Because of this analysis, it is recommended that R.P.P.P. Area "U" (Shadyside) be recertified.**