

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION BRIEFING

PROPOSED RECERTIFICATION OF RESIDENTIAL PERMIT PARKING PROGRAM AREA B

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, requiring the Parking Permit Officer to 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 “B”, Central & West Oakland (see map on page 6). This district includes all of Chesterfield Road in West Oakland and is generally bounded by the Boulevard of the Allies (non-inclusive), Halket Street, Forbes Avenue (non-inclusive), Coltart Avenue and Bates Street in Central Oakland.

3. BACKGROUND

Originally, the reason for lack of sufficient legal on-street parking spaces for residents in Central & West Oakland, Area “B” was due to employees of the various Oakland hospitals and the University of Pittsburgh’s students and employees saturating this residential neighborhood with parked vehicles.

The Central & West Oakland 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 “B” of the R.P.P.P. was approved in June of 1983. It was expanded in February of 1991.

4 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Recertification is based on the questionnaire results, a 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

Questionnaire responses indicated that the majority of Central & West Oakland residents still desired the program.

Of the 310 questionnaires sent in 2010, 63 were returned (20.3%). Of those responses, 95.1% (25% more than the required criteria and 12% more than the last recertification) would like the program to continue on their street. The returned questionnaires showed that only 13.1% (5% less than last recertification) of permit holders, with an opinion, believed the program had created hardships for them, 57.2% found it easier or the same to park near their homes in the last year, with 42.8% finding it more difficult.

- o 75% of the permit holders with an opinion and who lived in the permit area prior to the program implementation, found it very difficult to park near their home prior to the implementation of the program.
- o 82% of the permit holders, with an opinion, were satisfied with the boundaries of the program.
- o 80.6% were satisfied with hours of the program.
- o 62.9% were satisfied with enforcement of the program.

The greatest number of complaints were regarding too many permits per house (12 comments), visitor passes being abused (9 comments), need for more enforcement (8 comments) and requests for enforcement to leave their vehicles (7 comments). 5 residents wrote that without the Residential Parking Permit Program, they would not be able to park.

The cost of maintaining the program (office staff, enforcement and supplies) is currently \$673,494. Enforcement costs alone are \$419,137.00. This far exceeds the \$240,000.00 that currently comes in from permit fees. Since the Residential Parking Program does not generate any additional revenue, an increase in enforcement would not be a viable option with the current budget constraints. Having the enforcement officers in their vehicles increases the speed by which they can get around the area, increasing enforcement in the long run.

Under the law we must sell permits to every resident. We check the occupancy of each address to make sure only residents legally living there get a permit. While most people were happy with the boundaries, a few wanted them to expand. However, Area B is surrounded by the University of Pittsburgh to the north, hospitals and RPPP Area D to the east, RPPP Areas E and M to the south and hospitals and Area C to the west. There is nowhere we can expand the district.

b. PARKING SURVEY RESULTS

The Parking Survey Results showed that the program is still needed for Central & West Oakland and was effective in providing at least 16% more spaces in the West Oakland section of Area “B” and 35% more spaces in the Central Oakland section of Area “B” 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 2010 of each street is presented in Table A (page 4). Area “B” was surveyed on July 29, 2010. The total spaces available in Area “B” are 264 with 295 permits in use during the 2009 - 2010 permit year. However, this does not take into account the available off-street spaces. Only those streets surveyed are included in the chart. Since Buffalo Street and Feeney Way no longer exist, we have taken them off the chart, but those spaces and permits existed when the survey was done.

Table A presents for each block face and for area “B”, 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 residential parkers on each street.
- o Percentage of non-residential 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 2010.

As shown on Table A, the total percent of spaces occupied in 2010 was 71%. Of these 34% were non-resident vehicles. Approximately 29% of parking spaces are still available for residents to park in. Before the program over 90% of the spaces were unavailable to the residents.

As a result of the program, there are 23% more available spaces in West Oakland and 21% more available spaces in Central Oakland, showing that the Residential Parking Permit Program has been successful for Central & West Oakland, Area “B”.

c. PRIMARY IMPACTORS

The ordinance requires us to identify that the primary impactors are still in existence. **Based on the comments on the questionnaires, the University of Pittsburgh and the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center are still primary impactors for this area and pose a parking threat to the residents in Area B.**

d. FEEDBACK FROM THE COMMUNITY

On March 18, 2010, we held a meeting for the Area B permit holders. There was agreement that R.P.P. Area “B” be recertified for an additional four years without any changes.

TABLE A

Street Names	Res. Parkers	Non-res. Parkers	Visitor's Passes	Total # Parkers	Total Available Spaces
Chesterfield Rd	37	12	5	54	72
Bates St	4	4	0	8	13
Coltart Ave	30	13	4	47	80
Halket St & Halket PI	17	29	4	50	59
Louisa St	14	4	1	19	23
Zulema St	6	2	2	10	17
Total	108	64	16	188	264

Street Names	% of Res. Parkers	% of Non-res. Parkers	% of Space Occupied
Chesterfield Rd	69%	22%	75%
Bates St	50%	50%	62%
Coltart Ave	69%	30%	58%
Halket St & Halket PI	34%	58%	85%
Louisa St	74%	21%	83%
Zulema St	60%	20%	59%
Total	57%	34%	71%

Sections	% Spaces Occupied	% Spaces Occupied Prior to the Program	% Difference
Chesterfield	75%	98%	-23%
Bates, Coltart, Halket St & Halket PI, Louisa & Zulema	70%	91%	-21%

5 RECERTIFICATION

In conclusion, our analysis has shown that 95.1% of residents who had an opinion are still in favor of the program, 25% more than the required 70% for inclusion into the program. The Residential Parking Permit Program for Central & West Oakland, Area “B”, has freed-up 26% of available spaces for residents as reflected in the 2010 survey, compared with less than 10% of the spaces available before implementation of the program. The primary impactors, the Oakland hospitals and the University of Pittsburgh still pose a danger of their employees, students and visitors using the residential streets for their parking. Finally, at a meeting where all the permit holders were invited to attend, there was agreement to recertify area “B” (Central & West Oakland).

Based on this analysis, it is recommended that Residential Parking Permit Program Area “B” (Central & West Oakland) be recertified.

