

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION BRIEFING

PROPOSED RECERTIFICATION OF RESIDENTIAL PERMIT PARKING PROGRAM AREA D

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 "D", Central Oakland (see map on page 7). This district is generally bounded by Sennott Street, Fresco Way and Iroquois Way on the north, the paper alley between McKee Street and Coltart Street and Bates Street on the west, the Boulevard of the Allies on the south, and Parkview Avenue, Boundary Street, Joncaire Street and Bouquet Street on the east.

3. BACKGROUND

Originally, the reason for the lack of sufficient legal on-street parking spaces for residents in Central Oakland, Area "D", was due to employees of the various Oakland Hospitals, downtown commuters who rode the Boulevard of the Allies buses to work, and the University of Pittsburgh's students and employees saturating this residential neighborhood with parked vehicles.

The Central Oakland residents desired to reduce this volume of non-residential parking on residential streets. They chose to establish a residential parking program as a means of achieving this reduction. Area "D" R.P.P.P. was approved in July of 1984 and 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

For this area, the R.P.P.P. contacted Area “D” community groups and asked them to distribute questionnaires to their residents. Of the 146 questionnaires returned, 94% (24% more than the required criteria) were still in favor of the program. The responses showed that only 23% of permit holders, with an opinion, believed the program had created hardships for them, 94% would like the program to continue on their street, 43% found it easier or the same to park near their homes in the last year while 57% found it more difficult.

- 72% of the permit holders, with an opinion, found it difficult to park near their home prior to the implementation of the program.
- 73% of the permit holders, with an opinion, were satisfied with the boundaries of the program.
- 78% were satisfied with hours of the program.
- 65% are satisfied with enforcement of the program.

There were 183 comments on the questionnaires. The greatest number of comments were regarding the lack of enforcement (33 comments), too many visitor’s passes were being issued (24 comments) and too many permits per house (21 comments).

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.

Under city law every legal resident is entitled a parking permit for every vehicle they own. This law also restricts the number of passes that can be issued to a resident according to the unit’s occupancy. The desire to decrease boundaries has been a topic for quite some time, with a portion of the community desiring a subdivision of the area, while the majority of the residents would like the area’s boundaries to stay as they are. This matter will be addressed through the Oakland Community Council.

b. PARKING SURVEY RESULTS

The Parking Survey Results showed that the program is still needed for Central Oakland and was effective in providing 44% 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 2010 and prior to the program of each street is presented in Table A (pages 4 & 5). Area "D" was surveyed on Aug 5, Aug 6, and Aug 20 in 2010. The information on the chart is the most current for each block.

The total spaces available in Area "D" is 1143 with 1494 permits in use during the 2009 - 2010 permit year. However, this does not take into account the available off-street spaces. Only the streets surveyed are included in the chart. We are currently looking into this parking deficit situation with the Pittsburgh Parking Authority.

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

- Number of residential parkers on each street.
- Number of non-residential parkers (without permit or visitor pass) on each street.
- Number of visitor pass parkers on each street.
- Total number of parkers.
- Total available spaces for each street.
- Percentage of resident parkers on each street.
- Percentage of non-resident parkers (without visitor pass or permit) on each street.
- Percent of spaces occupied on each street.
- Percent of spaces occupied on each street prior to the program.
- Difference between the percent of space occupied on each street prior to the program and the street surveys of the summer 2010.

As shown on Table A, the total percent of spaces occupied in 2009 and 2010 was 60%. Of these, 28% were non-resident vehicles. Approximately 40% parking spaces were still available for resident parking. Prior to the program, 104% of the spaces were utilized.

Due to the program, there has been a 44% decrease in occupied spaces, showing that the Residential Parking Permit Program has been successful for Central Oakland, Area "D".

c. PRIMARY IMPACTORS

The ordinance requires us to identify that the primary impactors are still in existence. The University of Pittsburgh, Magee-Women's Hospital and the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center are primary impactors for the area. We contacted the City of Pittsburgh's Finance Office to verify the existence of the University of Pittsburgh, Magee-Women's Hospital and the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center's. The Finance Office pulled up the taxes filed under the University of Pittsburgh, Magee-Women's Hospital and the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center that showed that all three organizations paid all taxes for the most recent year.

TABLE A

Street Names	Residential Parkers	Non-res. Parkers	Visitor's Passes	Total # Parkers	Total Available Spaces
Atwood St.	69	23	12	104	120
Bates St.	21	14	7	42	108
Boundary St.	6	7	0	13	30
Dawson	25	33	1	59	111
Louisa St.	21	3	3	27	88
Mckee Place	41	21	7	69	99
Meyran Ave	64	15	13	92	177
Oakland Ave	48	11	11	70	102
Oakland Square	10	2	2	14	24
Parkview St.	37	16	0	53	94
Pier St.	11	2	0	13	16
S Bouquet St.	6	6	3	15	25
Semple	30	6	9	45	60
Wellsford St.	16	14	0	30	44
Ward St.	23	18	0	41	45
Total	428	191	68	687	1143

TABLE A (continued)

Street Names	% of Residential Parkers	% of Non-res. Parkers	% of Space Occupied	% of Space Occupied Prior to Program	% of Difference
Atwood St.	66%	22%	87%	112%	-25%
Bates St.	50%	33%	39%	100%	-61%
Boundary St.	46%	54%	43% *		
Dawson	42%	56%	53% *		
Louisa St.	78%	11%	31%	93%	-62%
Mckee Place	59%	30%	70%	102%	-32%
Meyran Ave	70%	16%	52%	104%	-52%
Oakland Ave	69%	16%	69%	99%	-30%
Oakland Square	71%	14%	58% *		
Parkview St.	70%	30%	56%	101%	-45%
Pier St.	85%	15%	81%	81%	0%
S Bouquet St.	40%	40%	60% *		
Semple	67%	13%	75%	114%	-39%
Wellsford St.	53%	47%	68%	100%	-32%
Ward St.	56%	44%	91% *		
Total	62%	28%	60%	104%	-44%

* For Boundary St, Dawson St, Oakland Square and S Bouquet St and Ward St, the data of spaces prior to program are not available.

d. FEEDBACK FROM THE COMMUNITY

At the Oakland Community Council meeting on March 25, 2010, the organization unanimously requested that R.P.P.P. Area “D” be recertified for an additional four years. They took responsibility for distributing the questionnaires to the residents.

5. RECERTIFICATION

In conclusion, our analysis has shown that 94% of residents who had an opinion are still in favor of the program, 24% more than the required 70% for inclusion into the program, are still in favor of the program. The Residential Parking Permit for Central Oakland, Area “D”, has freed-up 44% of available spaces for residents as reflected in the 2009 – 2010 survey, compared with no spaces before implementation of the program. The primary impactors, the University of Pittsburgh, the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, and Magee-Women’s Hospital, still pose a danger of their employees, students and visitors using the residential streets for their parking. Finally, the residents at the community meeting on March 25, 2010 showed unanimous support for the program.

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

MAP OF AREA "D"

