

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION BRIEFING

PROPOSED RECERTIFICATION OF RESIDENTIAL PERMIT PARKING PROGRAM AREA M

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 “M”, South Oakland (see map on page 6). This district is generally bounded by the Boulevard of the Allies, Parkview Avenue, Frazier Street (non-inclusive) and Bates Street (non-inclusive).

3. BACKGROUND

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

The South 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 “M” R.P.P.P. was approved in July of 1988. It was expanded in 1990 and 1992.

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 South Oakland residents still desired the program.

Of the 426 questionnaires sent in November 2010, 53 were returned (12.4%). Of those responses, 96% (26% more than the required criteria) who had an opinion were still in favor of the program. The responses showed that only 36% of permit holders, with an opinion, believed the program had created hardships for them, 56% found it good or the same to park near their homes in the last year, with 44% finding it more difficult.

- o 80% of the permit holders, with an opinion, found it very difficult to park near their home prior to the implementation of the program.
- o 86% of the permit holders, with an opinion, are satisfied with the boundaries of the program.
- o 58% are satisfied with hours of the program.
- o 51% are satisfied with enforcement of the program.
- o 51% think the city gives a clear understanding of the program.
- o 79% of the visitor's pass users are satisfied with the visitors' passes.

The greatest number of complaints was regarding too many permits per house (19 comments), the desire to increase the hours of the program (12 comments), the need for more enforcement (9 comments), extending the area boundary(5 comments) and the need for more than one visitor's pass per person (5 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 the law we must sell permits to every resident. Changes in the one per household limitation on visitors' passes would require a code amendment. Also, additional visitors' passes would undermine the ability of the program to protect parking for residents. While most people were happy with the boundaries, a few wanted to expand. If more than 70% of residents in the objective street are willing to be included in R.P.P.P Area M, we will add that street to M. The hours could be increased and we will contact the Oakland City Council to determine if there is adequate support for this change.

b. PARKING SURVEY RESULTS

The Parking Survey Results showed that the program is still needed for South Oakland and was effective in providing at least 56% 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 2010 of each street is presented in Table A (page 4). Area “M” was surveyed on October 27 and November 3, 2010. The total spaces available in Area “M” are 406 with 402 permits in use during the 2009-2010 permit year. Only those streets surveyed are included in the chart.

Table A presents for each block face and for area “M”, 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 November of 2010.

As shown on Table A, the total percentage of spaces occupied in 2010 was 48%, with 9% being non-resident vehicles. Approximately 52% of available spaces were still available for resident parking. Prior to the program, over 100% of the spaces were utilized.

Due to the program, there has been a 56% decrease in occupied spaces, showing that the Residential Parking Permit Program has been successful for South Oakland, Area “M”.

c. PRIMARY IMPACTORS

The ordinance requires us to identify that the primary impactors are still in existence. **The University of Pittsburgh and the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center were primary impactors for the area. Based on a field investigation we made on Nov 15, 2010, the University of Pittsburgh and the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center are still in existence.**

d. FEEDBACK FROM THE COMMUNITY

On November 10, 2010, we held a meeting for the Area “M” permit holders. There was agreement that R.P.P.P. Area “M” be recertified for an additional four years without any changes.

TABLE A

STREET NAMES	END STREETS	RES. PARKERS	NON-RES. PARKERS	VISITORS PASSES	TOTAL NO. PARKERS	TOTAL AVAILABLE SPACES
Belgreen Place	Ward to Dawson	1	0	0	1	7
Cato Street	Juliet to Ward	16	4	0	20	39
Cato Street	Romeo to Juliet	5	1	0	6	22
Dawson Street	Swinburne to Blvd. of Allies	37	4	5	46	57
Dawson Street	Frazier to Swinburne	20	4	1	25	68
Edith Place	Ward to Dawson	5	7	1	13	16
Juliet Street	Cato to Thora	18	2	1	21	46
Parkview Avenue	Swinburne to Blvd. of Allies	27	5	0	32	89
Swinburne Street	Dawson to Parkview	1	2	0	3	6
Virgila Place	Juliet to Hardie	4	2	0	6	17
Ward Street	Cato to Thora	19	4	0	23	39
Total		153	35	8	196	406

STREET NAMES	END STREETS	% RES. PARKERS	% NON-RES PARKERS	% SPACES OCCUPIED	% SPACES OCCUPIED PRIOR TO PROGRAM	% DIFFERENCE
Belgreen Place	Ward to Dawson	100%	0%	14%	62%	-48%
Cato Street	Juliet to Ward	80%	10%	51%	92%	-41%
Cato Street	Romeo to Juliet	83%	5%	27%	67%	-40%
Dawson Street	Swinburne to Blvd. of Allies	80%	7%	81%	109%	-28%
Dawson Street	Frazier to Swinburne	80%	6%	37%	79%	-42%
Edith Place	Ward to Dawson	38%	44%	81%		81%
Juliet Street	Cato to Thora	86%	4%	46%	124%	-78%
Parkview Avenue	Swinburne to Blvd. of Allies	84%	6%	36%	101%	-65%
Swinburne Street	Dawson to Parkview	33%	33%	50%	83%	-33%
Virgila Place	Juliet to Hardie	67%	12%	35%	133%	-98%
Ward Street	Cato to Thora	83%	10%	59%	159%	-100%
Total		78%	9%	48%	104%	-56%

5 RECERTIFICATION

In conclusion, our analysis has shown that 96% 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 for South Oakland, Area “M”, has freed-up 56% of available spaces for residents as reflected in the 2010 survey, compared with over 100% of spaces being occupied before implementation of the program. The primary impactors, the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center and the University of Pittsburgh, still pose a danger of their employees, students and visitors using the residential streets for their parking. Finally, the Oakland Community Council requested the recertification Area “M” (South Oakland).

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

