

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION BRIEFING

PROPOSED RECERTIFICATION OF RESIDENTIAL PERMIT PARKING PROGRAM AREA "H"

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 "H", (Bloomfield). The district is generally bounded by Penn Avenue (non-inclusive), Amboy Way, Baum Boulevard (non-inclusive), Lorigan Street, Cedarville Street and Edmond Street.

3. BACKGROUND

The original reason for the lack of sufficient legal on-street parking spaces for residents in Bloomfield, Area "H", was due to an oversaturation of vehicles belonging to employees and customers of the various businesses of the Bloomfield business district and the Western Pennsylvania and Shadyside hospitals.

Bloomfield 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 "H" of the R.P.P.P. was approved in October of 1985, with an expansion of its boundaries in 1986, 1989, 1993, and 1994.

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 key points highlighted:

a. QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

Questionnaire responses indicated that the majority of Bloomfield residents still desired the program. Of the 459 questionnaires sent out, 202 (44%) were returned. Of those responses, 80 (10 % more than the required criteria) were in favor of the program's continuation.

The questionnaire results also showed that 80%, with an opinion, found parking near their homes to be "easier" or "about the same" since the start of the program; 20% have had a more difficult time finding a parking space.

- 84% of permit holders, with an opinion, were satisfied with the method of issuing permits.
- 90% of permit holders, with an opinion, were satisfied with the boundaries of the program.
- 92% of permit holders, with an opinion, were satisfied with public notification and information about the program.
- 87% of permit holders, with an opinion, were satisfied with the hours of the program.
- 79% of permit holders, with an opinion, were satisfied with the visitor's passes.

Concerns from permit holders:

Enforcement Issues

- Need more timely and efficient patrolling
- Need more efficient and consistent ticketing
- Need for evening enforcement because of businesses. (ex. Silky's has heavy customer inflows due to sporting events)
- People living near the border area find difficulties parking in front of their homes

We will convey these concerns to the enforcement office. The hours were determined by the residents. Because of the management plan, anyone may park after 6:00 p.m. It would need to be amended through City Council. Enforcement after dark is problematic and more expensive. While we can consider this, the residents need to understand that extended enforcement will not occur on a regular basis. Enforcement has always been an issue facing residents and the program. 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.

Parking Permit/Visitor's Pass

- Complaints about visitor's passes being abused
- Request for more than one visitor's pass
- Request for more parking permits for organizations like churches
- Complaints about parking permits being abused, i.e., one car has more than one permit from different areas; illegal reselling of parking permits
- Hospital/Multiple rental apartments causing a shortage of parking spaces

We will convey abuse concerns to the enforcement office. More parking permits for organizations and more visitors' passes would require a change in the Code. In dense neighborhoods, such as Bloomfield, every additional permit and visitors' pass issued to a non-resident takes a space away from a resident. We are reluctant to pursue this without documented community support.

We have contacted the Parking Authority about the Hospital Nursing Residents and have solved that issue. Apartment dwellers are residents and it would be unconstitutional to treat them any differently than other residents. The Law Department has told us several times we may not create artificial classifications.

Suggestions from permit holders:

- Cardboard place cards instead of stickers for Visitor's Passes
- Additional ways to replace their permit instead of visiting the office
- Provide options for electronic renewal process/ online survey
- Better monitor the number of permits issued to the spaces available
- Boundary extension—areas should be wider so people can visit neighbors
- Shorten the grace period
- Terminate the first warning
- Raise the fine (currently \$35)
- Prioritize senior residents who have problem walking but cannot find a place to park in front of their house.

We will discuss the warning issue with the enforcement office. Shortening the grace period would require a change in the management plan, which was designed by the residents. It would need to be amended through City Council.

The reason for the static visitors' pass is to allow the enforcement officers to enforce from the vehicle. Place cards would require enforcement by foot. Permits can be replaced by mail and we will investigate options for moving the process online.

The program does not sell spaces on the street. Some streets have more density than the number of spaces for those cars. We look at available parking and projected number of cars for the district when we create a permit district.

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 Area H, we will add that street to H we will move to include them in Area H. The bigger the permit area, the more likely there would be a cross-parker problem (cars from one section of a district parking in another section of the district). We create different districts in the same neighborhood to protect against that. Visitors to other districts should use the visitors' pass.

Changing the fine would require a change in the City Code. Since this would affect all districts, there would need to be a discussion across the City.

Senior residents are residents and it would be unconstitutional to treat them any differently than other residents. The Law Department has told us several times we may not create artificial classifications. If they have a disability, they can request an accessible parking space from the City.

b. PARKING SURVEY RESULTS

The Parking Survey Results showed that the program is still needed for Bloomfield and was effective in providing 26% more spaces for these residents to park on the streets surveyed.

The results of the on-street parking survey of Area "H" were collected in the spring of 2010, and are displayed on pages 6.

The total spaces available in Area "H" are 1464 with 1644 permits that were in use during the 2000-2001 permit year. While this implies a deficit in parking, there are also a large number of off-street parking spaces.

Tables A & B present for each block face and for Area "H", 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 spring of 2010.

As shown in the table, the average percent of spaces occupied in 2010 was 50.5%, with 35.0% being non-resident vehicles. Approximately 49.5% of the spaces were still available for resident parking. Prior to the program, 76.4% of the spaces were utilized.

Due to the program, there has been a 25.9% decrease in occupied spaces, showing that the Residential Parking Permit Program has been successful for Bloomfield, Area "H".

c. PRIMARY IMPACTORS

The ordinance requires us to identify that the primary impactors are still in existence. Based on field investigation the Bloomfield business district and the Western Pennsylvania and Shadyside Hospitals are still in existence. Western Pennsylvania has reduced its staff, and thus its impact, but remains a major presence in the Bloomfield area.

d. FEEDBACK FROM THE COMMUNITY

The Department of City Planning staff held the community meeting for Area "H" on July 20th, 2009. 42 residents attended the meeting among which the majority supported continuation of the program.

At the meeting, residents expressed their concerns about hospital staff parking in the permit area. This led to a discussion about the effectiveness of the shuttle system provided by the hospitals. Another issue related to visitor passes, with complaints over visitors getting tickets for staying more than 3 days. In addition, concerns over tenants in apartment buildings taking up more spaces than just in front of those properties were discussed.

5 RECERTIFICATION

In conclusion, our analysis has shown that 80% of residents are still in favor of the program, 10% more than the required criteria of 70%. The Residential Parking Permit Program for Bloomfield, Area "H", has allowed for a 26% increase in the number of available spaces for residents, as reflected in the 2010 survey. The primary impactors, the Western Pennsylvania and Shadyside hospitals and the Bloomfield business district, are still in existence and continue to pose a danger to residential parking. Finally, at a meeting where all the permit holders were invited to attend, ~~all~~ those attending were in support of the program's continuation in their area.

Based on this analysis, it is recommended that Residential Parking Permit Program Area "H" (Bloomfield) be recertified.

TABLE A

Street Names	Res. Parkers	Non-Res. Parkers	Visitors Passes	Total No. Parkers	Total Available Spaces
Aspen	13	3	0	16	36
Cedarville	22	3	2	27	56
Cypress	44	27	0	71	180
Edmond	41	15	5	61	80
Friendship	10	76	1	87	100
Gross	73	23	8	105	198
Harriet	9	2	0	11	34
Lorigan	7	0	0	7	21
Osceola	13	7	5	25	42
Powhattan	2	16	0	18	30
S. Evaline	18	4	0	22	53
S. Mathilda	46	26	9	81	130
S. Millvale	52	19	4	75	107
S. Winebiddle	53	21	8	82	149
Sciota	37	18	0	55	138
State	2	14	0	16	26
West Penn	10	7	2	19	44
Woodworth	2	1	0	3	15
Yew	5	3	0	8	25
Total	459	285	44	789	1464

TABLE B

Street Names	% Res. Parkers	% Non-Res. Parkers	% Spaces Occupied	% Spaces Occupied Prior to Program	% Difference
Aspen	81.3%	18.8%	44.4%	65%	-20.6%
Cedarville	81.5%	11.1%	48.2%	48.2%	0.0%
Cypress	62%	38%	39.4%	88%	-48.6%
Edmond	67.2%	24.6%	76.3%	85%	-8.8%
Friendship	11.5%	87.4%	87%	95.6%	-8.6%
Gross	69.5%	21.9%	53%	91%	-38.0%
Harriet	81.8%	18.2%	32.4%	39%	-6.6%
Lorigan	100%	0%	33.3%	75%	-41.7%
Osceola	52%	28%	59.5%	96%	-36.5%
Powhattan	11.1%	88.9%	60%	83%	-23.0%
S. Evaline	81.8%	18.2%	41.5%	88%	-46.5%
S. Mathilda	56.8%	32.1%	62.3%	95%	-32.7%
S. Millvale	69.3%	25.3%	70.1%	86%	-15.9%
S. Winebiddle	64.6%	25.6%	55%	77%	-22.0%
Sciota	67.3%	32.7%	39.9%	96%	-56.1%
State	12.5%	87.5%	61.5%	73%	-11.5%
West Penn	52.6%	36.8%	43.2%	19%	24.2%
Woodworth	66.7%	33.3%	20%	93%	-73.0%
Yew	62.5%	37.5%	32%	58%	-26.0%
Average	60.6%	35.0%	50.5%	76.4%	-25.9%

