

**RE-CERTIFICATION OF RESIDENTIAL PARKING PERMIT PROGRAM**  
**AREA Q**

**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. This ordinance currently reads on determining whether to renew a designation as a residential parking permit area for a particular residential area, the Parking Permit Officer 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. The verification process includes a City Planning Commission briefing before being submitted to City Council for approval.

**2. R.P.P.P. District**

The area to be recertified is Area Q, South Craig Street Area-Oakland (see map pg. 5). The district is generally bounded by Henry Street, South Neville Street, Forbes Avenue and South Craig Street.

**3. Background**

Area Q was approved by the City Council and the City Planning Commission on September 19, 1989. This original designation was based on the lack of legal on street parking due to the impact of parkers destined for Carnegie Mellon University, the University of Pittsburgh, the Craig Street Business District, and various other nearby institutions. The residents of the South Craig Street desired the creation of a Residential Parking Permit District to reduce the volume of non-resident parkers caused by these primary impactors.

**4. Summary of Findings**

Recertification is based on the findings of a (a) questionnaire, (b) parking survey, (c) analysis of primary impactors, (d) feedback from scheduled meetings and discussions with community leaders.

The following is a summary with key points highlighted:

a. QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

**By sending out questionnaires, the R.P.P.P. was able to determine that the required number of Area “Q” permit holders still desired the program. Of the 69 questionnaires sent this year, 11 were returned (16%) showing that 91% (21% more than the required criteria) were still in favor of the program. The questionnaires showed that only 9% of permit holders, with an opinion, believe the program had created hardships for them, 25% found it easier or the same to park near their homes in the last year, 25% found it more difficult**

- o 30% of the permit holders who had lived in the permit district prior to the program being implemented, with an opinion, found it very difficult to park near their home prior to the implementation of the program.
- o 85% of the permit holders, with an opinion, are satisfied with the boundaries of the program.
- o 83% are satisfied with hours of the program.
- o 86% are satisfied with enforcement of the program.

While there were 26 comments expressed on the questionnaire covering 19 issues, none were made by more than two respondents. Nor were there any consistent threads in the comments.

b. PARKING SURVEY RESULTS

As shown on Table A, (page 4) the total percent of spaces occupied in 1999 was 51%, with 37% being non-resident vehicles. Approximately 49% of available spaces are still left for residents to park in when before the program 90% of the spaces were utilized.

**Due to the program, there has been a decrease of at least 39% spaces being occupied showing that the Residential Parking Permit Program has definitely worked for the South Craig Street, Area “Q”.**

c. PRIMARY IMPACTORS

**The ordinance requires us to identify that the primary impactors are still in existence. Based on the internship program and questionnaires University of Pittsburgh, Carnegie Mellon University and the Craig Street Business District are still in existence.**

The Department currently has interns from both the University of Pittsburgh and Carnegie Mellon University. They both go to meetings at the Oakland Campuses. Questionnaires came back from the residents referencing the businesses as a parking issue.

d. FEEDBACK FROM THE COMMUNITY

**The permit holder meeting was held on Thursday, December 6, 2012 at 6:30 pm at the Lutheran Center 4515 Forbes Avenue (upstairs) but no one showed up. There was no verbal feedback from the community except for the questionnaire results. Based on the questionnaire results, there were no proposed changes for this program.**

## **5. RECERTIFICATION**

As conclusion, our analysis has shown that, 91%, 21% more then the required criteria of 70% for inclusion into the program, are still in favor of the program. Second, the Residential Parking Permit for the South Craig Street, Area “Q”, has freed-up 51% available spaces for the residents in 2005, compared with 10% being available before implementation of the program. This is an increase of 39% more spaces available. Third, parking by commuters using the primary impactor, students and employees going to University of Pittsburgh, Carnegie Mellon University and the Craig Street Business District are still impacting residential streets in the area.

**Because of this analysis, it is recommended that R.P.P. Area “Q” be recertified.**

TABLE A

STREET NAMES	PERMIT PARKERS	NON-PERMIT PARKERS	VISITORS' PASSES	TOTAL NO. PARKERS	TOTAL AVAILABLE SPACES
Filmore Street	4	2	1	7	14
Henry Street	8	3	0	11	12
South Neville Street	1	1	0	2	8
Winthrop Street	7	1	2	10	14
<i>Total</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>48</i>

TABLE B

STREET NAMES	% PERMIT PARKERS	% NON-PERMIT PARKERS	% SPACES OCCUPIED	% SPACES OCCUPIED PRIOR TO PROGRAM	% DIFFERENCE
Filmore Street	29	14	50	100	-50
Henry Street	67	25	92	100	-8
South Neville Street	13	13	26	100	-74
Winthrop Street	50	7	71	100	-29
<i>Total</i>	<i>42</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>63</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>-37</i>

## SUMMARY OF AREA Q QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS\_2012

<b>Question 1</b>	<b>Street Name and Parking District</b> Area Q		
<b>Question 2</b>	<b>Difficulties finding a parking space near home before the permit parking program?</b>		
	<i>Very difficult</i>	3	27%
	<i>Difficult</i>	2	18%
	<i>Not difficult</i>	3	27%
	<i>Moved in since program started</i>	3	27%
<b>Question 3</b>	<b>Experience finding a parking space near home in last year?</b>		
	<i>Harder</i>	3	30%
	<i>Same</i>	4	40%
	<i>Easier</i>	3	30%
<b>Question 4</b>	<b>Are you satisfied with the Boundaries of the Program?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i>	11	100%
	<i>No</i>	0	0%
<b>Question 5</b>	<b>Are you satisfied with the hours of the program operation?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i>	9	82%
	<i>No</i>	2	18%
<b>Question 6</b>	<b>Are you satisfied with the enforcement of the program?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i>	7	64%
	<i>No</i>	4	36%
<b>Question 7</b>	<b>Are you satisfied with the method of issuing the permits?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i>	8	73%
	<i>No</i>	3	27%
<b>Question 8</b>	<b>Are you satisfied with the public notification and info. concerning the program?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i>	8	80%
	<i>No</i>	2	20%
<b>Question 9</b>	<b>Are you satisfied with the visitor's passes?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i>	7	70%
	<i>No</i>	3	30%
<b>Question 10</b>	<b>Has the Parking Program created any hardships on your household?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i>	2	20%
	<i>No</i>	8	80%
<b>Question 11</b>	<b>Change in amount of moving traffic since start of parking program?</b>		
	<i>Increased</i>	3	30%
	<i>Same</i>	6	60%
	<i>Decreased</i>	1	10%
<b>Question 12</b>	<b>Change in amount of litter since start of parking program?</b>		
	<i>Increased</i>	1	10%
	<i>Same</i>	8	80%
	<i>Decreased</i>	1	10%