

RECERTIFICATION OF RESIDENTIAL PARKING PERMIT PROGRAM
AREA S

1. INTRODUCTION

On May 25, 1993 Title 5 of the Pittsburgh Code Chapter 549, of the Residential Parking Permit Program (RPPP), section 549.06 was amended so that the Parking Permit Officer (Planning Director) would 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 RPPP, 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. RPPP DISTRICT

The area to be recertified is area "S", Terrace Village/Upper Hill. This district includes Avalon Street, Brackenridge Street, Allequippa Street (Brackenridge Street to Avalon Street), Ewart Drive, Bryn Mawr Road (Iowa Street to Centre Avenue), and Centre Avenue (Landleiss Place to Bigelow Boulevard).

3. BACKGROUND

Originally, the reason for lack of sufficient legal on-street parking spaces for residents in Terrace Village and Upper Hill, area "S" was due to employees to Veterans Hospital and the students and employees going to Schenley High School (now closed) and the University of Pittsburgh which saturated this residential neighborhood with parked vehicles.

The Terrace Village/Upper Hill 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 "S" became effective February 19, 1992, and was implemented that following May.

4 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Recertification is based on the questionnaire results, 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

By sending out questionnaires, RPPP was able to determine that the majority of permit holders still desire the program. Of the 140 questionnaires sent this year, 39 were returned (27%) showing that 75% (5% more then the required criteria) were still in favor of the program. The questionnaires showed that only 15% of permit holders, with an opinion, believe the program had created hardships for them, 95% found it easier or the same to park near their homes in the last year, 5% found it more difficult

- o 47% of the permit holders, with an opinion, found it very difficult to park near their home prior to the implementation of the program.
- o 94% of the permit holders, with an opinion, are satisfied with the boundaries of the program.
- o 88% of the permit holders, with an opinion, are satisfied with hours of the program.
- o 68% of the permit holders, with an opinion, are satisfied with enforcement of the program.

b. PARKING SURVEY RESULTS

The Parking Survey Results showed that the program is still needed for Terrace Village/Upper Hill and was effective in providing 74% 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 2015 and prior to the program of each street are presented in Table A. Area "S" was surveyed on June 22, 2015.

The total spaces available in area "S" are 223 with 140 permits currently in use. Only those streets surveyed are included in the chart.

Table A presents for each block face and for Area "S", 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 summer of 2015.

As shown on Table A, the total percent of spaces occupied in 1995 was 29%, with 39% of these spaces being occupied by non-resident vehicles. Approximately 74% of available spaces are left for residents to park in when before the program there were 13% of the spaces available.

Prior to the program, 87% of the spaces were being utilized.

Due to the program, there has been a decrease of 61% spaces being occupied showing that the Residential Parking Permit Program has definitely worked for the Terrace Village/Upper Hill, area "S".

c. PRIMARY IMPACTORS

To determine if the primary impactors still existed, a survey of the area was done on June 22, 2015 of people parking on Centre Avenue, Avalon Street, and Brackenridge Street. Of the 32 vehicles parked on the streets, 28 destinations were established. Of these 28, 61% (17 vehicles) were parked there while the driver was at the University of Pittsburgh, 25% (7 vehicles) were parked there while the driver was at the Veterans Hospital, and 14% (4 vehicles) were residential parkers with permits. In addition, residents of Avalon Street expressed major concerns about non-residential parking along their street by employees and visitors of the Veterans Hospital, and are still in high favor of the Residential Parking Permit Program.

5 RECERTIFICATION

As conclusion, our analysis has shown that, 75%, 5% more than the required criteria of 70% for inclusion into the program are still in favor of the program. Second, the Residential Parking Permit for the Terrace Village/Upper Hill, area "S", has freed-up 74% available spaces for the residents in 2015, compared with 13% being available before implementation of the program. Third, the primary impactors- Veterans Hospital and the University of Pittsburgh- still pose a danger of using the residential streets to park on. Last, the permit holders are in strong favor of recertifying area "S".

Because of this analysis, it is recommended that RPPP area "S" be recertified.

TABLE A

STREET NAMES	RES. PARKERS	NON-RES. PARKERS	VISITORS' PASSES PARKERS	TOTAL NO. PARKERS	TOTAL AVAILABLE
Avalon Street	12	2	0	14	40
Brackendridge Street	16	1	0	17	22
Bryn Mawr Road	2	0	0	2	4
Centre Ave	17	10	1	13	125
Ewart Drive	5	1	0	2	15
<i>Total</i>	<i>52</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>50</i>	<i>223</i>

STREET NAMES	% RES PARKERS	% NON-RES PARKERS	% SPACES OCCUPIED	% SPACES OCCUPIED PRIOR TO PROGRAM	% DIFFERENCE
Avalon Street	86	14	35	70	-35
Brackenridge Street	94	6	77	105	-28
Bryn Mawr Road	50	0	50	33	-17
Centre Avenue	15	77	14	97	-83
Ewart Drive	50	50	13	22	-9
<i>Total</i>	<i>68</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>26</i>	<i>87</i>	<i>-61</i>