

**TRAFFIC AND PARKING PLANNING COMMISSION**

**PUBLIC HEARING ON THE CMU PARKING STUDY**

**AUGUST 13, 2013**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS POSED BY THE PUBLIC**

Question #1: Barbara Rauth – 3331 Eastmont Avenue – For Recommendation #2 does everyone have to have a permit?

ANSWER: It will be up to Council to determine how much of this recommendation is implemented. However, the study contemplates that only those households needing on-street parking would need to get a permit. If you had no vehicle or had sufficient off-street parking you would not need to get a permit.

Question #2: Michelle Ross – 3251 Beacon Hill Avenue – For Recommendation #3 how does this impact residents?

ANSWER: The study would allow residents who had a residential parking permit to park their cars at the additional meters for free. So there would be no impact on residents if they had a residential parking permit.

Question #3: Karen Coyle – 1256 Wisconsin Avenue – For Recommendation #3 would I have a parking meter in front of my house?

ANSWER: The study doesn't address this but in its basic form, the answer would be yes. However, it will be up to the Traffic and Parking Planning Commission and then Council to determine if they want to move forward with this recommendation and if so, whether to modify it. One possible modification would be to add the additional meters but not in front of single family residences.

Question #4: John Essey – 3238 Gaylord Avenue – For Recommendation #3 how do you prevent people from paying at the meter instead of getting a residential parking permit?

ANSWER: Because the price of a residential parking permit, even if raised, would be significantly less than paying into a meter on a daily basis we don't see this as a potential problem.

Question #5: Michelle Ross – 3251 Beacon Hill Avenue – For Recommendation #6 how many smart meters would be needed, how much would they cost, and how far apart do they need to be placed?

ANSWER: The price of the smart meter that was just installed in our new parking lot by #1 Cochran was \$12,630 which included installation, shipping and a number of extra features. This price was higher because only one smart meter was purchased. This is the same smart meter used by Mt. Lebanon. We would need 8 additional smart meters if we were to place one at each of our other parking lots. Or we would need 5 additional smart meters if we were to skip the three small lots at Illinois, Tennessee and the Village Shops. The total cost for 8 additional smart meters would be approximately \$70,000. The total cost for 5 additional smart meters would be approximately \$55,000. If we were to place meters on West Liberty and Potomac we would need an additional 29 and 10 smart meters respectively. That is based on having one smart meter approximately every block on both streets wherever there is existing metered parking. We do not have a cost for buying the meters in this sort of quantity but the cost per meter would go down.

Question #6: Kelly Arenson – Grandin Avenue - Regarding the recommendation to make some streets one way in order to allow parking on both sides of the streets where currently there is parking on only one side (my street is one such street), I am concerned that the driving space on such streets would become so narrow that large vehicles, such as emergency vehicles, delivery and moving trucks, would be unable to maneuver easily through the street. Some streets, such as Grandin, are already quite narrow, and parking on both sides of the street would worsen the situation.

ANSWER: The recommendation from the study would be to look at each street individually. Some streets are not wide enough as you need enough space for 8 feet of parking on each side plus the travel lane. If Council pursues this recommendation we would evaluate each street and recommend only those streets that were physically capable of handling one-way traffic and two-sided parking.

---

Comment #1: Kelly Arenson – Grandin Avenue - Special consideration needs to be given to parking restrictions on streets that are located close to T-stops. (I live down the street from the Dormont Junction T-stop.) These streets have different parking needs than those in other parts of the city, especially concerning the times of day in which parking permits are required on the street. One of the proposed changes is to require permits only in the evenings, but this would be disastrous on streets next to the T: people who do not live on the streets would park their cars there in order to walk to the T, making parking more difficult for residents. For streets close to the T, it would be better if parking permits were required 24-hours-a-day or if no changes were made to the current restrictions (permits required throughout the daytime); either of these options would be better than requiring permits only in the evening. In addition, streets close to the T would benefit from additional restrictions on Saturdays and Sundays, when non-residents may be parking on the street to take the T to sporting events downtown.

- Comment #2: Kelly Arenson – Grandin Avenue - Regarding an increase in the parking permit fee, I do not support this since it penalizes even those households who have only one car and must park their car on the street because they have no off-street parking options. I take it that the raised fee is meant to deter households from parking on the street if they have off-street parking and to encourage people to reduce their number of cars. Neither of these goals is furthered by raising fees for households who own only one car and cannot park off-street. If the permit price is to be raised, it should be raised for second or third permits and for households that currently have off-street parking options but choose not to use them.
- Comment #3: Kelly Arenson – Grandin Avenue - The CMU report made an excellent recommendation that when issuing permits the Borough should gather information from households regarding their off-street parking options and number of cars so as to limit or eliminate permits for those households with off-street options and/or own too many cars. I think that this idea, more than any others in the report, would help alleviate parking problems in Dormont. This would help free up parking for households who lack off-street parking and ensure that households do not receive permits if they have off-street options, even if they decide not to use such options.
- Comment #4: Joan Hodson – 1210 Wisconsin Avenue – She loves the idea that residential permits would be valid anywhere in the Borough.
- Comment #5: Barbara Carasco – 1249 Illinois Avenue – She would pay more for better parking.
- Comment #6: Greg Langel – 1500 Hillsdale Avenue – He feels it is unfair to residents who live on blocks where the meters would be added in Recommendation #3 and doesn't like this recommendation.
- Comment #7: Greg Langel – 1500 Hillsdale Avenue – He feels that Recommendation #4 is extreme and radical and that it is not fair to punish those with off-street parking. He also suggested looking at this on a block by block basis.
- Comment #8: Kathy Bernard – 3059 Pinehurst Avenue – She feels that Recommendation #4 is punitive and will negatively impact property values.
- Comment #9: John Essey – 3238 Gaylord Avenue – He feels that Recommendation #4 may not be good for everyone but it might be necessary to solve our parking problems.
- Comment #10: Barbara Rauth – 3331 Eastmont Avenue – She feels that it makes parking harder when people don't use their off street parking.