

Parking Permits Revised Tariff – Comments February 2018

Subject: Objection to proposed parking permit changes: Visitor Permits

I am writing to you regarding the proposed parking permit changes detailed here.

There are a number of significant changes proposed.

- the change in validity of Visitor Permits to 1 year
- the removal of 2 hour visitor permits
- the removal of 2 week visitor permits
- raising age of concessionary scheme from 60 to 65 years

I strongly object to the change in validity of Visitor Permits to 1 year.

I strongly object to the removal of 2 week permits & 2 hour permits.

I also strongly object to the misleading disingenuous language used in the traffic order documents used to explain and justify the changes, saying it is on "environmental grounds" or "to encourage use of more sustainable modes of transport", when it is clear all the changes involve increased cost to the people of Haringey, residents of Haringey, the people you represent and therefore increased revenue to the Council.

It is outrageous and disgraceful that you are trying to introduce fundamental, significant, basic changes to the permits and permit system, which have existed for years/decades, using a Traffic Order without any consultation or without a separate consultation.

(objections and responses to a Traffic Order cannot be treated as consultation)

It is clear you the council are ignoring democracy and taking shortcuts on democracy by not notifying residents appropriately and not carrying out a suitable consultation on these fundamental and significant changes to the parking scheme in Haringey.

You the council sent emails to residents weeks after the traffic order was advertised, which was on 2 Feb 2018.

I received an email 2 weeks after on 16 Feb 2018, a neighbour received an email on 14 Feb 2018.

to this council parking report in 2010, where you the council carried out a consultation just on increasing parking charges, as an example of what you have done previously.

http://www.haringey.gov.uk/sites/haringeygovuk/files/parking_charges_main_report-2.pdf The changes you the council are now proposing are far greater and more significant, yet you have not carried out any consultation and have only attempted to contact residents weeks after advertising the traffic order.

	Change in validity of Visitor Permits to 1 year
--	---

By definition people have to buy visitor permits in advance, they don't know when they will need them or use

To whom it may concern

I am writing to make an objection against the changes to the proposed increase in parking permit charges, as advised in an e-mail dated 16th Feb.

Firstly, in relation to increasing resident permit charges; I don't believe that anyone would argue against the desire to decrease pollution. However, increasing charges for older vehicles in an attempt to encourage those drivers to purchase more economically friendly vehicles is not taking into account the reasons for people still owning these vehicles and therefore the underlying issues. Haringey, by and large, is not an affluent area and this move will simply penalise drivers in an underprivileged area who may not be able to afford newer vehicles with fewer emissions. There is no motion in place to assist with this, such as a scrappage scheme and no other moves put forward as an incentive to help Haringey residents make the transition. When the parking permits were introduced in my current area (which incidentally is not in close proximity to any train stations or shopping centres and was not really necessary), the cost of a permit was £30. This has since increased far above the rate of inflation to almost double the amount. Under the proposals, the cost of a permit will rise to almost five times the original cost for some older vehicles which is completely unacceptable. I also note that while vehicles which are registered after 1st March 2001 are subject to this huge increase, vehicles registered before this date are looking at an increase of a minimum of £13 more on the current cost for a smaller engine. This appears questionable when the CO2 emissions are likely to be high in all older vehicles; therefore I do not think that the justification for such a rise in charge can honestly fall under a wish to cut pollution. Furthermore, since road tax increases also take CO2 emissions into account with regards the pricing, this means drivers are penalised twice over for the same issue. Under the same umbrella, although I agree with a 6 month option, I do not think it ethical to charge what used to be the cost of an annual permit for half the duration.

Secondly, removing the 2 hour permits is inadvisable. There may be circumstances, for example, under which a workman may need to repair something within the home which will take longer than an hour but is not required to be at the location for the day. Using two one hour permits is unfair, particularly when the cost of one hour permits is increasing. I would suggest that if it is no longer going to be possible to keep permits for longer than a year, the cost of permits should actually be reduced, as they will be invalid after this time and this will substantially decrease their usage. There does not appear to be a problem in this area with anyone having a vast amount of visitor permits and additional vehicles parking on the road all the time. If people do not use the permits they have been issued in a year, why should they not be able to use those in the next year? I have personally returned unused visitor permits for a refund or new permits and was completely ignored, having to purchase more as I could not speak with a council representative or trace exactly where they had gone.

These proposals are not in the interests of the people who currently hold parking permits in Ashford Avenue,N8.

Having talked to some car-owning neighbours in this road It appears that we are perfectly happy with the situation as it is. It's been a haven of peace & quiet, and a palpable reduction in pollution since the 11am-1pm restriction was set up.

We are already paying for the pleasure - on top of what increases in Council Tax are promised !

Please think again.

I completely object to the increase in parking permit charges. It's bad enough the streets are disgustingly filthy without charging more for residents and their visitors to park.it brings disgrace to the residents.

Sent: 23 February 2018 16:17

Subject: Objection to proposed parking permit changes: Visitor Permits

Objection to proposed parking permit changes: Visitor Permits

I am writing to you regarding the proposed parking permit changes detailed here.

<http://www.haringey.gov.uk/parking-roads-and-travel/roads-and-streets/traffic-managementorders/list-traffic-management-orders>

5

There are a number of significant changes proposed.

- -the change in validity of Visitor Permits to 1 year
- -the removal of 2 hour visitor permits
- -the removal of 2 week visitor permits
- -raising age of concessionary scheme from 60 to 65 years

I vehemently oppose and object to Haringey Councils proposal to amend street parking permits and charges.

I do not agree with any of the proposed changes and I think its disgusting that you seek more money from residents. Perhaps you should get your accounts in order. The Council seem to spend way too much on consulting fees with little to show for it. Similarly you have a huge surplus so try using that.

I expect you'll be hearing from many more dissatisfied residents who will find this unacceptable.

6

Strongly object to these unfair changes

West of the borough is not subject to such.

7

It's all just so corrupt. If you were Tories, I would not be surprised. But you're not so what is your excuse?

8

Just cannot vote for you people any more. It just goes on and on.

9

I strongly object to Haringey Council's proposals to increase CPZ residents' permit charges and visitor charges with effect from this Spring.

The proposed residential charge would be an increase of over 50%.

The proposed visitor charges represent increases of 100% or more.

These increases would be far, far above the rate of inflation or any increases in residents' incomes. They would be a devastating blow to residents in many categories, both those who need to use cars and those who need to have parking available so that they may receive visitors. Needless to say, those who have small children & buggies, who have to cope with heavy loads (family shopping, musical instruments/sound equipment, tools, computer equipment, etc), or who live alone and/or need carers and/or are elderly would be particularly affected.

Such increases would be an outrageous insult to large numbers of Haringey residents who are

10 feeling the pain of austerity in every aspect of their budgets. These proposals are punitive and anti-democratic in the extreme, and may well be a brazen attempt to lay the ground for even worse Council depredations to come.

The rationale offered for the proposed increases is pitiful bureaucratic control-think - reminiscent of 1984. I expect my local Council to run essential services like education, waste disposal, public housing and libraries in an efficient and cost-effective manner, not to take on the role of Big Brother by dictating to people how they should live their lives.

The Council must cut out unnecessary waste, reduce exorbitant officials' salaries which are multiples of the Prime Minister's salary, discontinue paid holidays on the French Riviera for officials, eliminate non-essential activities like Haringey People (it's the digital 21st century now), slim down and audit Councillor's expenses (make Councillors use public transport, not cars/taxis), etc, etc, and transform itself into a lean, mean, financially responsible & democratically accountable operation.

I am writing to object your parking permit proposal. I am a home owner on Fairbourne Rd which comes under the Bruce Grove West parking Zone.

I was only notified by email 9 days ago only giving me till today to send my objection - even though your proposal was dated on the 2nd February.

We were encouraged to sign up for resident parking as Parking had become on our road increasingly difficult due to parking restrictions operating on neighbouring roads. We already pay Road Tax but were charged for the permits anyway as another way for the council to receive extra revenue.

You are now proposing to increase my permit by a further £66.00 - which I think is very unfair.

In addition you are abolishing the 2hr visitor permits - which I have brought in bulk to have available for my visitors - these are non refundable under your proposal - why should I loose my money?

I also object that you are raising the cost of the hour permit to 80p - why should we be charged to have visitors?

It seems that you are not doing this to benefit the residents and local business in the area but purely to make an increased revenue for the council - we already pay plenty of taxes and I think we are being unfairly targeted.

I await your kind reply.

Kind Regards,

To Whom it May Concern,

I am absolutely disgusted on your recent proposed parking charges, published on the 2nd of February.

I completely object to this amendment. Not only have you not written to any residents affected by this change but tried

to sneakily and quickly put the changes in place.

How much more money are you trying to wring out of hard working residents? Are you not already changing extortionate prices? Why are you putting up charges when the majority of residents completely disagree to your proposal?

You didn't even have the decency to let anyone know, what about those who do not have access to email?

That's why Haringey council is constantly blasted by the media as you only have your own interest at heart and do not care at all what the views of the residents may be.

Absolutely disgusted with your approach and I hope you reconsider your proposal, which I guess will fall on deaf ears, like everything else in haringey council does.

A very disgruntled resident of the disgusting borough.

This message is sent as an expression of my disappointment at the proposed increase in parking permit charges.

Initially the status quo was changed by the painting of new lines and the putting up of associated signs on residential roads and charging the residents for the privilege. And now you are proposing to demand even more money. What are you honestly doing with the money you are collecting that you have to hike the price up so drastically? Was there an influx of requests by residents asking for such actions.

As a resident, I suggest that you either leave the charges as they are or scrap them all together.

Thank you for your attention

To whom it may concern,

I am very dismayed at the proposals to change the parking permits in Haringey. We pay for 2 resident permits and often cannot find a space. Also, we have lots of family members visiting us and already pay a lot for the visitor vouchers.

Please go not change the parking in Priory Gardens as there is not enough room to park at present, it will only get worse. We pay a fortune already for permits and vouchers.

Kind regards,

Dear Madam, Sir

I understand your need to raise more revenue from parking. However, I strongly object to your proposals, e.g.

1. You do not say how much additional revenue your proposals will raise. The suggested increase is well beyond reasonable limits. In light of the current inflation rate I would expect an increase 5% reasonable. However, your proposals are far in excess of that.

2. You do not explicitly say what the extra revenue is for. I would only agree to any increase above the before mentioned that are solely earmarked to improve road quality, street furniture and the repair of pot holes - Why don't you drive through Causton Road or near the top of Cholmeley Park (N6) to ascertain what I mean.

I object to changes that you propose

Yours faithfully

Cholmeley Park, N6

My primary objection to the parking changes is the massive increase in cost.

Clearly the resident's permits are significantly more expensive but the visitors permit changes are completely unacceptable.

Examples:

1 hour permit currently 35p to be increased to 80P

No more 2 hour permits (currently 70p) will increase to £1.60 using 2x 1 hour

No more 2 week permits (currently £13.70)) using 12 daily permits will cost £42 (I use these when my daughter comes home from university), it will make family visits outrageously expensive.

These increases are well beyond inflation.

Secondly these changes have not been widely advertised, just an e mail sent to some people (certainly not all residents as many older people will not use e mail). It was not made clear that there was a very short time scale to object. This is not true consultation.

Every household should have been notified with a flyer and given ample time to respond.

This appears to me to be yet another way of the council trying to raise money with indirect taxes.

Regards,

As a resident of the borough of Haringey, I find it distressing that you are increasing the prices of hourly visitors parking permits by over 100%. I live in the new Bruce Grove North CPZ and fully understand the justification for introducing the zone as it has alleviated congestion on our road. But in less than a year, you've more than DOUBLED the charge of hourly visitors permits with no reasonable justification! It seems to me to be a new strategy to generate more revenue for the council.

I look forward to hearing the reason for such a steep rise.

Sent from Outlook Email App for Android

Please see attached comments on the above titled proposed amendments. Please acknowledge receipt.

Regards,

From:

Sent: 17 February 2018 18:18

To: Permit Changes; traffic.orders@haringey.gov.uk;

Subject: RE: Proposed amendments to on street parking permits and charges- Objections

Objection

In Dongola Road where I live, houses are mostly long-resident homeowners.

If at all, there should be separate tariffs for long-term residents and short lease residents. The concessionary scheme should stay the same. While many people used to work until 65, they now retire much earlier.

Residents and myself have been against the street parking permits all those years, but the Council just kept repeating

the vote until the council won. So in Dongola Road we have resident parking permits only since less than a year. Hence,

increasing the tariff is completely out of the question.

Regards,

Dear Sirs,

I understand your need to raise more revenue from parking. However, I have a number of objections to your proposals.

1. You do not say how much additional revenue your proposals will raise. The increase is well beyond reasonable limits. I would expect 5% or even a one off 10%. Your proposals are far in excess of that.
2. You propose to withdraw the two hour permit. This permit corresponds with the two hour restricted parking period and is the one most used by residents. Should we use two one hour permits at a very increased cost? You may feel you have to increase charges, but why withdraw the most useful permit? Do you understand the needs of residents? Have you canvassed the needs of residents?
3. Why remove the limits on the number of permits residents can buy? What is to prevent some residents from buying and selling large numbers of parking permits for profit and turning our roads into car parks? It is very hard to understand why you say "that the offer be limited to
22 an hourly and daily visitor parking permit,"... and that this "removes the need for an upper limit on the number of permits residents can buy." It does not. Please explain precisely the logic of your statements. Please explain how this proposed change is in the interests of anybody.
4. Why require all permits to be used within the calendar year and why then propose to refuse to refund residents for unused permits? Do you think that this is of any assistance to residents?

Overall, I think that these changes are very poorly thought through. You should be much more open about your needs; if you were, there would be greater sympathy for the increase in revenue you require.

I object to the changes that you propose.

I'm writing to register an objection to the proposed changes to parking charges and permits.

They appear to represent little more than a cash grab, targeting people who have no alternative to paying whatever fee you choose to charge.

(1) You seek to "encourage.. drivers to use more fuel efficient vehicles." This implies you are suggesting people living in one of the UK's poorest boroughs should pay thousands of pounds to save a smaller amount on parking permits.

(2) While it's admirable to "encourage people to travel more sustainably", it's ridiculous to suggest people living in a congested London borough routinely choose to travel by car for their own entertainment. Driving in Haringey is anything but entertaining.

I'm frequently forced to use my car because, travelling with an infant, it's often impossible to even board a bus. Waiting 20-30 minutes just to get on a bus is laughable at any time of year,

and in winter outrageous.

While I understand the availability of buses is an issue for TfL - it does look an awful lot like you are seeking to profit from this problem, rather than assist in easing it.

(3) I find it hard to believe the restrictions on permits, specifically imposing a 12-month lifespan and refusing to exchange or refund unused permits, will do anything to free up the availability of parking in the borough. They will, however, undoubtedly increase the revenue raised through the sale of permits that will, in the end, never actually be used. The cost of a one-hour permit is more than double under this plan. In any other world this would be shameless profiteering.

I understand that London cannot function with ever increasing levels of road traffic. I also agree that public transport should be encouraged, and favoured where possible. But increasingly I feel even owning a car is frowned upon, regardless of circumstances, and car owners are seen as suitable targets to be soaked for as much additional revenue as possible.

(cc copies to local councillors for info)

24

Dear Haringey

The point of charging is to stop valuable resident space being used by commuters and that seems reasonable enough. I don't see it as a way of penalising residents and so I oppose the proposed changes.

Those visiting my address include two music teachers, biology and chemistry tutors, not to mention friends and relations, builders etc.

While on the subject of complaints, can I point to the worsening state of roads pavements. I did not trouble your offices with a claim for a burst tyre which happened on a pothole near Muswell hill

With respect and best wishes

Dear Madam or Sir,

the proposed changes have come to my attention only because I received an email from the Haringey Liberal Democrats. The consultation period is short even by Haringey standards and would fuel suspicions that this is intended to sneak in under the radar. I would be interested to know how local people were informed it was taking place.

The argument put forward for the increase is an aim to reduce car ownership whereas in fact it just puts more pressure on lower-income households who may need a car for work and can't afford a new model with lower emissions. While a small increase might be reasonable, it would be fairer to levy a higher tax on those residents with second and third vehicles often monstrously large for city streets. It won't touch the well-off at all.

Visitor parking has just been made more challenging with the removal of the coin machines. Not everyone has a mobile phone. The permits we can buy are expensive and I would argue that residents/council tax payers should qualify for an allocation of free tickets. Anyone who has a carer who needs a car should be exempt from all charges.

If the main reason for these changes is to increase income as I suspect it probably is, Haringey Council could help itself by making its existing operation more efficient. My son attempted to buy a parking permit for our street, Uplands Road. The process was so bureaucratic and so many obstacles were put in the way because his name didn't appear on any of the household bills. Never mind that he was a special constable and was on Haringey's own payroll! So he didn't bother in the end and the council lost potential revenue. From my conversations in the community, he is not the only one.

The authority could also tidy up the road markings. I wonder how many parking fines cannot be upheld because these do not meet legal requirements.

I hope you will widen the scope of this consultation and extend its duration so that you can gather the broadest range of views.

Yours faithfully,

My Feedback – Basic Points

- * This is a very high percentage increase!
- * Give the services we have had this is blatantly unjustified!
- * Ridiculous additional admin charges especially given the no returns policy!.
- * You offer no value for money and make buying permits deliberately difficult.

26 Can I suggest we should be able to use the Haringey parking app! This would solve all sorts of problems!

Please remember

The people of Haringey are some of the poorest in London! Are you serious – I thought Labour councils were supposed to look after the working people??

Thanks

Regards

Sir/Madam,

Your proposed rise in parking permit charges is excessive. I object.

27

I object to the new changes.

28

Moreover, I was never consulted about these proposed changes.

I object to the parking permit charges increasing in Haringey

29

I am writing to object to some of the proposals contained in "Proposed Amendments to on Street Parking Permits and Charges. The Haringey (Controlled Parking Zones) (Amendment No. *) Order 201".

These proposals include the removal of the right offered to residents by the current traffic management orders to a refund for any unused visitors parking permits. Specifically the proposed new orders state "It is anticipated that those permits would be used within the year purchased.....Unused permits would....not be exchanged or refunded".

Most residents are not able to plan exactly how many permits they will need. The new proposals will make it more difficult to manage visitor parking without buying a surfeit of permits that will will now expire more quickly and be non-refundable.

Also included in these proposals is a change which increases the cost of visitor parking by more than double.

As a policy, these changes are tantamount to a move towards more regressive local taxation and will unduly impact on the poorest in the borough.

I would urge the Council to review the cost increases and to consider an online system for the issue of visitor parking such as is used on other London Boroughs."

I was shocked to hear about your proposed increase in visitor parking. This is just another cynical and dishonest way of making money out of residents. Where do you get 125% increase from - what about carers and visitors who can't afford to visit the elderly and disabled. I think the amount of council tax you already charge is ridiculous anyway.

I am disappointed that Haringey Council has failed to properly consult and engage with residents on widespread changes that will affect thousands of people every day.

32

I have always been a Labour but it seem the current Labour Council are just set on back door taxes. First the cost of collecting garden waist to about £9 per collection now with parking permits. It just seem if you want to loose next by-election because my vote is out the window and myself and other will be spreading the work on social media.

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

33

I have already commented - adversely - on the large percentage increase
- 150% for me - for the annual permit. I would also ask that visitor
permits are not limited to use in a single year.

I wish to lodge my complaint regarding Haringeys proposed changes to parking and visitor permits.

Firstly there us no good reason to stop issuing the 2 hour visitor permits in 2 hour zones. Not only that but the reason for councils cost increase makes no sense except to make more money and tax local residents to have their friends and family visit them.

I am also appalled that there has been no dialogue with the residents and the letter was sent out two weeks after its date but still expecting us to respond within three weeks, two of which it had been sitting in someone's desk. Intentional or incompetent - makes no difference. A week is not enough time to gather any meaningful response.

At the very least this period should be extended and a public meeting held to discuss these proposals.

I suspect otherwise residents will make their feelings known at the upcoming local elections.

Kindly confirm receipt. I look forward to your response.

Dear Sir /Madam

I think it is absolutely outrageous that our labour run council would treat its residents in such an appalling manner by failing to consult its residents at all let alone adequately in disclosing the proposed increase to parking permits. Most boroughs are significantly cheaper with some offering their residents a free permit every year for the first car whilst rightly penalising those who have more than one car in their household. If i were not able to drive the people in my family would suffer a significant hardship in having to take taxis as for them-public & hospital transport is completely unsuitable. I would not have known about this proposal were it not for our local constable who keep us informed by email. I am strongly considering taking my future votes back to the liberal democrats as labour seem to be too busy fighting the opposition instead of fighting FOR the people.

Dear Sir/Madan,

I have read your proposal and I want to mention about one thing that most of the neighbours do not like.

You are planning to charge more to those neighbours that they are good citizen and they are paying their Resident Parking Permit charges. Some of which are retired old pensioners.

What about those neighbours that they just open their front gardens walls and are parking their cars inside their gardens without drop kerbs and without paying any Parking Charges?

Are this legal? Are they still going be except from this charges? If this is legal please let me know so I will open my front garden and park my car without drop kerbs and without paying any charges.

Hoping to here from you in due course.

Thank you.

I am writing to register an objection to the proposed increase in parking permits. Increasing the annual residential parking permit is outrageous and not on!!!!

I wish to strongly object to the proposed changes to the parking charges.

The increase for the resident permit for my car (reg before 2001) is to increased by 50% !! That is completely ridiculous! Inflation is at almost 3% and although any increase is unwelcome I would have expected an increase more in line with this!

The price increases across the board you are proposing are simply day light robbery and affront to the residents of Haringey.

I respectfully request that you re-considered and if an increase is to be made it would be more in line with inflation.

39	Stop making profit out of car owners.
	We objet to the new proposed amendments to on street parking permits and charges!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
40	
	Please think again
	This email is to lodge my opposition to the proposed planned changes to parking permits in the borough.
	There is a massive disparity between cost changes being applied (or not) on some all day permits, versus those on 1 or 2 hour permits - how can it be fair to increase prices for some permits by more than 100 percent and leave others untouched - it makes it a postcode lottery for residents. Additionally, certain groups E.g. carers, will be massively impacted by these proposed changes which are unfair and communicated so late in the day, that many residents will not have time to comment before the deadline. Why were the proposals only sent to residents many days after the consultation was published?
41	
	Yours in frustration,
42	I am strongly opposed to the proposed hike in parking permit fees for Finsbury Park. The cost of parking outside our own house for ourselves and our guests is already high enough and this is an unfair and cynical way of raising revenue for the council.

I strongly object to your new parking charges proposals which will see huge increases in charges for residents, carers and visitors with little valid justification or reasonable consultation period.

The parking charge have increased each year since its start at greater than inflation rate, with no consultation or justification ever given for the increases.

You should not be using this system as a cash cow to effectively increase council tax for carowning residents without their agreement.

Once again Haringey council are finding something else to make the residents

pay more for parking to fill their coffers now empty. Just hope that residents when it comes to voting in May they will VOTE THEM OUT

I object - this is a residential middle / lower middle class borough with hard working families that cannot be asked to fund councils through parking fees.

We need more employment in the borough to absorb people from councils not more charges - this is NOT mayfair !

Read my article in Parliamentary review about creating more employment

Sent from my iPhone

In my honest opinion this is disgraceful behaviour by the council ,but nothing surprises me in Haringey any more .For personal reasons this is going to add further financial pressure to me as I am on a very low income .

I am a resident of Haringey .

I am very disturbed to learn about increases in Parking permit charges and restrictions. I realise there is an ANTI CAR movement .. but you will kill the cow that gives you milk in the long run.

I have already stopped shopping except for small items I carry on the bus or on foot . . . in Muswell Hill . .and other places as I do not own a smart phone and find it difficult to pay to park now. Luckily I can drive to Tesco and park FREE .

I would spend more money locally in independent shops. .. the few that remain

Your measures are detrimental to the community at large . .especially to residents who need visits by carers .

I hope voters will decide for a change to a more humane system in the forthcoming elections.

Haringey is NOT a happy place at the moment.

Dear Sir/Madam,

As I Haringey resident I wish to object to the change in Parking permit charges. This is a rise of more than 100%. It is unreasonable and undemocratic.

People's wages have not gone up by 100% and neither has public transport provision.

Please do not do this. It will make life so much more difficult and expensive for residents. We need a car to go and see parents and for some people to get to work. I cycle to work, but I need a car for other reasons and my husband has to drive a car to work because he works in North West London and there is no viable 24 hour public transport link. He is a doctor.

Please do not do this.

Yours faithfully,

I am writing to object to some of the proposals contained in "Proposed Amendments to on Street Parking Permits and Charges. The Haringey (Controlled Parking Zones) (Amendment No. *) Order 201".

These proposals include the removal of the right offered to residents by the current traffic management orders to a refund for any unused visitors parking permits. Specifically the proposed new orders state "It is anticipated that those permits would be used within the year purchased.....Unused permits would.....not be exchanged or refunded".

Most residents are not able to plan exactly how many permits they will need. The new proposals will make it more difficult to manage visitor parking without buying a surfeit of permits that will now expire more quickly and be non-refundable.

Also included in these proposals is a change which increases the cost of visitor parking by more than double.

As a policy, these changes are tantamount to a move towards more regressive local taxation and will unduly impact on the poorest in the borough.

I would urge the Council to review the cost increases and to consider an online system for the issue of visitor parking such as is used on other London Boroughs. Yours faithfully

These proposals include the removal of the right offered to residents by the current traffic management orders to a refund for any unused visitors parking permits. Specifically the proposed new orders state "It is anticipated that those permits would be used within the year purchased.....Unused permits would.....not be exchanged or refunded". Most residents are not able to plan exactly how many permits they will need. The new proposals will make it more difficult to manage visitor parking without buying a surfeit of permits that will now expire more quickly and be non-refundable. Also included in these proposals is a change which increases the cost of visitor parking by more than double. As a policy, these changes are tantamount to a move towards more regressive local taxation and will unduly impact on the poorest in the borough. I would urge the Council to review the cost increases and to consider an online system for the issue of visitor parking such as is used on other London Boroughs."

I am writing to object to some of the proposals contained in "Proposed Amendments to on Street Parking Permits and Charges. The Haringey (Controlled Parking Zones) (Amendment No. *) Order 201".

These proposals include the removal of the right offered to residents by the current traffic management orders to a refund for any unused visitors parking permits. Specifically the proposed new orders state "It is anticipated that those permits would be used within the year purchased.....Unused permits would....not be exchanged or refunded".

Most residents are not able to plan exactly how many permits they will need. The new proposals will make it more difficult to manage visitor parking without buying a surfeit of permits that will now expire more quickly and be non-refundable.

Also included in these proposals is a change which increases the cost of visitor parking by more than double.

As a policy, these changes are tantamount to a move towards more regressive local taxation and will unduly impact on the poorest in the borough.

I would urge the Council to review the cost increases and to consider an online system for the issue of visitor parking such as is used on other London Boroughs.

Yours faithfully

These proposals include the removal of the right offered to residents by the current traffic management orders to a refund for any unused visitors parking permits. Specifically the proposed new orders state "It is anticipated that those permits would be used within the year purchased.....Unused permits would.....not be exchanged or refunded".

Most residents are not able to plan exactly how many permits they will need. The new proposals will make it more difficult to manage visitor parking without buying a surfeit of permits that will now expire more quickly and be non-refundable.

Also included in these proposals is a change which increases the cost of visitor parking by more than double.

As a policy, these changes are tantamount to a move towards more regressive local taxation and will unduly impact on the poorest in the borough.

I would urge the Council to review the cost increases and to consider an online system for the issue of visitor parking such as is used on other London Boroughs."

I would like to object to several of the proposed changes detailed in the document titled "Propose Parking Charges" dated 2nd Feb 2018.

My son, who lives on Beresford Rd with his wife and toddler, will be severely affected by all the extra costs involved. I travel to London from Suffolk every fortnight to stay for 3 days to with caring for my grandson & I need to have my car with me for ferrying him to nursery & playgroup.

As well as a rise in the costs for an annual residents permits, visitors permits costs increasing by an astronomical 128% is an unacceptable rise which adds another burden on young parents needing essential daily visitor parking.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to object to several of the proposed changes detailed in the document titled "Propose Parking Charges" dated 2nd Feb 2018.

(http://www.haringey.gov.uk/sites/haringeygovuk/files/propose_parking_charges.zip)

* As well as a rise in residents permits - visitors permits cost increasing 128% is an unacceptable rise, particularly for people such as myself who rely on regular child-carer visits.

* Adding an "administration charge for the processing of permits" also seems ridiculously excessive at £11.80! What exactly would this pay for?

54 * Having the permits expire after 12 months is a clear attempt to gouge even more money from people and is completely unnecessary.

* Giving residents 21 days from the proposal date (2nd Feb) would be fairer if you actually sent out information on that date - I had no leaflet through the door and was only notified by email on the 16th. A clear attempt to reduce the number of objections.

I just hope enough residents hear of this proposal and make their thoughts known. I can't imagine anyone would feel these points are fair or beneficial to anyone other than the council.

Yours faithfully,

55

Please find attached my objection to your proposals, following the emailed letter from Ann Cunningham dated 2 February 2018 (and emailed on 16 February 2018).

I would like to voice my disappointment and disgust at the proposed rise in the cost of visitor parking permits.

I am 60 years old, live alone and have arthritis; in the past couple of weeks I have had a full hip replacement. Although I am not disabled, I do rely on my retired sister's help with shopping and chores around my flat. My sister normally visits two weekday afternoons and on Saturdays, using on average around 16 hours of visitor parking permits a week.

I have resided at my property for 34 years; when I moved here there were no parking restrictions. I took part in your consultation to introduce CPZ in our street and supported this as residents were promised that for the cost of a few pence for visitors to park, this would fund a zebra crossing at the junction of Fairfax Road/Harringay Gardens/Green Lanes. The zebra crossing never materialised however the lucrative CPZ was introduced.

I currently pay 18p an hour for visitor parking permits, which you are proposing to put up by an outrageous 444% to 80p an hour raising my current yearly cost of parking permits from £149.76 to £665.60!

I appreciate that council budgets have been cut and that the council needs to raise money for essential services, but I believe residents already pay enough to enable friends and family to visit, and am therefore opposed to this proposed increase in visitors parking permits.

Firstly, communication on this matter has been unsatisfactory. I received notification of these proposed changes on the 16th February via email. On reading the notice via the links in the email I was made aware that I had 21 days from the date of the notice to make a representation on the matter. The date of the notice was 2nd February. Why has it taken 14 days for the emails to residents to be issued? This is not acceptable and the date for representations to be made should be extended.

My objections:

* I live in Crouch End A, where we have parking restrictions between 10am-12pm on week days. You are proposing to increase the hourly permit charge from 35p to 80p an hour. This is a rise of 129%, which is wholly unacceptable. You are penalising residents that live within a CPZ that is for two hours a day. What is your justification for this increase?

57 *

My current yearly parking permit is £114.20 this will rise to £140, which is a 23% increase. Again, what is the justification for this increase and how will you be using this money to combat pollution in Haringey.

* Your proposed plans are contradictory. By allowing a second permit to be purchased at the same cost as the first you are actually encouraging households to have more than one car, which is against your proposed reasons for increasing parking permits based on car emissions.

I do support the principle of aligning the cost of parking permits to emissions, however I strongly believe Haringey are masking these huge and unjustified increases behind a so called 'green' policy.

I look forward to receiving your response on this matter.

I would like to strongly object to the change in resident parking permits costs.

My car falls into the bracket below:

Vehicles registered before 1 March 2001 (or where CO2 emissions are not documented)

1550 cc to 3000cc	£180.00	£90.00	£114.00	£148.40
-------------------	---------	--------	---------	---------

Why do you think that targeting older car users in this way is in any way fair?

Do you not think that if those with older cars could afford newer ones they wouldn't already be driving them?

I would like you to justify increasing the cost from £114.00 to £180.00. This is a huge rise and is completely unacceptable.

Also, visitor permits changes are a joke.

58

Old cost of 2 hour permit 70p

Old cost of 1 hour permit 35p

New cost of 1 hour permit 80p

Please explain how you justify increasing 1 hours permits by more than 100%

As far as I can tell most permits will be going up.

This is yet another revenue raising exercise by this council targeting as usual the humble resident but dressing

it up as 'for environmental reasons'

I'm fed up with being hit by unreasonable rises.

Please stop using us as cash cows, we do not have an endless pot of money to keep paying for these rises.

Look forward to your stock answers to my objections.

Do not change the parking laws that are now in place.

You are again trying to rip us off for more money.

Kind regards

59

I have just read that there will be a large increase in price for parking permits and you won't be able to change out of date ones either???

So not only our visitors who drive are now being more restricted and costing us more and now we can't exchange out of date either?

This is totally unfair and extremely mean spirited.

For goodness sake we can't even have a social life of visitors without it costing a fortune !!!

Totally unacceptable !??

60

Sent from my iPhone

I strenuously object to charges for visitor parking in Haringey. I also object to being unable to refund unused vouchers, any increase in charges and Haringey's mounting stealth tax on residents via charges for garden waste collections and visitor parking fees.

61 The council also does not take into account residents' objections to unwarranted charges and attempts to increase these types of stealth taxes and makes false assumptions that residents pay them because they're happy to, rather than because they have no choice!

This is clearly a ploy to suck even more money out of hard pressed residents, disguised under the umbrella of low emissions.

In addition, 6 monthly permits, a guaranteed high revenue for Haringey Council.

As a Council, your behaviour is deplorable. You stop or close essential services and continuously raise prizes on everything that you possibly can.

I have looked at the proposed charges, which equate to an increase of £50 on our parking permit. This is on top of the exorbitant council tax charges, whilst the roads are potholed, weeds untreated, pavements dangerous and litter strewn in every street.

Please note my objection, which obviously is worth nothing, as these decisions on increases have already been made, and this is just a kangaroo court to tick the boxes.

Sincerely

A VERY DISGUSTED RESIDENT.

I am writing to object to some of the proposals contained in "Proposed Amendments to on Street Parking Permits and Charges. The Haringey (Controlled Parking Zones) (Amendment No. *) Order 201".

These proposals include the removal of the right offered to residents by the current traffic management orders to a refund for any unused visitors parking permits. Specifically the proposed new orders state "It is anticipated that those permits would be used within the year purchased.....Unused permits would....not be exchanged or refunded".

Most residents are not able to plan exactly how many permits they will need. The new proposals will make it more difficult to manage visitor parking without buying a surfeit of permits that will now expire more quickly and be non-refundable.

Also included in these proposals is a change which increases the cost of visitor parking by more

than double.

As a policy, these changes are tantamount to a move towards more regressive local taxation and will unduly impact on the poorest in the borough.

I would urge the Council to review the cost increases and to consider an alternative (possibly online) system for the issue of visitor parking such as is used on other London Boroughs.

I look forward to your considered response.

I am e-mailing to lodge a strong objection to the proposed changes to the parking arrangements in the Borough and to the massive increase in charges. These are way beyond inflation and are punitive.

For example, the current cost of my resident's parking permit is £114.20. The proposal is to increase this to £140, a rise of 23%.

64

The proposals for visitors' permits are even worse. I find the 2 hour permits to be very useful and so I object on principle to their being discontinued. But the proposal for one hour permits is truly outrageous. The proposal is to increase the charge for one hour from 35p to 80p, an increase of 129% and more than the cost of the current two hour permit. Why should residents be required to pay that for their visitors?

I appreciate that the Council is in difficult financial circumstances, and I accept that some increase is inevitable, but these proposals are wholly unreasonable, represent a harsh punitive charge upon residents and will inevitably lead to more evasion. I urge you to withdraw the proposals and replace them with something much more reasonable.

I would like to object to the following changes to the Visitors' parking permits:-

2 (c) amend the residents' visitors' parking permit scheme so that the permits would be limited to hourly and daily operation. This would remove the need for an upper limit on numbers that could be purchased and It is anticipated that those permits would be used within the year purchased and not stock piled for future years. Unused permits would therefore not be exchanged or refunded. It is also proposed that the charge for hourly permits would be increased to 80p per hour;

Paragraph 2C makes little sense. Removing all but the daily and hourly permits gives no rationale to "remove the need for an upper limit on numbers". Moreover no reason at all is given why it should be "anticipated that those permits would be used within the year purchased". It is unclear - is this a rolling 12 months? I imagine not, and unless you pay the prohibitive administration to buy permits only when you know will need them immediately (a rare event for most people), then people will mostly likely buy permits in January for use within that year - i.e. stock pile them. What is the problem with keeping permits for future use? Having paid for them, why should we not keep them for unanticipated needs (plumber, electrician, friend visiting etc)? Why should the Council be trying to make life more difficult for its electorate?

What is clear is that this measure is nothing more than an attempt by the Council to raise income by increasing the number of unusable permits. As such it is objectionable, underhand and an abuse of power by the Council.

Yours sincerely

I object to the proposed change to the parking permits within the Haringey

CPZ.

London N10

I think this proposal is outrageous. You put in unnecessary parking restrictions in my area, put on loads of events in Finsbury Park increasing the restricted days and now you are proposing to put up visitor parking by 200 per cent to deter me from having friends and relatives being able to visit me. This is on top of the likely extortionate council tax increases you propose in April and the loss of free green waste collections. Salaries haven't gone up for years but the council seem to think they have a blank cheque to do as they like to residents

Hi

I'd be grateful if you could forward details of the proposed changes Haringey intends to make in relation to resident parking permits.

In a time when people are being faced with uncertainty and financial pressure, I feel the proposals I've heard about amount to an unfair increase in charges which is well above inflation.

Local authorities have a duty to act within reason and I would argue that this breaches that duty.

I feel this is nothing more than a stealth tax being put into drivers. To get a cheaper residential parking permit the only choice would be to have a plug in hybrid/electric car and due to the fact chargers do not seem to exist anywhere near my home there is no choice but to pay more. Never mind the near doubling of the price of the hourly and daily temporary permits.

When will there be an open forum/consultation to discuss this directly with residents?

Regards

Thank you.

Please register my objection to the increase in charges and removal of 2-hour vouchers for the visitor permits. Also the expiry on these and the fact you can no longer purchase in person at the library

Sent: 09 February 2018 12:55

To: Traffic Orders <Traffic.Orders@haringey.gov.uk>

Subject: CPZ increased charges 'consultation' BGN/BG/BGW

70

Hello

I've seen a photograph of a notice in a local Facebook group about a proposed increase to CPZ charges in our area. Yes, a photograph. Surely not a way to do a consultation that ends 23 February 2018?!

Not only that but the link to the consultation - http://haringey.gov/traffic_orders - does not work.

While I'm in favour of the CPZ, I think the changes to visitor permit charges is not reasonable. No 2-hours and 1-hour doubling in price? I don't think that is fair to charge 80p for an hour, especially as we need to use these if someone is just popping past or here for 5-10 minutes.

I'm sure my neighbours have some other feedback on this, but are unable to comment, so please send us the link or put a notice through everyone's door. Thanks!

To whom it may concern,

I wish to object to your proposed amendment to your current parking regulation with regard to the local Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ).

2(a) vary the parking charges of on-street parking permits as set out in the Schedule below. The new tariff structure incorporates the CO2 emission bands used by the DVLA and is intended to encourage people to travel more sustainably and for drivers to use more fuel efficient vehicles. This also introduces a 6 month permit option for residents and carers permits;

May I point out that whilst central government make it their priority to discourage citizens from using cars and encouraging sustainability - it does not necessarily need to be yours in local government. As you quite rightly point out, the DVLA already has CO2 emission banding and we are taxed accordingly because of the polluting nature of cars throughout Britain's road network. This, however, is not your job. You are charging for cars that are stationary and therefore the whole CO2 emission banding is quite irrelevant. I understand taxing households for second and thirds cars, but to impose such a high penalty for cars, for example, over 255 CO2 g/km is simply an opportunistic scheme employed by Haringey Council.

71

Please review your logic behind this. Bear in mind also that since charging people to pay, the road (mine is Napier Road) is now very sparsely filled with cars. Your job is done and there is no need to continue increasing prices like this.

Furthermore, the 2-week permits are very helpful to those with emergencies and a variety of genuine uses in daily life. Your intention to scrap these are very cruel. Please reconsider.

As always, we are at your mercy, living on roads where we once did not have to pay to park outside our own home! Let me make it clear, that the right thing to do in the first place would have been to award each home, on application, one FREE parking permit considering it was those outsiders (bus drivers and the like) who caused the problem in the first place. But it would seem that rather than taking a pragmatic and sensible approach, Haringey Council seized the opportunity to generate income via the obvious route.

To whom it may concern,

Please find this email as a formal objection to the proposed parking charge changes in Haringey.

Firstly I feel that the change to bring parking charges in line with the emissions bands as set by the DVLA is completely discriminatory. My partner and I bought a vehicle based on a smallish budget (£5,000) but requiring something that was big enough for our dog to sit in the back in comfort on longer journeys and also carry large items of furniture for vintage markets (which my partner does throughout the year). We in no way could afford to buy a new vehicle which would be able to fulfil these needs and also reduce the emissions. We use our vehicle up to three times a week for journeys to places where we cannot access easily with public transport such as local woods for walking the dog or visiting said vintage furnitures. The fact that we are being penalised in the same way that someone who uses their car every day seems incredibly unfair. Perhaps more pressing for Haringey over punishing private residence is to try to resolve the

72 built up congestion and standstill traffic of buses, HGVs and taxis on roads such as Green Lanes which in turn are spewing out a huge amount of toxins. We have recently bought an old house which is in dire need of renovation and are looking to restore it to something close to its former glory as a family home and I feel we are now being penalised with increased costs for an essential part of that house.

As well as the private residence permits, the fact that at present it is possible to purchase a two hour permit for a two hour zone so that a visitor, whether private or trade (which we will require heavily over the next 12 weeks), can park legally without fear of being issued with a PCN is incredibly cost effective and useful. However, this costs 70p at present. Under your proposal this two hour permit is being discontinued and it will become necessary to purchase two one hour permits. At the moment these cost 35p each but under the new proposal they will cost 80p each so that a two hour permit will effectively become £1.60 – an 129% increase in cost. Again, for a couple that are trying to keep the feeling of the neighbourhood alive and well and ensure a house remains in private ownership, not in the hands of developers charging huge rent, we feel completely let down by Haringey council in trying to bring in these new charges.

We object to the new parking permits on the following grounds.

* The increase in price for the hourly permits is ridiculous - making it 80p is a 129% increase on the existing price. This is WAY out of kilter with any kind of rise (given inflation is at 3.0%)

Coupled with a £100 increase in the parking permit this is outrageous and we object wholly and fully to what appears to be yet another council attack on motorists.

Also, this email is right on the deadline stated on the timeline - why is it being sent out so late. It would appear that this is a ploy to stop people from objecting.

This is mismanagement and poor information and requires more consultation before it should go into effect.

Hi there -

Why are the 2 hour permits being discontinued?

This increases the cost of a visitor's permit from 70p to £3.50. a 500% increase ?

This is is completely outrageous.

Is there going to be a public consultation about this - and if so what are the details?

On Palmerston Road we voted not have residents' parking and it was brought in regardless.

Regards

Cannot open this document on the website. Please can you in future check it works before putting it online. There is limited time for objections and you are cutting down further this time by not providing a clear and functioning website.

Is the aim of the 6-month permit a ruse to further catch people out if they forget to renew their permit in time or a move to make the yearly charge feel smaller.

You need to address the non-paying motorists that park on our street who diligently move their cars around the parking restriction period to avoid paying any charge whatsoever. This would stop a lot of unnecessary car journeys and movement if the actual object of the exercise is to reduce pollution and not just increase Haringey's revenue.

Yours sincerely

As a resident of a non CPZ street I have to say that this latest ill- conceived plan from Haringey will only serve to increase parking problems in the borough.

My street borders on the CPZ zone and every morning car owners from the zone arrive in droves desperately seeking spaces for their vehicles, (rather than pay for a permit in their own road). This is in addition to their visitors and tradesmen using this as a free parking area, sometimes for days or even weeks. By hiking the price by this extortionate degree you will only deter people from purchasing permits and worsening the problem in streets like mine.

Reconsider.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I wish to object to the proposed amendments to on street parking permits and charges with relation to the cost for parking permits.

I do not agree with the adjustment of parking prices based on CO2 emission bands. I feel strongly that this cost has already been incurred for on the road costs and the council has no right to apply it for parking permits. I do not think it is ethical to penalise individuals based on their car's CO2 emission band and then not reinvest these takings into tackling CO2 levels.

This is a formal objection to the over inflated rise in the the charges for the CPZ in Stroud Green/Crouch End CPZ's. There is no other reason for ripping us off other than making money, end of. This is just hiked up every year as you lot know we have no choice except to park our car on the roads. This is not a CPZ change, it's a stealth tax on people who don't have the luxury of a drive to park on.

78

As a matter of interest I am placing a FOI request in find out how much money the council generates from the charges across the borough for all CPZ's compared to the cost of actually administering the cost of running CPZ's. I can't believe for one moment that the cost of a handful of parking wardens out weigh the cost of running CPZ's. Someone, somewhere is making a lot of money out of this and it has to stop. This is not in the interests of anyone except to make money by blackmail for council. I am asking for a formal enquiry into the costs generated by these schemes.

Clearly motorists are been ripped off by these charges as we already pay VED for our cars. I will also raise with my local MP

Dear Haringey,

I formally object to the changes proposed by Haringey regarding the Visitors Parking permits. The removal of the 2 hourly permits is unacceptable and the increase in cost to the hourly one is not justified. I also object to the fact unused permits can not be refunded as ordering permits takes time so most people order more than they need in case.

79

Your changes will effect as usual the most vulnerable. As you don't allow free parking to Carers, a lot of our permits are used for carers. The cost is funded by ourselves. We cannot get one essential parking permit as firstly the cost, care agencies won't pay, and also we have several carers each day. I also object to the fact that you Have sneakily trying to pass this giving only 21 days for objections. Why have you not consulted sending leaflets to the effect homes? You did when it came to the brown bins. This is disgusting and hope you will think again. I will certainly think twice who I'm going to vote for in the coming elections.

Dear Madam

I am writing to object to some of the proposals contained in "Proposed Amendments to on Street Parking Permits and Charges. The Haringey (Controlled Parking Zones) (Amendment No. *) Order 201".

These proposals include the removal of the right offered to residents by the current traffic management orders to a refund for any unused visitors parking permits. Specifically the proposed new orders state "It is anticipated that those permits would be used within the year purchased.....Unused permits would....not be exchanged or refunded".

Most residents are not able to plan exactly how many permits they will need. The new proposals will make it more difficult to manage visitor parking without buying a surfeit of permits that will now expire more quickly and be non-refundable.

Also included in these proposals is a change which increases the cost of visitor parking by more than double.

As a policy, these changes are tantamount to a move towards more regressive local taxation and will unduly impact on the poorest in the borough.

I would urge the Council to reviews the cost increases and to consider an online system for the issue of visitor parking such as is used on other London Boroughs. Yours sincerely,

Hello,

I am a resident of Duckett Road (in the Green Lanes CPZ). . I recently paid £ 114.20 for my annual residents permit. You are proposing an increase (for my next permit) of £ 65.80 to £ 180, an increase of nearly 58%. This seems grossly unfair and would like to know how you can possibly justify such a large increase. I am not a heavy user of my vehicle, but having been paying (promptly) for my permit every year since the early 2000s. This increase is way, way, way above the current rate of inflation.

I object to these changes. I used to see local government an expression of local democracy and think of the council as My Council which I elect and which does things for my benefit. Now I think of it as a version of Ryannair. Unable or unwilling to raise council tax you seek instead to impose charges, catch people out and impose fines. I am particularly incensed by the change to visitor parking permits (VPs), this is an increase of over 100%. It has nothing to do with parking control, it is there purely to raise money. It is a tax on visitors and an aid to social isolation. When my son and his family visited us after Christmas, the streets were quiet and half empty but nevertheless you had your enforcement team out looking to easy pickings and they were ticketed. I had a visitor permit for them but it had slipped my mind that on 27 December it was needed. A family visit therefore cost them £60.

82

You propose that in future we will be unable to carry VPs over from one year to another. You say it is to avoid us stockpiling them, so now we know that this charge is to be ratcheted up by you each year.

As for you emissions-related charges, older and more polluting cars are disappearing anyway with the passage of time. They are likely to be owned by poorer people, so wide penalise them in the meantime?

83

Who ever came up with this idea needs to be replaced I suppose it's a way of creating more jobs and promoting staff. The council has cut back and closed areas of care and support to vulnerable youngsters and the elderly due to lack of funds but when it come to causing havoc to residents It's appears to be ok

Dear Sirs,

I believe this is a very bad idea.

84

The only purpose for this is to create more administration and waste more money for a council which is supposed to be short of funds. Yours sincerely

Thank-you for your email informing me of proposed changes to the Parking Permit Scheme

As a resident of Haringey Park i strongly object to the proposed changes as follows .I have been a permanent resident for over 10 years .

1, The proposed changes to the Resident's Parking Permit which require a renewal of permit every six months will cause a great deal of inconvenience to permanent residents and involve more admin costs for the council.

2, Removing the two -hourly Visitors Parking Permit will mean that residents will have to remind their visitors to put a new permit in their car every hour .This is unnecessarily restrictive and will again penalise permanent residents .

3 I feel that once again the council are not taking in to account the needs of permanent residents in the area .In Haringey Park we are already having to cope with the increased traffic and restrictions caused by filming in the Town Hall and the proposed changes to the Town Hall will have a huge impact on the local area .

4 It is unfair to raise the age of the Concessionary Visitors Parking Permits .This is will again penalise older residents of the borough .

I am very disappointed that these proposals are being made by the council and will be making my views known to the local councillor and MP .

Dear Haringey Council

I've reviewed your proposed changes to the parking permit regime. As a Labour Council I think you should adopt a policy which ensure that NO ONE faces a rise in parking charges which is greater than the current CPI increase that you apply to pension or other increases. Any other approach is exploiting your resident population.

The majority of people who have cars can not afford to replace them . I would like you to publish the data you have undoubtedly based your modelling on, which identifies, using the current

86

information you have, exactly how much additional revenue you expect this set of changes to yield on a ward by ward basis.

I would be interested to see the correlation between your CPZs, the anticipated change in yields and the publically available information on air pollution in different wards of the borough.

Please could you let me have that information by return so that I can consider if I would like to make further representations before you summarise the response to this consultation and report it to cabinet as part of the budget setting process.

Dear Haringey Team,

I doubt that anyone will take this email seriously but I will write it in any case.

I have watched the residential permit increase regularly in line with vehicle emissions. I drive an old and big car, for two reasons. Firstly it was given to me by my parents so was free. At the time there was no way I could afford to buy any sort of car (the previous one was beyond economical repair) but it was essential to have one as I am a self employed musician and the ability to drive and to own a car is essential in order to be able to reach destinations that are not served by public transport, or where transport is not available late at night.

I have three children, one of whom plays the double bass so a large car is necessary. It really is not possible to transport such an instrument on public transport except in extreme circumstances.

Apart from transporting my son locally with his bass, I rarely use my car in town and reserve its use for long journeys to work when I cannot take a train. I use the tube and that sustainable form of transport called legs. If I can walk somewhere in an hour, rain or shine, I walk.

I understand the need to encourage people to use more environmentally friendly vehicles but what if someone simply cannot afford to buy a new car? I don't expect anyone in any position of power will ever see sense and charge people for the way they use the roads (eg as in France). I use my car responsibly and infrequently, causing, I am sure, far less pollution than someone with a more environmentally friendly vehicle who drives to work every day.

Regards from an incredibly frustrated resident.

I think this is disgusting!!!! Just another way to tax people more! You should be ashamed!!!

Sent from my iPhone

How dare you. You just lie and make up rules to suit yourself.

This is horrific.

You did not consult us about making the changes permanent. You pushed through changes with a 50 : 50 for and against.

89

I am a tax payer who travels to work and you are adding an extra hundreds of pounds to my bill.

No. NO NO.

I totally disagree.

Dear Sir/ Madam,

I am writing to raise some objections to your proposed changes to parking permits following the e-mail below.

My objections relate to visitors parking permits.

I live in Crouch End where the majority of parking restrictions are for 2 hours only. Currently a 2 hour permit is 70p. Under your proposals this will jump to £1.60 because of needing to buy 2 1 hour permits. An increase of almost 130%. Although there has not been a rise in sometime, such a steep rise is likely to have a real impact on those most vulnerable e.g. the elderly who benefit from visitors. I therefore believe you need to review the pricing to ensure a lower increase.

90

Further, removing the ability to purchase 2 hour permits not only means the cost increases far more but it also very inconvenient. Most trades people and other visitors need a permit for the full 2 hours and the daily permits are extremely expensive to purchase when only 2 hours is needed. I therefore would like the ability to still purchase 2 hour permits in all areas that have a 2 hour restriction.

In addition, I object to your proposal for permits to expire. Currently, when ordering visitors permits they take a few weeks to arrive. In fact my last lot took 4 weeks and I had to chase for them. As a result it is necessary to ensure I always have a certain amount. For example, we recently needed a roof repair last minute and I needed vouchers for 5 days to cover this. I would not have been able to get them in time if I had not had any spare. It is very difficult to predict how many I may use year to year therefore and with the proposal for them to expire, I will end up either losing money or not having permits when I need them. I would therefore like for this proposal to be reconsidered. If the permits were to expire 2 years after purchase that would be more helpful.

I hope you can take this feedback into consideration.

Dear CPZ Team

This is a representation in response to the above consultation: I understand the closing date is now 13th March. I am a resident in Sylvan Avenue (Woodside West CPZ).

The general thrust of the changes seems fair - although I concede I might think differently if I drove a car much above the 130 gms/km band !

However, I do have an objection and a suggestion.

The objection is on behalf of those, like me, that live in a CPZ with only a part-time restriction of 1 or 2 hours such as Woodside West: 2 hours 11.00 am to 1.00 pm.

A current 2 hour permit - covering the whole period of restriction - costs 70p: its replacement - 2 x 1 hr @80p - is more than double.

This change, only a year after introduction of the CPZ, is not so much inflationary as explosive and unlike the increases for some Residents' Permits, I find it hard to identify any realistic environmental benefit.

91

(Whether a resident in Sandford Avenue (say) should have to pay £3.50 for a visitor to park for the day, while I pay £1.60 for the same privilege is outside the scope of this consultation.)

The suggestion is that there is some concession or arrangement for those who may have prebought a number of 1 hr and 2 hr visitors' permits (which are issued with no expiry date, after all) and still have them 'in stock' at the time the new systems are introduced: they should remain valid.

I accept that steps would need to be taken to prevent people rushing out now and buying the maximum no. of 70p/2hr permits as a hedge against the increase. This could possibly be done by selling all future VPs with an expiry date or by accepting current 2 hr permits (maybe as 1 hr permits) in the new system, probably for a fixed or transition period: perhaps both.

Similarly, the current 1 hr permits should also remain valid after the change.

I have copied this response to the Woodside Ward Councillors not only because I hope they will share my concerns as a resident but because of the potential political impact of these changes, especially in an election year.

Dear Haringey,

I'm writing to raise objections to the proposed changes to parking permits in the borough. Whilst I broadly agree with the principal of banded charges in line with vehicle emissions, I believe that many of the changes being made will disproportionately and unjustly increase the financial burden on households in the borough. I feel it is particularly unreasonable to more than double the hourly price of visitors permits without any reason given whatsoever. Myself and my partner regularly give parking permits to family members that allow them to look after our children whilst we are working, so for us the price of work will increase if these changes go through. Two five hour visits a week that currently costs £3.50 will now require two daily permits and cost £7, so we are paying £14+ more a month for no improvement in service whatsoever.

92

I am also concerned that a lack of trading permits mean small businesses will be forced to pay £20 a day, and that unused vouchers will not be valid after the change, meaning much money spent by local residents will now be wasted.

I would be grateful if you could reconsider these proposals and give some thought to a more meaningful consultation process that takes more thorough consideration of the views of local residents.

I strongly object to Haringey Council's proposals to increase CPZ residents' permit charges and

visitor charges with effect from this Spring.

The proposed residential charges would be an increase of over 50%.

The proposed visitor charges represent increases of 100% or more.

These increases would be far, far above the rate of inflation or any increases in residents' incomes. They would be a devastating blow to residents in many categories, both those who need to use cars and those who need to have parking available so that they may receive visitors. Needless to say, those who have small children & buggies, who have to cope with heavy loads (family shopping, musical instruments/sound equipment, tools, computer equipment, etc), or who live alone and/or need carers and/or are elderly would be particularly affected.

93

Such increases would be an outrageous insult to large numbers of Haringey residents who are feeling the pain of austerity in every aspect of their budgets. These proposals are punitive and anti-democratic in the extreme, and may well be a brazen attempt to lay the ground for even worse Council depredations to come.

The rationale offered for the proposed increases is pitiful bureaucratic control-think - reminiscent of 1984. I expect my local Council to run essential services like education, waste disposal, public housing and libraries in an efficient and cost-effective manner, not to take on the role of Big Brother by dictating to people how they should live their lives.

The Council must cut out unnecessary waste, reduce exorbitant officials' salaries which are multiples of the Prime Minister's salary, discontinue paid holidays on the French Riviera for officials, eliminate non-essential activities like Haringey People (it's the digital 21st century now), slim down and audit Councillors' expenses (make Councillors use public transport, not cars/taxis), etc, etc, and transform itself into a lean, mean, financially responsible & democratically accountable operation.

On behalf of the Cromwell Area Residents Association we would like to formally object to the proposed changes to the visitors permits. We feel the new permits would increase the cost to purchase, would require two permits to cover a single days parking and we are concerned that there is no limit to the number that can be purchased per property.

Regards,

I wish to register my objection to the huge increase in the cost of the one hour visitors parking permit. Also, why have these permits to be used up within the year? I found it so difficult to buy a new supply of permits a few months ago, necessitating a visit to the office eventually as, for some reason I wasn't able to purchase them online, that I bought a large number of permits. I don't often have to use them and thought they would last me for a few years. I am a pensioner and this is an unwelcome additional expense.

Morning

I strongly object to the proposed new charges for visitors parking permit. It is already difficult parking around Wood Green, and I just do not understand why Haringey just want to take more money from local residents. Haringey just keep taking and taking without giving back a high standard of service back to the community. Look at how dirty our streets are, people speeding and getting away with it and petty crime has increased over the years etc etc!!

With regards

To whom it may concern

Being a resident that will be directly affected by this proposal I would like to object to some of the points raised in the "Proposed Amendments to on Street Parking Permits and Charges. The Haringey (Controlled Parking Zones) (Amendment No. *) Order 201".

I received an email dated 16 February 2018 advising me of the changes proposed for parking charges with the opportunity to raise objections by 22 February 2018 – this is a wholly unacceptable consultation period and I believe council guidelines on public consultations as it gives less than a week for residents impacted to raise objects and concerns. The period given to reply includes the tail end of half term when residents may still be away. Was this intentionally to reduce the number of possible responses?

In view of the proposal I would like to lodge the following objections:

1. Expiry of permits at end of the year – "It is anticipated that those permits would be used within the year purchased.....Unused permits would not be exchanged or refunded".

It is not always possible to anticipate how many permits you will need each year and of course it varies. The majority of residents will want to keep a stock. It is wholly unfair that these permits cannot be (i) used the following year as currently and (ii) exchanged or refunded. Huge numbers of unused permits will have to be repurchased the following year. 97

2. One hour permits replacing two hour permits – the two hour permits are very useful. The new one hour permit is nearly the same price (almost double?)?? as the two hour permit which will be discontinued – this is whole unfair particular on residents (mostly in the east of the borough where CPZs have longer hours) and puts increased financial pressure on those residents who can least afford it. There are many residents with health issues that have visits such as carers and health professionals and are on low incomes which this will affect the most. This unfairly impacts them.

3. Removing upper limit of permits that can be purchased – this has the potential danger that permits will be purchased and traded on the black market to people outside of the borough who have no business (work or visitors) to be parking here. I thought the whole idea of the CPZs was to protect parking for residents and reduce traffic in the borough? This would open up a trade for commuters wishing to use the borough as a staging post for their journeys.

4. With the introduction of this increase and additional charges the Haringey Council are introducing a stealth tax on its resident where CPZs are in place. If the aim is to have a positive impact on traffic and parking in the borough these proposals are no solution.

Other London boroughs are using electronic systems to enable residents to purchase visitors permits. Are Haringey investigating the possibility of doing this?

I would ask the council to withdraw these changes to the current system and find a better way.

This is a highjacking, not a consultation. Haringey residents have not been given anywhere near a reasonable amount of time to consider the 'suggested' changes, which includes a 125% hike in charges. I realise that councils are under extreme financial pressure but this smash and grab approach to clawing back funds is not going to go down well with the people who live in this borough. And don't call this a consultation if it is in fact a plain and simple order to pay up.

It is quite unacceptable to make such huge increases in charges. If the plan was to make incremental increases over, say, three years, that would offer some sort of softening effect to the blow. The Council, by acting in this autocratic way are not serving the Haringey community and should extend the consultation immediately and public meetings should be scheduled. You will then find out how the residents feel about the changes - and perhaps get some good suggestions on how to proceed.

Dear Sirs,

I am writing to object to the proposed changes to visitor parking in the borough.

Currently, a (2-hour) permit costs 70p for my visitor to park in my CPZ and this would enable them to stay all day. If my understanding of the proposed changes is correct, this will be replaced by a £3.50 daily permit - I assume one can't simply use 2x1hour permits as per the current 2-hour permit. Am I correct?

99 If so, this represents a 5-fold increase and I think this is completely unacceptable; also the proposal to make the permits only applicable to the calendar year and at the same time, to not offer refunds for unused permits takes no account of your customers situation eg someone is expecting guests for Christmas (so permits are purchased) but then the party doesn't happen. The likelihood is that the permits would be unused by year-end and therefore wasted.

I would appreciate some clarification of the proposal in respect of the above, and if the adverse elements have been interpreted correctly, to register my objection to the plan.

Yours Sincerely

Dear Ms. Cunningham,

I would like to object to the proposed changes in visitor parking.

Living in Cromwell Ave. N6 I found the existing scheme worked well. 70p for two hours is a reasonable price if someone wants to visit or if a trader needs to come.

100 Now it will be £3.50 for two hours. Exorbitant. Why is a Labour council trying to fleece residents?

Again, I object to the proposals.

Yours sincerely,

Dear Sir/Madam,

I hereby object to the following in the proposed amendments:

Firstly, the visitor permits being cut back to just the hourly permits and daily permits being available. Its going to be more than 100% more expensive for residents to buy permits after this happens. If you have someone staying with you for a weekend or two weeks it seems ridiculous that you will have to buy a number of permits to cover this time and obviously as mentioned a lot more expensive. Plus we should have the versatility of a selection of parking permits as one size does not fit all.

Secondly, I also object to the fact that parking permits will need to be used within one year. It doesn't make any sense! You say this will stop people stock piling permits? But then you are taking the limit away of what people can buy so they can stockpile a whole load of them to use or sell as they wish within a year! We like to have a backup of permits in case we have visitors because we have busy lives and don't always have the time to order more or wait for them to be

101 delivered. If you have paid for a visitor permit it should not run out! This is purely a way of extracting more money from people as the council knows that people will forget and then have to buy more. Once you have paid for them it should be able to be used, or at the very least exchanged, which is still not ideal as again when you're busy its just a complete waste of your time and money.

These things are just another tax on residents of Haringey and it should be stopped. It follows the new charges for garden waste collection which people with no cars have no choice but to pay. Now you are targeting people's right to have visitors at their home.

Please stop these amendments.

Best

Dear Haringey Council

I am very unhappy with the new changes to the parking permit scheme.

Firstly the increase in visitor parking costs of over 125%, with carers potentially having to pay an additional £100 to park. As a pensioner I feel that such a large increase is discriminator toward the elderly, disabled and low income families. For a labour council you should be ashamed of yourselves.

I am unhappy that the "consultation" on these proposals, which were published on the 2nd February, but only circulated to residents by email a fortnight later, will close this Friday, the 23rd February.

We are disappointed that Haringey Council has once again failed to properly consult and engage with residents on widespread changes that will affect thousands of people daily.

102

The proposed changes will also see the limit on the number of visitor permits removed, potentially opening up the opportunity for residents to buy and sell permits, turning the borough into a giant park-and-ride for commuters to central London, and will require all permits to be used within the calendar year of which they were purchased, with the option of refunds scrapped entirely, causing more concern for residents.

I object to these ill-thought-through proposals that will likely see an increase in private vehicle travel across, what is already, one of the most polluted boroughs in the UK.

It is an absolute disgrace.

Kind regards

To: Traffic Management Group,

I am replying to the email I received on 16th February regarding the proposed amendments to on street parking permits & charges, and making comments on the proposal. I would also refer you to my email to you dated Monday 19th February when I pointed out that the link to the web page where the proposed order was supposed to be, did not actually show the proposed order, so it was not possible to see what the proposals were.

Firstly, I wish to object to the short notice given to residents of these changes. As mentioned above I received an email on 16th February relating to the proposed changes, which was the first I knew of them, and when using the link in the email the details of the changes were not visible on the web page. They only became visible today 22nd February which is the day before the closing date for any comments or objections. This is not enough time for people who will be affected by these changes to give their comments.

2. there is mention of a "6 month permit option" does that mean that permanent residents can still have annual permits?

103

3. the proposal at a) to amend the residents' visitors' parking permit scheme so that the permits would be limited to hourly and daily operation. – I do not understand the logic here when you say "This would remove the need for an upper limit on numbers that could be purchased" why does this supposedly remove the need for an upper limit?

If people can get unlimited numbers of hourly and daily visitor permits what will be the effect be on parking in our roads, especially when the Spurs stadium is finished and next years football season starts. If you do not limit the number of visitor permits what means will there be to prevent people selling them to Spurs fans or commuters to allow others to park in our CPZ?

I strongly object to increasing the cost of the one hour permit from 35p to 80p, which would be 10p more than the current 2 hour permit and a completely unreasonable 130% increase.

4. I consider it a disbenefit to reduce the period of validity of the permits to one year and strongly object to this. It would be an inconvenience to have to keep reordering visitor permits so they don't go out of date if I don't use as many as anticipated, and see the money paid for them

wasted. At least with the current scheme I can order them with confidence that any not used this year can be used in the next 2 or 3 years.

Why are Haringey proposing to further limit the period of validity when neighbouring boroughs such as Waltham Forest don't have any validity limits on their visitor permits? This appears to be yet another money making scheme for the council to the detriment of residents who buy permits.

5. I also strongly object to the proposal for discontinuing two hour and two week visitor permits, especially when you propose to more than double the cost of a one hour permit as well.

This seems like an excuse to simply increase the costs to residents of having visitors, and will have a particularly negative impact on elderly and disabled residents. One hour is rarely enough for a family visit so the two hour permit is much more useful for that, though one hour permits for visits by carers etc are helpful.

To whom it may concern,

Dear Sir/Madam,

Although I find it reasonable to align the cost to CO2 emissions, I object on three points regarding visitor parking permits:

1) The current 2-hour Visitor Permits allow visitors who wish to stay a few hours to avoid displaying an awkward number of permits, hence they are very convenient and I don't see any reason to discontinue them. Therefore I object to their discontinuation.

104

2) The price of 1-hour Visitor Permits has a proposed increase of more than double (from 35p to 80p), which I find very hard to justify, especially considering that the maximum number of permits per household would be lifted. Also, the new price increase doesn't correspond to an equal improvement of the service itself.

I understand the Council's intention to encourage using other forms of transport, but such a steep increase in price is only affecting those who cannot do otherwise. For these reasons, I object to such a rise in price.

3) I object to the proposal of not being able to use visitors permits

acquired in previous years. The Council is slow in issuing visitor parking permits (days by post, or hours queuing, which is not always possible) therefore it is often useful to have a few spare ones at home. It would be different if they could be purchased on-line and printed straight away, but this is not the case. Furthermore, given that resident parking permits can be refunded in case residents leaving the area, the same principle should apply to visitor parking permits.

For these reasons, I object to the proposal that visitor parking permits will not be refundable or that it will not be possible to swap the expired permits for new ones (as it has been so far).

Yours faithfully,

Dear Haringey Council

I object most vehemently against the proposed changes to the proposed CPZ charges.

The "consultation" on these proposals, which were published on the 2nd February, but only circulated to residents by email a fortnight later, will close this Friday, the 23rd February. I am extremely disappointed that the council should consider this to be a proper consultation and engagement with residents on widespread changes that will affect thousands of people daily.

I note that my Parking Permit will increase from £114 to £180. The justification is that it is in line with DVLA CO2 emission bands. In my case the bands are unchanged from the current ones.

Vehicles registered before 1 March 2001 (or where CO2 emissions are not documented)

Not over 1549 cc	£70.00	£35.00	£57.00	£91.30	1550 cc to 3000cc	£180.00	£90.00
£114.00	£148.40		3001cc and above	£280.00	£140.00		171.30
£228.40							

105

How is this £66 increase justified if my banding has not changed? This is a flagrant moneymaking racket that I'm sure it was hoped would increase Council funding until the next year when I'm sure that the CPZ fees will rise again. CPZ legislation specifically prohibits councils using CPZ fees for revenue collection. I see this move as a direct contradiction to the legislation.

As to the changes to Visitors' Parking Permits you baldly state that "The visitor parking permits scheme offers a range of permits at very low cost, which does not help manage demand for parking spaces or encourage the use of more sustainable modes of transport". There is no background to this assertion. Where are the reasons behind this statement? I see it purely as an unjustified means of raising the cost of the Parking Permits.

Also, I would like to see the figures behind this assertion; "Many residents are now in full time employment when accessing the concessionary scheme". How were these figures obtained and where can they be reviewed?

As to not being able to use the permits beyond the year they are issued and abolishing refunds for unused permits I cannot see the rationalisation behind this. Is there evidence that residents have been "stockpiling" permits and if there is where is it? This is also no reason for unused permits not to be exchanged or refunded. Why is it "expected" that permits would be used within the year purchased?

And finally why should it be necessary for that the charge for hourly permits be increased to 80p per hour, bringing it more in line with charges applied in other London boroughs? Does the Council regularly check with other London Boroughs regarding their charges, and lower any of Haringeys' that are higher than the others?

Yours sincerely

I live in the Fortis Green CPZ and currently park one car on the road and use visitors permits.

Please can someone explain to me why the one hour visitor permit has had to be increased from 35p to 80p? I can understand the need for occasional small rises, but cannot understand this. The impression given is that parking policy in the borough is driven by money making rather than good management of our streets.

While not related to the CPZ, I would also like to comment here about the new paybyphone parking charges which are ludicrous and discriminate against residents who do not carry a phone or find it difficult to cope with apps/texting. I cannot see why you can't still operate the coin meters in addition to the pay by phone.

106

When parking charges were introduced in Muswell Hill there was initially a 20 min grace period of no payment so if you were just going quickly into one shop for 5 – 10 mins then you could be out of the space quicker by not having to find change/go to the meter. This kept the parking bays circulating quickly for these types of users. The price then moved up to 20p and then 80p. Now the default charge is £1.95 for 30 mins which you can override to £1.35 for 20 mins. This is a very high charge and seems to have little to do with freeing up parking bays and more to do with raising money and a 30p admin charge for using a mobile system where you give users no choice of an alternative cash payment is not reasonable.

I would be grateful if you would respond to this email.

I object to the proposed increase in price of visitors parking permits which well exceeds inflation

I also object to the suggestion that a whole year of permits be bought in advance and then potentially expire before use creating intentional waste. Instead I propose the current system or an automated system where you can pay online each day as other local boroughs have.

Thank you

I want to object to the increase in price for parking in the area. I want to also object to any change to visitor or builders daily permits. These increases are not making our area better the roads are not cleaned and the safety of our cars is not good.

concerned resident Napier Road n17

I am writing to object to the proposed changes to the fees for Bruce grove cpz. We were not consulted properly on the changes and are now being told that changes to the visitor permits will cost us substantially more. Also it would appear that the permits we have already bought will be invalid. There has been no real consultation and the information given is sketchy and lacks clarity. This proposal reads like a done deal with the express intention of ripping off residents. We were supposed to have a consultation regarding the implementation of the cpz and then a consultation regarding possible changes to times etc... neither of these consultations were forthcoming and now the council is determined to implement further even more punitive charges to residents. I will be contacting my local councillors regarding this matter and am considering writing to county hall and the communities secretary regarding Haringey councils shameful treatment of its residents and it's all to frequent lack of meaningful consultation.

Yours with disappointment,

The latest proposals are a cynical fundraising exercise. When the parking permit scheme was introduced we were assured that it was not a fundraising exercise but a means of reducing unwanted commuter parking near public transport hubs and on residential streets.

In my street, Middle Lane, N8 there is a 2-hour period requiring a parking permit from 10.00-12.00. No longer is it possible to buy a 2-hour visitor permit for 70p; instead one is required to purchase 2 x 1-hour permits at a cost of £1.60, a more than 100% increase. An annual permit for my car will rise from £114 to £160 a 40% rise.

It is clear that the council now wishes to make full use of the parking permit scheme as a revenue-raising source. Doubtless the costs will continue to increase way beyond inflation.

Why should I continue to vote for this administration?

Please do not introduce the proposed changes to Haringey's temporary parking permit system. It would be very poor value for, and onerous upon, residents. I would like my formal objection to the proposals to be taken into consideration.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to raise the following concerns with regards to the proposed amendments to on street parking permits in Haringey:

- * There has been an inadequate period of consultation on these proposals and a distinct lack of awareness being raised, with emails only being sent to current people on your system. A complete disregard to residents that have not previously purchased permits and therefore not on your records.

- * The lifting of the number of visitor permits one will be able to purchase will open the system 112 up to abuse with residents selling on permits.

- * The expiry dates being changed to within the calendar year, with no refund policy is a complete nuisance. I buy my permits every so often and value having them there should I need a last minute tradesperson or a family/friend visit. To retrieve the permits to only find they have expired would be a complete nightmare and creates another chore that I will need to monitor to ensure I always have access to valid permits.

- * The increase to these charges also reeks of Haringey Council attempting another money making scheme. Surely the HDV is enough!

I look forward to hearing your response to these concerns.

To Haringey Council:

Although these charges do not directly affect me at the moment, I have no doubt that, in time, they will. As a Council, you seem to want to bleed residents dry! These increases are absolutely outrageous!

You would not need to be proposing these measures if you first got your own "house" in order by claiming unpaid council taxes, NOT spending £32m on refurbishing a building for your own offices whilst some people live in horrific accommodation, and doing what most normal people have to do, making do with the current Council Offices. I could list other wastages but wont.

113

I have no idea what is going to happen with the boundaries of our borough, but ever since Labour got into power, when Hornsey lost its autonomy, the area has gone down and down in so many ways. Really sad for those of us who remember a better time and for those who have never had a better time and deserve it!

It seems that you never ever listen so I doubt you will now. I love my home and the area but you as a Labour Council manage to spoil and mar most things others hold dear and will probably drive me away given time. I so hope you lose seats at the forthcoming local elections, and in time to reverse the HDV which only you seem to want. It's just about money of course not peoples' lives.

I would like to strongly object to the proposed new parking charges.

The 50% increase to my residence parking charge is unjustifiable.

114

I also object strongly to the changes to the visitors permits!

I am writing to raise an objection to the proposed changes to Haringey parking permits. The ground for objection are as follows:-

Loss of 2 hour visitor permits. These are currently charged at 70p per permit and are used widely across the borough as many streets have 2 hour restrictions. The proposal only retains all day permit or 1 hour permits, meaning that people living in streets with a 2hour restriction will be forced to purchase all day permits charged at £3.50 each, an increase of 500%. This coupled with the administration fee of £11.80 per transaction, the years' time limit on purchased permits, and the scrapping of refunds for unused permits means that it will be prohibitively expensive and complex for anyone living in a two hour restriction zone to have visitors or family stay.

115 An average of 20% increase in annual residents parking permits without any rationale or justification. The existing permits are already banded on CO2 omissions and the re-banding proposes increased charges even for low emitting vehicles, only vehicles below 120 CO2g/km see a very modest reduction with all other categories having increases.

As a local resident in Haringey, I am writing to object to some of the proposals contained in "Proposed Amendments to on Street Parking Permits and Charges. The Haringey (Controlled Parking Zones) (Amendment No. *) Order 201". These proposals include the removal of the right offered to residents by the current traffic management orders to a refund for any unused visitors parking permits. Specifically the proposed new orders state "It is anticipated that those permits would be used within the year purchased.....Unused permits would....not be exchanged or refunded".

This is outrageous and not in the interests of residents. As it is, they cost a lot of money, the cost seems now likely to be doubled ie. one hour costing more and 2 hour disbanded. Most residents are not able to plan exactly how many permits they will need. The new proposals will make it more difficult to manage visitor parking without buying a surfeit of permits that will

116

now expire more quickly and be non-refundable.

This is not in the interests of residents and absolutely against the borough's commitment to helping those more vulnerable and promoting equality of opportunity. As a policy, these changes are tantamount to a move towards more regressive local taxation and will unduly impact on the poorest in the borough. I would urge the Council to review the cost increases and to consider an online system for the issue of visitor parking such as is used on other London Boroughs."

Dear Sir/Madam

Thank you for your email regarding the changes to parking permits in our area.

I am surprised that so little time has been allowed for consulting residents on these significant changes. Nevertheless, I am writing to you promptly to make you aware of my concerns.

I note that you are proposing to more than double visitor parking costs. This will place a significant additional burden on relatives and carers of residents who are dependent on regular visitors – in our case, our adult children and our relatives.

117

I am very concerned that it is proposed that the limit on the number of visitor permits is to be removed. This seems to open up the possibility of residents buying and selling permits to commuters, which would completely undermine the entire point of residents' parking permits while offering rewards to unscrupulous residents willing to exploit the system. Conversely, the proposal to require all permits to be used within the calendar year of which they were purchased with no option of a refund would penalise genuine residents lawfully using the permit system in the way the legislation intends.

I call on the council to reconsider these proposals in the light of these very pertinent objections.

Yours faithfully

Dear Sir/Madame

I write to object to the changes proposed to street parking permits and charges. 125% increase for visitor permits is outrageous, and can not be justified. Our mother presently has carers arriving four times a day, due to a fractured hip, and we have builders in to change her bathroom to a wet room, as requested by her doctor.

118

How can you justify increasing visitor charges by 125%?

If the council believes it can rip off residents by using the CPZ's as a cash cow, then we must remove them.

Not a happy resident.

Why are you raising visitors permits? Where will this 125% hike go to?

It's outrageous. You are making it impossible for people to work in haringey. So what's the benefit to that?

119

If you want to make more money quickly, why don't you install working speed cameras and get them that way?

Dear Sir or Madam,

I recently received an email communication (14th Feb) which detailed your proposed changes to the parking permit charges.

At present I already pay an increased cost for my permit which is detailed as CO2 related and now I understand that you want to fall in line with the DVLA CO2 costs. I think this is an absolute travesty, when my vehicle is parked the engine is not running and therefore no emissions. At present in the Hornsey South area local residents have been emailing frontline due to the issues we have with parking near our homes (Tottenham Lane N8), this means that we are driving around the block sometimes in excess of 30 minutes as we live in an area which is one way system, this obviously adds to the emissions problem!

I have only recently purchased a permit due to a change in employment, prior to this I drove to and from work daily and apart from the cost of my road tax I was not being punished for the CO2 emissions. So I drove more and paid less and now I'm using public transport to commute,

how can this be right?

My car tax is almost £600 and as a responsible car owner I have my car serviced regularly, on each occasion I get my emissions checked in line with the MOT criteria in this country. I feel that your proposal is just another way to make money from the hard working residents in your borough, it's an absolute farce.

I hope that a lot of other Haringey residents oppose this proposal and you rethink this.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards

Dear Council Officer and Harringay ward councillors

I received an e mail (which I assume was from the council although it did not say) on February 14th informing me that the Council is proposing to make changes to parking permits and charges.

I have a number of points to make in response.

1. I have looked on the Council website and the information there says:

Any person desiring to object to the proposed Order or make other representation should send a statement in writing of either their objection and the grounds thereof or of their representation to the Traffic Management Group, River Park House, 1st floor, 225, High Road, Wood Green, N22 8HQ or to traffic.orders@haringey.gov.uk within 21 days from the date of this Notice.

121

However this notice is dated February 2nd, which means I have had only 9 days in which to respond. I have not seen this information anywhere else, and it suggests the Council does not really want residents' views.

2. Visitors parking: I note the more than 100% increase in hourly/two hourly parking charges. I do not think such a large increase is right. It amounts to a local tax that affects residents of the borough disproportionately and unfairly, given that some CPZs restrictions last 10+hours a day while in others it is merely 2. I object to this proposal.
3. Purchasing of visitors parking permits. I am horrified by this proposal:

It is anticipated that those permits would be used within the year purchased and not stock piled for future years. Unused permits would therefore not be exchanged or refunded.

How do you expect residents to accurately guess how many permits they will use in a year/month/ week? Visits are planned, sometimes get put off, people drop in, emergency plumber is needed etc etc etc. Add to this the fact (and it is a fact) that the Councils

Systems are slow, inefficient and incompetent, people wait more than two weeks for permits to be sent out by post, or queue up for hours at the library. This proposal is totally unacceptable.

4. Current visitor's permits: I cannot see a date at which you propose this change to happen. The permits I currently have recently purchased are valid up to 2020 – can you please confirm that these will be honoured.

Yours sincerely

To whom it may concern

I understand that you are increasing parking permits in my Zone (I live in Lancaster Road, N4) by 129%, i.e. for an hourly ticket from 35p to 80p per hour. Is this correct? I understand also there is no change in the cost for a daily ticket which will stay at £3.50 per day. Is this correct? I can't find any information on the Haringey Website.

As we live in an 8.30am to 6.30pm zone, and we have controlled parking six days a week and sometimes on Sunday afternoon, it is impossible for me to predict when buying them how many I'll need for all eventualities in my household. I think therefore it would be very inflexible of Haringey to limit the life of these tickets to one year.

Also I feel unhappy about the end of the 2 hour ticket. We'll be faffing about with tickets all day. Lining them up on the car window takes for ever and it is an unnecessary complication to an already deeply annoying process. Can you please rethink this?

I have never bought up to the limit of tickets, so do not see why they now need to be limitless, but if you are only going to give them a year of use, I can see that many people will over buy tickets unnecessarily.

Hello there,

I was recently made aware that Haringey Council is planning on doubling the price of Visitor Parking Permits. I'm writing to make my displeasure clear.

You want to raise resident permits, and visitor permits will be increasing 128%. I believe Barnett Council tried doing the same a couple of years ago and things backfires spectacularly, with the council being demanded they return a lot of the money charged. It would be a shame if the same happened with the council I love living in.

The "administration charge" at £11.80 is also ludicrous, there's a reason I pay council tax, it's for this type of work as well.

123

Permits will expire after 12 months - for what reason? Why do I need to keep purchasing permits when I still have others at home? Again, if this is an attempt to fleece more money out of residents, I've already read you're planning on raising council tax, and again, the reason I pay it is for this type of thing.

Like I said, I think these measures are ridiculous and as a resident I'm leaving my written protest here.

Regards,

I wish to register my objection to your proposed removal of 2 hour visitor permits. As I live in a CPZ with a 2 hour restriction, 2 hour permits are what I need. I can see no justification for your raising the rate for 1 hour permits by more than 100 percent, and forcing me to buy two.

This means that what currently costs 70p would cost £1.60.

How can you justify that?

Sent from my iPhone

I would like to make an objection to the proposed changes to visitor's parking permits.

Not only are you proposing to increase the charges, but also to limit the flexibility of them. What is the reasoning behind discontinuing the weekend/2 hourly/2 week permit? The current flexibility is EXACTLY what is needed for visitor's permits.

Then on top of that, to restrict how long the permits are valid for is outrageous. You are expecting residents to accurately calculate how many daily or one hour permits they will need in the current year, knowing full well that due to the cumbersome and slow process of obtaining permits, residents will need to over-buy.

Regards,

Hello

I am writing in response to the proposed changes to visitors parking permits. In particular I am opposed to the 67% increase in cost for the equivalent permits required once the two week visitor's permit is removed as an option. I am not opposed to the increase in permits or the admin charge but this particular change is ridiculous and does not reflect inflation even if you take in to account the time since the last increase. I like many others living in London find their extended families are outside of the city and therefore they only visit for holidays and the requirement for a permit doesn't make it easy for ad hoc visits. Due to distance and time visitors will stay for a week or two, allowing time to order and pay in advance. There is a high proportion of residents in this borough that live on the poverty line and with this increase may find themselves even more isolated as they will not be able to afford the equivalent permits!

126

I feel strongly this option should be reviewed, have you considered a weekly option?

Regards

Thank you for sending to me the proposed amendments to on street parking permits and charges.

I have the following objection:

* I do not agree that the temporary permits should be altered in the way that is proposed.

127

* There are many areas that have 2 hour parking restrictions from Mon-Fri which makes the 2-hour visitor permits very useful. If the council is struggling with income then I would suggest keeping the 2-hour visitors permit. If you priced the permits 50p for 1 hour and £1.00 for 2 hours you may end up selling more permits and getting more income. The change in price per permit is also less dramatic which would help lower income families.

Regards,

Dear sir / madam

128

I object to the changes that are being made to the residents parking permits scheme; particularly the abolition of the 2 hour visitor permit. For those of us who live in a zone with a 2 hour restriction, this makes absolutely no sense and effectively increases the prices of a visitor permit to cover the times by 120% which is extortionate and wholly inappropriate. The notification you have given to residents of these changes is scandalous and unnecessarily short and I urge you to reconsider the whole proposal.

N17 6DG

...with future permit prices pls.

129

... ..

To whom it may concern,

I was really disappointed to receive your email this morning.

I completely disagree with this proposal.

You are going to charge me almost DOUBLE the price I already pay to keep my car parked, and I mean PARKED, in front of my house. On top of that, what I already pay for (Belmont CPZ) doesn't allow me to park my car any nearer shops, commercial center and underground stations comparing other residential parking permits like WG CPZ which include a wider area.

When my car is parked it doesn't pollute the air so I can't see how you think of reducing the co2 emission with this amendment.

This is just another way to fill the coffers of the council from hard working families.

Sent from my iPhone

Dear Haringey-

It is not clear from this communication (below) what we have to do.

In fact, it not convincing why this has to happen at all, unless it is just another way of the council charging us more (which is the most obvious conclusion).

Also, this is the first I have heard of a concessionary scheme for people over 60 (now being changed to 65). Can you please tell me what this entails as I have been paying since residents parking began and am now aged 70.

I'd like to object to the excessive increase in the cost of residents' parking visitor permits. An increase of over 100% is completely unreasonable from 35p to 80p per hour. Your costs cannot have more than doubled so there is no justification for this gigantic increase.

Dear Sir or Madam,

I wish to object to the proposed changes to cpz visitor permits, specifically the substantial proposed increase in 1 hour permits. I live within the Wood Green Inner zone, where restrictions are in place from 8am-10pm 7 days a week. I am very concerned at the proposed increase to the cost of 1 hour permits from the current 35p to 80p. I believe this cost is punitive. Those residents who have family and friends who do not live locally (or within London) need visitor permits in order for them to visit occasionally.

133 Additionally, for those of us who live in social housing, there will be the additional cost of permits for contractors, many of whom are instructed to visit by the landlord rather than requested by the tenant. There are very few pay and display parking bays and, as they are adjacent to Turnpike Lane, there is very rarely a space. Residents/tenants find themselves in the position of either providing a permit or watching the contractor drive away with a , 'sorry, luv, nowhere to park and I can't risk a ticket'. If the price of permits increases as proposed, it could easily cost a resident £3.20 a day across 2 or 3 days. This, for many, is unaffordable and I strongly believe it is unethical and unfair of Haringey Council to benefit financially from situations over which residents have no agency.

I trust that you will add my views to others that you receive during this period.

Best regards,

As a resident in a Inderwick Rd we only have controlled parking for two hours a day. This initiative means an increase of over 100% for my visitors permit.

134 I therefore object to the proposal.

Sent from my iPhone

135

You are a disgrace your views don't represent the people who pay your wages in rates you are robbing use the hard working class blue collar workers you are no different to to the scum bag government don't think for one moment your fooling any one I not voting for you again HARRINGAY robbing council

136

I DO NOT AGREE WITH GETTING RID OF SOME OF THE VISITORS PERMITS AND JUST BEING LEFT WITH DAILY ONES IT IS DISGUSTING & A WASTE OF A TICKET IF NOT VISITING FOR THE DAY

137

Concerned haringey resident

I am dismayed to hear that you are effectively nearly tripling the price that a resident on a 2 hour CPZ will need to pay for each day of visitor parking.

How is this sudden huge increase to be justified?

I am writing to lodge my objection to the parking permit proposed changes

This is clearly another ill conceived way for harringeey council to try and make money from its residents and the bizzare and complex list of costs for residential permits depending on ages and emission rating of a car is nothing more than a tax on the poorest who may not afford new 'cleaner' cars. If it is for the commitment to environmental clean up as you claim I would rather see an improvement to our green spaces and the planting of trees which have a far greater impact on co2 and other pollutants than simply taxing cars needing to come into the borough and park.

With the visitor permits I cannot see a justification of the large rise in price? Can you explain how these new costs were arrived at for visitor permits?

Also the notion that they have to be used within a year -why? What is wrong with people buying

suit

138 in bulk or are we supposed to fully plan out the number of visitors we have each year to Haringey councils parking permit office? What reason do you for this 'rule' beyond the justification of you planning to increase the permits year on year so you don't want people to have permits remaining at a cheaper price?

Many of us buy daily permits in advance because of the extremely long admin time it often takes between date of application & payment to date of receiving the permits- at times Ive waited over 4 weeks! Not handy if we have guests who decide to come round with a few days notice. I currently have spare permits, would these become void?

Please remember that we are tax paying residents and have the right to a quality and ease of existence without being seen as potential profit sources.

Thank you for your forwarding contact with regards upcoming changes to charges and discontinuation of certain permits within my boundary of Cornwall Avenue. Whilst it is explained away, as ever, for the apparent 'good of the community' and to align to CO2 and DVLA processes, we all, in fact, know it is to do purely with upping costs, charging more extortionate and institutionalised discriminatory costs, and I for one certainly object. The same thing was said to us, and fobbed onto us with regards the irrelevant and defunct eye sore that is the bicycle hangar on Cornwall Avenue, that I was not consulted with as a resident, and I can absolutely and definitively confirm that it has yet to be used or utilised by anybody and can almost guarantee it will never be used. This is Haringey, not Oxfordshire. Nobody is going to

like,

139 ride a bike in Cornwall Avenue and certainly nobody is going to be stupid enough to leave it exposed in an area of rife crime and poverty. You can dress it up as much as you but Haringey is a ghetto, rife with underprivileged, poor and ill educated communities that have zero interest in emissions and such like, so creating schemes to mask more costs isn't going to wash.

This is, as everything in Haringey is, an ill thought out scheme. Be it traffic, safeguarding children, assisting the population, schools, hospitals, everything in Haringey is useless, and making us pay more in order to fund your hair brained schemes is becoming tiresome.

Dear Sir/Madam,

In addition to the below email, I would also like to point out that raising the price of 1 hour visitor permits by more than double seems rather drastic. I completely understand a small raise (similar to your admin charge moving from £11.70 to £11.80) but 35p to 80p seems extreme.

Also, as a local resident, I tend to only use 2-hour permits as that is a minimum amount of time that friends would like to visit. I've appreciated having the flexibility to choose 1 or 2 hour permits for friends, but to make us line up 1 hour permits in succession on the dashboard is unnecessarily time consuming, and will make friends feel even more uncomfortable about visiting us for 3 hours.

140

We look forward to hearing back from you.

To whom it may concern,

I wish to object to your proposed amendment to your current parking regulation with regard to the local Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ).

2(a) vary the parking charges of on-street parking permits as set out in the Schedule below. The new tariff structure incorporates the CO2 emission bands used by the DVLA and is intended to encourage people to travel more sustainably and for drivers to use more fuel efficient vehicles. This also introduces a 6 month permit option for residents and carers permits;

May I point out that whilst central government make it their priority to discourage citizens from using cars and encouraging sustainability - it does not necessarily need to be yours in local government. As you quite rightly point out, the DVLA already has CO2 emission banding and we are taxed accordingly because of the polluting nature of cars throughout Britain's road network. This, however, is not your job. You are charging for cars that are stationary and therefore the whole CO2 emission banding is quite irrelevant. I understand taxing households for second and thirds cars, but to impose such a high penalty for cars, for example, over 255 CO2 g/km is simply an opportunistic scheme employed by Haringey Council.

Please review your logic behind this. Bear in mind also that since charging people to pay, the road (mine is Napier Road) is now very sparsely filled with cars. Your job is done and there is no need to continue increasing prices like this.

Furthermore, the 2-week permits are very helpful to those with emergencies and a variety of genuine uses in daily life. Your intention to scrap these are very cruel. Please reconsider.

As always, we are at your mercy, living on roads where we once did not have to pay to park outside our own home! Let me make it clear, that the right thing to do in the first place would have been to award each home, on application, one FREE parking permit considering it was those outsiders (bus drivers and the like) who caused the problem in the first place. But it would seem that rather than taking a pragmatic and sensible approach, Haringey Council seized the opportunity to generate income via the obvious route.

1. At present it is possible to purchase a two hour permit for a two hour zone so that a visitor, whether private or trade, can park legally without fear of being issued with a PCN. This costs 70p at present. Under the proposal this two hour permit is being discontinued and it will become necessary to purchase two one hour permits. At the moment they cost 35p each but under the new proposal they will cost a 80p each so that a two hour permit will effectively become £1.60 – a 129% increase in cost. This hits those of us with an 8am to 10pm parking scheme particularly hard and is unfair.

2. Permits will have to be used 'within the year of purchase'. It is nearly impossible to forecast how many of these permits we will need and this will introduce severe inconvenience when residents have to obtain them more that once a year. They will not be refundable.

Begin forwarded message:

I am sorry, my first e-mail was wrongly addressed.

Thank you for the information regarding the increased parking fees and your reasons for this increase with which I agree. However, I have noted that it is proposed that the cost of the visitors' parking tickets increase from 35p per hour to 80p, ie more than 100%. Those with 2hour parking restrictions (mainly in the west of the borough) will be paying a maximum of £1.60 whereas those with 10.5 hours parking restriction (mainly in the east of the borough) will pay in excess of £8 unless they use a daily ticket costing £3.50 which is still more than twice the price paid by people in a 2-hour zone and that is patently unfair.

I would urge you either to reconsider the charges or reconsider the number of hours covered by the CPZ in the different parts of the borough.

I look forward to your response.

Hello,

I would like it known that i protest the following amendment:

The Haringey (controlled parking zones) (amendment no *) order 201*

T12

First of all as a holder of a residence parking permit i have had no information of this proposed change and i found out through facebook. No email or letter has been received. Given this 143 directly affects residents i would have expected a base level of communication.

If i have not received notice of this how many other people have not received it and can therefore not object to the changes?

I object to the changes because of the following:

At present it is possible to purchase a two hour permit for a two hour zone so that a visitor, whether private or trade, can park legally without fear of being issued with a PCN. This costs 70p at present. Under the proposal this two hour permit is being discontinued and it will become necessary to purchase two one hour permits. At the moment they cost 35p each but under the new proposal they will cost 80p each so that a two hour permit will effectively become £1.60 – a 129% increase in cost.

You are making no changes to the cost of those that live in a full-day parking, So residents in all day zones suffer no increase whatsoever whilst those in a two-hour zone face a 129% increase. Why?

I would like to understand why you feel a 129% increase to a 2 hour parking permit is required? And the maths and logic you did to get to this figure?

I look forward to your response.

Dear Sirs,

I wish to object to the proposed changes in parking permits in Haringey. My objections are as follows:

The increase in cost to 80p for one hour permits is far too steep, costing more than double at present.

The requirement that permits should be used within one year means people will then be left with

144

unused permits for which they have paid - at present the cumbersome system of issuing permits means that it is necessary to purchase a few in reserve to use when needed.

Removing the two-hour permit means a visitor who comes for a longer time will have to display a cumbersome number of permits.

I further object that these proposed changes have not been sufficiently publicised to allow comment within the time-limit, and therefore seem like 'back-door' changes. As they will have a severe impact on many people, particularly older and disabled people in the borough, there should be a wider consultation.

I am opposed to the new way of charging for visitors permits and the lack of conciliation on current permits.

145

You need to provide people time, they can't just change their car overnight.

The cost of visitors permits should not raise for 2 hours nor be made to put in multiple permits.

I am writing to object to the proposed raise in hourly visitor parking permit prices.

We support reasonable measures that actually tackle the problem of car pollution but this price increase seems to be a money making scheme masquerading as a 'green initiative'.

We live on a street that requires permits 7 days a week.

Guests or repair persons coming to our house do not and cannot purchase parking permits from you. So we are obliged to give them permits to park on our street.

Therefore raising the cost of hourly permits will not encourage them to drive more fuel effective vehicles - or to drive less. - It will just cost us more money.

More than doubling the cost of 1 hour permits from \$0.35 to £0.80 is unreasonable and is effectively an additional tax we will have to pay to live in Haringey.

Please reconsider this action.

I read with some horror the proposal and tried to understand the justification from the documents detailing the proposal but alas could not find substantive reasoning.

The previous charges had a reasonable scale increasing with Carbon emissions.

The previous charges recognized the importance of visitor permits of varying duration to match the parking restrictions, the new proposals do not.

The proposed charges are a significant increase versus the previous charges but no forecast is made of the increased revenue the Council will receive, therefore, I am documenting a formal

Freedom of Information Request to the council for the revenue forecast of Controlled Parking Zones

in Haringey both before and after the imposition of proposed new charges.

As a resident I believed an increase in my yearly Parking permit of 63.5% is indefensible as is the increase in a visitor parking permit for one hour of 129% !

Dear Haringey Council,

In regard to the proposal to charge for parking permits in alignment with the DVLA.

Is there a correlation that a parked vehicle produces the emissions described. It is a contradiction of the most basic logic that a parked vehicle would produce emissions at all, therefore there is no justification to align DVLA data possible air pollution.

Haringey Council is supposedly a Labour Council and would in its constitution have the best interests of the residents, workers and visitors of the borough. Obviously this is not the case, as yet again the Labour Council has decided to add another financial cost to the hard working people of the borough in this Traffic Order.

I own a car, which I use seldom, for the most part it is parked outside where I live. I cycle to work and back and walk to most places. My road, Warham Road, N4 is to all intents and purposes a cut through from St Ann's Road to Wightman Road, for all the traffic travelling into

148

London. In the morning there is a steady stream of commercial vans and commuter cars, all producing emissions, whereas my car is not. The use of the road has been raised many times, especially during election periods, yet as usual nothing has changed. This seems atypical of Haringey Council's lack of respect for its residents.

If you really wanted to make a difference to air quality levels then you would do something to reduce the vehicular traffic through residential roads. Think of the possibility - a Haringey Congestion Charging Zone, use of ANPR technology to work in line with a local low emission zone.

Please desist from following Conservative Party notions of capitalist revenue generation, sort out your corrupt and inefficient services and act in representation of the people, not your own shortcomings.

Sorry if this is on the last day of responses, but I am recovering from a chest infection and Bronchitis. I have no proof if this is linked to my vehicle emissions as it has been parked for the

most part. Perhaps it could be linked to the through traffic, which transverses the borough free of charge, polluting as it goes.

Dear Haringey,

Thank you for you emails on the subject of residents parking in relation to harmful emissions produced by some of the residents cars. An extremely relevant factor in the matter as described is of course the annual mileage of such parked vehicles. That is, obviously a vehicle that spends most of its year not moving will contribute very little to emissions that are harmful to the environment. I hope Haringey will find a way to factor this in when increasing parking charges.

Also I am surprised to learn that there is / has been a concessionary parking rate for those over 60 for the last 20 years

I am now 67 years old and have been parking in Highgate Ave N6 for the last 46 years and to the best of my knowledge I have never known of or been offered this concessionary rate which I presume means I have been being over charged for the past 7 years ? Would you give your comments on the above and also instruct me how I might go about claiming a refund for this over charge.

.

Yours Sincerely

Dear Sirs,

Ref. Proposed increases in Parking Permit charges in Haringey.

Thank you for your email concerning proposed increases in the cost of parking permits.

It is of course completely disingenuous to charge for parking permits according to the CO2 emissions of the parked vehicle on the grounds of environmental concerns.

Cars do not emit CO2 when they are parked. They do emit CO2 when they are running, but the amount of CO2 emitted by any given vehicle is entirely dependent upon the number of hours/miles for which the engine is running.

150

I have the same car that I had when I was working but since I retired I have cut my emissions by at least 50% as I no longer need my car for commuting to and from work during antisocial hours when public transport was not an acceptable alternative. I have further reduced my CO2 emissions in Haringey and London by using my car predominantly for occasional journeys outside London.

In retirement my car CO2 emissions have been considerably reduced, my income has also been considerably reduced, and now you propose a considerable increase in parking permit costs – I fail to see any justification for this increase.

The only fair way to set parking permit charges is to relate CO2 emissions to annual mileage, which I admit could probably not be achieved by Haringey Council – but I have surely made a very good case for reducing the cost of parking permits for pensioners.

I anticipate your brush off response in due course.

I object to the proposed changes to the parking permit prices.

The government charge vehicle tax on the emission band because as you are using the vehicle on the road you are giving out those emissions and are being charged for it appropriately for the pollution caused.

However once parked outside my home I (others) am (are) no longer giving out any emissions! so how is it deemed fair to change to park based on a vehicles emissions when none are being emitted! It is totally an unfair change, if anything the charge should be by the amount of space you use the longer the car the more space you use and pay more, not by the emissions you are not giving out when parked.

151

I do not drive my car during the week and therefore do not congest and do not pollute during this time, whereas someone driving will, therefore I feel that you are making the wrong metric. Check how many miles a year people are doing on their MOT and then charge based on miles driven and reward people for not driving.

152

Hi,

You can make "residents parking permits" to be in force every day - not only to increase taxes and parking permits charges.

People pay to park every day not only Monday till Saturday, but Sunday as well.

Is very difficult to find the parking space when on Sunday you came back from somewhere.

153

We strongly object to the proposed increased charges for parking my car in the Wood Green zone. We don't see why an increase is needed. Also we do not want the changes in the permits themselves. We do not want the 1hour/2hour/and fortnightly permit to go.!!! Also many people retire at 60 or are not in work, so why penalise them, by raising the concessionary age.

Why did anyone think this was a good idea. We will only end up paying, and more for our visitors.

154

Please reply to my email so that we know you have received it.

I am writing to raise my concerns about the proposed changes to parking permits in Haringey, specifically:

* It appears that you are proposing to raise the cost of visitor permits by 125%. As the costs associated with the production of permits are minimal, this increase seems excessive.

* You are proposing an expiry date on visitor parking permits. What is the justification for this? Have you considered how residents use their visitor permits? Unless you have a regular visitor, such as a carer – visitors are, almost by definition, irregular and may be unexpected. So this approach effectively forces residents to buy visitors permits, at greatly inflated cost, which may expire before they are used.

We all understand the financial pressures on councils at the moment and some of us are happy to accept some level of parking restrictions/charges as a cost of having the use of a car. However, my recent experiences of dealing with Haringey Council (seeking help with residential care for an elderly relative, trying to report a dangerous pothole) give me the general impression that it has lost sight of its reason to exist, namely to serve residents of the borough.

I object to having to pay even more when my sister, daughter, son, grandchildren come to visit me. Haringey! You are yet again trying to make money out of basic family life. Disgusting!

Sent from my iPad

I live in N15 my age 73 i have visitors permit with concessions Will i have to pay more for these concessions if so when?

I find these proposals to be ill thought through and not practical and urge you to rethink these plans. The consultation 'window' has also not been generous, which leads to the conclusion that full consultation with all stakeholders was not really part of your plans.

Please do not implement these changes as it will, in effect act as a deterrent for older people to receive visitors and carers etc, so will make life even harder for local residents of a certain age.

Regards

Dear Sir/Madam,

I have only just been alerted to the proposal Re: a consultation regarding changing the parking we have.

Nobody has consulted us residents here on Muswell Road. None of my neighbours know of this consultation. We have not received any email to which has been confirmed was sent out giving a deadline this Friday!!

Why haven't we heard about this?

There has not been a problem with being able to park in the last 8 years I have lived here. There is no need for any permit controlled parking.

This has been a great benefit to why I moved here and enjoy visitors/family being able to visit and stay without the terror of parking hours or expiration.

On what grounds is this parking needing to be proposed?

I really hope this is not yet another money making device targetting communities and families who cannot afford this as well as the cut in all community care and so preventing families and friends to visit.

Please may I get a reply to my concerns and answers to my questions.

Thank you,

Hello Haringey council,

I think it's despicable that the parking permit charges are being increased again.

I live on Higham road (N17), and never had an issue parking before the permits were introduced last year. Now I am paying 117£ per year in permit fees, and the situation is exactly the same as before, and according to the new fees my permit will go to 180£. This is a 100% increase on the first year and 54% increase on the second year! This is a lot of money to pay for a non-existent service. My permit is valid until Feb 2018 and you can't just invalidate them without offering refunds.

Additionally I believe it's very cheeky for you to publish this info on 2nd of Feb but circulate it via email only on Feb 14th, and expecting feedback from people just one week later (Feb 23rd).

Another classic Haringey Council 'consultation'..

I know the overall goal is to get less people to own cars or at least more efficient ones, but not everyone can afford to do so. This is just one extra tax to Haringey residents!

My wife and I have young children and use the car rarely only for grocery shopping mostly. We don't drive to work (I cycle she takes public transport). We use the car very little and it's not worth it for us to spend thousands to buy a newer car.. especially after what we pay for mortgage and nursery fees.

So in my case I'll have to fork up the extra parking permit charge and the overall end result won't be one less car on the road (what you wanted), but rather only more money in your pocket (which is actually what you REALLY wanted, right?).

I have several objections to the proposed new changes:

1. If there are no limits on the number of visitor's permits one can buy, what is to stop a widespread secondary market so that commuters use Haringey as one big car park from which to take public transport into the city?
2. There does not seem to be any account taken of carers' needs to park. This is an underpaid group of people on whom the borough relies and I would expect the council to support them.
3. I received your email about this on 15th February. Why was there so much delay between passing the decision and informing residents (voters). I am not aware of much consultation on this.

Yours faithfully,

Dear Haringey

I am writing to object to some of the proposals contained in "Proposed Amendments to on Street Parking Permits and Charges. The Haringey (Controlled Parking Zones) (Amendment No. *) Order 201". These proposals include the removal of the right offered to residents by the current traffic management orders to a refund for any unused visitors parking permits. Specifically the proposed new orders state "It is anticipated that those permits would be used within the year purchased.....Unused permits would....not be exchanged or refunded". Most residents are not able to plan exactly how many permits they will need. The new proposals will make it very difficult to manage visitor parking without buying a surfeit of permits that will now expire more quickly and be non-refundable. If people buy less permits than they need they may then find themselves in a situation where they need a permit but have run out. Moreover

162 the two-hour parking permit is very useful and avoids having to replace the permit every hour; the loss of the two hour permit will also be an additional inconvenience. Also included in these proposals is a change which increases the cost of visitor parking by more than double. This is really unacceptable. As a policy, these changes are tantamount to a move towards more regressive local taxation and will unduly impact on the poorest in the borough, something the Labour Party-supporting Council members are supposedly concerned about. I would urge the Council to review these proposed cost increases and also to consider an online system for the issue of visitor parking such as is used on other London Boroughs.

Your sincerely

Hello

I have some concerns on the new parking tariffs and wish to object to the extent of changes.

Firstly a 129% increase in the visitor parking charge is really ridiculous and is simply taking advantage of residents. If family want to visit us we should be able to offer them parking in our quiet street without being ripped off.

Why would you want to stop the 2 hours permits? You talk about environmental concerns, but if a visitor want to park for a few hours then we would have to waste card and take longer to scratch out the relevant bits and risk making a mistake. I do see that the daily permits are unchanged which would mean in some cases this would be used rather than the hourly which helps a bit.

163 I do not understand the logic of having no limit on numbers purchased. This surely would mean some would be bought by some residents and sold on to traders. Also what is the expiry as it is impossible to predict how many would be used in a year so it is not fair to shorten the expiry and then offer no refunds.

With the annual permits, how come diesel cars would in effect pay less then many petrol cars as they have lower CO2. Most of the problems in London are caused by Deisel. Also a £40 rise between a car that is 149 and another which is 152 is too steep. They should be kept to £20 bands.

As usual it does feel like yet another money raising exercise without any care or duty to us residents.

Dear Sir I am in receipt of an email sent by your department on 15 February 2018 notifying me of changes in parking regulations which will affect me as a resident in the Stroud Green CPZ.

I wish to protest against certain aspects of these changes in the strongest terms as I believe that this has been, at best, poorly thought out, and no recognition has been taken of the problems likely to be caused by these proposals to residents, many of who are elderly or infirm, in two-hour CPZs such as the one in which I live.

That Haringey wish to rationalise parking I sympathise with and have no objections at all to the simplification and rationalisation of resident parking permits in general and their alignment with VED. However the "simplification" of temporary visitors permits has created certain problems to which I wish to object and ask you to urgently reconsider.

You propose to abolish all such permits with the exception of a one-hour permit and a full-day permit. The full-day permit, only of relevance in full day CPZs, such as those in Tottenham, does not increase in cost at all - remaining £3.50 for the day. However you propose that there will be no limit on the number of these permits which will enable local residents who are entrepreneurial to acquire substantial quantities which they can resell to persons not resident in the borough who can obtain full-day parking near tube stations in zone three at bargain prices. Is this really your intention?

164

More seriously, however, is the proposed change to the two-hour permit - for residents who live in a two-hour CPZ this is, in effect, an all day permit. However under your proposals residents will now need to purchase two such permits each day to enable their visitors and tradesmen to park without fear of a PCN. The cost of a one hour permit increases from 35p to 80p, and to have effect for two hours will require residents to have two so for them the cost rises from 70p, the current cost of a two hour permit, to £1.60 - this represents an exceptional and outrageous 129% increase in the cost of parking with no justification whatsoever. Here again the proposal is to allow an unlimited number of such permits to be purchased but these permits will have a new significant defect. It is proposed, we are told, that they will only be valid for the year (the calendar year I assume) in which they are purchased, we are told, "to prevent stockpiling".

Like the full-day permit this could lead to resale but consider the impact on parking control officers who will now need to patrol each two-hour CPZ twice each day, rather than once each day, to ensure that valid permits are being displayed for both hours - is this really an intended consequence?

I would suspect that the vast majority of residents purchasing quantities of vouchers in a twohour CPZ are elderly, they purchase more permits than they need because they fear that family, or carers, or trades-persons may need to park on an unexpected basis and yet under this proposal, unlike the current visitor permits they will find that a permit purchased in late November or early December will expire in a matter of weeks. This proposal is a great disservice to residents in all parts of the borough

I would also like to complain about the lack of publicity for this substantial change to existing

arrangements: without being told by a third party, I would have had no way of knowing of these proposals. They do not even appear on the list of consultations on the Haringey website. All issues subject to consultation should appear there; putting them only under Traffic Management Orders could be considered to be hiding them.

My first objection is to the cost of permits for carers: It seems extraordinary that Haringey would levy a substantial charge on carers providing a vital and generally poorly paid or voluntary service. I would urge the re-examination of this aspect of the proposal.

My remaining objections are confined to Visitors Permits. I am not directly affected by other types of permits, and do not have time to assess the proposal.

Visitors Permits:

165

When Haringey introduced the CPZ in Bounds Green, it was to address the problem of parking being monopolised by day commuters and longer term parking by people using local transport links to access airports and stations and leaving cars parked for the duration of their trip. This objective has largely been met. We were told that charges would be set at a reasonable rate to cover the costs of the scheme.

The current proposals introduce:

1 a steep increase in cost (more than double for two hours of parking):

It is not clear why this is being imposed. Parking schemes are supposed to cover their costs, not to make a profit for the council. Either the council is taking a profit or the costs have spiralled out of control.

2 a reduction in flexibility:

Currently many of the Haringey CPZs are for two hours daily. A two hour visitor's permit is therefore extremely useful I urge the council to retain two hour permits.

It is proposed that permits will be valid only for a year, and that unused permits will not be refunded. This is a significant worsening of the current system, and whilst I understand that the council would like to retain flexibility for future years, this should not come at the cost of worsening the service to residents. The lack of a refund for unused tickets smacks of sharp practice, which does unfortunately appear to be an increasing feature of public administration. It will also lead to a cost increase for the council since residents will need to make a purchase every year, and possibly all at the same time of year. It is sadly difficult to be confident that Haringey will be able to service this requirement effectively.

3 the potential for more permits to be offered for resale:

The proposal states that supplying only one hour or daily visitor permits would remove the need for a cap on the number that could be purchased. However, this statement and the logic behind are far from clear. What is clear is that there would be significant potential to buy permits for resale, thus subverting the whole point of the CPZs. It would also allow residents in developments where planning permission has been allowed on the basis that residential parking permits will not be availa

Have the Council followed due process and given sufficient consultation time. Will there be sufficient parking spaces for local residents with extra permits being issued ?

I cannot understand why I was notified of this consultation only one week before its closing date and would ask you to extend the consultation period and ensure greater publicity for these proposals.

In addition, I strongly object to the proposed changes as follows:

1. I see no reason why the age for the concessionary rate should be changed from 60 to 65. It is intended for retired people and retirement age is now so varied that 65 cannot be taken as a valid age.
2. How can it be considered reasonable to change the charge from 70p for 2 hours to 2x80p = £1.60, a rise of 130% in round terms.
3. It is totally unreasonable to suggest not swapping permits that are outstanding at year end when there is no way for individuals to calculate how many they might need if, for example, ordering early in the year.
4. For resident's permits charged by emission levels the introduction of a more complex system cannot be justified by anything other than a money-raising ruse, especially since there can be absolutely no justification for increasing the charges by 40 to 75% for some in one of the lower emission levels, but by only 23-58% for the intermediate levels and then just 16%, though rising to 63%, for the highest band.

I have only just heard about proposed changes through the local Lib-Dems. As usual the Labour-run LA seem to be attempting to railroad changes without proper consultation.

I am against the changes and will be informing the Local Government Ombudsman that - yet again - Haringey Council are behaving in an undemocratic fashion and that they seem to have complete contempt for the local population. I have voted Labour for years in GEs, but in the next local elections I will be once again voting for Lib-Dems & Greens.

168

Haringey never inform local residents about changes until they are a done deal (except for recent letter about proposed changes to how rental properties in borough operate). It's a disgrace!

And as far as I can see CPZs are just a cash cow (rates always go up) and nothing to do with making residents' lives easier.

To whom it may concern

I am writing to object to the proposals contained in "Proposed Amendments to on Street Parking Permits and Charges. The Haringey (Controlled Parking Zones) (Amendment No. *) Order 201".

The "consultation" on these proposals, which was published on the 2nd February, but only circulated to residents by email a fortnight later on 16th February, closes on Friday, the 23rd February .

Once again Haringey Council has failed to properly consult and engage with residents on widespread changes that will affect thousands of people daily. This is totally unacceptable.

169

The proposed changes includes a rise in resident permits and the cost of purchasing visitor permits is increasing by over 125%

An administration fee for processing permits will be increased.

Visitor permits will expire after 12 months with no option for refund available for unused permits.

Carers will have to potentially pay up to £100.00 more to park.

I oppose all the above proposals and request the council to start again and consult with residents in a timely and proper fashion.

I am writing to complain about the proposed parking permit changes.

1) I am complaining that the notification was not done appropriately. A few signs were put up on the streets 21 days before the deadline by the council but I have not received any official notification personally – despite the fact I am not only a resident but also signed up for purchasing visitor permits. I only received the links to the “consultation” when they were shared on local Facebook groups by concerned residents who had investigated by themselves.

2) I do not have an issue with changing the system per se, or for increasing the charges as we all know the councils are working under severe budget cuts. However I object to the below proposal re not refunding or exchanging permits not used within a year

170

“amend the residents’ visitors’ parking permit scheme so that the permits would be limited to hourly and daily operation. This would remove the need for an upper limit on numbers that could be purchased and It is anticipated that those permits would be used within the year purchased and not stock piled for future years. Unused permits would therefore not be exchanged or refunded. It is also proposed that the charge for hourly permits would be increased to 80p per hour.”

This absolutely cannot work under the current system of issuing permits. When I first registered it took weeks to even get my name and address recognised on the system, and then more weeks before I was able to get through on the phone and order a range of visitor permits, from 1 hour to 1 day. These were purely to cover emergencies like tradesmen, and it was very lucky that when I did have a roof leak and needed it fixed asap, that the permits had arrived by that stage.

We cannot wait until a tradesman is booked and then try to get a permit arranged if it takes weeks. Equally an emergency cannot be put on hold because a parking permit is unavailable, eg what about illness or accident requiring home visits or help?

Refunds and exchanges absolutely have to be allowed in order to make it fair to all, and to allow those of us who hold some “in case” to not be penalised for planning ahead

3) 33) If the council decides to implement the changes (and I assume it will be pushed through regardless, given very few people will have time or knowledge of these changes to complain in time), what is the date for the changeover? What about existing permits held?

4) The current system of issuing permits does not work for anybody. It needs to be more efficient (immediate ordering online for example) but also be mindful that many people do not have the internet, or are able to spend hours queueing for customer “service” at council offices. Charging any admin charge is already outrageous for the service provided, so raising it as below is not acceptable. Additionally it mentions refunds; that is inconsistent with saying no refunds will be offered, and it is an unnecessary charge if permits are simply issued with no expiry date. This is also an environmental issue – why create a system that forced thousands of pieces of paper to be thrown away every year?

It is proposed to raise the administration charge for t

Sir/Madam.

Please would you answer the questions.

1. Are these actually proposed changes or is this what you are doing?
2. When?
3. I bought a number of permits last year. How do I get a refund for them? 171

OBJECTIONS:

- You have taken away the option for a person to pay by cash, cheque, phone, bank transfer. Online is not the only and it is Not appropriate for everyone. People who cannot manage this by themselves, because of health or other reasons, become very vulnerable as they have to give their personal banking details to someone else. This is not safe. The Council must offer another way of paying that takes personal security into account.
- I have been told about this just two days ago. Your email did not give me any deadline. It took a long time to find the relevant details via your link. A friend told me that the deadline is tomorrow.

This is absolutely no notice whatsoever. Haringey Council has to give people decent notice.

Please will you answer the 3 questions above, or forward this email to some who can.

I am writing with reference to your email dated 16 February 2018, subject: Proposed

amendments to on street parking permits and charges.

As I understand it, (from discussion within Bruce Grove Residents Network, and on reading this document http://www.haringey.gov.uk/sites/haringeygovuk/files/2018_t12_-_permit_charges_2_nop.pdf) there is actually a "consultation" being held on this issue. Evidently this "consultation" opened on 2 February 2018 and responses are required by 23 February 2018.

I find it outrageous that I wasn't informed about these changes until more than halfway through the "consultation", and the email alerting me to these changes at no point mentioned that there was in fact a "consultation", which would be closing ONE WEEK from the date of the email. Is this how democracy works in Haringey? Or is it just incompetence?

172

I do not own a car. I am really pleased that a CPZ has recently been put in place in my road (Newlyn Road) and feel the impact has been very positive. Overall I support measures which discourage use of cars in London.

Since the CPZ has been in place, I have purchased a supply of one-hour visitor parking permits for use by friends and traders visiting my flat. I don't often need to use them, but as far as I am aware, they can be used until the end of 2019.

However, if I understand correctly, the proposed changes would mean I can only use them until the end of this year. That's not a huge amount of money wasted but I don't see how it can actually be legal for the Council to randomly decide that something I purchased in good faith expecting to be valid for another 22 months will now only be valid for the next 10 months.

So I strongly object to that change in particular.

There seem to be similar changes to short-term permits, e.g. weekend ones, 2-hour ones, etc. They are either being curtailed or discontinued altogether. Presumably the same applies - people have bought them in good faith and will lose money when they are discontinued or cut short.

i would strongly suggest that refunds are made in all these circumstances. Perhaps this is the plan but it doesn't seem to be mentioned anywhere.

I would be grateful for confirmation that you have received this email and that my objection and suggestion have been fed into your "consultation"

I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed Traffic Management Order amending the charges for residents and visitors permits. My comments on the proposals are contained in the attached documents.

Kind regards,

I am extremely unhappy with these new proposals and with your failure to consult residents before bringing implementing them.

174

I agree with your aim of reducing private car use but oppose your actions to bring this about. Why restrict the life of vouchers to one year only? Why abolish the 2-hour permit? Why no mention of greatly increasing the number of electric charging points?

Dear Traffic management team,

This refers to your email of 16 February 2018 regarding your proposed amendments to on street parking permits and charges.

I am writing to object to the proposed amendments.

?1) Residents have not been given enough time to respond to the proposed changes. The proposals were published on 2nd February 2018, but I and other residents of the borough received your email on the 16th of Feb. This gives us only 7 days to respond. Given the large scale of the ? changes this is not enough time for all who are affected being able to respond.

2) I am concerned about the proposal to remove the limit on the number of visitor permits. This will cause a serious problem on many streets in the CPZs but in particular in Priory Gardens,

175

N6 as it opens up the possibility that residents can purchase permits with the intention to sell them to those outside the zone. As Highgate station is located at the end of Priory Gardens, this could turn the street into a car park for Highgate Station with residents outside the Priory Gardens CPZ purchasing permits and parking on the street in order to commute into central London.

3) I am also concerned about the increase in the cost of permits by over 125% and also the requirement that all permits have to be used within the calendar year in which they were purchased, with the option of refunds scrapped entirely.

it is disappointing that Haringey Council has failed to properly consult and engage with residents on widespread changes that will affect the daily lives of nearly all those live in the borough.

I would like to submit my objections to these ill-thought-through proposals that will very likely result in an increase in private vehicle travel across what is one of the most polluted boroughs in the UK. As Highgate Station is located in Priory Gardens the residents of this street will likely see a huge increase in vehicular traffic in what is already a very busy street.

I urge Haringey Council to reconsider the proposed changes particularly the option to buy unlimited permits.

Yours faithfully,

To whom it may concern.

We object for the following reasons:-

1. The very short notice you have allowed for this so called

'consultation' on your

proposals; these proposals were published on 2nd February 2018

and you only emailed

residents almost 2 weeks later on 16th February with a closing

date for our comments just

7 days later on 23rd February, this is far too short notice.

176

2. Increased cost of Visitors Parking of over 125% with carers

potentially having to pay an

additional £100 to park; we propose that carers increase should

be dropped due to the

carers having to take the brunt of the breakdown of the Social Services.

3. The removal of the limit of Visitors Parking Permits which will

allow residents to buy and

sell permits and therefore turn the Borough into a park-and-ride

for commuters.

The requirement for all Permits to be used within the calendar

year, with the option of

no refunds, is an extremely bad idea and not in the interest of

the residents.

4. Most of your proposals will increase the vehicle travel across the Borough to the detriment of air quality and pollution in what is already one of the most polluted Boroughs in the UK.

In the short time you have allowed, we have now received serious comments and criticism from the local Liberal Party and we support these wholeheartedly and we agree with their comments, and, in the light of this sound criticism, we urgently request you to reconsider these ill conceived proposals which are definitely not in the interest of the residents of Haringey. We urge you to take the Liberal objections seriously. It is extremely difficult to understand how a Labour Council can make such proposals.

Yours sincerely

In the short time you have allowed, we have now received serious comments and criticism from the local Liberal Party, and we support these wholeheartedly and we agree with their comments and, in the

light of this sound criticism, we urgently request you reconsider

these ill conceived proposals which are definitely not in the

interests of the residents of Haringey.

As a resident of Denton Road, I would like to object most strongly to the fact that Haringey have left so little time for consultation and the receipt of objections to the increased prices & the changes to the issuing of permits.

I think this time limit should definitely be extended to allow for residents such as myself to fully appreciate & consult on both the implications of these price increases and changes to the issuing of permits, such as visitors and carers permits - which at first glance would seem not to be well thought through.

Thank you

Your decision to increase fees for parking permits without proper public consultation is outrageous, as is putting a time-limit on their validity. I would not have known about this had I not received a notification from the LibDems. Please reconsider adding to the financial burden of already financially-stretched residents.

Sent from my iPad

Please can you respond to my concerns relating to an email I received on 19th February.

1) If the email I received was a "Proposal of Amendments to on street Parking Permits" who is it being proposed to and how can I let you know I disagree with your proposals and as a tax payer I don't want to pay for these changes?

2) How can removing the limit of visitors permits reduce pollution? This will simply mean that MORE PEOPLE can drive into our borough and park and unscrupulous residents will be able to make a profit by selling on unlimited permits encouraging an almost black market in the permits allowing commuters and trades people to make use of Haringey as a great big car park. 179

3) Why are short-hold tenancies to be favoured over long term tenants - the price increase is far in excess of inflation and it's not as though the council tax is reducing. It seems more than 125% increase! I can understand increasing for second vehicles but on a first car it's excessive

Please can you let me know how these comments are being collated and why we were not notified of this consultation with more time to comment??

Many Thanks

Dear Sir or Madam

I am a resident and with my wife am a house owner living in

I understand your need to raise more revenue from parking. However, I have a number of objections to your proposals.

They are

1) You do not say how much additional revenue your proposals will raise. The increase is well beyond reasonable limits. I would expect 5% or even a one off 10%. Your proposals are far in excess of that however.

2) You propose to withdraw the two hour permit. This corresponds with the two hour restricted parking period and is the one I use the most. Should I use two one hour permits at a very increased cost? You may feel you have to increase charges, but why withdraw the most useful permit?

3) Why remove the limits on the number of permits residents can buy? What is to prevent some

180

residents from buying and selling large numbers of parking permits for profit and turning our roads into car parks?

It is very hard to understand why " that the offer be limited to an hourly and daily visitor parking permit,"... this "removes the need for an upper limit on the number of permits residents can buy." It does not.

4) Why require all permits to be used within the calendar year and why then propose to refuse to refund residents for unused permits?

5) Why reduce the period from 1 year to six months? Is it because you wish to increase parking charges at twice the frequency?

Overall, I think that these changes are very poorly thought through. You should be much more open about your needs; if you were, there would be greater sympathy for the increase in revenue you require. I can only object in the strongest terms to the changes you propose.

To whom this may concern,

In relation to the proposed changes, I would firstly like to point out my disappointment, but not surprise in the underhand way in which this has been done. The consultation period started on the 2nd February, yet residents were not advised until the 16th, for something that finishes on the 23rd. I appreciate that the council are likely aware that it would be immensely unpopular and perhaps better to give limited time for the community to react to it, however I personally think it is an appalling way to behave. People have been making an effort to inform each other about it, however I do believe that this should be the responsibility of the council.

In relation to the costs proposed, the increases are somewhat extortionate and the removal of two hour and two-week permits makes little sense. Having had to use a temporary permit this year for a courtesy car, I can personally speak of the importance of being able to purchase this instead of relying on one-day passes.

181

I appreciate that Haringey has great ambitions to be 'green', however this, like many other schemes appears to come at the expense of the actual residents. It is expensive enough to own a car and where it is a necessity, why should people be unduly punished? For the next two years I will need to have daily access to a car as an essential requirement of my course. Parking restrictions were imposed after I gained a place on this course, however I was able to budget for this from my limited bursary.

A further concern about the increase in costs is how other people, particularly those hit quite hard by austerity are considered in these proposals. The underlying message is to ditch your car, or buy an electric one. These are not options for most Haringey residents, especially those in the East of the borough. In details published on your own website, Haringey and many of its individual wards continue to be amongst the most deprived in the country. Has the impact of these changes been considered for poorer residents?

In closing, I strongly object to the proposed changes and the way in which the proposals have been shared with residents.

Regards,

Dear Team,

I am writing to object to the proposed parking changes which received no adequate consultation from residents and do not take local opinion into consideration.

I am a resident, and have purchased visitor parking permits in the past for any visitors or

workmen who might visit the property between 10 -12 Mon –Fri.

However I have been totally excluded from the consultation process, despite living her for over 40 years and purchasing visitor parking permits. I have not received any written or email information about the proposed changes. I only knew about them through the local Lib Dem councillor. I am not a member of the Lib Dem party, but they have done a better job of informing me than you have.

I accessed the relevant online information and I wish to register my strong disagreement with the proposed changes. Having read the information very carefully, including arguments on ecological grounds, it seems clear to me that this is merely an attempt to raise more money by doubling the hourly cost, and requiring residents to run out to replace the first visitor parking permit after an hour, rather than feeling secure that visitors are fully covered for the two hours required.

My suspicion is that hourly permits only are being issued as a foretaste of increasing the number of daily hours covered by the CPZ from 2 hours to say three or four hours at some time

183

in the future.

There is no justification for this enormous increase in costs.

As to your reference to 'stockpiling ' the permits. None of us know how many visitors we will have within the relevant parking hours, nor when we will need a plumber, builder etc so it makes sense to buy a reasonable amount of permits. Your suggestion that the increase in price will make people reduce their vehicle use is also doubtful.. Nearly all tradesmen use vehicles as most of them need to transport tools. Equally one cannot foretell where each visitor is coming from, and whether they could use public transport. I believe this is a transparent money raising attempt by the Council

As I was not even informed about this proposal I have a very jaundiced view about the value of this so called consultation and wonder how many other people have also been ignored.

However now I have finally been made aware of the issue ,I strongly oppose it.

Please log my objection to the proposed changes to street parking charges.

Please understand my anger at the way this consultation is handled by the council. In the current world we need local government to act honestly and with integrity for the benefit of residents. In handling

184

It like this it gives the opposite impression.

Many thanks

185

Your job is to serve the people of the Haringey but whenever any consultation with the people is required you subvert it, you publish vital information which residents need to respond to just before a holiday, you delay the time needed to respond and generally treat us as unimportant in the process. You are now doing this again with the massive rise in parking permits.

186

I have absolutely no respect for you and your fellow councillors and workers.

You are a shameful lot because you justify this underhand behaviour as necessary in doing the best for the people of the borough.

That, is , immoral.

Thank you for the email you sent me (as an affected parking permit holder and buyer of visitors

permits) yesterday about the proposed traffic management order listed on your website as "advertised" on 2 February. It is right (and probably essential where technology makes it so easy) for public authorities to alert taxpayers about proposals that can reasonably be expected to affect them.

I would like first to object to the fact that you informed me about it after almost two thirds of the consultation period (13 of the "usual" 21 days) had elapsed. Why not contact local taxpayers known to be affected on the day the proposal is advertised? The obvious answer is that you hope to limit the scope for objections. The only other answer I can think of is simple incompetence and disorganisation. Which is it?

Secondly, I object to the zipped format of the order, because it means I am unable to access it easily (at all, at the moment) on my tablet or phone. Why can you not publish in html and pdf formats that can be readily accessed on all devices? As it is, I am basing my further, substantive objections on information from harringayonline.

Thirdly, and substantively, from what I have been able to work out thanks to harringayonline, 187 the proposals for visitors parking involve reducing flexibility (including by getting rid of the two hour visitors permit), increasing cost (one hour permits costing roughly what two hour or ones currently do), and forcing us to choose between stockpiling permits (and losing the price paid for those that remain unused when their validity period expires), and not having them when we need them (if we don't want to over-buy on a "just in case" basis). So:

- I object to the increased cost,
- I object to the inability to buy permits instantly online (the single most important practical point, for me), and
- I object to the absence of a simple mechanism (given the absence of instant online purchasing) for refunds or effective validity period extension.

Most of all, I object to the lack of openness and honesty (as opposed to what seems like grudging compliance with legal obligations) about exactly what is proposed, how it will affect

local taxpayers, why it is proposed, what alternatives were considered, and why this approach was preferred.

Yours faithfully

Hello

I've seen a photograph of a notice in a local Facebook group about a proposed increase to CPZ charges in our area. Yes, a photograph. Surely not a way to do a consultation that ends 23 February 2018?!

Not only that but the link to the consultation - http://haringey.gov/traffic_orders - does not work.

188

While I'm in favour of the CPZ, I think the changes to visitor permit charges is not reasonable. No 2-hours and 1-hour doubling in price? I don't think that is fair to charge 80p for an hour, especially as we need to use these if someone is just popping past or here for 5-10 minutes.

I'm sure my neighbours have some other feedback on this, but are unable to comment, so please send us the link or put a notice through everyone's door. Thanks!

The proposed increases on visitor permits in CPZs and the time limited nature of them is outrageous. This should not go ahead.

189

As a current resident of Haringey and parking permit holder I wish to write to object to the proposed amendments.

I can understand why the council is trying to bring the bands into line on co2 emissions but I can't understand the reasons behind the change in visitor parking:

? How does getting rid of any yearly restrictions be part of any policy to encourage people to use public transport?

? Could this change not potentially encourage some residents to give/sell the visitor permits to people?

? I live near the Broadway in Crouch End and already there have been two cinemas built, a large

190

number of flats being built with insufficient parking and a taxi office that although was denied trading permission as it remained there after permission was denied it is now allowed to trade with no restrictions on the number of taxis allowed to park so unfortunately on Rosebery Gardens this means a lot!

? I work in Hertfordshire and have to travel to work by car and then pick up a small child from school, every day is a battle when I return home to park anywhere near my flat. The introduction of residents parking made a huge difference please don't take away the benefit by making the visitor parking unrestricted as I fear this would then make it obsolete.

? How does making the visitors parking permits only valid for the calendar year be more flexible? It would just make it more expensive and harder to manage for residents who use these permits in the way they were intended.

Please reconsider the proposals and also why was there a delay in communicating this to residents giving us such a small window to feedback?

Dear Sir/Madam.

I would like to ask a question that doesn't seem to be answered in the literature that I have read re: the proposed amendment to parking permits in Haringey.

1) will the current hourly permits that I currently own be valid if the changes come in? I have already purchased them so this would seem a little unfair if money already spent on permits is to be discarded!

2) will my current resident permit be valid up until its renewal date and only then will the new charge come in to play?

I would also like to lodge a formal objection.

- I have witnessed other areas of the Haringey borough with shorter CPZ hours and those areas seem to work very well for the residents and those visiting the areas. My current CPZ, which is Bruce Grove BRG, is set at 8am - 6:30pm. It is a very small CPZ and I fail to see the need for such stringent parking regulations. It isn't near any mainline shops or train stations and has mostly residents in houses, rather than multiple-occupancy properties. I feel that it would help the residents of our CPZ if the parking hours were slightly relaxed and put from 8 - 1:30pm for example. What with the increase in permit prices and visitor ticket prices, if people are visiting the CPZ and are allowed to park for free after a certain time, this might sweeten the bitter pill! I would welcome your response on this issue and I look forward to the response on my above two questions.

I don't quite understand the meaning of this:

(a) amend the residents' visitors' parking permit scheme so that the permits would be limited to hourly and daily operation. This would remove the need for an upper limit on numbers that could be purchased and It is anticipated that those permits would be used within the year purchased and not stock piled for future years. Unused permits would therefore not be exchanged or refunded. It is also proposed that the charge for hourly permits would be increased to 80p per hour;

Do I take it that:

- * you will no longer be issuing 2 hour permits?
- * how does that remove the upper limit on permits issued?
- * how does it reduce the amount cars are used?
- * at the moment one makes a guess as to how many permits we might need. With the system you seem to propose that permits would be valid from May - May (in my case). One could be caught out at the year end, waiting for a few extra permits. Is that what you propose? Flexibility would seem to be a good thing as well as fair and reasonable.

Many thanks,

Kind regards,

Please I already paid my parking permit. I will be away on holiday for two months as from March to April 2018.

Please can you tell me if I would be affected by new regulations. I hope to hear from your office before I leave for my holiday as from 28:02:2018 and thank you.

Kind regards.

Hi there

I don't like the sound of 6 monthly parking permits unless you also retain the annual ones.

194

It's hard enough remembering to renew the permits on a yearly basis - let alone every 6 months

The proposal for 6 monthly residents permits is not a good idea. It could lead to confusion and people forgetting to renew also more time consuming for residents and the council.

If 6 monthly permits are introduced there should be the option for 12 months as well..

195

Yours sincerely,

by email

.

Hi

Just wondering what happens if you have already bought a yearly parking permit?

196

Maybe it would be better to give people a choice of 6 months or 12?

Best

Sent from my iPhone

Dear friends,

Thanks for sending the notices about parking permits in my street.

I understand that types of visitors permits will be reduced to 1-hour and 1-day, and that the charges for visitors permits and parking our own car will change.

Questions:

197

1. When will these new rates start to apply?

2. For how long will I be able to use my existing stock of 1-hour, 2-hour, 1-day and weekend visitors passes?

(I bought what I estimated would be. sufficient to last more than a year, reckoning that buying a large supply at one time would be less trouble to me and the Council staff than buying little and often.)

3) If some of this stock remains unused at the end of its validity, will I be able to get a refund or exchange them for new permits? If so, how?

I look forward to hearing from you.

Hi

My husband is 74 and I'm 65, both of us have parking permits and we were not aware of any senior concessions available. Please let me know the discount available.

Kind regards

Hi,

I just received an email saying there were proposed new prices for parking permits inline with the DVLA co2 emissions. The link sent had no information on this.

Please could you let me know what the new proposals are? Also why Haringey council has to be 'inline' with the DVLA. A parked car causes no Co2.

Best regards.

Hello

Will you please send me details of concessions as they apply to the over '60s.

Thank you.

Hello

I wonder if you could clarify as to whether or not I am entitled to a concession on my parking permit. I am 61 years old.

201

Many thanks

Dear Sir/Madam,

Your new residents parking rules referred to a concession for residents over the age of 60.

202

My wife and I are xxx and live in Stanhope. Are we eligible for a reduction in the cost of a residents parking permit?

Thank you in in advance for your reply.

Dear Haringey Parking

I have just seen your e-mail advising about changes to the Residents' Parking Permits scheme.

The interesting paragraph was the last one advising that the age concession will rise from 60 to 65. I have never known of the existence of this concession before and have always paid the standard price for my Parking Permit ever since the CPZ was introduced (age 70 currently, 71 later this year).

Can you please advise the prices for the age concession?

Thank you

Sorry, I made a mistake with these dates in the email that I sent you this morning.
(forwarded below)

Point 2 should read -

2. Can I check with you that I will have 21 days from the date of receiving the notice on 14th February making the deadline 7th March and not 21 days from the 2nd February (the date on the notice) making the deadline 23rd February as that would, unfairly, only give residents 9 days to consider the proposals?

----- Forwarded Message -----

From:

To: "traffic.orders@haringey.gov.uk" <traffic.orders@haringey.gov.uk>

Sent: Thursday, 15 February 2018, 9:32

Subject: CPZ permit changes

204

I received your notification about CPZ permit charge changes by email yesterday, 14th February.

I haven't had much chance to study the proposals in detail yet but I did notice that I could send any objections or representations to yourselves within 21 days from the date of the notice.

1. Can I check with you that I will have 21 days from the date of receiving the notice on 14th February making the deadline 14th March and not 21 days from the 2nd February (the date on the notice) making the deadline 2nd March as that would, unfairly, only give residents 16 days to consider the proposals?
2. When are these proposed changes, if agreed, due to come into effect?
3. I already have some visitor permits - 9 two hour and 4 daily, which have a use-by date of 2020. Will I still be able to use these if the new charges are introduced?

I tried to access further information via your link which did not work; hence thee mail.

205

I would appreciate a response by e mail to this one.

Yours Faithfully,

Thanks for the update. A permit valid in all parts of Haringey is a very fair innovation. I am 66 but unaware of any parking concessions for permits. Please enlighten me

206

Sent from Samsung Mobile on O2

207

In regard to the email I received about new parking proposed changes will I still be able to use the visitors parking permits I have already purchased and for how long will they be valid now ?

Thanks, Wood Green resident.

Please straight your data about permit.

I do not hold an active permit

208

Kind regards

Dear sir/madam,

I have just received an entitled 'permit changes'

I am confused as we are hold a TEN permit which enables us to park on event days only; these permits are not chargeable.

Will these permits now be 6 monthly as well?

I have lived at the same address for 22 years so to have to renew a permit every 6 months is really tonight be to me consuming.

The link in provided on the email doesn't actually take you to the charges for permits!

Can you a snapshot of the proposed charges?

Kind regards,

Hello

Can i make a plea for the retention of annual permits please?

I am a pensioner and i am worried i'll forget to pay for one evry 6 months.

210

This is making life more complicated.

Can you help me please? I don't want to be on the wrong side of the law.

All the best

As a resident and property owner on Priory Gardens - a road adjacent to Highgate tube station -

would like to strongly object to the proposed parking changes.

This road is a cul de sac.

All the properties here are residential and the majority own cars with only street parking.

The road is already parked on both sides at all times.

211

If you allow residents from the entire borough to drive their cars to this road and park them by the tube then absolute chaos will ensue. The traffic, blocking of driveways and continuous turning of cars in this road will also be a MAJOR SAFETY ISSUE.

The parking on this road was already changed due to the safety concerns - since there also needs to be access to the tube station at the end of this cul de sac in case of FIRE OR EVACUATION EMERGENCY.

I, and all the residents on priory gardens are disappointed that Haringey Council has once again failed to properly consult and engage with residents on widespread changes that will affect thousands of people daily.

If this change is allowed to happen, the residents of Priory Gardens are already planning a campaign group and appeal to our MPs and trafficking and residential law to reverse such unsafe and improper changes.

Please acknowledge receipt of my objection.

Dear Traffic Orders

I do not agree with the following proposals:

- * Removal of 2 hour visitor permits

- * Increased cost of visitor permits

- * Increased cost of resident permits

212

- * Removal of concessions for people aged 60+

- * Restrictions on permits for traders

The reason I do not agree with the proposals is because the council has not made a sufficiently strong case for them. The only reason given is to "encourage people to travel more sustainably and for drivers to use more fuel efficient vehicles". These proposals will not do that; they will simply increase the cost involved of owning a car.

For many people owning a car is a necessity because it is a) cheaper than public transport b) often the quickest means of reaching some healthcare providers eg breast screening providers located a considerable distance away from the area in which they live c) a safer and more convenient way of transporting children, luggage or other heavy goods, and elderly people around given the lack of accessibility of some railway stations eg Alexandra Palace

station/Bowes Park/Hornsey/Harringay stations which have no lift to the platforms and are therefore unfit for elderly people, or those with heavy bags or pushchairs etc to use.

Increasing the age at which residents may access the concessionary half price residents' visitors' permit scheme from 60 years to 65 years and over does not encourage people in that age group to travel more sustainably; the removal of the concession simply increases the cost for people in that age group.

Finally I disagree with these proposals as a whole as they discriminate against people in lower income brackets who will find the increased costs punitive whilst those in upper income brackets will be able to absorb them more easily. I believe these proposals to be in breach of Equalities legislation for that reason.

To whom it may concern,

Dear Sir/Madam,

Although I find reasonable to align the cost to CO2 emissions, I object on three points regarding visitor parking permits:

- 1) The current 2-hour Visitor Permits allow visitors who wish to stay a few hours to avoid displaying an awkward number of permits, hence they are very convenient and I don't see any reason to discontinue them. Therefore I object to their discontinuation.
- 2) The price of 1-hour Visitor Permits has a proposed increase of more than double (from 35p to 80p), which I find very hard to justify, especially considering that the maximum number of permits per household would be lifted. Also, the new price increase doesn't correspond to an equal improvement of the service itself.

I understand the Council's intention to encourage using other forms of transport, but such a steep increase in price is only affecting those who cannot do otherwise. For these reasons, I object to such a rise in price.

3) I object to the proposal of not being able to use visitors permits acquired in previous years. The Council is slow in issuing visitor parking permits (days by post, or hours queuing, which is not always possible) therefore it is often useful to have a few spare ones at home. It would be different if they could be purchased on-line and printed straight away, but this is not the case. Furthermore, given that resident parking permits can be refunded in case residents leaving the area, the same principle should apply to visitor parking permits. For these reasons, I object to the proposal that visitor parking permits will not be refundable or that it will not be possible to swap the expired permits for new ones (as it has been so far).

Yours faithfully,

Dear Sirs

214

I do not regard your proposals to discontinue the two hour permits and to double the 1 hour charges as in any way reasonable or justifiable. The 2 hour permits are the most useful of all the permits and to scrap them is illogical. Furthermore you have not advanced any reasons for doing so. Nor have you advanced any reason for increasing the 1 hour permits by over 100%. That cannot be in line with any inflationary figures nor indices.

These proposals are detrimental to the residents and council tax payers of Haringey and offer no benefit to them. If you wish to increase the financial burden on the tax payers then you should justify it properly not bulldoze it through without a proper explanation.

Dear Officer,

Although I support banding of permits to resident vehicles to address environmental issues, I object to the huge increase in cost of hourly permits as this is going to disproportionately affect poorer residents. I also object to the proposal of not offering refunds for unused permits this will include current permits already purchased as is implied. There needs to be a grace period of 6 months to a year to take into account the lack of prior notice to people who bought batch 215 of permits without knowing they were suddenly going to be discontinued.

Yours sincerely,

Dear sir/madam

I wish to lodge my objections to your proposals for the above. It does not appear to be a serious consultation given that you only informed me on 16 February and consultation closes on 23 February. A week is insufficient for serious consideration.

1. I think you should seriously consider longer times for the parking restrictions as I'm fed up with commuters parking outside my house to go by train into London. And restrictions
2. Whilst I'm happy to pay a small increase, I do not consider that an increase in visitor parking costs of over 125% is reasonable, with carers potentially having to pay an additional £100 to park.
3. I consider you should keep the one hour permits. It enables deliveries etc.
4. Not to be able to use parking permits over a number of years makes no rational sense and is punitive.

Please reconsider your proposed amendments.

Yours sincerely

Dear Traffic Orders

I object to this proposal to change the 1 hour permit from 35p to become 80p

This is over double to the original cost and far higher than inflation.

This does not welcome visitors to the area.

217

I live on a road which last year was made a parking permit required road. It used not to be.

I request you reconsider the raise to be more in line with inflation.

Yours faithfully

I find it easier to buy a several 2 hour permits, 1 hour permits and daily permits in one go to save time and ensure that guests and tradesmen working on my house (it's a Victorian house that requires lots of maintenance and frequent repairs) can visit at short notice.

Making this more difficult and more expensive is not going to reduce car use - builders and plumbers will always arrive in vans. Limiting the permits to a single calendar year will also be very time consuming. To save money I will now have to buy a permit a week or so before I think someone might visit my home, especially towards the end of the year. This will mean consulting a psychic to find out when a pipe might burst or my central heating might fail. Visitors over the Christmas period are going to cause a headache too. They will have to announce their arrival and the length of their stay a good week before so the council can post the appropriate permit.

As the permits are already time limited by having a limited number of years to scratch off, I can't believe "stockpiling" visitor permits is a serious problem that needs addressing.

After removing free garden recycling and bulky item collection, this looks suspiciously like another stealth tax. I would much prefer it if you simply increased council tax, that would be more honest, fairer and far less time consuming for residents.

Also, as I have seen very little publicity for these changes, I don't believe this "consultation process" is a fair one.

I wish to lodge my objection to the above proposed changes to visitor parking permits.

I live in Middle Lane and we use 2-hour permits for visitors. The proposals mean that we will need 2 x 1 hour permits to cover the 2 hours and this cost is increasing by more than 100%. This is way over inflation.

Also, I completely object to permits having a one-year limit and not being refundable if you have any left over at the end of the year. It is very inconvenient having to buy permits often as your service is slow and cumbersome. It is also impossible to gauge how many permits we will need in a given year. Hence, we, the tax payers are just being inconvenienced and penalised by this change. This is particularly problematic for permits purchased in good faith before this change was proposed.

Yours

As a resident I am considerably disturbed at the proposed increases in the parking charges as follows:-

1. There appears to be no legitimate reason to increase the visitor permit charges by 130% which is outrageous. In addition your proposal to discontinue the two-hour permit and limit it to an hourly operation and to be used within the year purchased is incomprehensible, especially as it is unrealistic to expect people to know how many permits to purchase in a year.

2. So far as the residential parking permits are concerned, again, an increase of 63% does not seem to me to be fair, reasonable or justifiable.

From the above it would appear that you seem to think that the residents have unlimited funds to satisfy your need to raise revenue. Given the fact that the residents are simply paying for parking their cars outside their own residence there is a limit to what you should be expecting them to pay and not simply applying legalised extortion!

These proposals need to be re-examined so that they are fair and reasonable.

I would like it noted that I don't agree with the changes proposed to parking / visitor passes for Rathcoole Gardens.

Kind regards,

Your proposals would increase the amount I pay to park my car on the Queen's Highway near my house by over £100.00

The withdrawal of the 2 hr permits would mean I have to use 2 nr 1 hr permits at a cost of £1.60 for anyone, ie tradesmen or visitors remaining during the proscribed hours.

The council's costs will not have increased by anything like the % increase you are proposing to charge.

222

I object to these proposals.

Please think again.

I object to the price rise of one hour vouchers, and the scrapping of all the other vouchers except daily, this is unfair and giving very little choice for residents.

223

I object to the proposed changes to the charges for the visitor parking permits.

1). The increase to the pricing from 35p per hour to 80 p per hour - a staggering 129% increase.

2). I object to the 1 year expiry of the visitor permits. One can't forecast how many permits will be needed, it is highly likely that they will expire before the end date and therefore be wasted.

224

225

I bought lots of hour and two hour tickets for visitors which are valid till 2020 . Can you confirm these will be honoured?

Dear All,

After opening the lengthy documents and reading them I was interested to find your slant on the truth. I find that the many documents do not allow many people to understand the new proposed rules and I feel that this has been done on purpose to prevent a lot of people commenting on your proposals.

So here are my comments in bullet points so that you understand.

1. Your proposed changes state that they are to do with environmental issues and air quality. You then state that many people chose to own a car. This is a fabrication on your part. You are simplifying a complex issue that you do not want to address. A lot of people have to own a car because public transport does not get them to work at the time of day or place where they have managed to find employment.

- * Hence you are penalising people who want to work but have to get a car to do so.
- * There are people who care for elderly relatives and need to be able to drop everything to go to their aid. These people will be penalised. These people might not be registered as carers but might be, in effect, carers in some way. Again the middle income low paid person. 226
- * Very few people work close to home anymore.
- * You penalise people for garden waste. But people with cars who can take their own rubbish to tips are also penalised. This makes no sense. But you also want to get rid of fly tippers - makes no sense.

2. 6 monthly permit - fine.

3. Visitors parking permit.

- * Moving the age for concessions to age 65 years - fine.
- * Disabled drivers getting double the allocation of visitors permits - widely unfair. Disabled people need support, but I feel the level of support is excessive.
- * Rationalising the offer - no you just want more money. Stop trying to hide your intentions. There should NOT be just an hourly or daily visitors permit. Why do you not allow a 2 hourly permit? Also an expiry date of 1 year is just money grabbing on your part. This is totally unacceptable. I would expect at least a 2 to 3 year expiry date as getting these tickets from Haringey council is a chore. Delivery drivers need these tickets etc... and I have found that getting through to buy them is difficult and long winded. Online purchase I have never been able to do and going in person to the office at woodgreen library is a cattle market with a 2 hour wait.

* Not getting a refund for unused permits - fine.

* Increasing the permits to be inline with other boroughs - this is you just wanting to see how much money you can get away with charging. UNACCEPTABLE. This is over a 100% increase in cost.!

4. Increase in admin fee - fine.

5. What on earth do you mean when you talk about permission to park dispensation e.g. house removals. Does this mean that I would have to pay for a delivery man or builder? £20 a day on top of all my other bills? This is diabolical. I DO NOT AGREE.

6. Daily VP - no abbreviations should ever be used on a document such as this. What do you mean.

7. I do not agree with you streamlining the daily visitors permits.

8. I notice that you have made permanent the CPZ in my area without asking the residents again. You brought CPZ in on an about 50:50 for/ against. You try every 18 months to bring it in. Eventually you got fi

Hello,

I have read the proposals. It does not state whether current vouchers can be transferred over and still used; or if they will be refunded. Could this be clarified please.

As a resident who uses vouchers infrequently when I have visitors or tradespeople, I'm not so keen on the proposal that the vouchers will only be valid for year and not rolled over. It's no much stock piling but it takes time to wait for vouchers to be sent (3 weeks last time I ordered on line) which created problems if needed in short notice. So you can't help but have to order a number in advance. Perhaps the time for delivery could be reduced?

Thank you

I am writing to object:

1) The current 2-hour Visitor Permits allow visitors who wish to stay a few hours to avoid displaying an awkward number of permits, hence they are very convenient and I don't see any reason to discontinue them. I object to their discontinuation.

2) The price of 1-hour Visitor Permits has a proposed increase of more than double (from 35p to 80p), which I find very hard to justify. Also, the new price increase doesn't correspond to an equal improvement of the service itself. I understand the Council's intention to encourage using other forms of transport, but such a steep increase in price is only penalising those who cannot do otherwise. For these reasons, I objected to such a rise in price. I don't have a car but friends should be able to visit without it costing me a fortune.

3) I object to the proposal of not being able to use visitors permits acquired in previous years. Such a proposal goes against any rational thinking, like saying that clothes, once purchased, expire after a few months. The Council is slow in issuing visitor parking permits (days by post, or hours queuing, which is not always possible) therefore it is often useful to have a few spare ones at home. It would be different if they could be purchased on-line and printed straight away, but this is not the case. Furthermore, given that resident parking permits can be refunded in case residents leaving the area, the same principle should apply to visitor parking permits.

Am I understanding this correctly? You are replacing the current 70p two hour permit with a daily £3.50 permit? Really?

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to register my objection to the proposed amendments to the Haringey visitor parking permit scheme.

It is my understanding that the new proposals will make visitor parking significantly more expensive (the removal of the 2-hour permit and increase in price of the 1-hour permit to 80p amounting to the hourly rate more than doubling), as well as the expiry date for these permits becoming significantly shorter - to be used within a year. Given that the current system of applying for visitor permits can take up to (and, in my experience, sometimes more than) 2 weeks for the permits to be delivered after ordering, it is simply not realistic for permits to be purchased as and when needed - for which reason, a long validity period is required in order to avoid having unused permits leftover at the end of a year. I also understand that the council intends to stop issuing refunds for unused permits, which further compounds this problem.

230

There does not appear to be any logic behind these proposals, given that they seem to directly contradict the apparent intention to make it 'easier' for residents to purchase visitor parking permits, and given the extortionate price increases and lack of refunds for unused permits, the changes are likely to have a significant financial impact on residents who purchase them.

I would ask that these proposals are reconsidered to avoid unfairly penalising residents - at the very least by retaining the ability to apply for refunds for unused vouchers, if not by decreasing the amount by which the prices are due to increase.

Kind regards,

To whom it may concern

I totally feel the new proposal is in appropriate, also you have introduced 6 monthly permit for tenancy but I hope your not getting rid of 12 monthly for permanent resident like myself.

Also why don't you act on what you preach, as I can never find parking space on my street because haringey employees park on my road. Please get a grip. Already it is difficult to have guest come due to parking restrictions.

You are introducing new pricing banking on the fact that we have high number of minority and many don't know how to or have have time to make an objection, as they are too busy trying to earn a living to feed their family.

231

Really annoyed

And I hope this is looked in properly and haringey need to find other roots of raising money. Haringey are going low in service as time goes on, prime example is streets smell because you do collection every fortnight.

We have a raise in crimes in Wood Green and don't feel safe in our own street?

I have also Ccd in our local MP as I would love to see if my vote has come to waste?

Regards

to:: Anne Cunningham, head of parking at Haringey

ref two hour permit is being discontinued

I wish to object to this proposal... if indeed it is a proposal because I only know of it through a facebook page

I am a resident on a CPZ (Mount View Road) and I have the 2 hour permits. I do not understand any reason to change them.

Please send me the details

Thank you

I am writing to object to some of the proposals contained in "Proposed Amendments to on Street Parking Permits and Charges. The Haringey (Controlled Parking Zones) (Amendment No. *) Order 201".

These proposals include the removal of the right offered to residents by the current traffic management orders to a refund for any unused visitors parking permits. Specifically the proposed new orders state "It is anticipated that those permits would be used within the year purchased.....Unused permits would.....not be exchanged or refunded".

Most residents are not able to plan exactly how many permits they will need. The new proposals will make it more difficult to manage visitor parking without buying a surfeit of permits that will will now expire more quickly and be non-refundable.

233

Also included in these proposals is a change which increases the cost of visitor parking by more than double.

As a policy, these changes are tantamount to a move towards more regressive local taxation and will unduly impact on the poorest in the borough.

I would urge the Council to reviews the cost increases and to consider an online system for the issue of visitor parking such as is used on other London Boroughs.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to register the following objections to the proposed TMO of 2nd February 2018:

- I strongly object to the removal of the 2 week permit. This is incredibly useful in situations in which friends and family are visiting for a longer period of time, especially as when helping to care for an ill relative. Using 14 day permits, as would have to be the case under the proposals, would render the parking prohibitively expensive- more than a 6 month resident's permit. It is

also essential for when residents have to use a temporary vehicle, for instance when their usual car is being serviced or repaired for an extended period of time. It is entirely reasonable that someone visiting for 2 weeks should be able to buy a voucher at a discount to the usual day rate.

-I also strongly object to the scale of the increase in the price of the hourly voucher, to nearly double the current price. With the removal of the 2 hour vouchers, a more modest increase would be far more reasonable.

Hi I would like to say that I object to Haringey Council increasing the price of the permits that we had forced on us.

The proposed of being in line with the dvla co2 emissions is unjustified as it's a perking permit so there will be 0 emissions from the vehicle when the car is parked.

Will Haringey Council be charging everyone on there emissions that drive through the borough??

I understand you want to get rid of the 2 hour permit.

This is the most common one used as you don't want to pop out ever hour to put a permit in you don't know how long a visiting person is going to stay.

235 The hours the permit for whl is active there has never been a problem. Our problem is match days market days and after 6pm. The parking restrictions don't help residents at all.

We should have been event days only.

As we are not event days it would be better to end at 9pm this way the council can ticket people up until then is a better way of the council making money rather than making residents pays.

Every single one of the proposals is about more money nothing and unjust.

We pay the government the co2 duty on our cars we should not have to pay on emissions when there will be non coming from the vehicle when parked.

-I know no one will be taking any notice of this as no one at the council ever listens to residents

Dear Madam/Sir,

Having reviewed the proposed amendments to on street parking permits and charges, I would like to raise some objections.

1) The current 2-hour Visitor Permits allow visitors who wish to stay a few hours to avoid displaying an awkward number of permits, hence they are very convenient and I don't see any reason to discontinue them.

Therefore I object to their discontinuation.

2) The price of 1-hour Visitor Permits has a proposed increase of more than double (from 35p to 80p), which I find very hard to justify,

236 especially considering that the maximum number of permits per household would be lifted. Also, the new price increase doesn't correspond to an equal improvement of the service itself. I understand the Council's intention to encourage using other forms of transport, but such a steep increase in price is only penalising those who cannot do otherwise. For these reasons, I strongly object to such a rise in price.

3) I object to the proposal of not being able to use visitors permits acquired in previous years. Such a proposal goes against any rational thinking, like saying that clothes, once purchased, expire after a few months. The Council is slow in issuing visitor parking permits (days by post, or hours queuing, which is not always possible) therefore it is

often useful to have a few spare ones at home. It would be different if they could be purchased on-line and printed straight away, but this is not the case. Furthermore, given that resident parking permits can be refunded in case residents leaving the area, the same principle should apply to visitor parking permits.

Yours sincerely,

I have received this email but am unclear what you are consulting on. I pay a fortune in visitor permits and to park outside my house. I assume you are putting up the charges again but cannot see the details from the links. Please explain how much you are putting them up by, in addition to putting up charges for bin collection, green waste and council tax.

Sent from my iPad

I object to the changes to residents visitor permits no longer being issued for 2 hours. We live in a CPZ which is 10-12 an obviously this suits us to have this facility as most visitors will be at least 2 hours.

I also very much object to your price increase for this from 35p an hour to 80p an hour!!! This is an increase of 228%.

This is an extortionate amount which the less well off in the borough will greatly suffer for. An absolutely unjustified staggering increase.

I would also note that you give 21 days from the notice (see attached) which is the 2nd Feb 2018 but you only send this email on the 14th Feb giving people a little over a week to object. Not really very good timing yet again by the Council!!

I wish to object to the proposal to remove 2-hour parking permits. I no longer have a car, so I rely on friends and relatives to carry out errands for me, and workmen occasionally require them when they do work on my house. Usually I give them two hour tickets to cover the 11 a.m. 1 p.m. period when the zone operates. Having to fill out two tickets instead of one wastes my time and generates more wasted paper.

239

Hello,

Re: Proposed amendments

The amendments you are proposing will penalise those well off, including pensioners, so I am objecting to them.

240

The system we originally signed up to and were consulted on has changed part way through the scheme. This is neither just nor transparent.

When parking vouchers that were originally bought we were told that they would be valid until 2020. It is now being proposed that they will no longer be valid and the money will not be refunded. Again this is unjust and detrimental with those on a limited income.

Dear sir/madam,

241

As a resident of Haringey, I would like to register my objection to your proposed changes, in particular the size of the increase in charges and the duration of the permits.

I'd like to object strongly to the proposal to have to use permits in the calendar year of issue

How are we supposed to know how many permits we will need? We will either have to keep ordering, or have a surplus go to waste - when you are also proposing to more than double the cost of having a visitor park - with no justification.

242

Also, with no limit on the number of permits allowed, what is to stop people setting up a business to sell them on to non-residents? Or is this the plan - so you can make more money out of the system?

To whom it may concern

-I would like to object to the proposed changes regarding residents and visitors parking permits.

Residents parking permits

The rationale for raising costs by a disproportionate amount is based on encouraging residents to not have cars with high emissions. I object to penalising through a raise in costs of permits and frankly at a rate of over 100% is hugely disproportionate.

I own a car in the borough and I am not in a financial position to embark on selling my existing car and purchasing another one based on rising costs of parking. I think emissions is an excuse

243

to get more revenue from residents and nothing more. If parking is the issue then introduce a flat rate on parking on the road for all cars and residents. I am unsure is your argument is about parking or driving. I understood the CPZ was introduced to help residents park nearby their houses so people outside the borough would be discouraged from driving and parking to stations and shopping centres did not clog up the roads. It works when it supports residents not penalising them! Perhaps you should raise the costs for parking meters on the roads but residents who have lived in the borough for many years, pay dearly to live in zone 3 and and have paid big taxes should not be penalised again by the council.

Visitors permits

Why have you suggested raising from 35p an hour to 80p? There is no reason other than generating revenue. The balance of 1 and 2 hour permits allows more flexibility for residents when they have visitors although I can understand the 2 hour ones are unnecessary and these could be replaced with the 1 hour ones. However, I strongly disagree with the steep increase on the 1 hour permits. This is ridiculously high for an area such as Wood Green outer zone given the timings of operation.

Thank you

To whom it may concern,

This is an email objecting to proposal to increase the costs of visitor permits and also to not refund unused visitor permits. I also object to the notion of visitor permits having a year expiry date.

244

I do not agree with your proposals and reject them.

Dear Haringey Council

I have studied the proposals "2018 T12 Permit Changes" and have a number of serious concerns.

These relate to the changes proposed to Visitors Permits.

As a resident who only has occasional need for Visitor Permits, mostly for tradespeople to carry out activities related to my residence, I have no idea how many permits I require in any year.

- 1) when state require permit to be used in year of purchase, how are permits to be labelled? If it is not one year from date of purchase then it is simply a money making scheme.
- 2) It will be much fairer to allow a permit to be valid for two years from purchase.
- 3) How quickly can new permits be purchased and be delivered?
- 4) I object to people being able to buy unlimited permits. This will allow certain people to operate a parking business on our streets. It will certainly not reduce the amount of vehicles trying to park.

I hope you consider my points seriously

Objection to proposed parking permit changes: Visitor Permits

I am writing to you regarding the proposed parking permit changes detailed here.

<http://www.haringey.gov.uk/parking-roads-and-travel/roads-and-streets/traffic-managementorders/list-traffic-management-orders>

There are a number of significant changes proposed.

I am writing regarding:

- the change in validity of Visitor Permits to 1 year

- the removal of 2 hour visitor permits

- the removal of 2 week visitor permits

- raising age of concessionary scheme from 60 to 65 years

I strongly object to the change in validity of Visitor Permits to 1 year.

I strongly object to the removal of 2 week permits & 2 hour permits.

I also strongly object to the misleading disingenuous language used in the traffic order documents used to explain and justify the changes, saying it is on "environmental grounds" or "to encourage use of more sustainable modes of transport", when it is clear all the changes involve increased cost to the people of Haringey, residents of Haringey, the people you represent and therefore increased revenue to the Council.

It is outrageous and disgraceful that you are trying to introduce fundamental, significant, basic changes to the permits and permit system, which have existed for years/decades, using a Traffic Order without any consultation or without a separate consultation.

(objections and responses to a Traffic Order cannot be treated as consultation)

It is clear you the council are ignoring democracy and taking shortcuts on democracy by not notifying residents appropriately and not carrying out a suitable consultation on these fundamental and significant changes to the parking scheme in Haringey.

You the council sent emails to residents weeks after the traffic order was advertised, which was on 2 Feb 2018.

I received an email 2 weeks after on 16 Feb 2018, a neighbour received an email on 14 Feb 2018.

Change in validity of Visitor Permits to 1 year

By definition people have to buy visitor permits in advance, they don't know when they will need them or use them.

As a resident you always want to have enough visitor permits in case you need them, so you will buy more than you may need.

So inevitably you are going to have unused permits if the validity period is too short like the 1 year you are proposing, which is unfair & unreasonable.

Having a validity of years, like the current 5 years, gives residents reasonable time to use them, changing to 1 year is wholly unreasonable.

It also allows the council to administer the scheme in a satisfactory manner regarding printing permits and sending permits to residents, so residents have a clear long period to use the visitor permits. If y

Objection to proposed parking permit changes: Visitor Permits

I am writing to you regarding the proposed parking permit changes detailed here.

<http://www.haringey.gov.uk/parking-roads-and-travel/roads-and-streets/traffic-managementorders/list-traffic-management-orders>

There are a number of significant changes proposed.

I am writing regarding:

- the change in validity of Visitor Permits to 1 year
- the removal of 2 hour visitor permits
- the removal of 2 week visitor permits
- raising age of concessionary scheme from 60 to 65 years

247

I strongly object to the change in validity of Visitor Permits to 1 year.

I strongly object to the removal of 2 week permits & 2 hour permits.

I also strongly object to the misleading disingenuous language used in the traffic order documents used to explain and justify the changes, saying it is on "environmental grounds" or "to encourage use of more sustainable modes of transport", when it is clear all the changes involve increased cost to the people of Haringey, residents of Haringey, the people you represent and therefore increased revenue to the Council.

It is outrageous and disgraceful that you are trying to introduce fundamental, significant, basic changes to the permits and permit system, which have existed for years/decades, using a Traffic Order without any consultation or without a separate consultation.

(objections and responses to a Traffic Order cannot be treated as consultation)

It is clear you the council are ignoring democracy and taking shortcuts on democracy by not notifying residents appropriately and not carrying out a suitable consultation on these fundamental and significant changes to the parking scheme in Haringey.

I also refer you to this council parking report in 2010, where you the council carried out a consultation just on increasing parking charges, as an example of what you have done previously.

The changes you the council are now proposing are far greater and more significant, yet you have not carried out any consultation and have only attempted to contact residents weeks after advertising the traffic order.

Change in validity of Visitor Permits to 1 year

By definition people have to buy visitor permits in advance, they don't know when they will need them or use them.

As a resident you always want to have enough visitor permits in case you need them, so you will buy more than you may need.

So inevitably you are going to have unused permits if the validity period is too short like the 1 year you are proposing, which is unfair & unreasonable.

Having a validity of years, like the current 5 years, gives residents reasonable time to use them, changing to 1 year is wholly unreasonable.

It also allows the council to administer the scheme in a satisfactory manner regarding printing permits and sending permits to residents, so residents have a clear long period to use the visitor permits.

Dear Haringey Council

I am writing to object to the proposed amendments to the District parking permits and charges for Haringey CPZs, Order 210, T12, as follows:

Proposed Amendments to District Parking Permits and Charges: Haringey CPZs, Order 210, T12

Objecting to 2(c) Visitors' Parking Permit Scheme :

"It is anticipated that those permits would be used within the year purchased and not stock piled for future years. Unused permits would therefore not be exchanged or refunded". 248

Objections -

- i) that residents' would have to (over)estimate the number of permits they need before the year end, and probably be left with un refundable surplus - which would make a further and unjustifiable charge of 80p per unused / unusable permit over and above permits actually used;
- ii) that to comply with the Order it would also be necessary before the year's end to apply and pay for Permits for use in the next year, not to be in breach from 1 January;
- iii) that administratively this would create an undesirable pre-Christmas pinch-point for Haringey Council, and also for residents whom the Council exists to serve, and not inconvenience grossly.

These clauses should be removed from the Proposed Amendments.

Objecting to the scale of the charge increases for residents and visitors permits.

Regarding the increase in the visitors permit Charge from 35p per hour to 80p: and the cost of my annual resident's permit charge from £51.70 to £91.30, these increases are proportionally high, and they are well over inflation in a time of falling real incomes for many people, myself included.

Yours faithfully

Dear Ms Cunningham

I am writing to point out serious flaws in the proposals outlined below. These proposals were notified to me by email with no clear information about how or when to lodge objections. I understand that this may now be the last day, although the date I was sent the email was only 14 February. This is a clear breach of procedure given that the proposals are dated 2 February. The email gives no detail about the increases in charges, which are significant.

My objections to the substance of the changes are as follows:

249 1 The lifting of the limit to the number of visitor permits allowed is foolish. It carries the risk that people living in high parking demand areas will buy excessive numbers of permits in order to sell these at a premium for non-resident parking - for example, on match days or to allow commuter parking.

2 Linked to this there can be no justification for the expiry of visitor permits after only one year with no refund permitted. An unfair burden on those who cannot predict easily the number of visitors they may receive. It is likely that faced with the prospect of losing money from out of date unused permits, people will sell them as described in point 1 above. There would be no prospect of policing such abuse.

I am copying in my local councillor to this email.

there are a number of issues i find unacceptable.

1. that permits will be for one year only.

how will this work? when does the year start?

when the last permits were issued? how can residents work out how many they may need and how to manage at the turn of the year.

2. the rise in cost is excessive

3. removing the 60 yrs concession, i am now retired and have not got the same income. no 250 state pension until 66 yet have more visitors during the day. it seems very wrong to "tax" the elderly.

4. my existing permits are valid until 2020 will i not be able to use them once the changes come in to force?

5. when is this going to happen?

the only good thing i can see is that there will be no limit to how many one can buy over the year.

To whom it may concern

I am writing to object to some of the proposals contained in "Proposed Amendments to on Street Parking Permits and Charges. The Haringey (Controlled Parking Zones) (Amendment No. *) Order 201".

These proposals include the removal of the right offered to residents by the current traffic management orders to a refund for any unused visitors parking permits. Specifically the proposed new orders state "It is anticipated that those permits would be used within the year purchased.....Unused permits would.....not be exchanged or refunded". 251

Most residents are not able to plan exactly how many permits they will need. The new proposals will make it more difficult to manage visitor parking without buying a surfeit of permits that will will now expire more quickly and be non-refundable.

Also included in these proposals is a change which increases the cost of visitor parking by more than double.

As a policy, these changes are tantamount to a move towards more regressive local taxation and will unduly impact on the poorest in the borough.

I would urge the Council to review the cost increases and to consider an online system for the issue of visitor parking such as is used on other London Boroughs.

I am against the proposal of the visitor permits changing to a non limited allocation and turning into an all day permit. We have battled to bring CPZ to this ward and living on a popular heavily congested road, I fear people will take advantage of the all day permits and sell to people who want to park all day on our roads. The current method of hourly will be more effective, will not be abused and won't turn our roads to a multi car park.

I hope you listen to the residents and make the changes suggested

To whom it may concern,

Dear Sir/Madam,

Although I find reasonable to align the cost to CO2 emissions, I object on three points regarding visitor parking permits:

- 1) The current 2-hour Visitor Permits allow visitors who wish to stay a few hours to avoid displaying an awkward number of permits, hence they are very convenient and I don't see any reason to discontinue them. Therefore I object to their discontinuation.
- 2) The price of 1-hour Visitor Permits has a proposed increase of more than double (from 35p to 80p), which I find very hard to justify, especially considering that the maximum number of permits per household would be lifted. Also, the new price increase doesn't correspond to an 252 equal improvement of the service itself.

I understand the Council's intention to encourage using other forms of transport, but such a steep increase in price is only affecting those who cannot do otherwise. For these reasons, I object to such a rise in price.

- 3) I object to the proposal of not being able to use visitors permits acquired in previous years. The Council is slow in issuing visitor parking permits (days by post, or hours queuing, which is not always possible) therefore it is often useful to have a few spare ones at home. It would be different if they could be purchased on-line and printed straight away, but this is not the case. Furthermore, given that resident parking permits can be refunded in case residents leaving the area, the same principle should apply to visitor parking permits. For these reasons, I object to the proposal that visitor parking permits will not be refundable or that it will not be possible to swap the expired permits for new ones (as it has been so far).

To whom it may concern,

Dear Sir/Madam,

Although I find reasonable to align the cost to CO2 emissions, I object on three points regarding visitor parking permits:

- 1) The current 2-hour Visitor Permits allow visitors who wish to stay a few hours to avoid displaying an awkward number of permits, hence they are very convenient and I don't see any reason to discontinue them. Therefore I object to their discontinuation.
- 2) The price of 1-hour Visitor Permits has a proposed increase of more than double (from 35p to 80p), which I find very hard to justify, especially considering that the maximum number of permits per household would be lifted. Also, the new price increase doesn't correspond to an equal improvement of the service itself.

I understand the Council's intention to encourage using other forms of transport, but such a steep increase in price is only affecting those who cannot do otherwise. For these reasons, I object to such a rise in price.

3) I object to the proposal of not being able to use visitors permits acquired in previous years. The Council is slow in issuing visitor parking permits (days by post, or hours queuing, which is not always possible) therefore it is often useful to have a few spare ones at home. It would be different if they could be purchased on-line and printed straight away, but this is not the case. Furthermore, given that resident parking permits can be refunded in case residents leaving the area, the same principle should apply to visitor parking permits. For these reasons, I object to the proposal that visitor parking permits will not be refundable or that it will not be possible to swap the expired permits for new ones (as it has been so far).

Yours faithfully,

To whom it may concern,

Dear Sir/Madam,

Although I find reasonable to align the cost to CO2 emissions, I object on three points regarding visitor parking permits:

1) The current 2-hour Visitor Permits allow visitors who wish to stay a few hours to avoid displaying an awkward number of permits, hence they are very convenient and I don't see any reason to discontinue them. Therefore I object to their discontinuation.

2) I object to the proposal of not being able to use visitors permits acquired in previous years. The Council is slow in issuing visitor parking permits (days by post, or hours queuing, which is not always possible) therefore it is often useful to have a few spare ones at home. It would be different if they could be purchased on-line and printed straight away, but this is not the case. Furthermore, given that resident parking permits can be refunded in case residents leaving the area, the same principle should apply to visitor parking permits. For these reasons, I object to the proposal that visitor parking permits will not be refundable or that it will not be possible to swap the expired permits for new ones (as it has been so far).

Yours faithfully,

To whom it may concern,

To whom it may concern,

Dear Sir/Madam,

Although I find reasonable to align the cost to CO2 emissions, I object on three points regarding changes to visitor parking permits:

1) The current 2-hour Visitor Permits allow visitors who wish to stay a few hours to avoid displaying an awkward number of permits, hence they are very convenient and I don't see any reason to discontinue them. Therefore I object to their discontinuation.

255

2) The price of 1-hour Visitor Permits has a proposed increase of more than double (from 35p to 80p), which I find very hard to justify, especially considering that the maximum number of permits per household would be lifted. Also, the new price increase doesn't correspond to an equal improvement of the service itself.

I understand the Council's intention to encourage using other forms of transport, but such a steep increase in price is only affecting those who cannot do otherwise. Elderly people for example, who need to have family visit to assist with care or even just to provide company are immediately penalised. For these reasons, I object to such a rise in price.

3) I object to the proposal of not being able to use visitors permits acquired in previous years. The Council is slow in issuing visitor parking permits (days by post, or hours queuing, which is not always possible) therefore it is often useful to have a few spare ones at home. It would be

different if they could be purchased on-line and printed straight away, but this is not the case. It is arbitrary and unfair practice against residents. Furthermore, given that resident parking permits can be refunded in case residents leaving the area, the same principle should apply to visitor parking permits. For these reasons, I object to the proposal that visitor parking permits will not be refundable or that it will not be possible to swap the expired permits for new ones (as it has been so far).

Yours faithfully,

Please note, in accordance with data protection requirements please ensure my personal contact details and any sensitive personal data are removed before publishing / sharing this email.

To whom it may concern,

Dear Sir/Madam,

Although I find it reasonable to align the cost to CO2 emissions, I object on three points regarding visitor parking permits:

- 1) The current 2-hour Visitor Permits allow visitors who wish to stay a few hours to avoid displaying an awkward number of permits, hence they are very convenient and I don't see any reason to discontinue them. Therefore I object to their discontinuation.
- 2) The price of 1-hour Visitor Permits has a proposed increase of more than double (from 35p to 80p), which I find very hard to justify, especially considering that the maximum number of permits per household would be lifted. Also, the new price increase doesn't correspond to an 256 equal improvement of the service itself.

I understand the Council's intention to encourage using other forms of transport, but such a steep increase in price is only affecting those who cannot do otherwise. For these reasons, I object to such a rise in price.

- 3) I object to the proposal of not being able to use visitors permits acquired in previous years. The Council is slow in issuing visitor parking permits (days by post, or hours queuing, which is not always possible) therefore it is often useful to have a few spare ones at home. It would be different if they could be purchased on-line and printed straight away, but this is not the case. Furthermore, given that resident parking permits can be refunded in case residents leaving the area, the same principle should apply to visitor parking permits. For these reasons, I object to the proposal that visitor parking permits will not be refundable or that it will not be possible to swap the expired permits for new ones (as it has been so far).

Yours faithfully,

I have recently received the review charge increase in relation to the permit charges that will be shortly be in force.

Unfortunately I'm not happy that the council refuse to refund on old permits that have not been used and the increase in a visitor permit.

Also as much as I am happy that the permit on Clonmell road is in force it has not benefited the workers in this street. I work non-Friday in an office so I don't get back home until 5-5.30pm. At this time the permits do not apply and then I still struggle to get a space outside or near my house of which I have paid a fee for. On Thursday-Friday when I am home i sometimes cannot get parked in the morning after school run but only after the second school run from 3.30. As for the weekend the permits do not apply to our road and therefore we are still finding it difficult to

257

park outside on near outlet house and often parked on another street and doors away. The adjacent Road summer hill road has parking from 8am-6pm. This would benefit the residents on Clonmell rd as we are having a knock on effect. It has improved slightly but for the amount of money we have to pay we expect further development for residents to be able to park outside their house as we would be able to park after work

I look forward to hearing from you

I look forward to hearing from you

Regards

I am writing to object to some of the proposals contained in "Proposed Amendments to on Street Parking Permits and Charges. The Haringey (Controlled Parking Zones) (Amendment No. *) Order 201".

These proposals include the removal of the right offered to residents by the current traffic management orders to a refund for any unused visitors parking permits. Specifically the proposed new orders state "It is anticipated that those permits would be used within the year purchased.....Unused permits would.....not be exchanged or refunded".

Most residents are not able to plan exactly how many permits they will need. The new proposals will make it more difficult to manage visitor parking without buying a surfeit of permits that will now expire more quickly and be non-refundable.

Also included in these proposals is a change which increases the cost of visitor parking by more than double.

As a policy, these changes are tantamount to a move towards more regressive local taxation and will unduly impact on the poorest in the borough.

I would urge the Council to review the cost increases and to consider an alternative (possibly online) system for the issue of visitor parking such as is used on other London Boroughs.

I look forward to your considered response.

Please can you confirm what the position is with respect to any unused visitor permits once the new arrangements come into force? Can residents obtain refunds for the permits they purchased prior to the changes being introduced?

I am writing to object to some of the proposals contained in "Proposed Amendments to on Street Parking Permits and Charges. The Haringey (Controlled Parking Zones) (Amendment No. *) Order 201".

I received an email dated 16 February 2018 advising me of the changes for parking charges with the opportunity to raise objections by 22 February 2018 – this is less than a week and includes the tail end of half term when residents may still be away – this is wholly unacceptable.

In additions I would like to lodge the following objections:

1. Expiry of permits at end of the year – "It is anticipated that those permits would be used within the year purchased.....Unused permits would not be exchanged or refunded".

It is not always possible to anticipate how many permits you will need each year and of course it varies. The majority of residents will want to keep a stock. It is wholly unfair that these permits cannot be (i) used the following year as currently and (ii) exchanged or refunded. Huge numbers of unused permits will have to be repurchased the following year.

2. One hour permits replacing two hour permits – the two hour permits are very useful. The new one hour permit is nearly the same price (almost double?)?? as the two hour permit which

260

will be discontinued – this is whole unfair particular on residents (mostly in the east of the borough where CPZs have longer hours) and puts increased financial pressure on those residents who can least afford it.

3. Removing upper limit of permits that can be purchased – this has the potential danger that permits will be purchased and traded on the black market to people outside of the borough who have no business (work or visitors) to be parking here. I thought the whole idea of the CPZs was to protect parking for residents!

Other London boroughs are using electronic systems to enable residents to purchase visitors permits. Are Haringey investigating the possibility of doing this?

I would ask the council to reconsider these changes to the current system.

Regards

I am writing to object to some of the proposals contained in "Proposed Amendments to on Street Parking Permits and Charges. The Haringey (Controlled Parking Zones) (Amendment No. *) Order 201".

These proposals include the removal of the right offered to residents by the current traffic management orders to a refund for any unused visitors parking permits. Specifically the proposed new orders state "It is anticipated that those permits would be used within the year purchased.....Unused permits would....not be exchanged or refunded".

Most residents are not able to plan exactly how many permits they will need. The new proposals will make it more difficult to manage visitor parking without buying a surfeit of permits that will now expire more quickly and be non-refundable.

Also included in these proposals is a change which increases the cost of visitor parking by more than double.

As a policy, these changes are tantamount to a move towards more regressive local taxation and will unduly impact on the poorest in the borough.

I would urge the Council to review the cost increases and to consider an online system for the issue of visitor parking such as is used on other London Boroughs.

Yours sincerely
Dear Sir/Madam,

The changes you plan to make are drastic and unfair. Looking at your proposed amendments there will only be daily and one hourly permits. You are also doing away with visitor permits for two week periods which means I can't supply my Family visitors with a permit to visit me for a longer period of time and are relying on daily permits which work out much dearer for me.

Regarding your one hourly permits you are also only having a one year time limit and means I have to buy small amounts as I can't claim back for unused tickets. If I buy a larger amount on the assumption that I know how many visitors I am going to have then I have to keep a constant track of how many permits I have at any one time. Surely it would be more fair to have one hourly and daily permits lasting three years. This way I am not having to assume how many visitors I am going to have.

Also, you should allow me the privilege for my Family visitors to visit me for longer periods of time. Maybe you don't live in the borough and therefore don't have any Family visitors visiting you for a longer period of time.

I wish to object to your proposed parking permit changes especially to the discontinuing of two week visitor permits. This is especially unfair for elderly residents who like to have Family visitors visiting for a longer period of time without having to constantly renew one hour permits. It's good for your parking wardens because they know that residents will unknowingly lapse with time control. You are relying on residents to supply daily permits so your wardens have less to check. This means residents are forking out much more money which is good for the Council but unfair for the resident.

Please consider my points as you could be facing a large resident backlash with the loss of Council seats at the next Council election. Residents will object and not stand for unfair practices.

Your Council did nothing about parking hours between 8 am and 10 pm the last time objections were requested. These hours are too severe for residents wishing to park near their homes. Maybe this time the residents will object more forcefully regarding your proposed changes to parking permits. This also opens the way to permit touting and you will have touts selling permits on the street to visitors wishing to park in the Borough.

You need to reconsider your parking permit changes and look after the residents who pay your salaries.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to object the proposal set forward in regards to resident parking Permits.

I currently reside in Fairbourne Rd, N17 which falls under Bruce Grove West Zone.

Although I am currently not a vehicle owner, I have purchased several visitor 2hr Parking permits for my visitors which under your new proposal will be void and they are non refundable.

263

I don't see that it is fair that I should loose money because of your new proposed plan.

Why does the two hour parking permits need to be scrapped? You are also making it more expensive to purchase hourly permits and I think it is a greedy crafty way to get more money from residents.

Many of us were unhappy about the parking restrictions in the first place and now you are making it impossible for people to visit us using cars.

I also object to the fact that I was not notified about the proposed plan or the consultation period and only found out by chance. How can you expect people to have their say if you do not give them the opportunity to do so?

I look forward to your response.

I am writing to object to some of the proposals contained in "Proposed Amendments to on Street Parking Permits and Charges. The Haringey (Controlled Parking Zones) (Amendment No. *) Order 201".

These proposals include the removal of the right offered to residents by the current traffic management orders to a refund for any unused visitors parking permits. Specifically the proposed new orders state "It is anticipated that those permits would be used within the year purchased.....Unused permits would.....not be exchanged or refunded".

Most residents are not able to plan exactly how many permits they will need. The new proposals will make it more difficult to manage visitor parking without buying a surfeit of permits that will now expire more quickly and be non-refundable.

264

Also included in these proposals is a change which increases the cost of visitor parking by more than double.

As a policy, these changes are tantamount to a move towards more regressive local taxation and will unduly impact on the poorest in the borough.

I would urge the Council to review the cost increases and to consider an online system for the issue of visitor parking such as is used on other London Boroughs.

I object to the rise in price, especially for disabled companion badge, the shorter expiry date and no refund for unused visitor permit, and admin fee.

265

Also despite the fact that you have my details on file that you have not contacted me to consult.

Hi

266

I have a lot of two-hour parking permits: as the change is being brought in unilaterally by Haringey, I assume that I will be able to change these free of charge to one-hour permits?

Please note that I object to your proposals to issue only residents' daily parking permit with a one year validity period - or is it actually going to be less than that in practice for "late" purchasers in any year??

And how can it be reasonable to justify increasing the age at which discounts kick in? Or increasingly penalising any resident who cannot afford to buy a new low emission car? What did your equality impact considerations (if any) tell you?

And how do you justify unlimited permit sales per household while claiming you are trying to bring about reduced vehicle use?

All told, these revisions look like another opportunistic Haringey Council scheme to engineer bad value and poorer life quality. Well - I object to all your bad ideas on these matters. A change in your mindset is overdue - why don't you try and do things that give residents BETTER value for a change?

As an organisation you appear intent on pushing the envelope to see how much more you can hamper and annoy residents with every contact opportunity. (Such as all the parking cash payment machines that are sat there out of use and "being removed" as your notices so irritatingly put it.).

Please have another think and change your dreadful proposed parking scheme changes so people can say: "thanks Haringey Council for not ripping us off for a change".

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to object to some of the proposals contained in the "Haringey (Controlled Parking Zones) (Amendment No. *) Order 201" and the other documents in the 'Proposed Parking Charges' documents here: <http://www.haringey.gov.uk/parking-roads-and-travel/roads-andstreets/traffic-management-orders/list-traffic-management-orders> relating to Residents' Visitors Parking Permits

These proposals include the removal of the right offered to residents by the current traffic management orders to a refund for any unused visitors parking permits. Specifically the proposed new orders state "It is anticipated that those permits would be used within the year purchased.....Unused permits would.....not be exchanged or refunded".

Most residents are not able to plan exactly how many permits they will need, particularly when the council system for issuing them is so tardy and unreliable. The new proposals will make it even more difficult to manage visitor parking without buying a surfeit of permits that will now expire more quickly and be non-refundable. This is a clear attempt to raise revenue knowing full well that there will be huge numbers of unused vouchers that will have to be re-purchased each year.

Also included in these proposals is a change which increases the cost of visitor parking by more than double (by increasing the cost of 1 hour permits from 35p each to 80p) and gets rid of the useful 2 hour permits which are currently 70p each. This is a huge increase and is not justified by the reasoning provided.

As a policy, these changes will unduly impact on the poorest in the borough, and those who need visitor permits for daily carers, for example.

I urge the Council to review the cost increases and to consider introducing a more efficient online system for the issue of visitor parking such as is used on other London Boroughs.

I also urge my ward councillors, cc'd here, to object on behalf of the residents in West Green who will be disproportionately affected, as compared to the richer half of the borough.

Dear Sir/Madam,

It is unclear from the paperwork whether visitor parking vouchers that have already been issued will still be valid once the new scheme is introduced. This needs to be clarified in any Traffic Management Order and accompanying documents. If they will no longer be valid, I would then like to raise an objection as this should have been stated when the vouchers were purchased. However, I hope that this is not the case.

Dear Ms Cunningham

Some aspects of the proposal are not clear to me, so the first two of my objections are dependent on questions I raise below.

It is stated that permits should be used within the year purchased and that 'unused permits would therefore not be exchanged or refunded'. Does 'within the year purchased' mean within one year from the date of purchase, or within the same calendar year? The latter would mean that permits could be purchased in December and be invalid in January, so I assume this is not the case but if so I object to this approach. It should of course be one year from the date of purchase.

Once the 2 hour, 2 week and weekend permits are no longer available, will those currently held still be

valid? I assume so since many people will have bought these to use over the coming months. If my assumption is not correct, and they will not still be valid, I object on the basis that 270 they were purchased in good faith without knowledge of this proposal until after their purchase.

The Traders' permit is currently £8 per day or about £147 for one month. The proposed 'permission to park' permit is £20 per day, or about £400 for one month excluding any Saturday working. In the Statement of Reasons there is a focus on air quality and encouraging residents to use cleaner transport. What is the reason then for this massive increase for traders? I plan to have work done on my house taking up to 12 weeks in the next year or so. The council will be charging me at least £1200 for the Traders' vehicle (the trader buys the permit but of course the resident pays for it). This is unjustified and as mentioned above there is no attempt to justify it in the SOR. We cannot expect traders, who arrive with their equipment, to travel on public transport or bicycles. I object strongly to this huge and unexplained increase.

Finally I object to the timescale of this consultation. It was apparently published on 2nd February but you waited until 16th February to let residents know. As you will realise we do not look at the council web site regularly so it would have been a good idea to bring this proposal to our attention on 2nd rather than two weeks later and just one week before your deadline. This

delay is bound to generate suspicion that the council would prefer not to receive residents' comments on this proposal.

Hi,

I would like to raise an objection to your proposed amendments to the on street parking permits. I object to the fact that you are removing some of the types of permits available and therefore causing residents to have to purchase more to cover longer periods than are being offered.

Also, you are not refunding any unused tickets anymore, and those issued will only be for a year(?)....this is extremely annoying as people never know quite how many they will need, and when they might require them - and because you have now taken away the ability to purchase these in person at the customer services desks, residents visitors could fall foul of the parking wardens because they will be unable to get tickets. It takes an average of two weeks at least to do this by post or online (remember as well that not everyone is online, and this will particularly affect the elderly) and if it takes that long to get them you could easily run out because you wouldn't want to buy too many (-no refunds) and circumstances could happen where you might suddenly need several at once and use up the ones you had, then you can't get any more because it takes too long to get them, and maybe you'd need one for a doctor or something.

I also feel that your new proposals will open up the residents parking to all and sundry from outside the borough, and having to pay a small fortune for my parking I strongly object to opening this to everyone.....after all surely that is what the car parks and shared parking bays are for?

The system works at the moment, everyone knows what to do, why change it?

Dear Sirs

I want to protest against the visitor parking permits having to be all used within

A year. Previously the period was valid for longer. Can you advise the position on pensioners concessions on the actual yearly rate of payment for parking in Cromwell

Avenue. The communication received was not clear on the above points.

I am a Haringey resident in the Wood Green controlled parking zone.

I do not wish to have the cost of the parking permits greatly increased.

I do not want the permits to have a one year expiry date, as it is hard to plan exactly how many permits you will need each year as you cannot plan for family illness, urgent repairs to you property etc when you need to have parking permits ready in stock.

I do not want people to be able to buy excessive amounts of permits that they could sell on for other people to use to park in the Borough.

I would like to comment on the proposed amendments.

1. With regard to limiting visitor permits to a one year expiry: I only use mine occasionally for when tradespeople need to park therefore I would like to have ones that last more than a year. You are just increasing paperwork for people to have to apply annually for small numbers.

2. I would also like there to be places to park - therefore visitors permits numbers should be limited unless the residents are needing to have permits for carers.

3. Lastly I think that we should provide parking for essential people such as teachers in schools. I live near Tetherdown School where there is no parking on the grounds- I think that staff should be allowed to park for free in streets nearby during working hours.

Yours sincerely

Sent from my iPhone

I wonder if you can tell me the answer to the question below ie will I be able to use my outstanding 2 hour tickets which I have and which are valid until 2020.

----- Forwarded Message -----

Sent: Friday, 16 February 2018, 13:15

Subject: Parking charges

Will I be able to use up my 2-hour parking tickets which are valid until 2020?

Hi

I have just heard about these.

I live in a recently converted CPZ in Tottenham. I don't own a car but have purchased enough visitor permits to last a couple of years at a cost of over £100.

And you are now proposing to make changes making these invalid and even charging me for the pleasure of changing them (£11.80).

This is ludicrous and disgusting behaviour. I am a hard working single parent trying to make ends meet and do the right thing and give back to my community by volunteering while working and the local council propose this less than a year of putting something in place.

Please explain your reasoning for this, how you expect people to pay and justify making changes and charging us for these changes less than a year later.

I will be writing to the local MP as I have before as this is despicable behaviour.

I look forward to a reply.

Sent from my Samsung Galaxy smartphone.

Hello,

I live in Harringay and I've bought parking permits for visitors (1 hour, 2 hours and dailies) and wanted to check if I am free to keep using them or if they will expire?

I got a notice via email about parking permit changes and wasn't sure if it will affect me in this instance.

Dear Haringey

You are wrong to seek to introduce these new parking regulations without consultation. This is one reason I am giving you my views.

Firstly, the Parking Office cannot cope as it is. I am awaiting a reply which has long exceeded its target reply period.

Secondly, it is a mistake to reduce the life of permits to a single year. As a person working for the Council, you may have no idea how hard it is to renew or get additional permits. As a pensioner, I would like to draw to your attention that not all older people have computers, let alone scanners, and they may have great difficulty renewing permits on line. I cannot use a scanner, and am really worried about how I will get permits for the car we are buying. Especially as the Parking Office has not replied to my query about appointments.

278

And why should you scap refunds when the are in all morality reasonably requested?

You need to think again about your Parking Regulations, and to remember that the Council exists to serve the residents, so you owe it to us to have a user friendly scheme. We have got better things to do than spend time on our permits and vouchers every year. And while I am about it, please could you ensure that the Parking Office replies to me.

To whom it may concern

I have already expressed my objection to the hike in prices.

I wish to add that I object to the voiding of existing vouchers that we have purchased. You should have a phasing out scheme if anything.

279

Also we need the 2 hour and weekly passes. I have a friend and family looking after my house in August and will need a week pass for them.

I am in favour of the CPZ but this, this now seems just a money-making scheme.

Yours sincerely

I wish to object to the visitors parking permits only being valid for 1 year, i.e. the year they are purchased. It is impossible to know how many you will need for the year and the period they are valid for is already restricted, and many pensioners will have a supply in case they need them. At the very least we should be able to continue to use the ones we have until they expiry date. What will happen is everyone will only buy a small number and there will not be any that they throw away because they are out of date so the Council will lose in the end. When the CPZ Permits for this area were put in place Bounds Green CPZ was supposed to be at a

280

nominal charge, the excuse being that it was to stop the public who use the Tube to get to work

parking their cars. If residents can buy an unspecified amount of parking permits and they sell them to the travelling public this makes the Council reason for setting up the CPZ absolute nonsense. You can only screw so much money from householders, pensioners do not have a bottomless pit of money. Where is the public consultation, why have no leaflets been distributed. Again this Council has failed its residents.

To whom it may concern

The changes to the street parking only came to my attention on 2nd February . I, nor the other car holder in this household, were never involved in any prior consultation.

281

I do not agree with the plans and fear that the Borough will become a stop over for car users working in the city and surrounding areas. The new changes will also be more costly for residents. As a tax paying resident who has seen no improvement to our roads, I would like to have less grand schemes and more practical infrastructure. More money should be spent on filling potholes, cleaning streets and general road maintenance.

If you consulted more widely then you would really find out what the residents feel.

Proposed Amendments to District Parking Permits and Charges: Haringey CPZs, Order 210, T12

Objecting to 2(c) Visitors' Parking Permit Scheme :

"It is anticipated that those permits would be used within the year purchased and not stock piled for future years. Unused permits would therefore not be exchanged or refunded".

Objections -

1. that residents' would have to (over)estimate the number of permits they need before the year end, and probably be left with un refundable surplus - which would make a further and unjustifiable charge of 80p per unused / unusable permit over and above permits actually used;
2. that to comply with the Order it would also be necessary before the year's end to apply and pay for Permits for use in the next year, not to be in breach from 1 January;
3. that administratively this would create an undesirable pre-Christmas pinch-point for Haringey Council, and also for residents whom the Council exists to serve, and not inconvenience grossly.

These clauses should be removed from the Proposed Amendments.

I would like to object to the introduction of further charges for on street parking where I live. The operating hours of the restrictions are unnecessarily long and the charges are too much.

This appears to be yet another way of Haringey council making money out of local residents. I see people on my street everyday issuing tickets but yet I only see a street cleaner once a week and even then he doesn't have time to do his job properly. Haringey is dirty rubbish isn't cleared up and theres no initiatives to target problem spots. You need to spend your time on providing basic services rather than making the residents life more difficult and thinking up ways to charge more. Enfield doesn't have the extent of charges that Haringey does so why do you NEED to do this? Why do you need to abolish refunds! One things for sure is that all the new plans you have come up with are not designed to serve local residents.

Regards

Dear Sir/Madam

Having read through the proposals for the possible changes in parking permits I am strongly opposed to the changes.

1. Having purchased a significant amount of existing parking permits I think it is outrageous for there to be no refunds/repayment if any new scheme is introduced. I demand repayment for unused vouchers purchased in good faith.

284

2. I am strongly opposed to what is effectively a price rise in parking charges proposed in the new tables. This is exactly the behaviour every resident feared would happen from Haringey Council following the introduction of CPZ and will be resisted.

3. The incredibly short time for real consultation (the Council email only arrived on Feb 16th, two whole weeks after the publication of the proposals makes this 'consultation an absolute joke, although sadly very similar to almost all recent Council 'consultations.

As chair of Residents Network group I will be raising the issue with all our residents and will take up their views at our 1st March meeting.

Dear Haringey Council

I find the proposal to change the parking charges in Haringey most objectionable. We are already penalised for having a car and the right to park in our own st, but now you want to make parking even worse. It is often very difficult to park at busy times in parking zone areas but with lifting the limit in vouchers purchased, you will increase the trading of vouchers for parking.

285

I also strongly object to the expiry dates being added to them as this will mean more revenue for the council at the expense and stress of its residents. How are you to know how many vouchers you are going to need? It all depends on how popular you are or how many service visits you require throughout the year. I think it's scandalous and the council should seriously re think this proposal.

To who it may concern,

I write to concisely express my objection on the off chance that such objections are taken into account.

286

The consultation process is muddled and the proposed increases are unreasonable and unjust. It is not possible to predict the number of permits required in a particular year. Charging for issuing permits that expire within each calendar year, without the right to refund them is unjust.

Please look to make savings elsewhere - inwardly preferably.

Many of the proposals are terrible. In particular:

Unused permits are to expire. There is no good reason for this that I can find, it will only cause residents to buy more permits than they need, and to waste their money. This would be a clumsy and novel tax.

287

The increase is also out of proportion with the RPI and would be a clumsy and novel tax.

I object emphatically to the very short consultation period.

I object to the introduction of a 12 month expiry of parking permits. Residents should be able to either exchange the permits or to have a reasonable expiry period, such as 2 years. Residents should not be treated with mistrust; "stockpiling" as you have asserted.

288

Your justification for rationing permits is also flawed. 2 hour permits provides flexibility to residents and visitors and should not be discontinued.

It is noted the increase in permits will have an adverse impact to residents in poorer parts of the borough that have longer CPZ restrictions.

I wish to report my deep concerns about changes to visitor parking permits. I understand the Council is short of money but the abolition of 2 hour permits which currently cost 70p to have one hour permits for 80p each is excessive.

I am also particularly concerned that you have to use them within the year as sometimes I need them at short notice and I do not find it very easy to purchase new permits from you. In the past I have bought 20 2 hour permits which I use when needed which may be used over 2/3 years.

Please keep the 2 hour permits and don't have them expire within an one year.

Hello,

I just wanted to confirm as its not clear from the below that if you have visitor day and hourly permits that you haven't used they are still valid, and will remain valid, if the proposals are adopted rather than having to buy new ones immediately.

I note the proposed changes and that in the future visitors permits will have an expiry date. Will passes already issued remain valid?

Yours,

A number of issues arise from your proposals.

1. If we already have visitors permits of which I bought plenty and were valid till 2020 would I be able to use them up or will they become invalid and I lose the money I paid for them?

2. If not, would this be legal to have had people pay for them with certain validity only to find they are worthless?

3. The proposals to limit the permits to only one hour seems anomalous since we have a 2 hour restriction in place. Wouldn't it be more sensible to retain 2 hour permits to save having to scratch off 2 cards at a time and because most visitors, family or friends are likely to be there for 2 hours especially if they are staying over as my daughters sometimes do.

4. If this were to be implemented which I am not happy about, when would it be implemented.

5. Only being able to buy visitors permits that last only 1 year seems difficult to plan since visitors arrivals can be erratic and either people may not buy enough for the year or would lose money on unused permits which again seems unfair.

6. Can I have some clarity on the £11 20?? admin fee for what? For issuing visitors permits or annual permits? I do not recall having to make this payment in the single year that our CPZ has been in place and if this has to be paid each time we apply for permits that would make them quite expensive for someone like myself who no longer works. The concessionary rate of 34p for 2 hours would rise to £1.60 until I reach 65. This is almost a 500% increase. Is this appropriate? Maybe people already on concessionary rates could remain on them and only apply the 65 year old concession arrangement to new applicants or in new CPZs?

Could you please respond to these concerns asap and indicate whether we are able to officially object to these proposals.

Thank you for your time

Hello

I previously had a permit for Seymour Road, however I have moved out of this property and subsequently do not require the permit. Is there any way of claiming back the money on the permit?

Thanks

To whom it may concern,

I would like to lodge by objection to the current parking permit amendments being considered:

Withdrawing the limit per year will create more congestion on the roads

Not allowing residents to exchange out of date permits isn't acceptable on top of a price increase.... where is the justice in that.

It would be nice to think that your decisions were in favour of the Haringey people as opposed to against.

I bought over £200 of visitor parking permits and have over £100 left. Am i able to use these with the proposed changes or do I need to exchange/refund them. it is not clear.

Regards

Sent from my Samsung Galaxy smartphone.

I am writing to object to some of the proposals contained in "Proposed Amendments to on Street Parking Permits and Charges. The Haringey (Controlled Parking Zones) (Amendment No. *) Order 201".

These proposals include the removal of the right offered to residents by the current traffic management orders to a refund for any unused visitors parking permits. Specifically the proposed new orders state "It is anticipated that those permits would be used within the year purchased.....Unused permits would....not be exchanged or refunded".

Most residents are not able to plan exactly how many permits they will need. The new proposals will make it more difficult to manage visitor parking without buying a surfeit of permits that will will now expire more quickly and be non-refundable.

297 Also included in these proposals is a change which increases the cost of visitor parking by more than double.

As a policy, these changes are tantamount to a move towards more regressive local taxation and will unduly impact on the poorest in the borough.

I would urge the Council to review the cost increases as they allow those with money to use Haringey as a giant car park whilst stopping those on more limited budgets having friends or family over with cars.

Perhaps you could consider an online system for the issue of visitor parking such as is used on other London Boroughs of easier?

I wish to object to the proposed amendments insofar as they may invalidate about 15 2 hour vouchers purchased by me from Haringey some time ago and which remain unused to date. There was no limit of time on their use and it would be unlawful for Haringey, having sold them to me to use, then to declare them invalid.

Hello,

I've just read your announcement about changes to visitors parking permits. I recently bought a number of visitor permits which have a validity until 2020. Please can you confirm that these will continue to be valid and useable until 2020?

I understand that charges need to be increased and whilst they seem high, I am not objecting to the increased cost.

I am however, objecting to the intention " that those permits would be used within the year purchased and not stock piled for future years. Unused permits would therefore not be exchanged or refunded" (clause c). This seems inappropriate and illogical, particularly as the permits I currently hold state 2019 as an end date. Surely these permits should be considered in the same way as postage stamps i.e. once bought, they have no end date? Until such time as the end date is clearly shown as being the current year, I see no reason for the Council imposing this condition.

Hi,

I have received an email informing me that there will be changes to the price of my resident permit and to the cost of visitors permits from 70p to £1.60 for the two hours required to cover restrictions in our road (Nelson road n8).

Could you confirm what will happen to the existing visitors permits that we have purchased?

I couldn't tell from the information available what date the changes will be coming into effect, and I have a number of existing vouchers.

Will we continue to be able to use them or will we receive refunds for any that are not able to be used?

Thank you,

Hello

I have three queries about this change:

- Assuming that there are no major objections, when will the proposed change come into effect?
- When the proposed change comes into effect, will I be able to continue to use the existing visitors parking vouchers that I have previously bought?
- If I cannot use the existing parking vouchers after the change, how can I obtain a refund?

Many thanks

To whom it may concern,

While I agree in principle with the measures proposed, I would like to note my opposition to some aspects of it:

- cost of parking permits aligned to CO2 emission bands: For any resident who already owns a car, the premise that increasing the cost of parking will encourage more fuel efficient vehicles is completely false, as it would require that residents sold their existing cars to purchase newer vehicles. This is particularly insulting to common sense when most residents won't have access to electric charging points anywhere near their homes. The only way in which such measure would be fair is that it were applied to cars purchased from the date of this order being effective. All cars already owned before this date, would still be kept on the old bands, the same as for cars registered before March 2001.
- simplification and limits to visitor permits. I fail to understand how this would encourage people to use other forms of transport. It has been said that new permits would expire in 12 months and be non-refundable but this is unclear in your document. If this passes through, I would expect Haringey Council to make available a system where one could purchase hourly passes with free next-day delivery.

Best regards,

Dear Sirs,

With regards to the proposed changes can you please confirm that the existing permits purchased in good face will still remain valid on the terms upon which they were purchased.

Can you also consider extending the proposed 12 month validity for new vouchers to 24 months to avoid unused vouchers becoming invalid and to reduce admin costs involved,

304

The cost for the hourly permits will increase from 35p to 80p. This is a massive hike in costs, could this increase be reviewed and set at a more reasonable fee of say 50p.

With kind regards,

Thank you for your e-mail. I trust that there will be provisions for those having permits (for parking and visitors) extending beyond the commencement of the new orders.

305

Regards

Hi !

This an objection to the PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ON STREET PARKING PERMITS AND CHARGES, in particular to the changes of the Visitors Parking Permit (VPP) shortening validity to just one year and the removal of the 2hours vpp.

Thanks

Dear Haringey

I am a council taxpayer and live on Hillfield Avenue I object to the increase in parking permit fees

1. I did not receive any notification of an increase in the fee for parking permits

307

2. I currently have 6 unused permits that I keep on hand for the extremely occasional use of workmen attending my property.

Are these still valid for use even if the price goes up? i would want a refund for the money I've paid to Haringey otherwise.

3. Why wasn't I informed? Random fly-posting is not effective in multi-occupancy buildings.

I look forward to a swift reply.

Have today received your e-mail about proposed changes to residents parking permits and would like to query the following please....

A) when are these proposed changes possibly coming into effect?

B) are you going to honour the passes we already have: ie I still have daily, weekend and even some of the original 4 hour ones! Since these have already been paid for I hope sincerely that you will.

C) reading your info it sounds as if you are going to let all and sundry park in Haringey if they apply, surely these outsiders can use the car parks or the pay and displays that are available. I don't see why they should be allowed to park if they don't live here.

Hello,

I recently purchased a residential permit to park. At the time of purchase the permit was supposed to arrive and be valid today. (16th February 2018). It hasn't arrived by post. When can I expect it and will I be subject to a penalty charge notice for not displaying the permit. Your immediate response is required.

Thank you

I have received your email concerning proposed amendments to On Street Parking Permits and Charges.

I note that it is proposed to change Visitors Parking Permits. I have purchased Visitors Parking Permits that are valid until the end of 2018. Can you confirm that these will continue to be valid this year, regardless of any changes to the policy introduced in 2018?

Hello

311

I cannot see what I am supposed to do with the 2 hour visit permits I have for visitors under the new changes. Can you advise please.

Thank s and regards

Hi

I have received your email about the changes to parking permits in our area and have a couple of questions.

1 - will the current visitor parking permits that we have still be valid once the new scheme comes in? We hold 2 hour visitor permits that are dated for another couple of years.

2 - when do the new visitor permits start being sold and / or come into use? Can we still buy the current 2 hour permits?

3 - will we be able to buy the new permits locally or will we need to buy them online? How long will they take to arrive if ordered online?

I do understand the logic in realigning the residents permits and charging accordingly but do strongly object to making the new 1 hour permits more expensive than the current 2 hour permits, along with the fact that they will run out in the year they are bought as it's not easy to predict how many you need and receive them in enough time when they are needed.

Kind regards

Sent from my iPhone

Dear Sirs,

I
limit
up.

object to the proposed resident's visitor parking permit charges. There should be no time
313 on when they can be used, two hour permits should continue, and charges should not go

Best regards,

HARINGEY COUNCIL – PUBLIC NOTICE

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ON STREET PARKING PERMITS AND CHARGES

Although I welcome the proposal to align the cost to CO2 emissions, I object the proposed changes to visitor parking permits on the following grounds:

- 1) The current 2-hour Visitor Permits are practical for visitors staying over one hour, and avoid the need to display an unwieldy number of permits. They are convenient both for residents and for visitors and I see not justification for discontinuing them. Therefore I object to their discontinuation.
- 2) The price of 1-hour Visitor Permits has a proposed increase of more than double (from 35p to 80p), which I find very hard to justify, especially considering that the maximum number of permits per household would be lifted.
- 3) The new price of permits does not correspond to an equal improvement of the service itself. As permits will now have a shelf life limited to 12 months, the proposed change is a disimprovement on current standards. I understand the Council's intention to encourage using other forms of transport, but such a steep increase in price, correlated with widening access to 314 visitor permits to anyone who applies, seems contradictory. It is hard to see this as anything other than a revenue generating move, badged as an attempt to encourage other forms of transport. For these reasons, I object both to the price rise and to the extension of access to visitor permits to all comers. is only affecting those who cannot do otherwise. For these reasons, I objected to such a rise in price.
- 4) I object to the proposal of not being able to use visitors permits acquired in previous years. Such a proposal is unreasonable. gThe Council is slow in issuing visitor parking permits (days by post, or hours queuing, which is not always possible) therefore it is often useful to have a few spare ones at home. It would be different if they could be purchased on-line and printed straight away, but this is not the case. Furthermore, given that resident parking permits can be refunded in case residents leaving the area, the same principle should apply to visitor parking permits.
- 5) I find the Council's suggestion that 'more car journeys = fewer car journeys' questionable. Changing the current policy of limiting permits to residents, and doling out visitor permits to anyone, from anywhere, who wants them will turn Noel Park, Parklands and Harringay into a park-and-ride car park for outer London residents. This will contravene the London Mayor's Clean Air Plan.

Attn. Anne Cunningham

I understand via the Stroud Green Residents Association that you are going to substantially increase the cost of parking permits in this CPZ. I also understand that you posted this information on the 2nd February without informing me, nor did you send the email explaining

315 your plans either to me or to we both have a permit at the same address.

Not only are you planning to increase the cost of these permits which are essential in the event of household emergencies, but are also time limiting these to the year of purchase. How are we supposed to know how many will be needed each year? But of course that is of no interest to you or your accountants.

This is another example of Haringey council's outrageous, objectionable and venal behaviour, filling its own coffers with no regard to the needs of the community.

Dear Haringey,

I am writing to object to some of the proposals contained in "Proposed Amendments to on Street Parking Permits and Charges. The Haringey (Controlled Parking Zones) (Amendment No. *) Order 201".

These proposals include the removal of the right offered to residents by the current traffic management orders to a refund for any unused visitors parking permits. Specifically the proposed new orders state "It is anticipated that those permits would be used within the year purchased.....Unused permits would....not be exchanged or refunded".

Most residents are not able to plan exactly how many permits they will need. The new 316 proposals will make it more difficult to manage visitor parking without buying a surfeit of permits that will now expire more quickly and be non-refundable.

Also included in these proposals is a change which increases the cost of visitor parking by more than double.

As a policy, these changes are tantamount to a move towards more regressive local taxation and will unduly impact on the poorest in the borough.

I would urge the Council to reviews the cost increases and to consider an online system for the issue of visitor parking such as is used on other London Boroughs.

I am writing to object to some of the proposals contained in "Proposed Amendments to on Street Parking Permits and Charges. The Haringey (Controlled Parking Zones) (Amendment No. *) Order 201".

These proposals include the removal of the right offered to residents by the current traffic management orders to a refund for any unused visitors parking permits. Specifically the proposed new orders state "It is anticipated that those permits would be used within the year purchased.....Unused permits would....not be exchanged or refunded".

Most residents, myself included, are not able to plan exactly how many permits they will need. The new proposals will make it more difficult to manage visitor parking without buying a surfeit of permits that will now expire more quickly and be non-refundable.

Also included in these proposals is a change which increases the cost of visitor parking by more than double which I think is completely unreasonable. I do not have a problem with the limits currently applied to the purchase of visitors permits so I do not understand why you would remove these limits? I also don't understand the logic you've used to say that removing the limit on visitors permits will encourage people to use alternative forms of transport – surely it will encourage the exact opposite?

As a policy, these changes are tantamount to a move towards more regressive local taxation and will unduly impact on the poorest in the borough.

I would urge the Council to review the cost increases and to consider an online system for the issue of visitor parking such as is used on other London Boroughs.

Dear Sir/Madam

Last year I bought a bulk of visitor permits because of building work on my home. I have quite a few tickets still left to use. I understand that the rules are changing regarding visitor parking in

Haringey and I'm concerned because of the new regulations I will not get a refund for the tickets I have left over. Can you please advise me - if you can phone me that would be great. My number is

I'm also due to renew my parking permit and will be 65 years in September. Can you please advise if i will still be able to buy a permit using a concessionary rate?

Thank you.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write to formally object to the proposed traffic order Haringey (Controlled Parking Zones) (Amendment No. *) Order 201* T12 dated 2nd February 2018. My objection relates specifically to a sentence in section 2(c):

It is anticipated that those permits would be used within the year purchased and not stock piled for future years. Unused permits would therefore not be exchanged or refunded.

319 I have objection to the above line for the following reasons:

1. Due to the 1-2 week turn around from ordering to delivery of visitor permits, coupled with the ad hoc nature of the need to use visitor permits, residents have no choice but to order permits in advance. The proposal to not exchange or refund permits will therefore cause huge numbers of unused permits to expire and having to be repurchased causing unnecessary expense for residents.

2. The requirement to have permits used in the year purchased creates a unbalanced situation that permits purchased at the start of the year have a longer life compared to those purchased at the end of the year, despite the cost remaining the same.

The above problems could be avoided by moving the visitor permit scheme into either the existing digital pay and display scheme (PayByPhone) or to use an alternative provider such as MiPermit (www.mipermit.com) that does specifically offer an online visitor permit scheme.

I would be interested to know what steps have been take to investigate the feasibility of making the resident and visitor permit scheme an electronic process.

I look forward to your response.

Kind regards

To who it may concern,

I would like to formally object to the proposed changes to the street parking permits and charges.

My objection is specifically related to the expiration of the visitor parking vouchers.

320

Once you have purchased visitor parking permits they should be able to be used over a 4-5 year period (as the current system) and not expire within the year. Visitors are very infrequent and therefore I don't believe the proposed changes are fair.

Kind regards

Hello,

. I've got annual residence parking permit which expires the end of this year.

Could you please tell me what I should do to avoid any further penalties?

321

Don't hesitate to contact if you need more details from me!

Thank you in advance

Dear Sir/Madam,

I received your notification about CPZ permit charge changes by email yesterday, 14th February.

I haven't had much chance to study the proposals in detail yet but I did notice that I could send any objections or representations to yourselves within 21 days from the date of the notice.

322

1. Can I check with you that I will have 21 days from the date of receiving the notice on 14th February making the deadline 14th March and not 21 days from the 2nd February (the date on the notice) making the deadline 2nd March as that would, unfairly, only give residents 16 days to consider the proposals?
2. When are these proposed changes, if agreed, due to come into effect?
3. I already have some visitor permits - 9 two hour and 4 daily, which have a use-by date of 2020. Will I still be able to use these if the new charges are introduced?

323

I object to the proposed new charges on the basis that you have failed to take into account the fact that diesel cars whilst having lower CO2 emissions will have higher NOX and other pollutant emissions than petrol cars. There is no reason why you should not have a surcharge for diesel cars, like many other boroughs in London have done.

Dear Sir/Madam

I would like to raise my concerns and express objections to proposals outlined in Proposed Parking Charges issued 02/02/18.

I am a longstanding resident of Haringey and contribute to the borough both as a tax payer and as a Registered Foster Carer.

I understand concerns about the environment and I support greater use of public transport. However, the council needs to recognise that many people have a legitimate need for a car without which their lives would be restricted. I am a foster carer and a part time manager, and someone with a long term health problem which limits my ability to use public transport. I am also a musician transporting heavy equipment regularly. Without a car I would not be able to do my day job or work as a musician. I am sure there are others with similar issues.

In relation to your proposals:

(a) vary the parking charges of on-street parking permits as set out in the Schedule below. The

324 new tariff structure incorporates the CO2 emission bands used by the DVLA and is intended to

encourage people to travel more sustainably and for drivers to use more fuel efficient vehicles. This also introduces a 6 month permit option for residents and carers permits;

The annual cost for me would be £180. This represents a 60% increase on £114 which is excessive.

(b) discontinue the traders permit, which currently allow traders working at properties in CPZs to purchase daily or monthly trader permits. This would be replaced with a 'permission to park' dispensation. This new system would allow traders to apply for the dispensation online and the charge would be £20 per day. This dispensation could also be extended to other ad hoc situations where motorists legitimately require parking, but are not entitled or cannot satisfy requirements for other permits, for example house removals;

I don't know what the current cost is but £20 per day is exorbitant and will discourage trade and employment in an area with high levels of unemployment

(c) amend the residents' visitors' parking permit scheme so that the permits would be limited to hourly and daily operation. This would remove the need for an upper limit on numbers that could be purchased and It is anticipated that those permits would be used within the year purchased and not stock piled for future years. Unused permits would therefore not be exchanged or refunded. It is also proposed that the charge for hourly permits would be increased to 80p per hour;

I have purchased a number of permits and because this is a new scheme it has not been possible to estimate the level of need. If the council does not allow residents to use the permits already issued, which have been purchased in good faith, this is tantamount to theft on the part of the council. Residents should at the very least be given the option of a refund. There should be scope to use up permits within at least a 2 year period because it is impossible to estimate level of use.

(d) increase the age at which residents may access the concessionary half price residents' visitors' permit scheme from 60 years to 65 years and over. There are no proposed changes to the concessionary scheme that applies to registered disabled residents;

Dear Ms Cunningham

We have recently been made aware of a consultation regarding changes to the implementation of the CPZ currently in operation in our area (BGN in my case).

While I am and have always been, very much in support of the CPZ and I can see the point of the changes to encourage the use of more emissions friendly vehicles (although this doesn't address Nos emissions anyway which is what is most talked about currently) there are a couple of aspects of the proposed changes that I must protest about.

325

1. The nullification of the current visitors permits: We have, as seemed sensible, purchased a number of visitors permits to cover future visitors. Making these permits invalid when the changes go through, would be wrong and be akin to theft in many peoples eyes. At the very least we should be able to 'sell' the permits back to the council for the new style permit or a refund.

2. The 'Permission to park' permit: Later on in the year we are planning on having some significant work done on our house. This will require a builder to park their vehicle nearby for a significant period, likely 12 weeks or more. It would seem that they would be expected to pay £20 a day for this, which is £120 per week or £1440 (at least) in total. Can this be right? If that is right it seems somewhat extortionate. In addition, these figures are for one vehicle only, on occasion I imagine there will be more, £20 a day seems too excessive.

1 As it is we have parking restrictions seven days a week starting at 8.30am in the morning until 10.30pm and that means friends or family can not come to visit if we do not have care parking tickets. Extra expense and privileges lost.

2 That is not all Gas, Electricity companies, builders will not do any work unless they are given a parking ticket.

3 Haringey is one of the highest council tax paying Boroughs in London. What are the privileges that we are offered if parking permits are also raised, when most working people are
326 finding it hard to pay their council tax.

4 The fact this proposals has not being well publicized and people are not aware of it. I only new because of the email sent to me by the Lib dem which says there are 2 days before the consultation period ends, which

is not a fare view of the people living and working in Haringey.

5 I would like the time extended and public meetings be held and leaflets put through the letter boxes for people to know their rights. The documentation be modified and in point form order easy to read and understand. Thank you

Dear Sir/Madam

I have not received a response to my previous email dated 16th February.

Your email outlining the massive increase in Parking Permits was sent on 16th Feb, although it was dated 2nd Feb. Unless the consultation period is extended beyond 23rd Feb this will not allow sufficient time for the residents affected to reply in line with your own criteria.

I do not agree with the increases as it will have a detrimental impact on low income, disabled,

327 and/or elderly residents requiring frequent visits from family/carers. My parents are 90 years old and with Council services becoming increasingly difficult to access the family I am very concerned that this move will further reduce the help available to keep them safe in their own home.

I also do not accept that Visitors Parking Permits should run out at the end of each year as the amount required cannot always be predicted and the elderly, disabled or sick will be unfairly pressurised to spend more than may be necessary under this policy.

I would appreciate a response as this proposal deserves a full consultation as it will effect a large number of vulnerable people.

To whom it concerns,

I've heard the visitor parking permits may increase in price and I want to strongly object to this. Living in an area with parking restrictions for long hours and on weekends is incredibly restrictive for seeing family and friends and having any kind of repairs done to your house. Which is especially frustrating, not to mention lonely and depressing when you have a young child or someone to care for.

Personally we live so far from the tube I can't understand the justification for any parking restrictions beyond an hour or two in the middle of the day.

What's more to increase the cost is extortionate. This is just a disgusting way to disguise another tax on local people. If you want to add tax to the council rates do it openly and fairly, not in a way that restricts our movements and our visitation rights.

328

Plus the traffic service has already, twice, failed to send me my vouchers on time, so twice I've had to contact the service and chase them. Likewise people on my street have had the same service and we've had to share vouchers at last minute instances. This shows locals are already not getting the service we pay for, and so increasing the fees is not acceptable.

As locals we have also already been charged extra by the council to recycle garden waste at a cost of £75 a year, these additional fees are becoming offensive. Not to mention for those that can not already afford the current fees. The council are creating an environment where only the wealthy can afford the luxuries of friends/family visiting, workmen to carry out repairs and their gardens to be kept tidy.

Please register my opposition to the increase in fees.

Good morning,

Please can you advise what the best course of action is. My father is coming to the end of his visitor car parking permits which allow for the 2 hour parking restriction in this road. I am his daughter and will soon be moving back to this address. How do I go about getting a parking permit for my car? It's a

329

Also we will be having building work done fairly soon so should we get a builders permit or can we use the visitors permits as the builders permits are only valid for a month and the work will take longer than this time?

I look forward to hearing from hearing from someone soon in order to sort out my parking before the visitor permits run out.

I have no issue with the majority of changes, but I want to object to 2 aspects of the proposed amendment to street parking in Haringey,namely:

- the £20 permission to park dispensation

By removing trader permits, you are effectively increasing the cost of any building work required to properties in the borough by £20 a day, as this cost will undoubtedly be passed on to residents.

So large projects (e.g. a new roof or an extension) will cost me, the resident, an additional £100 per working week. How can you justify this ?

330

- expiry of visitor parking permits (with no refunds)

You cannot expect residents to know exactly how many visitors they will have in a year. Permit hoarding is not a reason for this approach, especially if you provide the means to reclaim unused permits.

If you are going to set an expiry date on permits, you have to provide the ability to claim a refund on unused permits (with a small admin fee).

I can well understand the parking, pollution and traffic congestion in Crouch End. However, I am concerned the impact it will affect me, my situation is:-

331

- 1 I live alone
- 2 I do not live close to a bus stop
- 3 I have had 3 hip replacements
- 4 My social life is based on easy access to my favourite coffee shops
- 5 I do not qualify for disability allowance
- 6 My pensions are limited and do not include inflation linked
- 7 I am 83 years old

I would be glad if you could consider my predicament

I am objecting to proposed changes to parking permits in Haringey, which will discriminate against people under 65 who have frequent short visits from carers.

Also, taking away concessions from those between 60-65 discriminates against single people on low incomes.

332

Additionally, removing the one hour permits is unfair, given that sometimes an essential visit can be under one hour.

I suggest that these changes are purely to raise extra revenue for the council and are not in the interests of residents, which is why they have not been publicised.

I am writing to let you know that I have an objection to these proposals in respect of the Visitor Permits.

I am sure that I am not alone in using these permits almost exclusively for visits by traders to maintain or repair appliances, plumbing etc. These visits mostly take more than one and less than two hours. Most of these traders will not visit unless a permit is supplied.

333

The effect of these proposals, in particular the discontinuance of the two hour permit, will be to more than double the cost of the visit since almost always two one hour permits will be required.

Also since such visits are often urgent it is necessary to keep a stock of these permits. If they are only valid for the current year there will inevitably be costly wastage.

I believe that the implications of these proposals have not properly been thought out, and that they are inequitable.

Subject: Proposed Parking Charges, Consultation 2/2/18

I am sending in my comments to this consultation document late, one working day after deadline of 23rd Feb. This is because such a brief period, of 4 days, was given for response.

1. I welcome those measures which impose higher charges on the more polluting vehicles.
2. I object to the abolition of the 2 hour permits which are very useful for visiting trades people in particular. The cost of a visitor for two hours would under these proposals rise from 70p to £1.60. This seems unfair.
3. I have on occasion been approached by business people with premises on my road asking me to buy large numbers of visitors' permits on their behalf. I have refused and I think that the proposal to end any limit on the number of permits that an individual can purchase would lead to an increase in this practice which is undesirable.
4. The proposal to make visitor permits valid for only one year also seems unfair. It is very difficult to predict future needs and I for one have lost quite a bit of money by being over generous in ordering.
5. I support the campaign (see Ham and High, 22nd February) for carers to be given free parking permits as is the case in L.B. of Waltham Forest.

I trust that you will take my comments into account although they are a day late.

Received your email on the proposed changes and wish to make an objection to the fact that visitors parking permits will no longer be subject to a limited allocation. This seems absurd given that residents can already apply for permits in significant numbers as it is. Parking is extremely difficult for permit holders in Crouch End as it is, and this will clearly just worsen a bad situation. As a permit holder, I already have to pay to park, and can rarely get a space anywhere near my house.

There is no transparency here on Haringey's rationale for this whatsoever. I viewed link but cannot find any further information whatsoever. I also can't find anything on the proposed cost increases. Please can you be more explicit as to where this information can be found?

Look forward to hearing from you further.

Hi

With regards to the proposed parking changes dated 2 February 2018, I do not agree with these amendments. It seems to go against having a controlled parking zone if you don't limit the number of visitor passes. It is also to the detriment of residents who live in these CPZ especially where they live near a tube station for example as you are encouraging people to drive to the station and the surrounding streets are effectively a car park as they don't need to be conscious of the limited number of passes they have.

It would seem that a more environmentally friendly solution would to have more local buses during peak periods.

337

As a resident of Priory Gardens, I'd like to add my voice to concerns about the risk of unlimited sales of hourly / daily Highgate Tube CPZ parking passes as this runs the risk of abuse whereby Priory Gardens reverts to being a free-for-all parking wise, but with the council making some money from the inconvenience we will suffer

338

I am writing to object to proposed amendments to on street parking at Priory gardens, N6, namely 'visitors parking permits not being subject to a limited allocation'.

If there was an unlimited amount of Visitor Permits available, people could sell them to nonresidents and Priory Gardens could once again be the de facto car park to Highgate Station (as it was before we campaigned for the CPZ)!

This proposal encourages people that don't live in Priory Gardens to use their car to drive and park in priory gardens and then take public transport. Wouldn't it be better if they used public transport to get to the highgate tube station? There are number of buses such as W5, 134, 43, 263 going by that public can use to get them to Highgate station rather than the cars.

One of the key facets of the approved stadium transport strategy is the introduction by Enfield and Haringey Councils of an enlarged Major Event Day Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). These enlarged CPZs, in conjunction with recent and ongoing investment in the public transport network serving the stadium and additional mitigation measures being implemented by the Club itself, are intended to drive down the private car mode share in order to ensure that the local and strategic road network can cope with the increased stadium capacity.

Haringey Council has effectively already installed the enlarged Major Event Day CPZ. Enfield Council is currently consulting on its part of the CPZ extension, but with the intention that it is also in place before the first stadium events. Both Councils must produce a CPZ Code of Enforcement to ensure that that CPZ is enforced and therefore effective. The implementation of the Major Event Day CPZ extensions and the production of the Code of Enforcement are S.106 planning obligations upon each local authority.

The old White Hart Lane stadium eventually closed with a reduced capacity of approximately 32,000. Spurs is playing its home games for the 2017/18 season away from the area at Wembley Stadium and the new stadium will have an opening capacity of approximately 62,000.

It is imperative therefore that all key aspects of the stadium transport strategy are in place and effective.

1. concerned about the apparent removal of any cap on the number of daily visitors permits that can be purchased by residents. Even with the levying of a relatively small charge (£3.50), the system could potentially be open to abuse and the operation of the CPZ undermined, if passes are sold on to spectators on Major Event Days (as has been experienced at other venues). This could increase parking pressure in the area on Major Event Days; exacerbate the impact of any road closures; and adversely affect the operation of both TfL buses and the Club's own shuttle buses. What steps will the Council be taking to eliminate or reduce this risk?

2. also concerned about the timing of the proposed amendments in light of the increase in stadium capacity; the introduction of a significant extension to the Major Event Day CPZ in both Haringey and Enfield; and the absence of any Code of Enforcement (which we understand is still being drafted) to ensure that the Major Event Day CPZ will be operated effectively. Would it not be more prudent to assess the operation of the new stadium and the effectiveness of the enlarged CPZ and wider transport strategy over the first season or two before implementing any changes that might potentially undermine its operation?

I am writing to object to the new parking permit proposals. I discovered these proposals only by a chance notification from the Liberal Democrats, and even this information did not disclose the full details of these proposals. The failure to send a postal notification is a clear breach of your obligation to keep all residents fully informed and to give them the opportunity to object.

My objections to the substance of the changes are as follows:

1 The lifting of the limit to the number of visitor permits allowed is foolish. It carries the risk that people living in high parking demand areas will buy excessive numbers of permits in order to sell these at a premium for non-resident parking - for example, on match days or to allow commuter parking. This is also a clear contradiction to the council's stated aim of reducing car

use in the borough.

2 Linked to this there can be no justification for the expiry of visitor permits after only one year with no refund permitted. This constitutes an unfair burden on those who cannot predict easily the number of visitors they may receive. It is likely that faced with the prospect of losing money from out of date unused permits, people will sell them as described in point 1 above. There would be no prospect of policing such abuse.

Yours

To whom it may concern,

I object in the strongest terms to your suggested changes to the distribution of parking permits for a variety of reasons, not least the fact that it will encourage people from all over the borough to park in Priory Gardens in order to use the tube.

If you really want to encourage people to use public transport then please work with TFL to ensure that there is a bus route up Shepherd's Hill, not just to the roundabout by Stanhope Gardens but all the way up to Highgate Library.

341

I did not live in the street when there were no parking permits in place but I have been told by many that it was incredibly difficult for residents to park. This is not "fair".

I hope you take the considerations of the residents who live on the street most likely to be affected with utmost seriousness.

Dear Sirs,

I am writing in response to the proposal to allow the unlimited purchase of visitors parking permits in the CPZ around our home at Priory Gardens

I believe allowing the purchase of unlimited numbers of visitor permits would undermine the purpose of having a CPZ for residents. It would create a market in these vouchers and destroy the access to parking for residents that the current system allows. Of course the system should

342

allow some visitors' permits, as the current system does. But to remove any cap on the number people can buy would simply turn our street and others near the tube station into a park and ride zone rather than an area where residents could have a reasonable assumption of finding a space. Parking is already tight in our street but at the moment most residents who have purchased permits can find a space most of the time.

I hope this proposal does not go ahead and that you retain a cap on the number of visitor permits that people can buy.

Yours sincerely,

I would like to register my objections to the proposal for parking charges.

I would also like to complain about the lack of publicity for this substantial change to existing arrangements: without being told by a third party, I would have had no way of knowing of these proposals. They do not even appear on the list of consultations on the Haringey website. All issues subject to consultation should appear there; putting them only under Traffic Management Orders could be considered to be hiding them.

My first objection is to the cost of permits for carers: It seems extraordinary that Haringey would levy a substantial charge on carers providing a vital and generally poorly paid or voluntary service. I would urge the re-examination of this aspect of the proposal.

My remaining objections are confined to Visitors Permits. I am not directly affected by other types of permits, and do not have time to assess the proposal.

Visitors Permits:

When Haringey introduced the CPZ in Bounds Green, it was to address the problem of parking being monopolised by day commuters and longer term parking by people using local transport links to access airports and stations and leaving cars parked for the duration of their trip. This objective has largely been met. We were told that charges would be set at a reasonable rate to cover the costs of the scheme.

The current proposals introduce:

1a steep increase in cost (more than double for two hours of parking):

It is not clear why this is being imposed. Parking schemes are supposed to cover their costs, not to make a profit for the council. Either the council is taking a profit or the costs have spiralled out of control.

2a reduction in flexibility:

Currently many of the Haringey CPZs are for two hours daily. A two hour visitor's permit is therefore extremely useful. I urge the council to retain two hour permits.

It is proposed that permits will be valid only for a year, and that unused permits will not be refunded. This is a significant worsening of the current system, and whilst I understand that the council would like to retain flexibility for future years, this should not come at the cost of worsening the service to residents. The lack of a refund for unused tickets smacks of sharp practice, which does unfortunately appear to be an increasing feature of public administration. It will also lead to a cost increase for the council since residents will need to make a purchase every year, and possibly all at the same time of year. It is sadly difficult to be confident that Haringey will be able to service this requirement effectively.

3the potential for more permits to be offered for resale:

The proposal states that supplying only one hour or daily visitor permits would remove the need for a cap on the number that could be purchased. However, this statement and the logic behind are far from clear. What is clear is that there would be significant potential to buy permits for resale, thus subverting the whole point of the CPZs. It would also allow residents in developments where planning permission has been allowed on the basis that residential parking permits will not be available to subvert the planning intention by using visitor permits.

To whom it may concern

I am concerned about this change in policy as the whole reason we agreed to a CPZ in Priory Gardens was to have control over the number of cars parked in the street. Before CPZ and restricted numbers of visitor permits were introduced as a resident in the road it was impossible to park your car during the day as people would park their car on the road to then use the tube.

344 The benefit of paying to park your car on the road is that you can actually park your car on the road. If you give unlimited visitors permits then you are allowing people to pass permits out to any number of people and we will run into the same problem. The problem will be worse this time around as I use to have to park my car a long way down Shepherds Hill, that is now a different CPZ so I will have nowhere to park my car.

I do believe this a genuine problem as during the years of there being CPZ I have been regularly approached by people asking me to give them visitor permits so they can park on the road. I have always refused and only used the visitor permits for my visitors.. But taking off the limit will enable people in the wider Zone to give permits away freely as there is no downside to them doing so.

I am concerned about the proposed changes to the parking charges in Controlled Parking Zones. The main issues are:

1. The abolition of the limit on the number of visitor permits that can be purchased, particularly the daily permits. As a resident in the Highgate Station zone, I am concerned that people from outside this zone are being encouraged to come and park by the station. My road, which leads directly to the station, is a cul-de-sac and cannot support non-residential parking on the scale that this plan suggests.

Can you please assure me that visitor permits will only be issued for use by residents in their particular controlled zone. Is it

technically possible that anyone, regardless of where they live, could purchase a year's supply of daily permits (at a reasonable

345 weekly rate of £17.50) that would enable them to park by Highgate Station and continue their commute by public transport?

Are all visitor permits the same throughout the borough?

This would negate the whole point of residents' parking zones.

2. I am concerned in the increase in cost to carers, they deserve a reduction.

Otherwise, I agree in principal with the measures proposed.

Kind regards

Dear Sir/Madam,

I wish to object to the proposals to increase parking permit charges in Haringey and to lift the restriction on the number of permits that each household can buy.

First, home-owners and residents already pay substantial fees for the supposed privilege of being able to park their cars outside their homes and to be able to welcome visitors or engage workmen who come to their homes to carry out work. This is enough of an imposition without adding to the cost burden that residents already have to bear.

Secondly, I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposal to scrap the limit on the number of permits that can be purchased by each property. This proposal offers an open door to the few who would commercialise parking permits by selling them to non-residents of the area. This especially affects the residents of Priory Gardens, N6 which is a cul-de-sac leading to Highgate Underground Station. Our street is already over-burdened with high traffic volumes and limited parking bays. If unlimited permits are made available to Haringey residents, there is a very strong risk that the unscrupulous few would sell their surplus permits to persons living outside the area who wish to access the underground station to commute into and out of the centre of London.

Haringey's proposal would turn Priory Gardens and nearby streets into a park-and-drive zone, which would severely affect residents' ability to park or have visitors park in the few parking bays available in the street.

A decade or so ago Haringey turned this street into the most restrictive CPZ type in the borough precisely because of the considerations I have outlined above. To remove the ceiling on the number of parking permits issued to Haringey residents will destroy that carefully constructed CPZ plan in a trice.

Please do not implement these proposals.

May I please have your confirmation that this submission has been received, and that it will be included and carefully considered in the consultation process.

Yours faithfully,

Sent from my iPhone

Hello, I want to register my objection to a) the dishonest way this has been done and b) some of the proposed changes. You have not been transparent and I only heard about this from our community Facebook page - it seems you have only contacted people with online accounts, which of course will result in fewer comments. You need to contact ALL residents as most of us will be purchasing permits for ourselves and visitors.

I would also like it confirmed that the 1 and 2 hour passes will remain - these are the most useful for deliveries and workmen. We don't need dailies if someone is just coming to carry out a short job in our properties.

I don't agree with all permits having to be used in one year: we just can't tell how many we will need and get through in one year.

Most of all I object to number restrictions on visitor permits being removed - this could create a black economy free for all and your statement about allowing those 'who want to park in our borough' is a nonsense. It's RESIDENTS who need to be prioritised here!

Please acknowledge and respond to this email. Thanks in advance.

As a resident with no car I object in the strongest terms

- i to the increase in the cost of visitors parking permits
- ii to the unlimited supply
- iii to the 1 year validity proposal

Haringey Council is already milking residents with the new garden charges and the bi- weekly refuse collection which I don't think for a moment has led to an increase in recycling which was the rationale.

I am a pensioner living on a fixed income and rely on visitors having access to my home and workmen being able to access the property but I have no way of predicting the number I need. The current allowance and on going Year on Year validity are both satisfactory.

I use the Council to reconsider the proposals.

348

I wanted to express concern re the below statement about visitors permits being "simplified and not limited". As a resident of priory gardens, close to Highgate station, it is very important for parking on the street to be strictly limited to residents and their visitors. If permits are not limited this may result in people selling/giving away a significant number of visitor permits to non residents who wish to park in the road in order to use Highgate station. I would also like to further understand what is meant by "simplified" and "a fair approach".

349

How on earth can you consider allowing people to buy visitors parking permits. I live near Turnpike Lane and Wood Green stations and I have to pay to park where I live. I can still remember how I could often not be able to park anywhere in the road. Even now people park from 6pm Friday until 8am Monday mostly vans and once the new Spurs football ground is opened it will be impossible to park again because someone came up with the bright idea of charging people on the opposite side of the roundway to park during matches which is evenings and weekends so they all park in all the streets on my side of the roundway so they don't have to pay for permits. I really wish you people would think all these new schemes out before you inflict them on the residents in your borough. Who in their right mind wants to pay to park in their road and still not be able to park there. Every idea you come up with is just a new money making scheme with no consideration for the chaos you are causing. My other concern is all the visitors permits I have bought that you are going to make obsolete with no compensation for the tickets I have and I am going to have to buy more at twice the price. This whole scheme is disgusting and needs completely rethinking. Please someone sort this out.

I strongly object to the proposed changes in availability of visitor vouchers. An unlimited supply is contradictory to the aims and spirit of a Controlled Parking Zone. It creates uncontrolled and uncontrollable parking and effectively make the CPZ ineffective and invalid.

It is already difficult almost daily to find a parking space close to my house with existing permits and visitor vouchers during the restriction period due to the high number of visitor vouchers available and undoubtedly available for sale. You would be creating a black market in the sale of parking vouchers at the cost of residents.

While this is going on, I have to continue to pay heavily for the privilege to park my car within 100 yards of my house - a privilege open to most of this country's residents free of charge.

There are a number of elderly residents on Priory Gardens and for them and me having to carry shopping long distances is a memory i would not like to relive. We had to fight to get the CPZ when the case was clear and obvious that the road was being used as a carpark.. Don't make the same mistake again - respond to the points raised from the residents who know the situation well, and acknowledge and respect the needs of your tax payers.

Do not open the field to the possible exploiters of what will be a dysfunctional parking system.

Yours faithfully

With regard to item c) under the General Order, I wish to register my disquiet at the proposal to amend the residents' visitors' parking permit scheme so [...] as to remove the need for an upper limit on numbers that could be purchased

One can fear that a removal of an upper limit to hourly and daily permits will be perceived as an invitation to stockpile, precisely, with the attendant temptation of obliging non residents friends and acquaintances, or indeed gaining some benefit or income from such largesse.

How does the council propose to prevent such practices and what action would it take should they occur?

Other councils state clearly with regard to their own CPZ schemes that:

"Permits and visitor vouchers issued by the council are not for resale.

Visitor vouchers are only to be used for visitors to your property.

Visitor vouchers are not to be used by family, friends or colleagues who wish to park in the controlled parking zone without visiting your residency.

Failure to comply may constitute an offence under Section 115 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984."

Haringey's silence on the matter might be taken to be condoning what is an antisocial and parasitic practice.

With kind regards,

Dear

I have inspected these proposed changes- here are a few related comments:

1) I have recently encountered several discussions of the precise meaning of these proposals among local residents-

there is much concern that visitors permits currently held (and, as your document alludes to, occasionally stockpiled!) by local residents, would become immediately invalid under these changes, without the possibility of any refund. This was not my own original interpretation of these documents, but nothing has yet been done to allay these concerns, so I suggest that you issue a clarifying statement to the contrary at the earliest opportunity. (In case this is, in fact, the intention under the new scheme- I would object most strongly that the retrospective alteration of the terms of purchased permits would be unlawful.)

If you could respond directly, to clarify this point, I would be most grateful.

2) The cost of parking our vehicle will increase as a result of these changes. I have no great objection to this. However, on Sundays, when parking restrictions are not in effect in our area, we often struggle to park our vehicle in the vicinity of our property. Given we will be paying an even higher premium for the right to park, we would quite like to actually be able to do so on a

353 reliable basis! I would personally be keen to see an extension of the restricted hours to 7 days, in

areas where excessive parking by non-residents is a frequent issue. (Although I would propose that these areas then see an associated reduction in the cost of visitors permits).

3) To further the above point: with the removal of the full range of visitors permits, those living in streets with longer restriction periods are impacted most negatively. (For instance, at my current address, there are 10.5 x 6 restricted hours per week, whereas at my previous address, there were only 2 x 5 restricted hours.) I would suggest that the hourly cost of visitors permits should be made proportional to the number of restricted hours in specific areas.

4) I would like to highlight that this document's suggestion that altering residents' parking charges slightly will inspire residents to go out and replace their vehicles with less polluting models, is not only far-fetched, but also somewhat misinformed. (The emissions associated with the production of a brand new vehicle far outweigh any differential in lifetime emissions- see eg here.) I do however wholeheartedly support any initiatives that encourage and support the use of cycling and public transport in the borough. Perhaps the additional income associated with these increased charges could be directed to improve the currently dangerous state of many local roads in East Haringey (for cyclists in particular) and also the inadequate design of most cycleways in the Tottenham area?

5) Relatedly, I would comment that vehicles parked on Haringey streets are not the actual problem, and do not actually impact air quality- it is rather the vehicles driving in the area. I personally use my vehicle very infrequently, and I would happily see the introduction of greater disincentives (perhaps small daily charges?) against actually driving a vehicle within the borough.

Dear Sirs,

Although asking for the ZIP attachments, attached to your consultation in relation to street permits and charges, to be sent to me in another form, these have not been forthcoming. However, I would like to make comments on your "on street permits and charges" consultation.

I live on Wood Vale N10. I do not know whether this street has been included in your studies. If not, it should be. We are the closest residential street in N10 to Highgate tube station and the road is used as a "car park" for daily commuters and for people going on holiday, with cars being left outside properties for weeks and sometimes months on end. The majority of these cars do not belong to residents of the road. This then makes residents have to call the Council to remove certain cars, when people park across residents' driveways and makes access to driveways sometimes impossible to navigate in and out. (I am sure that the Council's time could be better used on other more pressing matters).

354

It would be interesting to see how well the road would work with a CPZ style situation for, say, a 6 month period, to see what impact this has on the street and on how regularly the Council is called about cars on the street.

As I say, I do not know what is exactly in the ZIP files that you have attached to your consultation, as I can not open them, but if it is to do with parking permits and charges to non residents parking on certain streets in the N10 area, I would strongly propose Wood Vale be included as a prime example road in need of attention in making people perhaps leave their cars at home, get public transport and walk to wherever they are going, instead of making the street one big "car park" and a major nuisance for residents.

Kind regards

Dear Traffic management team,

Thank you for your email of 16 February 2018 regarding your proposed amendments to on street parking permits and charges.

?

I am writing to object to the proposed amendments:

?1). As the proposals are being implemented on a large scale and borough-wide, I feel the residents have not been given enough time to respond carefully to the proposed changes. The proposals were published on 2nd February 2018, but I and other residents of the borough only received the email on the 16th of Feb. This gives us only 7 days time in which to respond to the proposals. Given the large scale of the ? changes it is unfair that the residents do have enough time to respond.

2) An even bigger concern is that the amendments being proposed intends to remove the limit on the number of visitor permits. This will cause a serious problem on many streets in the CPZs but in particular in Priory Gardens, N6. Removing the limit on the number of permits that residents can purchase ?potentially opens up the possibility of residents within each zone buying and selling unlimited permits to those outside the zone. As Highgate station is located at the end of Priory Gardens, this could potentially turn the street into a de facto car park for Highgate Station with residents outside the Priory Gardens CPZ purchasing permits and parking on the street in order to commute into central London.

3) Not only are our cost of permits going up by over 125%, the changes require all permits to be used within the calendar year of which they were purchased, with the option of refunds scrapped entirely. This is a very costly proposal for those who live within the zone and also inconvenient.

I am disappointed that Haringey Council has failed to properly consult and engage with residents on widespread changes that will affect the daily lives of nearly all those live in the borough.

I would like to submit my objections to these ill-thought-through proposals that will very likely see an increase in private vehicle travel across, what is already, one of the most polluted boroughs in the UK. As Highgate Station is located in Priory Gardens the residents of this street will likely see a huge jump in vehicular traffic in what is already a very busy street.

I would like to request Haringey Council to kindly reconsider the proposed changes particularly the option to buy unlimited permits.

Yours faithfully,

Dear Haringey Council,

I am a resident on Southwood Lane in Highgate. I wonder whether your proposed amendments to the parking permits take into account its impact on the parking situation on our road. We already experience significant pressure for local residents. I am a mother of three young children and I need to be able to park near the house. If the parking situation gets worse it would make it prohibited for us to leave the house. I would be grateful for your feedback on this matter.

Yours sincerely,

Hello

I strongly object to the proposed changes to parking:-

* There should be an annual restriction otherwise people may use this area for commuter parking if an unlimited supply is available to sell onto others. I bet a market will develop where these will be sold onto others. How will you ensure this doesn't happen? Parking is already tight in the area.

* There should not be the requirement to use the permits in that year unless the council will reimburse the cost of those unused which you propose not to. I buy enough for the long term. I have not bought any for over a year and may not buy for another year. it is not reasonable to expect me to plan so accurately my annual use or keep getting top ups. Surely this is more time consuming for the council to keep issuing new permits as people will order smaller amounts and its more time consuming for me.

* The increase in the charge for visitor parking is too high.

Please consider changing your proposals,

For the attention of Haringey Council.

I write to express my strong objection to the proposed parking permit changes on the following grounds:

- The change to unlimited visitor permits could mean that they are bought and sold on the open market leading to the borough becoming a car park. This would have the opposite effect of the intended reforms, and produce more pollution. Visitor permits should therefore continue to be limited and have longer life spans.

- The consultation process has been handled poorly, giving residents very little time to respond. The answer is to extend the consultation significantly and take into account concerns.

All the best,

Regarding the recent email outlining the new proposals for on street parking permits and charges, please find below my objections:

"The cost for parking permits will now be fully aligned with the CO2 emission bands set by the DVLA."

Fair enough but this should be a phased transition to allow people to more easily adapt to the new charging criteria. However, the level of CO2 emissions is mostly pertinent only to global warming and does not impact overtly on air quality. If you want to improve air quality then you should charge in relation to NOX emissions. I also believe this is more about Haringey Council wishing to raise more revenue than having much interest in air quality.

359 "Visitors parking permits will be simplified and no longer be subject to a limited allocation

This is to ensure we are taking a fair approach when it comes to everyone who wants to park in our borough and to encourage people to use other forms of transport if possible."

I'm all for simplification, but unlimited permits will encourage a black market in parking permits that will only mean even less parking space for bona fide residents. I also fail to understand how making parking permits more readily available with help encourage people to use other forms of transport - this is fanciful hyperbole.

"We propose raising the age of our concessionary scheme from 60 to 65 years."

I think this concession should only apply to those over 60 who are still in full time employment.

Given that I am often unable to park in my own street due to the lack of available space, to ramp up the charges and at the same time make more permits available is a kick in the teeth for bona fide residents who need to have a car in London.

Ann Cunningham,

Head of Operations, Haringey Traffic Management

Dear Ms Cunningham and Haringey traffic management,
Last Monday 19 February parking permit holders in Haringey received an email from you notifying us of major proposed changes to the parking permit system in Haringey. Only by accident did we find out that that the closing date for any objections is 23 February, tomorrow, leaving only 4 days for any responses. This date is not indicated anywhere on the 19 February mail.

Only by looking closely at the proposal documents available through the link

<http://www.haringey.gov.uk/parking-roads-and-travel/roads-and-streets/traffic-managementorders/list-traffic-management-orders>

did I find that it says – at the bottom of page one of one of the three documents (Permit Charges NOP.docx) – that any objections have to be sent within 21 days of the date of the document, given as 2 February. To find this it was necessary to read carefully through all three documents.

If the document was issued on 2 February, why was it only notified to residents on 19 February, giving only 4-5 days for responses? And why was this closing date of 23 February not clearly indicated in the email or on the website?

As 'public consultation' this is totally inadequate and unacceptable.

We also have objections to the proposals. The proposal to adapt charges to emissions and tax bands seems fine. However –

- You propose to abolish 2-hour visitor permits for 70p and replace them with only 1-hour permits at 80p. In our street we currently have a 2-hour CPZ, 11am-1pm Friday. So the cost of having any visitors, trades people etc parked during that time will more than double – an extraordinary increase.

- While abolishing the 2-hour permit you also propose to end any limit on the number of visitor permits individuals can buy but make the permits only valid for a year from purchase date (or a calendar year? this too is not clear), so that people would need to use them up in that time. These two ideas together seem tailor-made to encourage a market in selling on visitor permits to non-residents, commuters etc, which will only increase congestion and parking problems, precisely the opposite of what the Council should be trying to achieve. This seems utterly irresponsible and, again, unacceptable.

- Also, there is no date given on any of these documents for when you propose to bring these changes into force (the relevant space is left blank). Surely this information should be given in any genuine consultation?

And, we already have a number of 2-hour visitor permits bought in good faith. Will they still be usable if these changes come in, and for how long? There is no mention made at all of this.

For all these reasons I ask you to reconsider these proposals and allow time for proper public consultation.

Last Monday 19 February I and I think all other parking permit holders in Haringey received an email from you notifying us that you are proposing major changes to the parking permit regime. It was only pointed out to me by someone else that the closing date for any objections is 23 February, tomorrow, leaving effectively only 4 days for any responses. This date is not indicated anywhere on the 19 February mail.

Only by looking closely at the documents detailing the proposals available through the link <http://www.haringey.gov.uk/parking-roads-and-travel/roads-and-streets/traffic-managementorders/list-traffic-management-orders>

did I find that effectively it says at the bottom of page one of only one of the three documents (Permit Charges NOP.docx) that any objections have to be sent within 21 days of the date of the document, which was given as 2 February. To find this information it was necessary to read carefully through all three documents.

If the document was issued on 2 February, why was it only notified to residents on 19 February, giving only 4-5 days for responses? And why was this closing date of 23 February not clearly indicated in the email or on the website?

As 'public consultation' this is totally inadequate and unacceptable.

I also have objections to the proposals. The proposal to adapt charges to emissions and tax bands seems fine. However –

- You propose to abolish 2-hour visitor permits for 70p and replace them with only 1-hour permits at 80p. In our street we currently have a 2-hour CPZ, 11am-1pm Friday. So the cost of having any visitors, trades people etc parked during that time will more than double – an extraordinary increase.

- While abolishing the 2-hour permit you also propose to end any limit on the number of visitor permits individuals can buy but make the permits only valid for a year from purchase date (or a calendar year? this too is not clear), so that people would need to use them up in that time. These two ideas together seem tailor-made to encourage a market in selling on visitor permits to non-residents, commuters etc, which will only increase congestion and parking problems,

precisely the opposite of what the Council should be trying to achieve. This seems utterly irresponsible and, again, unacceptable.

- Also, there is no date given on any of these documents for when you propose to bring these changes into force (the relevant space is left blank). Surely this information should be given in any genuine consultation?

Also, too, I already have a number of 2-hour visitor permits that I bought in good faith. Will they still be usable if these changes come in, and for how long? There is no mention made at all of this.

For all these reasons I ask you to reconsider these proposals and to provide time for a proper public consultation.

362

If the limit on resident parking permits per household is removed the demand for spaces will increase, there is already a shortage of spaces available in my permit area - where are we to park?

To whom it may concern

363

I am shocked to see that the changes to parking in Haringey including parking permits have given residents less than a week to comment when the requirements are 21 days. I live in Priory gardens and I strongly object to the decision not to limit permit numbers. This invites a free-for –all for Haringey residents to sell their permits and this can lead to what was an impossible parking situation for Priory Gardens residents before the parking restrictions were in place. The limit on parking permits means that residents keep them for their own use. If certain situations require the use of more permits presumably it is not beyond the ability of the council to take this into account on a case by case basis.

If there is no limit on vouchers sold, residents can start business selling vouchers and the road will once again become a car park for people using the tube. Again we who live here will have to double park to get home, leading to obstruction for emergency vehicles as there was before the CPZ.

364

It is vital that Priory Gardens is not allowed to turn into a car park. We already have cars parked here taking a chance. We see people park and go to the Tube. Please do not let us go back to the bad old days before the CPZ.

No limit on visitor permits: more visitors will mean more air & traffic pollution as residents drive round looking for a place to park.

Visitor permits will last for 1yr only: but it is difficult to know how many permits one would need.

365

These are significant changes and there should be a longer consultation period so people can work out the implications.

I live next to Highgate Station and your proposals would result in people buying and selling permits to people who just want to park all day and use our cul de sac as a car park.

It is also very unfair that you would not allow people who have genuinely bought permits for visitors but haven't used them all, to not be able to exchange them.

We are residents here, not businesses. Why penalise us so harshly?

It is very unfair and I object to the changes that you have proposed including the price increases.

366

I'd like to object to the changes to the Proposed Parking Permit Charges for residential parking permit holders in Haringey.

The price increases seem severe - well above inflation! - and also scrapping the upper limit on visitor parking permits is asking for trouble: daily parking permits for £3.50 per day could easily become a commodity to be traded at will, with all the of the residents crowded out of our parking zone.

For this reason I'd like to ask you to go back to the drawing board.

With Kind Regards

367

To Haringey Traffic Management Group

I am writing in with my representation and objections to the PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ON STREET PARKING PERMITS AND CHARGES T12 order 201

I'm glad to read that you are committed to tackling pollution and improving air quality in the borough of Haringey.

But I object to the proportion of increase in charges for residential parking permit that you are proposing compared with the current rates.

I object because in terms of tackling pollution and improving air quality, the new charges target a subsection of residents and business who reside in the control parking zone regions; other road users outside the control parking zone are not subject to these additional charges or taxes

368 from the proposals and yet they may have a vehicle or two and are also causing pollution in the

borough. It would be more fair if all vehicle owners had to pay extra from their council tax or from other car charges and not just owner or business in controlled parking zone.

We already pay car tax to DVLA based on the CO2 emission band so I do not object to you using the new CO2 emission banding.

But I object to the disproportionate increase. For example looking at the 185cc to over 255cc banding. The current rate is £171.30 for cars in that banding. Taking in the new rate, for a vehicle of 185cc this will be a 17% increase to a 63% increase for a vehicle over 255cc. I think it is quite a large increase. I would consider it more proportionate if you capped it 5% to 10% and maybe introduce increase over a period of 3 to 5 years. But you already increase the charges yearly and maybe should use the same formula.

You mentioned this is to encourage car owners to move to less polluting cars but is that really going to be effective. Based on material about budgeting for council tax and previous budget, it was mention that increasing council tax would cause financial hardship to the residents of the borough. But here you are doing something similar with these large increases; targeting those same subset of residents; and would they be any more able to move to a less polluting vehicle or made to pay a large increase for their parking permit.

I also object to the huge and disproportionate increase of the 1 hour visitor parking permit from 35p per hour to 80p per hour. 35p to 80p may seem small, but that is a 128% increase. If I had a family visitor or a tradesmen in for a few hours, for a 4hr visit currently that would be 35p x 4 = £1.40. On the new rate, that is 80p x4 = £3.20 for a 4hr visit. Just because other boroughs are charging 80p an hour doesn't mean you should. If they were charging £1.20 an hour or £2 an hour, would you then follow. If you increase the hourly rate from 35p to 50p or 60p, that would be more agreeable, but not at 80p where it is a 128% increase. I'm not sure it would deter and make visitor use public transport or other modes of transport more but I think the increase of 128% is disproportional and not fair. There maybe the elderly or people in need, those in care who receive visitors who travel by car who do not get the concessional rates, visitors with heavy loads or items t

Firstly, I wish to state my surprise and dismay that The Council did not publicise the Proposed Changes to Parking regulations more heavily. Parking is a huge issue that effects all residents and the Traffic Management Group should have ensured that all residents knew about the proposals.

Parking in Hornsey Lane Gardens where I live is slowly getting worse. We know that commuters come into our street and park because we see the same cars arrive each morning and leave each evening. We know that there is a trade is visitors parking permits because these cars put new permits on every day.

I do not even have an issue with the staggering 130% increase in the cost of a 1 hour permit (from 35p to 80p). I am rather surprised about it as it will effects those on the lowest income.

I also do not have an issue with the simplification of the permits issuing system to one hour and daily permits. However, I cannot see how the statement that these changes 'would remove the need for an upper limit on numbers that can be purchased' can be justified. I already know that there are residents who sell their permits to commuters. Removing the limits will categorically increase this 'trade' attracting larger number of vehicles to come into the area, clog up our

roads and take up our parking.

In your 'Statement of Reasons' you suggest that these measures will improve air quality. I can't not see any objective evidence of this and believe that the removal of the upper limit will actually have a negative effect on air quality for the reasons given above.

It seems as if we are fast approaching the problems we had before CPZ was introduced. The only difference is that we now have to pay for the privilege of not being able to park!

I also fail to understand why a time limit should be set for use of parking permits. All this will do is hit residents who behave within the laws and those that that trade in parking permits will be able to sell their on within the 1 year time scale.

I urge the council to reject the amendments that remove the upper limit on parking permits and to reject the amendments that would lead to unused permits expiring after one year.

I would however ask that the council consider increasing the 2 hour time limit to four hours. This would bring our CPZ in line with Islington's on the other side of Hornsey Lane.

I am writing to object to the proposed changes to parking permits and charges on the basis that;

I do not think it is fair to increase parking charges. We live in a 2 hour zone and will incur increased costs for visitors permits.

I would not like to see the limit on the number of permits scrapped. It is more than sufficient to cover genuine visitors. If you scrap the limit then you are opening up the possibility of people selling on permits and increasing road traffic and congestion in our area. We already have a shockingly high level of pollution around our nurseries and schools.

I object to the 1 year expiration date of passes without a refund option. I wouldn't have an issue with this if there was an option of a refund, but as there isn't, people will just end up losing money on unused permits. That wouldn't be so bad if they were still affordable but now that they will be more expensive, I think it's completely unfair.

370

I am writing to object to you plan to allow residents an unlimited amount of parking permits as this will allow dishonest residents to sell on these permits to non residents. This will cause the parking problems the original arrangements were designed to halt.

371

I wish to object to the proposal to sell unlimited visitor permits in Priory Gardens for Highgate Station cpz.

Before the parking zone was established the road was used by large numbers of commuters to park before using the tube. It became virtually impossible for residents to park.

The proposal will allow this to happen again

372

I object strongly to the proposed changes to parking permits in Priory Gardens N6. Issuing parking permits to anyone outside this designated area will cause congestion, increased noise and pollution. Clearly this scheme negates the rationale behind controlled parking.

373

The recent proposed amendment is against the interests of all residents, especially those residents who live near an underground station, like Priory Gardens.

I therefore wish to object and ask that it be revised or thrown out.

374

Sent from my iPad

would like it put on record that we absolutely disagree with your proposed amendments to the street parking, particularly the option to buy as many parking permits as possible.

375

To whom it may concern,

I am very dismayed at the proposals to change the parking permits in Haringey. We pay for 2 resident permits and often cannot find a space. Also, we have lots of family members visiting us and already pay a lot for the visitor vouchers.

376

Please go not change the parking in Priory Gardens as there is not enough room to park at present, it will only get worse. We pay a fortune already for permits and vouchers.

Kind regards,

Dear Sir/ madam

My objections to the proposed changes to parking arrangements are as follows:

* we have a 2 hour restriction in Northwood Road so why remove the 2 hour permits ??
They are useful to give to visiting friends.

* I understand if you have to increase the annual charge for a parking permit - Haringey is cheaper than other boroughs

* But - if you are concerned about pollution why don't you substantially increase the charge for the higher polluting cars rather than making an across the board increase

- * I think it is wrong to impose a one year limit on permits - Camden doesn't do this 377
- * I think that there should still be a limit on the number of visitors permits that residents can purchase - the current level is quite generous - I don't understand your argument for increasing the number.

Please acknowledge receipt of this response to your consultation

These Orders have not been thoroughly thought through with consequences that will be unfortunate and not consistent with Haringey policies on reducing traffic and pollution. Quite the opposite, additional traffic would be encouraged, effectively turning the whole of Haringey into a car park.

The needs of people with protected characteristics have not duly been taken into account (<http://www.haringey.gov.uk/local-democracy/about-council/equalities/equality-impactassessments-eqia>).

The increase in costs seems extremely inconsiderate to most residents in Haringey.

The lack of flexibility at the year end will cause needless anxiety and inconvenience and would probably affect people with protected characteristics disproportionately.

We very strongly suggest these proposals which appear to be being rushed through should be paused and thought about much more carefully.

Regards,

Dear Sir, I am a resident of Priory Gardens. The proposal to allow anybody to buy parking permits defeats the purpose of having a controlled parking zone. I strongly object.

379

Dear Sir, I am a resident of Priory Gardens. The proposal to allow anybody to buy parking permits defeats the purpose of having a controlled parking zone. I strongly object.

380

I wish to object to the changes proposed above. They represent an increase in costs to residents of Haringey and go against the original objectives of allowing residents to park in CPZ areas at a reasonable cost.

The changes significantly raise the opportunity of a park and ride culture for people living outside the borough to buy visitors permits, block up parking spaces all day near tubes and trains - I live a 7 min walk from Bounds Green underground and a three minute walk from Bowes Park overground. This will defeat the original objective of allowing residents to park locally whilst penalising them for living close to transport links.

381

Please lodge my objection.

These changes represent an increase in costs and risk a park and ride culture. I wish to object to these changes. Please lodge my view against these proposals.

382

I am very concerned about the proposed changes to the on street parking permits and would like to strongly object to the changes.

383

I live on Priory Gardens near Highgate tube. If there are no limits to the number of visitors permits residents can purchase I am very concerned that it will lead to the permits being sold on to commuters, and our street returning to how it was in the days prior to the CPZ i.e. residents being unable to park near their property due to the spaces being taken by non- residents. Our street is already busy enough. I don't understand the Council's argument that not limiting numbers of permits will encourage people to take public transport- this doesn't make sense, and in my view will have the opposite effect and encourage drivers to use their cars more.

Dear sir/madam

384

I understand that the changes to parking permits in Haringey will allow residents to buy as many permits as they want in a year. Please can you let me know how you will avoid residents selling these to out of borough commuters who are looking for somewhere to park each day.

I am unable to open the ZIP files.

It appears that we have been given a very short time to comment on the proposed changes. Please ensure that you send me all of the details necessary for me to understand the possible changes and make comment.

385

The proposed changes will see the limit on the number of visitor permits removed, potentially opening up the opportunity for residents to buy and sell permits, turning the borough into a giant park-and-ride for commuters to central London.

I also object to the fact that you will require all permits to be used within the calendar year of which they were purchased. This is too inflexible.

386

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing to object to the proposed changes to the visitor parking permits in Haringey. Residential parking was introduced to restrict the use of the borough by commuters to Finsbury Park and other stations, with the enormous benefit of cleaner air in the borough, as well as available parking for residents when previously it was often impossible for them to find parking spaces in some streets. The cap on visitor passes available has prevented abuse of the system (buying up passes and selling them to commuters) while keeping the streets reasonably clear. We do not want to return to the overcrowding of previous years, and the risk of abuse flies in the face of Mayor Khan's admirable efforts to clean London's air and make the city a better place to live.

I suggest that Haringey Council is demonstrating itself to be out of step with both prevailing environmental trends and Labour Central Office's avowed policies in this regard. I urge you to maintain the visitor parking arrangements as they currently stand, and so prevent a return to the parking chaos, unacceptable air pollution, and traffic congestion that residential parking was originally designed to counter, and in which it has been reasonably successful.

Yours faithfully,

387

When one proposes a change to a regulation, it's expected that it's motivated by the will of improving the service to citizens.

Not by the greed of making even more money at the expenses of the citizens.

Unfortunately this is what appears to be the case here.

Charging more with the excuse of CO2 pollution makes little sense. Cars are parked in this case, they hardly emit gases when standing still. This would be a tax on possession, not on use. And the very many people in your borough who are not well-off, would be punished by this extra tax. All this in a borough that applies possibly the highest Council Tax in the UK. So the blessed fight against pollution (which I agree with, of course) should not be used as a cover to extract more money.

Even worse, please tell me the need to overhaul the Visitors' Parking Permit scheme: you want to extract money? OK, raise the charges.

But don't tell me that it's correct to remove the cap on the number of permits purchased: there's no rationale behind that, and people will use the mechanism to buy permits and re-sell them to non residents. It would be a smart way to kill the sustainability of our local environment: you'll have lots of cars travelling in our streets, which now would become a huge park-and-ride area. So much for your concerns about CO2 emissions...

Same for the nonsensical rule of not allowing permits to last beyond the end of the year. Do you really think that it's needed? does a little flexibility do much harm here? if I need a permit on January 2nd, will you work on New Year's Day to deliver it, since the ones I had bought in December are useless?

Remember: "Too many rules, too few examples" ...
Thank you for your attention.

P.S. and in the future, please, write to your residents in due time: the proposal was dated 2 February, the deadline for the consultation was 3 weeks later (23 Feb) and it took 2 weeks to your officers to draft and issue a email to us. Too much, even taking into account CO2 emissions...

I have some concerns about the proposed changes:

The proposed changes will see the limit on the number of visitor permits removed, potentially opening up the opportunity for residents to buy and sell permits, turning the borough into a giant park-and-ride for commuters to central London, and will require all permits to be used within the calendar year of which they were purchased, with the option of refunds scrapped entirely. I do not agree with these aspects of the plans, particularly the time limit/expiry date of visitors permits. There should also be a limit on the number of permits one can buy to avoid the risk of them being bought and sold. Twelve month permits need to be continued.

We need to reduce private vehicle travel across, what is already, one of the most polluted boroughs in the UK.

I am writing to object to the proposed changes in the parking permits in Haringey. I understand that you are intending to substantially increase the cost of visitor's permits. I understand that you may need to implement a slight increase but I do object to your suggesting such a major increase.

More worrying, however, is the proposal to allow the purchase of unlimited numbers of visitor's permits. I am extremely concerned that some residents will use this as an opportunity to sell permits to commuters who want to park in the borough. This is more easily avoided if the number of permits is limited per year.

Please could you reconsider the proposals put forward.

Many thanks.

Proposed amendments to on street parking permits and charges

I am writing to object to the amendments on the following grounds

1.Consultation by e mail only with too short a timescale

2 Limiting the number of visitor permits removed could lead to some for residents being and selling permits, turning the borough into a giant park-and-ride for commuters to central London

3, Requiring all permits to be used within the calendar year of which they were purchased, with the option of refunds scrapped entirely, will cause more concern for residents. 4. Consultations by the current council usually are ignored

I'd like to complain, this parking proposal obviously makes the current bad one worse. Right now, people come in cars and leave it here all day; leaving little space for those who live here

These proposals have not been given adequate consultation time and I am concerned that they might contain hidden cost increases and therefore I do not support the current council proposals.

I am dismayed by the fact that the Council has not properly consulted and engaged with the Borough's residents on the startling changes proposed - affecting thousands of people daily.

Haringey's proposed changes appears to be doing away with the limiting on the number of visitor permits issued. This creates the opportunity for residents to buy and sell permits, turning the borough into a giant park-and-ride for commuters to central London, and will require all permits to be used within the calendar year of which they were purchased, with the option of refunds scrapped entirely, causing more concern for residents.

Dear Parking Team

I'm writing to submit my comment based on the new proposal.

I think the issue of not refunding unused permits should be reviewed and removing a cap on the number of visitors permit should also be reviewed.

The issue of six months permits should be an option according to individual not making it compulsory as home owners do not move in and out of properties, so the issue of tenancy agreement does not affect them.

Can the above comments be considered.

Hello

As a resident of Abbeville Road in the Crouch End A Parking Zone I have read the proposed new rules and charges for parking, and I am concerned at their potential impact.

Firstly, the proposal to remove the limit on the number of permits any resident can purchase opens up the possibility of residents buying vast numbers of permits and selling them on to commuters, thus defeating the original purpose of the parking zone scheme. The further proposal to limit all pass validity to one year will further encourage residents to dispose of unused permits in this way.

Secondly, in our area the controlled hours are 10 to 12, and so can be covered by a 2 hour pass. Its removal will mean either using a day pass for most tradesmen, at a 500% increase in cost, or the inconvenience of 2 consecutive 1 hour passes. Will that even be permitted?

Thirdly, the proposals make no mention of what will happen to the unused passes I already have, which are valid until 2020. Can I continue to use them? Exchange them? Obtain a refund? or will they simply be written off?

These amendments would be thoroughly counterproductive,

I trust a re-think will take place

Dear Council,

I should like to object to the proposed changes in parking permits in Haringey.

I am a resident of Haringey, and buy a parking permit.

My objections are:

1. The rise in the cost of visitor permits, which will impose a huge burden on the visits of carers for our aging and ill population. I have seen a figure of an extra £100/year.
2. Issuing by the Council of an unlimited number of visitor permits in a year to residents, which opens the system to abuse of selling visitor permits to non- residents, and the use of Haringey parking for park and ride drivers from outside the borough.
3. The need to use them within a year rather than a few years, and with no refunds for unused permits, is burdensome to residents.

Yours truly,

Not happy w proposed changes

Cannot park in ferrestone road as is and now w restrictions lifted as I live near hornsey station everyone w come to my street

Why is it right that I have to pay a huge parking permit cost and now everyone can come anyway

399

W the new Smithfield development too the parking spaces around hornsey are at even more of a premium

I strongly oppose these proposals.

This is an increase in visitor parking costs of over 125%, with carers potentially having to pay an additional £100 to park.

The "consultation" on these proposals, which were published on the 2nd February, but only circulated to residents by email a fortnight later, will close this Friday, the 23rd February.

I am disappointed that Haringey Council has once again failed to properly consult and engage with residents on widespread changes that will affect thousands of people daily.

The proposed changes will also see the limit on the number of visitor permits removed, potentially opening up the opportunity for residents to buy and sell permits, turning the borough into a giant park-and-ride for commuters to central London, and will require all permits to be used within the calendar year of which they were purchased, with the option of refunds scrapped entirely, causing more concern for residents.

Poor show Haringey, once again.

I strongly disagree with proposed changes to parking charges and bitterly resent the way the council continues to extort money from residents.

Sent from my iPhone

Haringey council,

I would like to strongly object to the change in resident parking permits costs.

My car falls into the bracket below:

Vehicles registered before 1 March 2001 (or where CO2 emissions are not documented)

1550 cc to 3000cc	£180.00	£90.00	£114.00	£148.40
-------------------	---------	--------	---------	---------

Why do you think that targeting older car users in this way is in any way fair?

Do you not think that if those with older cars could afford newer ones they wouldn't already be driving them?

I would like you to justify increasing the cost from £114.00 to £180.00. This is a huge rise and is completely unacceptable.

Also, visitor permits changes are a joke.

Old cost of 2 hour permit 70p

Old cost of 1 hour permit 35p

New cost of 1 hour permit 80p

Please explain how you justify increasing 1 hours permits by more than 100%

As far as I can tell most permits will be going up.

This is yet another revenue raising exercise by this council targeting as usual the humble resident but dressing it up as 'for environmental reasons'

I'm fed up with being hit by unreasonable rises.

Please stop using us as cash cows, we do not have an endless pot of money to keep paying for these rises.

Proposed time limit on validity of Residents' Visitors Parking Permits.

"It is anticipated that those permits would be used within the year purchased ..."

"It is however expected, that those permits would be used within the year purchased and not stock piled for future years, where further car restraints measures may be required."

Although these expressions are used in the Statement of Reasons and the Notice of Proposed Amendments, I cannot see any provision in the draft Order itself limiting the validity of residence visitor's parking permits. How would this work, anyway? At present visitors permits can be used by scratching out one of 3 or 4 years. If, for example, permits were issued in 2018 limited to that calendar year, and a person wished to provide a permit to a visitor 1 January 2019, how would that situation be covered?

403

Paid for parking in residential streets

This does not relate to the present consultation, but it has long struck me as unsatisfactory that within any CPZ a motorist visiting someone, perhaps the commercial purposes, such as an estate agent, in a residential street has to walk a very considerable distance to find pay by phone parking. Not all residents wished to provide visitors vouchers to even legitimate visitors. It seems to be a simple proposition to designate a stretch of an existing residents pay for shared use between pay by phone users and resident permit holders; this could be done in any or every residential street. It would solve the problem I have described, whilst not reducing significantly the parking available to residents. Something to think about

404

CPZ visitor tickets..should be limited to a certain number per house p.a. to avoid them being sold on.

Sent from my Samsung Galaxy smartphone.

Dear Sirs

I would like to object to the proposed changes for the following reasons;

1. You are potentially penalising car owners who park their car in the street while taking public transport, walking or cycling to work in London
2. The proposed increase in fees is significantly higher than inflation and may restrict people from owning a car.
3. The proposed implementation of the increased fees do not assist local residents and may create tradeable parking permits which is surely not an aim of the proposed changes. Has this been properly considered?
4. There is nothing wrong with the existing scheme. If it is not broken, don't fix it. This looks like doing something just because you have too many people working at the council working doing too little.

Please consider leaving the existing system in place.

Best regards

For the reasons given by the lib dems these proposals are absurd.

Unlimited visitor permits will encourage more traffic into a congested and polluted borough. The price increases proposed for actual residents are extortionate

Labour clearly wants to encourage increased out of borough car use and make maximally amounts of money out of residents

I object

I live on Stapleton Hall Road near the Harringay Main Line station.

Parking permits were introduced to ensure residents like myself could park our cars as the free parking was making the street very attractive to non-residents.

Prior to the introduction you would see people parking up and wheeling their suitcase to the station.....we are 2 stops from the Eurostar.

For the sake of a few pounds people could park freely and go on holiday or away on business.

I also use to see old cars and people's work vans parked there for months on end.

Please do not allow this situation to reoccur. Keep the limits on the numbers of visitor tickets we can purchase to an acceptable level.

Many thanks

I would like to oppose the proposed changes to the parking permits restrictions. The current situation of localised permits has drastically cut down the parking problems in our neighbourhood where people were coming in from all over to leave their cars on our road and it was next to impossible to find a parking place. I fear the new proposals for borough-wide permits will see a return to those days. Also, I still have visitors permits which I bought a year ago which are unused, so I oppose any plans to put a year-long expiry date on them.

Hi there,

I would like to formally lodge my objection to the proposals around visitor parking permits.

It does not appear to be a fair change at all and in my opinion is the wrong route to go to try and encourage people to use other forms of transport.

Making it easier for people outside the borough to buy will just encourage people from surrounding boroughs to buy and park in Haringey.

Not re-issuing expired permits when you don't have an efficient process to purchase them is simply unfair.

Given that parking charges are not meant to be revenue generating activities, I'd like to understand more about the logic behind the proposal.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to object to several of the proposed changes detailed in the document titled "Propose Parking Charges" dated 2nd Feb 2018.

(http://www.haringey.gov.uk/sites/haringeygovuk/files/propose_parking_charges.zip)

- * As well as a rise in residents permits - visitors permits cost increasing 128% is an unacceptable rise, particularly for people such as myself who rely on regular child-carer visits.

- * Adding an "administration charge for the processing of permits" also seems ridiculously excessive at £11.80! What exactly would this pay for?

* Having the permits expire after 12 months is a clear attempt to gouge even more money from people and is completely unnecessary.

* Giving residents 21 days from the proposal date (2nd Feb) would be fairer if you actually sent out information on that date - I had no leaflet through the door and was only notified by email on the 16th. A clear attempt to reduce the number of objections.

I just hope enough residents hear of this proposal and make their thoughts known. I can't imagine anyone would feel these points are fair or beneficial to anyone other than the council.

Yours faithfully,

To whom it may concern,

I would like to lodge by objection to the current parking permit amendments being considered:

Withdrawing the limit per year will create more congestion on the roads

Not allowing residents to exchange out of date permits isn't acceptable on top of a price increase.... where is the justice in that?

It would be nice to thing that your decisions were in favour of the Haringey people as opposed to against.

Thank you.

Hi. I have recently read in the email that visitors parking permit will no longer be limited to a location. I would like to know when will this start and if this is gonna be for entire Haringey.
Thanks

Dear Sir/Madam,

We would like to send some initial objections to the recent proposed parking charge changes, sent out by email correspondence on the 14th February.

Our objections are two-fold:

1. Visitors parking to no longer be subject to a limited allocation

Removing the limit on the number of visitor passes will incentivise local residents near transport hubs to buy many hundreds of visitor passes and sell them online for a profit, turning many parts of Haringey into giant park and ride zones.

Haringey is already one of the most polluted boroughs in the country, and we should be looking to reduce car travel not adding incentives to increase it. This will also reduce the number of onstreet spaces available for those living in Haringey who have resident parking passes.

We question the reasoning for removing the limit. To quote

"Visitors parking permits will be simplified and no longer be subject to a limited allocation

This is to ensure we are taking a fair approach when it comes to everyone who wants to park in our borough and to encourage people to use other forms of transport if possible."

These statements are contradictory. Adding the ability for more visitor parking passes to be available will increase the amount of private vehicle use in the borough, and discourage people to use other forms of transport. We would therefore like to see a limit remain in place for the number of visitor permits available.

2. Removing the ability to get a refund on unused permits if not used in one year

"Unused permits would therefore not be exchanged or refunded"

With many people unaware how many permits they will need or use in a single year, removing the ability to get a refund on unused permits will lead to many under or over purchasing permits. Those that over purchase to be on the safe side will be financially penalised, whilst those who under purchase may be left with a shortfall in permits due to the length of time it can take to receive permits when ordered remotely, or the inconvenience and amount of time taken to purchase permits from an in-house location. We would therefore like to see refunds made available for any unused permits at the end of the year, and for all permits to be available for a minimum of 12 months from purchase, rather than to be used in a calendar year. This is particularly important for carers, support workers and other visitors to vulnerable residents.

Finally, I would like to direct you to the wording currently used on visitor permits, which is causing confusion for many, and leading to unfair fines being imposed.

The visitor permits clearly state on them "Time of arrival". Should a visitor arrive at a location with a CPZ controlled from 10am-noon (as in the case of Crouch End Zone A) at 8am, following the instructions on the visitor permit - they should scratch off 8am as their time of arrival. However the intention would clearly be for the permit to be used between 10am and noon. This is particularly difficult to understand for non-native English speakers, who have followed the instructions, and believe their 2-hour pass will entitle them to park between 10 and noon.

We strongly recommend that this wording is corrected so that th

Hello,

I'm worried about the changes to visitor parking in our CPZ.

Your email says 'Visitor Parking permits will be simplified and no longer subject to a limited allocation'.

If there is no limited allocation of permits, what is to stop residents selling them to nonresidents?

I live in Priory Gardens which is the back entrance to Highgate Station.

Our (Highgate Station) CPZ would become meaningless if anyone could buy visitor parking permits from residents allowing them to park here.

Priory Gardens would revert to the de facto station car park (which is what it was before we had the CPZ).

i payed over £100 for visitor parking permits over a week ago online and still haven't received them. It's now impossible to buy them over the counter.

Paying more for an appalling service is pretty galling.

I am writing to you to let you know that I object to your proposals to increase the cost of visitors' parking permits from 70 pence for 2 hours to 80 pence for one hour while reducing the period of validity of these tickets.

It is bad enough that the CPZ schemes have been introduced in the first place for reasons that fail to address the root cause of the overcrowding on our roads without subjecting residents to the tyranny of massive hikes in costs by stealth effectively.

Haringey Resident

I mostly agree, but I'm wondering why some of my neighbours DON'T pay the parking permit as they should, and what's worse is that they have more than one car You should remove the possibility to park in Marlborough Road to NOT residents so everyone will pay for the permit!! For me it's very tough to find parking space even if I pay for the resident permit!!

And it's annoying to find out that my neighbours have parked TWO cars without paying a penny!!!

417

Is it fair?

Furthermore you should control the parking status not only between 10-12 am but all around the day!!

A REAL taxpayer!!!

418

The price of inflation has gone up wages have not. I object to prices going up and the six month permit x

Sent from my iPhone

Why is the link to which you are directed to click on take you to a really vague page with various links?

It's hardly a user friendly site! I'm just concerned with what the new costs will be and how councils intend to fleece their boroughs further.

419

Why am I directed to Links that aren't related to proposed pricing for permits?

I live along Alexandra Park Road and have been informed of increase in permits. Please can you tell me what this increase will be please?

Thanks in advance

420

What you are proposing is just another cash cow scheme because this is going to cost the people of Haringey so people from outside the area also by having different times and streets parking it allows people to park for free therefore even if you do introduce short term permits it still won't stop free parking so the only way I can see this scheme working is to bring in cameras as Westminster have done so anybody entering parts of Haringey will have to pay a SMALL payment, but as I have always disagreed with parking charges I think all charges should be stopped. As Haringey has proposed the up grade of the borough so as to try and get more people from outside the area to use it but by having restricted parking people will not come in so once again be the first borough to do away with parking charges.

To whom it may concern.

I am writing to express my objections to the increase in parking permits. I am a resident in Crouch End, on a road where there is a 2 hour parking permit allocation between the hours of 10-12, hours at which I am at work and my car is with me. As a teacher in a neighbouring borough I have extensive amounts of holidays, however, these 16 weeks are the only times where I would require a permit, yet I have to pay for a whole year to cover this period of time. To find that my permit will increase in price by nearly £50 is an outrage, and to claim it is for the reduction in CO2 is insanity. You are claiming that you would rather households replace their cars more frequently than to stick with cars they have cherished and looked after for years. I am presuming that you are hinting at hybrid or fully electric cars. However, these have already been proven to be more damaging to the environment, due to the materials needed to make and destroy the battery packs, and that's not to mention their shorter life than a normal car.

421

You state that you aim for people to use public transport more, however, prices of public transport are increasing every year, so even if people did get rid of their car, they will then be penalised with rising costs in public transport. During my 10 years in London, a bus journey has already increased from 50p to the current rate. Surely this needs to be addressed first with the power/wealth hungry/fat cats, who line borough and parliamentary policy holders back pockets.

And finally, and probably my biggest frustration. When I return from work, at 6 or 7 at night (not between parking permit times as most people are already at work when this is active) can I find a parking space outside my house? The answer to that is almost never, resulting in me parking 2 or 3 roads away, so how do the permit times assist me. They don't actually work. The timings are all wrong. I am paying for the privilege to park outside my own house, without actually being able to.

These rises really do feel like another way to gain more money out of residence rather than focusing on other ways of saving money internally.

Hello

I am living in Haringey, on Devonshire hill lane, paying permit from one year and when I came from work later that means 3-4 days per week I don't have parking cause others without ticket are parked. It is not fair to pay for my car which is only on weekends at home and even not to have where to park. Or you make till 10 pm, or 7/7 or free to park again.

422

More neighbours will intend to make a letter to Haringey council to discuss this matter as is not impossible to pay for something what you don't use or someone else does.

I am waiting for your answer as well.

Thank you

Dear sir/madam,

Thank you for your email regarding the proposed traffic management new charges in Haringey.

I would like to highlight a matter that reflects this.

423

As a resident of Haringey for many years I have seen a major increase in visitor cars parking and frankly it has become a major issue for us residents to be able to park anywhere near our houses. We are not only having to deal with limited parking availability but these cars tend to also double park to protect their expensive cars hence taking up two spots! Maybe actual bays indicating the parking spot could be introduced to control this?

I would like to know why the borough has not looked into changing the hours of visitor's parking in the Green Lanes Controlled area? As an area now full of restaurants, cafes etc we have become an area ranking close to the West End...the increase in congestion is especially high after 18:30pm and Sunday's when it is free to park in the bays!

Maybe its time Green Lanes Haringey matched the control area times of Wood Green to 10pm?

Just my opinion...but I am sure many residents feel the same.

Dear policy maker,

Your 6 month residence permit policy idea is a crappy one. It will have no impact on the roads apart from moving cars to non permit areas where people can park. Obviously you won't be amending the cost to reflect this change.

424

Why not think about banning parking altogether. Your suggestion is a feeble attempt to resolve an issue created by your own planning policy.

I look forward to buying two big diesel guzzling cars in order to park each for a alternate six monthly period.

Yours sincerely

Is this email basically telling me that you are planning to increase prices and take more from elderly people...

425

May I remind Haringey Council that whilst you are raising prices for the new rich people that are moving into the borough into the "affordable housing properties" the ones that start at £500,000+ The majority of residents do not have fat salaries and can afford these increases. Our wages have stagnated over the last 10 years. Can the council remember this. Austerity is killing people... The council are out of touch with ordinary residents, the abandoned HDV scheme proved that.

I can only hope that the next council leader hates this whole privatisation and starts to consider ordinary working class people..

Dear Sir or Madam,

426

I feel nothing but despair at the suggested extortionate hoik in charges to residents with cars living in the borough of Haringey.

We are already under increasing pressures in our urban environment. How much do you think people can take?

Every little addition of this kind contributes to making London living intolerable and unfair.

Dear Sir,

I read with some horror the proposal in the Ham and High and tried to understand the justification for the increase in charges from the documents detailing the proposals. Alas I could not find any substantive reasoning. The previous charges had a reasonable scale increasing with Carbon emissions. The previous charges recognized the importance of visitor permits of varying duration to match the parking restrictions. The new proposals do not.

427

The proposed charges are a significant increase compared to the previous ones but no forecast is made of the increased revenue the Council will receive. Therefore, I am making a formal Freedom of Information Request to the council for the revenue forecast of Controlled Parking Zones in Haringey both before and after the imposition of the proposed new charges.

As a resident I believe an increase in my yearly Parking permit of 63.5% is indefensible as is the increase in a visitor parking permit for one hour of 129% !

These charges are outrageous.

I do hope you will reconsider.

Yours sincerely,

Proposed amendments to on street parking permits and charges

I write with regards to your recent communication with me regarding the above,

I am writing to express my views on raising the age of concessionary schemes from 60 to 65

It is NOT acceptable or fair to raise the age of the concessionary scheme at all. Older residents are already having to work longer as a result of corporate governance incompetence. Instead of retiring at 60 I now have to work until I am 66.

I now qualify for a pension having accomplished 36 full years of NI deductions but am obliged to work another 8 years.

If you are intent on scourging your residents further then do so equably and encompass those

428 who are already pensioners to create a level and fair platform for all.

You have sold off so many Haringey assets and still it's not enough to govern us with competence.

.It is not fair to further penalise people who through no fault of their own have to work longer and harder, who are suffering austerity measures for over 8 years at a time when so many of our local assets have been sold off and local services withdrawn

The article below demonstrates that the working populace pay higher amounts of council tax to offset those whose circumstances are somewhat diminished when Haringey could offset the shortfall by using it's reserves. Enough is enough

<https://www.npi.org.uk/blog/council-tax/council-cuts-consultations-must-offer-wider-rangeoptions-in/>

“Following its consultation, Haringey Council decided to meet this shortfall by requiring all working age CTS recipients except disabled people to pay 20% of their Council Tax however little income they had. Other changes included reducing the savings limit above which there is no eligibility for CTS as well as altering the rules relating to the back-dating claims for support. We estimated at the time that the changes saw around 18,000 Haringey households lose on average just under £210 per year.”

I am staggered at the changes you are proposing.

Whilst I will not suffer personally from the age being raised to 65 for concessionary rates, it is amazing that you are choosing to do this to a segment of the population who often does not work and is still entitled to, for example free travel on tfl from the age of 60.

Your proposed system for visitor parking permits is laughable. But an excellent business opportunity for those who buy up a lot and sell them on to builders and others who would like to have close access to the tube or the Whittington. Something worth considering on my part? How would you ever know? The logical progression of this is that the area is then clogged up by cars that should not be here and those that live here can't park.

429

That you are considering a tighter frame on the validity is crazy. And you're proposing scrapping the refund system. I buy visitors' permits and then expect to be refunded for any I haven't used in the two years. It doesn't make sense not to buy enough to cover needs for a couple of years as your system to get the things is outdated, user unfriendly and inconvenient.

Your proposals clearly indicate a lack of strategic vision in an attempt to generate income. You don't really think that successful operations like Amazon or Apple would consider such ill thought through proposals! Get your act together and work to represent the people in your borough supported by workable and fair operations.

I am 67 and have paid for a permit since 2011.

From your email I now wonder if I was actually required to pay due to my age. My date of birth is 29/04.1950.

430

I look forward to hearing from you,

431

Horrified that you are now more than doubling the cost of parking permits and consulting on charging the over 60s the full amount. As a woman who planned retirement at 60 only to be forced to try and stay in work till 66 I feel utterly betrayed by the council. You talk about the environment and air quality whilst introducing a garden waste charge so now, despite an 8 year wage freeze, I watch the refuse trucks trundle past my house and then have to get in my car and take the waste to the recycling centre, thus doubling the emissions. There is no joined up thinking by the council, instead you greedily and carelessly squeeze the already squeezed. Shame on you.

Sent from my iPad Please send me details of your parking permit concessionary scheme for people over 65. I am 66, I have a permit but I have only just heard about these concessions. Thank you,

432

Dear Sirs,

Can you confirm when these changes are due to come into force please.

I will be 60 on 23rd of March 2018 and wonder whether the concessionary rate will apply to me now or whether I will have to wait for another 5 years.

Regards

433

I am opposed to the raising of the concessionary age from 60 to 65 for parking permits.

The permits should be offered on either a 6 or 12 month basis.

The CO2 levels should be aligned with DVLA standards.

434

I strongly disagree with the proposal to increase the concessions from 60 to 65 years.

It appears that older people who have retired will be hard done by.

435

Specially in these difficult economic climate.

Shame on Haringey council.

Dear Haringey,

Whilst your proposal is welcomed and some of the proposals are good like the unlimited visitor permit allocation. I would have to disagree with your proposal to change the residential permit to a 6 month renewal basis.

Whilst this may suit a tenant who is on a 6 months contract it does not suit a tenant who is on a 12 month contract. More so, I am a homeowner and resident and not a tenant. I would come to think that residents like myself a homeowner are in the majority and would be unfair on us if we had to renew out permits every 6 months. Especially if it means we have to pay more over a given year. You should keep the resident permit renewals and prices as they are and perhaps give an option to residents that are tenants who would want a 6 month permit. This would be fair and reasonable.

Kind regards

436

I cannot open your propose traffic manage t order of 2.2.18. It is a zip file.

437

Sent from my iPad

438

Please find attached my objections to your proposals.

439

I would be grateful if you could inform me how my residents parking charge and visitors parking tickets will change from this year. I live in Shanklin Road and have a residents parking permit for my Honda car which at the moment is due to expire in November 2018. I also have visitors parking permits. I am over 65. It is not clear from your website how the costs will change.

Dear Sirs

I would like to object to this Order if it in any way affects the parking and use of my car which I have had for some time. I do not use it as much, and I have purchased the year's Permit of £57.

What changes are being proposed which would be detrimental to my current state of affairs?

Kindly respond.

440

441

If the LibDems get in next election, will they reverse this crap?
To whom it may concern

Perhaps Haringey Council should make an effort to check on the HIGH number of Disabled badge holders that appear to park in our streets (Woodside)

I cannot for one moment believe there are so many unfortunate people parking in our roads who CLAIM to be disabled but can drive the largest 4X4 vehicles on the market – I'd like to know how they can get into the cars that are so high up!

Our road is currently only parking permit Monday to Friday – to 6.30pm – I would suggest that you consider extending the permit to cover at least til Saturday 1pm- this way I will find a

442

parking space in front of my house on a Friday night when I get home from work. Instead of having to park around the corner on Zig Zags or worse and risk getting a ticket myself when I already pay enough for the yearly permit.

Please look into this- not sure how this matter can be tackled – but THIS should be a priority! Get checking the disabled badges and I'm sure Haringey will get a lot of fines put in order!!

Thank you

Regards

Disgruntled resident TINTERN ROAD

Dear Sirs,

443

I would like to comment upon the latest traffic proposals on some roads. However, I cannot open up the "zip" files. Could they please be sent to me as pdfs.

Thank you and kind regards

Hello,

444

Can you tell me when these changes are planned to kick in? I cannot see a date in the information provided.

.

Hey

I know that there are current proposals regarding parking in the district, but I would like to know if disabled spaces are ever looked at and decommissioned after the person they were specifically built for has either moved on or has passed away?

445

Between the start of Umfreville Road (Green Lanes End) and number 74 there are 3 disabled space which sit empty most of the time and people with blue badges can park anywhere they please, it is really difficult finding parking on this street and especially near my flat (82) so just wondered if this could be looked into? Also would it not be possible to allocate each flat or house with at least 1 guaranteed parking space outside there property's, we have to pay for parking so is it fair that sometimes we have to park at the top of the street or even on the next street over because of volume of traffic, I know most homes have more than one car but to give at least one space to each home would be a great gesture.

Many Thanks

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please find my comments below in respect of the proposed amendments to on street parking permits and charges.

I would first note that I was only notified of the consultation on 14 February, 12 days after the launch date. It also appears that notifications of the consultation are only being sent to those with active parking permit accounts (I have not received any other notification of the consultation) which will clearly skew the results of the consultation.

The purported purpose of the amendments is to encourage residents to move to more 446

sustainable modes of transport.

In reality, the cost of annual parking permits has stayed the same (I understand that there is some adjustment with an increase in price for more polluting cars in a band but that is offset by a reduction for the less polluting cars) and actually decreased for those households with two vehicles whilst the proposal is to more than double the cost of visitor permits (an increase from 35p to 80p).

This is clearly an incentive to own a car rather than use one occasionally as the demand requires, which would be more in line with the proposal aims. If the visitor passes are being doubled in price I would expect to see a proportionate increase in annual passes as well.

This is particularly relevant in boroughs such as Harringay where the majority of residents do not

own a car, but are being expected to subsidise the cheaper passes of the minority.

I also disagree strongly with the proposal to remove the limit on hourly visitor permits but have them expire after one year.

The reason given is to prevent stockpiling but, as there is no upper limit for permits, it appears that stockpiling would be unlikely in the vast majority of instances and instead it will benefit those who use the permits excessively, encouraging more car use.

Given the lead time in purchasing parking permits (two weeks appears standard in my experience) it is necessary to maintain some permits for urgent use and a proportion of these will inevitably carry over to the next year.

It is clear that this is a revenue generating exercise from the council with the expectation that expired permits will have to be replaced each year and produce additional income.

However, I would also add that not being able to carry permits over from one year to the next will encourage multiple smaller purchases to ensure that no vouchers are left over at the end of the year.

Moving from one or two large annual purchases to one purchase a month will, of course, greatly increase the council's costs in processing these permits negating any increased revenue that the council expects to make

This seems to us to be an incoherent strategy, though with a couple of acceptable features.

What is acceptable to a point/with reservations:

1. Simplification The current team seem unable to cope with the scheme as it exists, in my experience. For example they have failed to reply to a letter sent on the 2nd December; ambiguity surrounds which vouchers may be replaced or refunded and the introduction of the no refund rule on the 1 hour vouchers was not broadcast loud and clear to the whole borough; I was asked to verify my age despite my having been in receipt of concessionary vouchers for a number of years.

That said, revisions to charges do not necessarily mean improvements in their performance.

2. Revising the concessionary age from 60 to 65 seems reasonable, given what you say about some in-betweeners still working.

But this illustrates one major problem with the assumptions made about people, drivers and visitors within the borough. It is assumed that everyone should pay the same, whatever their income. From an environmental point of view, this may be sound, but from a fairness point of view it certainly isn't. And the increases in charges will fall most heavily on those on very low

incomes.

3. Aligning of the annual or six-month permits with the DVLA CO2 bands is sensible

4. Introducing 6 month permits with no penalty is good

Short-sighted in the extreme/not acceptable

1. Maintaining the daily rate is perhaps a good thing, but as one of only two time bands, coupled with lifting the ceiling on how many you can have, what leaps out to me is the scope for visitors entering into deals to use them for commuting. It is almost incentivised by the stark contrast.

2. No mention is made, I think, of the costs of despatch. Currently as I understand it, this is free. Will this continue? For a very limiting approach to be taken to the years within which permits can be used, this seems essential if people are to manage the volume of permits needed. The more residents have to make small repeat orders in order to not end up out of pocket, the greater the cost to the Council.

3. Environmentally the only element in this which has some coherence is the aligning of the annual or six-month permits with the DVLA CO2 bands. However, this is pretty much cancelled out by the removal of higher rates for 2nd or further cars. This is plain foolish.

4. Assumptions are made about how increasing the cost of hourly permits will encourage people to use alternative methods of transport. Why would it? Some residents are not well placed for public transport alternatives; some have visitors who are elderly or not very mobile. Unless you can provide evidence to the contrary, my assumption would be that where good transport links exist, people already use them.

5. Given my point about low incomes above, this will very probably translate into an increase in loneliness and isolation for many residents. This is already a big concern in the borough.

Even if such evidence(point 5) were to exist, it is impossible to justify an effective hike of 129% in the cost of these permits, if deployed over two-hour periods.

It is impossible not to feel that this is basically a money-spinner

Hello,

From the "Statement of Reasons".

"Whilst many of the Borough's residents may still chose to own a car, it is hoped that the proposed measures would encourage a change to less polluting vehicles."

448

I live on Uplands Road, N8 and I am one of those still choosing to own a car. I would very much like to change to a less polluting vehicle, namely a fully electric or electric hybrid vehicle. However, given the lack of electric charging facilities for street-parked cars on my road this is currently unfeasible. While my current vehicle is at the lower end of the emission banding, it does seem unfair to penalize owners of more polluting street-parked cars while not providing them with the facilities to switch to a more environmentally-friendly electric vehicle.

Yours,

449

I disagree with 6 months I don't understand why should be change if is ok how it is at the moment

Kind regards

Dear Sir/Madam,

I have received an email with the above title which includes a link to traffic management orders but once you get to that page it is not clear which items relate to the proposed changes.

I hold a resident parking permit for Woodside but there is no mention of that CPZ that I can find and the title of the email suggests it is a general change covering all CPZ's not just one.

I've looked at 2 or 3 of the traffic management orders which turn out to be either temporary or relate to specific streets, but none appear to relate to general changes.

Can you please provide a link to the relevant pages so I can see more the detail of what is proposed.

Thank you

I don't quite understand the meaning of this:

(a) amend the residents' visitors' parking permit scheme so that the permits would be limited to hourly and daily operation. This would remove the need for an upper limit on numbers that could be purchased and It is anticipated that those permits would be used within the year purchased and not stock piled for future years. Unused permits would therefore not be exchanged or refunded. It is also proposed that the charge for hourly permits would be increased to 80p per hour;

Do I take it that:

451

- * you will no longer be issuing 2 hour permits?
- * how does that remove the upper limit on permits issued?
- * how does it reduce the amount cars are used?
- * at the moment one makes a guess as to how many permits we might need. With the system you seem to propose that permits would be valid from May - May (in my case). One could be caught out at the year end, waiting for a few extra permits. Is that what you propose? Flexibility would seem to be a good thing as well as fair and reasonable.

Can you please confirm, given that the two hour permit is being abolished, whether two of the new one hour permits can be used together to cover a two hour period in a CPZ? Or would a whole day permit be required?

452

To whom it may concern:

strongly object to the Council's proposal to change the parking permits to six monthly. One year permits are more convenient - you will be doubling the amount of red tape and bureaucracy by changing to six monthly and clearly just doing it to increase your revenues. You say it is more convenient for people on short-hold tenancies - then why not allow people to choose either one yearly or six monthly permits?

It is not right that the Council is intending to put it's own agenda and interests ahead of the public's.

453

Hello

Thank you for the information about the resident permits. Will you be introducing resident permits for people who have drives? Even though they may be parking in their front gardens they still use up a whole parking space on the road with the drop curb and drive across the public pavement to get to their front gardens.

454

It seems this could be a good additional income stream and ensure that it is fair for all residents. Why should someone who takes up a whole parking space on the road not pay for a residents permit?

Kind regards

Hello,

Firstly, thank you for sending the information which i received on the 16th February informing me of changes from the 2nd February.

There does not seem to be any consultation time built in.

I understand you point about people staying for 6 months only but i see this as an obstacle to those of us who are permanent residents in the LA. it is another task and job to remember to do.

I do not see this as a solution to being 'fair' rather just easier. Why is it a problem to produce

455 either a 6 month or one year permit? Each year I have problems renewing my permits and do not

feel I should have to go through this twice a year and risk a possible fine if I am having problems getting the permit.

I also feel it is unfair to raise the concessionary age to 65. I am younger, however, times are hard enough as they are and to impose this extra cost on people who are struggling financial is unfair.

Your proposals do not seem to be for the benefit of those who year in year out pay council tax and quite frankly get little for it.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I have read your e-mail regarding changes to parking permits in Haringey.

456

While broadly in agreement it does seem to me that a 58% increase in the cost of a permit for cars pre 2001 above 1600cc (from £114 to £180) is disproportionate when you consider the increase below 1600cc is only in the region of 25%.

An increase to @£145 would appear fairer.

Is this the appropriate channel for my comments or is there an official consultation?

Regards

457

If you are thinking fair - Instead of targeting people by age why not target people by income? I earn peanuts whilst round the corner from me people are earning huge amounts of money and have 2 cars why not target them?

Sent from my iPhone

A CPZ was introduced to my Road last year.

My ability, as a Blue Badge holder, to park anywhere near my home has not been improved much because the available parking spaces have been drastically reduced by the introduction of yellow lines, some of which seem to be very arbitrary and the long yellow lines in front of private householders driveways. Often they take up 1 -2 car parking spaces.

It seems very inequitable to me that private individuals have been able to effectively buy car parking spaces, for their exclusive use, on a public road for their and do not have to pay for this ,like the majority of private residents, through car parking permits.

It is especially inequitable as private driveways can only be constructed when strict criteria apply and few residents can meet the criteria or have funds to pay for the construction or have large enough front gardens to accommodate a car.

458

Additionally, you state that permits have been introduced to deter car ownership and encourage alternative forms of travel and deter high emission vehicles.

Your current policy however does not apply to those with crossovers so it is again inequitable. Those with crossovers can have as many high emission vehicles that they can cram on to the plot with no financial deterrent.

Please consider this and respond.

Thanks

I feel that it is unfair that houses with driveways

459

Sent from my iPad

My browser cannot open them. Can you please provide them as PDFs ?

460

File especially required is proposed parking changes

Why the shortsightedness?

Hi

461

Can you please send the information directly as my browser cannot open the zip files. Thanks

462

I don't understand why some people in the community are exempt from paying parking permits. Why don't government introduce parking in Stamford hill area, do they all drive Hybrid cars.

463

Hi: I have a residents parking permit, and am over 65. Is there a concession on this permit?
Thanks.

I am happy to accept your changes under the proviso that you create and administer a print on demand solution for visitors permits, due to the ridiculous time it takes to issue visitors permits currently.

464

Due to your failings to issue permits in a reasonable time-frame is the only reason for me to stockpile visitor parking permits. The last contact I had regarding the failure to deliver visitor parking permits I was expected to take a day off work to visit the council offices in Wood Green. This is akin to offering to pay my council tax between 17:59 and 18:00 for collection in cash.

This is not a difficult problem to solve and I can supply you with a large list of councils across the UK that have been able to adopt such a system. If the process of payment is difficult I propose that you look at Gov UK Pay.

Dear Sirs,

I do not see any reference to motorcycles in the information you have sent via email.

465 I assume that as a result motorcycles continue to be exempt from any resident parking charge.

Kind regards

I have received your e-mail but I can't seem to download the documents to understand what changes you are making. I am not very tech able. Why do I have to buy a link to access documents which surely as a resident and council tax payer of L B Haringey I am entitled to in any event.

466 Your ps sincerely,

467 I am unable to understand what you are proposing, how it will affect me and if it does what will it cost?

Thank you for your email received today, outlining the proposed amendments to Parking Permits and charges.

468 I note that the letter is dated 2nd February and you advise I have 21 days to respond. Given this correspondence was only emailed today (16th February) at 20:24 hrs, please can you confirm that the 21 days response period will start from today?

Hi

469 No one in our household has a long term parking permit as we don't own a car.

470 Hi, as you changing that and that when you will make it easy to us to have this permit I do not understand why every year when I pay it I have to go to the internet café to print it no everyone have printer.

471 Please remove me from this list as I no longer live in Haringey

I am a resident of Hornsey South CPZ.

Could you please explain why a letter dated 2 February is emailed to residents on Friday 16 January for whom these amendments apply with a time restriction of 21 days to respond?

Either it is intentional to give residents less time to respond, or it is incompetent. Either way, it is unacceptable.

Kindly confirm that residents have 21 days from sending and delivery of the email to give us a fair and reasonable amount of time to digest and respond accordingly.

Please email me in respect of this matter by return.

I am a permanent resident.

69 years of age and an amputee.

I have a Blue badge and accompanying residents companion badge.

I am worried that my car will fall below the emissions regulations.

I am on a limited income, still working [self employed] and cannot

afford a new car. I do need the car. I do not get any assistance with the car, even though I have to have it adapted.

I feel penalised, and that it is unfair to expect me to pay even more to keep myself mobilised.

I do receive any benefits. I do my utmost to be independent.

What do you expect people like me to do?

I don't expect any kind of helpful reply from you.

It would just be 'toeing the line'/automaton kind of stuff.

So don't bother to reply unless you suggest something useful.

I just think you should know what it's like out there

for fellow human beings.

Thank you for advising me of impending changes to parking charges in Haringey.

I have received notification that my permit is due for renewal by 9/3/18. I have applied and paid for a further 12 months ,which you have acknowledged receipt of. However I was unable to print off the new permit.

In the light of your proposed changes will you be sending a revised application form for 6 months ?

Yours faithfully

let me know a bit more about this . Will One visitors permit cover all

roads in the borough. let me know price and when new permits start c

Dear Sirs/Madam,

I have received your email regarding the proposed changes to permit charges. I see that it is proposed to raise the age from 60 to 65 on the concessionary scheme.

I'm not sure as to when the full parking permit scheme was introduced from the match day scheme, but from its introduction I am seemingly unaware of a concessionary scheme. As far as I'm aware I have paid the full permit price according to CO2 emissions of my vehicles since the scheme began.

I have just in the last week renewed my current permit at £114. Thank you in anticipation of your review and response

Dear all,

Changes sound good. Any chance there could be a review of parking on Arnold Road N15? I pay for a permit but have great difficulty parking in my street on a Saturday evening and all day on Sunday due to market at Tottenham Green and events at the leisure centre. I often have to park quite far away at these times.

Regards,

Thankyou for those proposed amendements.

Can you tell me if the council , in implementing the new the pay by phone scheme, proposed this to the public first?

478

Kind regards

Dear Traffic Department,

I understand that 6 month permit rather than

479

an annual permit is to be introduced ? If so I do not think this is appropriate as it will increase bureaucracy for the council and residents.

Also I strongly oppose any increase in costs of permits based on CO2 DVLA bands . The manufacturers should cover this cost , not the motorist whom bought these vehicles in good faith.

Regards

480

Where exactly can I find the proposed new prices? It's not clear either from this email or the listtraffic-management-orders web page.

481

Also, if Haringey is so concerned about the environment, why are they closing the Tottenham recycling centre? That has obviously resulted in (a) a decline in recycling, (b) an increase in flytipping and (c) an increase in emissions from the cars of Tottenham residents who do continue to recycle but who now have to drive to Wood Green.

Sent from my iPhone

Good morning

I was just wondering when the permit changes will take place, I believe mine is up for renewal in March

Also visitors permits will the adjustment be made online?

482

Look forward to your reply.

Kind regards

Dear Sirs,

You sent me an email yesterday can you please confirm whether it relates to Mansfield Avenue 483 N15 or whether it is the Councils intention to introduce temporary parking permits to Birkbeck Road N17.

Kind Regards

I received an email regarding the above. I have tried to look at the new prices but am unable to view the document.

Please let me know what the proposed charges will be.

484

Regards,

Sent from my iPad

Hello,

I should like to comment on the proposed changes to parking permits and charges in Haringey dated 2 February 2018.

I note in particular there is no provision for historic vehicles – ie those that are in the “historic” vehicles taxation band (built over 40 years ago – currently 1978). These vehicles were built before emissions standards came into force and are generally exempted from emissions tax regimes because of their unsuitability for engine conversion or replacement – for example they are proposed to be exempted from the Mayor of London’s ULEZ.

Such vehicles are overwhelmingly owned by collectors and generally little used. Their preservation contributes to the history of our country and has little impact on CO2 or other undesirable emissions from the vehicle fleet as a whole.

Under your proposals a vehicle of 1800cc would see its annual parking charge increase very

significantly from £114.20 to £180.

To apply large parking permit charge increases to such vehicles would be disproportionate have no useful policy effect (since it cannot presumably be hoped that such vehicles will have their engines converted or be scrapped). There are almost certainly very few such vehicles in Haringey and to apply some kind of moderated approach to them would have very little impact on the financials of the scheme as a whole.

In summary, I would ask you to make specific provision for historic vehicles and to moderate your proposed charges accordingly – in line with practice in other environmental charging regimes, notably the Mayor of London's proposed ULEZ.

Please would you acknowledge receipt of this letter.

486 I can't open your zip files.

487 Hello -

I received your email about residents parking permits. When I clicked on the link you gave to get further information and details about new charges I couldn't access anything which clarified the situation at all. Is there someone I could speak to - or could you send me the information, please?

Thank you

	Thank you for your email re parking permit changes. To confirm:
492	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We are both over 65, indeed over 70. - As copied to you before the car has lower CO2 emissions than standard for its model as it has been adapted and maintained to run on Lpg.
493	There is no indication in your email as to when this will come into force, please explain.
494	I no longer have an active residents permit and I believe my record was updated. Please could you check and remove me from your records?
Total	N
488	<p>Hello</p> <p>I have an old car - a VW polo. I think first registered in 2000. I have residents' parking.</p> <p>I would like to know how I will be affected by the proposed changes, and when they take effect.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>
489	<p>Hi I have a 2014 BMW touring, what will my new parking charge be?</p> <p>Thanks</p>
490	<p>Thank you for your email about this. Unfortunately whilst I can open the webpage, I can't then open any of the links.</p> <p>Hi there</p> <p>When are the changes proposed to come into force ?</p> <p>Thanks</p>
491	