

Frontline Consultation

Parking Charges Statutory Consultation Report

Contents:

- Section 1. Overview Analysis of Representations
- Section 2. Detailed Objections and Responses
- Section 3. Examples of comments
- Section 4. General questions
- Section 5. Detailed comments

Introduction

The statutory consultation on parking permits and charges commenced on 3 June 2020 and ran until 24 June 2020. Residents were informed of the consultation by the following methods:

- Notices advertised in the local Press and London Gazette
- On street notices in the main 'town centre' areas including Green Lanes, Crouch End, Muswell Hill and Tottenham.
- Emails were sent out to some 54,813 resident and business permit holders.

The council consulted statutory bodies such as the Police, Ambulance, Fire Brigade, Bus Operators, Road Haulage Association and Freight Transport Association. Other stakeholders, such as cycling, environmental and disability groups were also notified of proposals with feedback sought.

The council used marketing software to reach our 54,813 permit holders via email. This software is able to tell us that 34,690 recipients opened those communications.

The parking consultation website which also included Frequently Asked Questions received 15,991 hits during the period of this consultation. This provides assurance that information on proposals reached a wide audience.

The council received 2651 responses to the consultation. There were no major objections to be considered. The objections and representations received involved:

- 2,277 responses from residents and businesses either objecting to proposals of making various representations
- 293 responses stated that proposals would disadvantage businesses
- 90 objections to the 25% diesel surcharge to on-street pay-to-park areas and off-street
- 374 responses were from residents supporting proposals.

Environmental groups such as Friends of the Earth responded in support of the proposals. The Haringey Cycling Campaign responded supporting proposals but felt that charges for electric vehicles were too low, given the environmental impacts during the manufacturing process.

The measures proposed are summarised below.

- Parking permits - a £10 increase across all existing parking permits.
- £50 surcharge on second and subsequent permits.
- £80 surcharge on diesel fuelled vehicles.
- 25% diesel surcharge on paid for parking on-street and in car parks.

Frontline Consultation

- Daily visitor permits be limited to a maximum of two visitor permits being used on any given day.
- Daily visitor permits to increase to £4 across all CPZ areas (50% concessionary reduction to apply).
- Free residential permit for Disabled Blue Badge Holders to replace the companion badge
- £20 administration charge for parking permit refunds, and scratch cards will be non-refundable

There were two responses from Elected Members forwarding on their constituent's views on proposals. In addition two Elected Members contacted service directly raising a number of questions in relation to proposals.

Section1. Overview Analysis of Representations

Responses have been grouped in two ways to provide clear information on objections and representations received:

- (i) Grouped in order of the subject of primary interest. Many respondents have not identified a specific measure but have just commented or objected more widely.
- (ii) Grouped by views or themes expressed.

Table 1 sets out volume of responses by main interest.

Table 1 Measure of main interest / subject of comments



Table 2 sets out the volume of response by theme.

Frontline Consultation

| | Count | % |
|--|-------|------|
| 4 Using the environment as a means to make money | 462 | 17% |
| 3 Proposals are draconian, especially now | 453 | 17% |
| 1 Diesel surcharge totally unfair. Ignores Euro6, ULEZ, & previous govt advice | 445 | 17% |
| 2 Permit charge hikes & VP limits are unreasonable (& very slow service) | 437 | 16% |
| 9 Support many of the objectives | 411 | 16% |
| 6 What is the parking surplus spent on? No visible benefits | 247 | 9% |
| 7 Why now, when many will lose their jobs? | 233 | 9% |
| 11 Admin and refund charges are unconvincing (esp with no current active controls) | 216 | 8% |
| 8 Not good when people need to use cars and avoid public transport | 186 | 7% |
| 10 General issues incl companion / carer & blue badges | 155 | 6% |
| 5 Increased on-street charges will not help local businesses | 142 | 5% |
| 12 Many families and workers need more than 1 vehicle | 72 | 3% |
| Total | 2650 | 100% |

Respondents have tended to take an overview of the proposed measures and comment accordingly, rather than selecting specific individual measures. Where individual measures have been focused on, it is the diesel surcharge which is most often objected to – as was illustrated in Table 1. The main theme is that all the proposed charges are excessive, especially at the present time of economic uncertainty associated with the COVID 19 crisis. The main objections and the Council response are set out below.

Section 2. Detailed Objections and Council's Responses

Objection: Haringey should not be introducing these charges at the present time/ this is not the time to introduce these charges.

Council response: Haringey has committed to improving air quality by introducing measures to encourage sustainable transport choices.

Poor air quality has a serious impact on the health and wellbeing of the most vulnerable in society. This includes those with existing respiratory problems and chronic illnesses, such as asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Those who live or work near main roads are at particular risk of health problems caused by air pollution.

We understand that many residents have been impacted economically by the Covid 19 pandemic, and that any increase in parking charges impact on those residents who own a car. However, we firmly believe that this is a time to promote measures that improve the health and well-being opportunities for all borough residents.

Objection: Diesel surcharge is not in line with ULEZ and fails to acknowledge that modern diesel vehicles are less polluting than many petrol engine vehicles.

Council response: Consideration was given to exempting Euro 6 diesel compliant vehicles from the proposed diesel surcharge and aligning the surcharge with the Ultra-Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) criteria. However, there are well documented concerns that real world performance of vehicles may not be as good as claimed by laboratory testing. While testing under euro certification is being modified to address this concern, the majority of Euro 6 compliant vehicles in circulation would have

Frontline Consultation

had their certification issued under the old testing methods. This makes it very difficult for us to rely on this certification to exempt Euro 6 from the diesel surcharge.

Objection: £50 surcharge for second or more vehicles is unfair because many households, such as those with large families, need more than one vehicle.

Council response: Currently, the Council allows individuals and households within CPZs to purchase as many parking permits as they require. However, it is important that the Council discourages multiple car ownership and achieves a less congested road network. This measure raises awareness of the environmental impact of multiple car ownership but does not restrict residents parking more than one vehicle. We hope that it will encourage residents to reconsider their transport options.

Objection 4: A 25% pay-to-park surcharge will unfairly impact on those who need to drive to go shopping. It will also hit struggling local shops and businesses and just encourage more journeys to out-of-town shopping centres.

Council response: A high percentage of vehicles using our on-street and car park facilities are diesel fuelled. It would be appropriate in normal circumstances to include short stay parking in any measures being proposed to improve air quality in the borough. However, the council recognises that this may not be the appropriate to implement this proposal. This will also aid our town centres in their recovery from the impacts of the Covid pandemic.

Objection: The Council is only doing this to make money.

Council response: The Council's Borough Plan, Transport Strategy and Air Quality Action plan (AQAP) set out requirements for improving air quality and actions required to reduce pollution that is harmful to the health and well-being of our residents.

When setting or reviewing parking charges the Council considers:

- the Council's transport and wider policy objectives
- statutory or legal requirements that may affect the setting of fees
- car ownership patterns
- the increasing demand for parking
- traffic management issues
- market conditions – (parking charges in other boroughs)
- cost of delivering the service
- impact of charges on relevant stakeholders

The Council has committed to acting decisively to improve air quality and this includes using parking policies as a tool to affect change.

Section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 states that any income that is generated must be paid into the parking revenue account, and any surplus ring-fenced and invested back into road maintenance and highway improvements, concessionary fares, environmental improvements and to administer the Disabled Blue Badge parking scheme.

Objection: The charges are unfair to those who cannot afford a newer car, which includes the poorest, elderly, and vulnerable / The charges are unfair to the poor and vulnerable.

Frontline Consultation

Council response: Any change to parking fee structures will have an impact on residents. However, the permit charge will remain relatively low in proportion to the cost of running and maintaining a car. Average annual cost of car ownership and use is in the region of £3k.

The proposals consulted on are designed to bring benefits for Haringey's residents. As highlighted within the Equalities Impact Assessment all residents will benefit from reduced traffic congestion and reduced numbers of polluting vehicles. This improved environment will encourage active travel such as walking and cycling leading to further health benefits all of which are seen as mitigating against the effects of increased parking charges which do impact more on low income groups which include BAME residents. The charges proposed represents a further step towards addressing health inequalities affecting groups who share the protected characteristics.

Objection: The charges are unfair to those who avoid using their cars, and often walk, cycle or use public transport. Unused cars do not pollute.

Council response: The only practical tool that the Council can use to incentivise the use of more fuel-efficient cars is through their parking permit and short-term parking charging structures.

Objection: Unfair to charge residents living in a CPZ, while currently allowing outside cars to park freely. It is unfair and creates divisions in the community.

Council response: The Council reduced parking enforcement in CPZs to support NHS and key workers, as well as residents adversely effected by the Covid 19 crisis. Enforcement resumed on 6 July 2020.

Objection: I already pay council and road tax and do not see why we should pay more.

Council response: Parking charges are not a tax, but a charge for a service. Those charges are intended to cover the costs of delivering the service.

Objection: Unfair to residents who do not have driveways, and increased costs still do not guarantee a parking space near to home.

Council response: In a CPZ the parking needs of residents and their visitors are prioritised. CPZs are designed so that the kerb space is managed effectively for the various user types, and to reduce commuter parking activity. This provides a greater opportunity for residents to park as close to their homes as possible.

Objection: Letters were not sent to every household about the proposed charges, not every resident was given a chance to voice an opinion.

Council response: It was not practical or cost effective to distribute letters to every household in the borough. The council is legally required to undertake a statutory consultation and advertise the appropriate Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) before implementing any changes to parking fees and charges. This means that the council must advertise the details of the proposals in local newspapers and the London Gazette.

The council consulted statutory bodies such as the Police, Ambulance, Fire Brigade, Bus Operators, Road Haulage Association and Freight Transport Association. Other stakeholders, such as cycling, environmental and disability groups were also notified of proposals with feedback sought.

Frontline Consultation

The proposals were also advertised on the Council's website providing web links to the TMOs. Notices were placed on street and within the council run car parks. We also sent a mailshot to over 54,000 permit holders. The proposals were also communicated on social media platforms. The Council went beyond the statutory requirement to notify stakeholders of proposals.

Objection: I will not support the companion badge removal due to the risk of theft and damage caused to vehicles. The companion badge also provides the user to park freely across the borough.

Council Response: The primary purpose of the Companion Badge (permit) is to avoid the need for the Disabled Blue Badge to be displayed overnight when the risk of theft of the badge is highest. Many boroughs who introduced similar schemes, have already replaced them with a free residential parking permits, which addresses the primary purpose of the concession and benefits all disabled badge holders while parked near their home. Any remaining unused time on companion badges will be refunded.

Objection; we strongly object to no refund of scratch cards. I also object to the cap on using them.

Council response: Visitors' permits are often purchased in large quantities due to the relatively low cost. Residents subsequently request a refund on unused permits or those expiring. As charges for those permits are relatively low the cost of processing these refunds often exceeds the value of the refund.

The Council is replacing the current scratch card (visitor) permits with virtual permits through the new IT system later this year. Residents will be able to exchange their scratch cards for virtual permits should they wish to do so. This will ensure that permits can be drawn down quickly and efficiently when required and they will not go out of date, reducing the need for a refund.

The measures consulted on restricts permit account holders to the use of two daily visitors permits per day. This measure is necessary to manage the situation whereby third parties are purchasing daily permits from residents at a premium, placing extreme pressure on roads in certain parts of the borough. It will not reduce resident's ability to receive visitors as in addition to two daily permits, hourly visitors permit may also be used.

Section 3. Examples of comments submitted in support of the proposed measures.

- I am in agreement that we need to look after the environment and that multiple cars per household are not the way to do it. However, I think that the issue should go further.
- Cycling is especially good right now as so many people don't want to go on buses while Covid19 is dominating our lives. You've got a real chance to make our borough really cycle friendly and to offer a proper alternative to car use
- I support the suggested increases in parking charges. Haringey needs to do much more to discourage car use and this is one way to do so.
- I'm all in favour. Anything that makes this borough a healthier place to live!
- I feel this is the right direction for Haringey and for London as a whole and the council should keep on this path, leading London forward.

Frontline Consultation

- Cars are also hugely expensive and not having one can contribute to people's pockets significantly, an average saving of around £3K per year.
- Encouraging walking, cycling and public transport in London is the way forward and can only lead to massive improvements in health, well-being
- I am very supportive of all of the increases and support the increase in charges fully. Thank you for your proposing these changes and I wish you all the best in convincing residents that this is a good thing for our borough.
- I agree with nearly all the proposals in principle, but a) I think the second car parking permits surcharge should be higher still. b) diesel fuelled vehicles should have a £250 surcharge at the minimum - these vehicles MUST get off the road right away.
- It is critical that roads passing schools and nurseries be as free of motor traffic as possible (i.e. buses only). Too many schools and nurseries in the borough suffer illegal levels of NO2 and PMs. Far too many people are dying prematurely, and the difference in air quality during lockdown has been a huge relief, even to those without underlying conditions. We are all breathing more easily, with better air quality
- Agree with proposals and extension of clean air within the north circular.
- I happily endorse any measure that reduces car use in Haringey. However I don't think the measures go far enough to appreciably change car owners' behaviour. I would substantially increase the proposed surcharges and use that money to provide a viable alternative to personal motorised transport.
- I live in a CPZ and have two permits. I would like to support your proposals. I would favour penalising pollution emitting cars and second permits, but the restrictions on visitor permits might be seen as encouraging car ownership in a way, and also as potentially anti-business. You might do some research on who the balance of use - social v business.
- I fully support the proposed increases in car parking permit costs, and in fact I would support an even higher increase for 2nd car ownership. Excessive car use is a blight on Haringey, and has a significant negative impact on quality of life in the borough. I would support increased spending on cycling and walking routes.
- I am very supportive of all of the increases and support the increase in charges fully. Thank you for your proposing these changes and I wish you all the best in convincing residents that this is a good thing for our borough.
- I am in agreement that we need to look after the environment and that multiple cars per household are not the way to do it.
- I am a resident of Haringey (N22) and am writing to support the suggested increases in parking charges. Haringey needs to do much more to discourage car use and this is one way to do so.
- As with smoking when everyone used to smoke on buses, tube, trains, and at work; there needs to be a culture change. Car transport causes pollution and subsequently ill health, respiratory problems due to air pollution killing more people than COVID. Road traffic is the biggest cause of accidental injury and death in children and young people and contributes to lack of fitness and obesity overall. It also fuels anti-social behaviours, notably road rage, drug

Frontline Consultation

dealing and fly tipping. Cars are also hugely expensive and not having one can contribute to people's pockets significantly, in offering an average saving of around £3K per year.

- However I don't think the measures go far enough to appreciably change car owners' behaviour. I would substantially increase the proposed surcharges and use that money to provide a viable alternative to personal motorised transport. The borough sorely needs a safe, segregated cycle infrastructure to encourage people away from cars.
- I do not think these fee increases will go far enough to curb excessive car use, and I recognise that parking restrictions are one of the most effective ways to reduce car use. With the levels of pollution in London breaching limits frequently please will you consider increasing the fees further?
- I'm pleased to see that there will be increases in the residential parking charges in Haringey. I hope that such increases might result in more modest cars, and fewer huge ones, which make driving on our residential streets difficult. It also might discourage households from having more than one car. We are in the midst of a climate emergency, and this will be a signal to residents that our individual actions matter. London is now provided with excellent public transport, which cannot be used safely by everyone during the Covid-19 crisis, but will be there still when this crisis passes.
- I have read all your proposed amendments to parking charges and permits, and heartily endorse them all. They will help car owners (and I am one) to pay their fair share for the pollution and noise they make, and the space they take up. At the same time, I ask that the council uses the extra income to encourage more active transport, making the streets safer for pedestrians and cyclists, promoting electric vehicles, and helping us all enjoy more "liveable" neighbourhoods. Good luck with these amendments!
- I fully support the proposed increases in car parking permit costs, and in fact I would support an even higher increase for 2nd car ownership. Excessive car use is blight on Haringey, and has a significant negative impact on quality of life in the borough. I would support increased spending on cycling and walking routes

Response in support from Friends of the Earth

We support the following proposed changes in parking permit charges.

- Parking permits - a £10 increase across all existing parking permits to support the significant costs of running, maintaining and enforcing our parking infrastructure
- Additional parking permits - A £50 surcharge on second and subsequent permits to reduce car ownership, promote active travel and more sustainable modes of travel
- Diesel fuelled vehicles - An £80 surcharge for diesel fuelled vehicles to highlight the impact of diesel emissions on local air quality and influence cleaner future vehicle choices
- On-street pay-to-park and off-street car parks - a 25% diesel surcharge to on-street pay-to-park areas and off-street car parks to discourage short trips within the borough

For the following reasons:

- We are in a **climate emergency** so drastic measures to discourage fossil fuel use in vehicles are justified. The increased charges, along with measures to encourage walking and cycling (and, when Covid-19 permits, public transport) and the ULEZ will encourage people to

Frontline Consultation

change their mode of transport to a more active mode – which would be better for health – or, if a car is still necessary for some journeys, away from diesel engines, and/or to use of electric vehicles. But there are social justice reasons to do this too.

There are other social justice grounds for supporting these changes:

- Around 50% of households in Haringey do not own a car
- Poorer households are less likely to own a car
- But poorer households are more affected by air pollution
- Air pollution also exacerbates Covid-19 which itself affects more deprived and BAME communities worse.
- The costs of motoring have not risen as much as public transport fares, and in fact the recent drop in petrol prices will save motorists many pounds a year. The price of petrol is about 25% less than it was in 2013 (see graph from the RAC Foundation below <https://www.racfoundation.org/data/uk-pump-prices-over-time>). In addition the fuel-tax escalator has been frozen for years by successive governments so motorists have escaped the main climate change taxation on fuel.



- The proposed increases in parking permit charges are small compared to the savings drivers are making in cheaper fuel.
- Parking permits are also a cheap way of renting land space. Cars are typically parked near their owner's homes >90% of the time, in effect renting a chunk of valuable public space that could be used for green space, cycle lanes etc. A car parking space is typically around 50 square feet. The average London office rent (pre-Covid-19) was about £52 per square feet, per month <https://www.mgmt.ucl.ac.uk/capital-of-entrepreneurs>, so if we charged parking spaces at a commercial rate, a car parking space would be worth $12 \times 50 \times £52 = £31,200$ per annum. At Brighton office prices it would be a lot less - £2,020. But a parking permit for £72 is still rather a bargain by comparison.
- The additional revenue will enable the Council to fund more active transport measures, thereby helping reduce air pollution and carbon emissions.

Frontline Consultation

Response in support from Haringey Cycling Campaign

I would like to comment, on behalf of Haringey Cycling Campaign CC, on the proposed amendments to parking charges and permits.

Broadly speaking HCC strongly supports the proposed changes, in particular the higher charges for diesel vehicles and for households possessing more than two vehicles, for the reasons set out below.

- The increased charges should reduce ownership and use of the more polluting vehicles. Air pollution disproportionately affects lower income families living on or near main roads, particularly in the East of the Borough.
- A reduction in air pollution will decrease the severity of Covid 19 infection.
- The increased charges may reduce the demand for parking spaces, so freeing space for cycle lanes, urban greening and widened pavements.
- The income from increased charges can be used to fund measures to enable active travel - it's important that residents are given the 'carrot' of better conditions in which to walk and cycle rather than just the 'stick' of increased charges for unsustainable transport
- in CO2 emissions will assist in achieving the Council's climate change objectives.
- The charges will to some extent balance the recent reduction in fuel costs (see RAC data below).
- Already over 50% of households in Haringey do not own a car and these measures could increase this proportion, or at least reduce car ownership and use, with a shift towards active travel, shared mobility and public transport.
- The proposed charge for an electric vehicle permit (£31) is too low. It should be the same or higher than the charge for a bike hangar space. Whilst the costings for bike hangers spaces is different to spaces for private cars, this level of charging sends out all the wrong messages by offering cheaper parking for someone who can afford a £30,000+ car than someone who can afford a bicycle. Awareness is growing of the environmental impact of electric cars both in use and manufacture, appearing to subsidise EV's may lead to owners of no-emission human powered vehicles and owners of low emission conventionally powered cars, to both view the revised charges as inequitable.

Section 4. General questions asked during the parking consultation:

Do you mean we can only buy two permits at a time?

Council response: Residents may purchase as many permits as they. Proposals involve allowing the use of only two daily permits at any one time. The purpose of this restriction is to reduce the opportunity of daily permits being resold by residents, placing additional pressure on the limited kerb space.

Are hourly visitor permits still available to purchase?

Frontline Consultation

Council response: There are no change proposed to hourly permits.

Is there a cap on the number of hourly and daily visitor permits that can be purchased at any one time?

Council response: There is no cap on the number of daily or hourly visitor parking permits that can be purchased.

How many hourly visitor permits can be used in one day?

Council response: There is no cap on the number of hourly visitors permits that can be used in one day.

How many daily visitor permits need to be displayed if I have a visitor for five days at my property?

Council response: Your visitor is required to display one daily visitor permit for each day of their stay, during the operational hours of the CPZ.

Will the concessionary discounts still apply to visitor permits?

Council response: The concessionary discounts (50% reduction in charge) will still be offered.

What incentive is the council offering to residents who own or want to switch to using an electric vehicle?

Council response: The permit charging structure incentivises the use the of fuelled efficient vehicles. The permit charge for an Electric Vehicle is quite low.

5. DETAILED COMMENTS SECTION

Example Comments and Objections on proposed measures

| Proposed Measure | Reason for objection / comment |
|---|--|
| 1 | £10 increase to support admin & enforcement |
| £10 increase to support admin & enforcement | What's the point to pay £10 extra if is very difficult to find a place in my street to park the car you give to many parking permits |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>£10 increase to support admin & enforcement</p> | <p>Regarding some of your proposed changes to the already expensive parking charges, I have some concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Parking permits – a £10 increase across all existing parking permits to support the significant costs of running, maintaining and enforcing our parking infrastructure. Not only are the permits already expensive, but there is COVID-19 and its impact on residents to consider. Most of the "parking infrastructure" is just on-road parking. For these reasons it would seem at least reasonable to freeze any increases until the crisis is over - especially as we are being discouraged from using public transport. The council has surely saved quite some money by furloughing parking attendants etc. for their own safety? * On-street pay-to-park and off-street car parks – a 25% surcharge to on-street pay-to-park areas and off-street car parks to discourage short trips within the borough. This sounds much like an excuse just to raise the prices. |
| <p>£10 increase to support admin & enforcement</p> | <p>We live at Alexandra Road, N8 . We made a conscious decision to retain a front garden, in order to prevent flooding by concreting over the ground. We also felt that a front garden enhances the road. We have no objection to paying to park our vehicle in the street and to some of the proposed changes as we very much in favour of reducing parking pressures, congestion, reducing carbon emissions and improving air quality. However, we feel some of the proposed changes are either ambiguous or discriminatory.</p> <p>1. Parking permits – a £10 increase across all existing parking permits to support the significant costs of running, maintaining and enforcing our parking infrastructure. We would argue that existing permits should be honoured until they are due for renewal. We would have thought that the additional staffing time required to send out and</p> |
| <p>£10 increase to support admin & enforcement</p> | <p>I strongly object to the hike in parking charges you are proposing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - £10 increase on all parking permits is without any justification as you had already increased them at the start of the year. - 25% increase in on street parking is unfair- you may be trying to avoid short trips, but if people are shopping they need their cars. The public transport system isn't good enough to be relied upon and many people will not feel safe crammed onto buses and tubes. you are also severely affecting the small shop keepers who rely on regular customer who want fresh food. - Increasing the daily visitors permits to £4 with no more than 2 per day- how can this be justified? What if you have carers, childcare, live alone. This can only isolate people even more. |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>£10 increase to support admin & enforcement</p> | <p>I am writing to protest at the proposed increases to parking permit prices.</p> <p>1. You are increasing the annual cost of a resident's permit by £10. This may not in itself seem a big increase but it is an increase nonetheless and paves the way for future increases. I had to retire from work early due to ill-health but due to government policies I do not yet receive my state pension. Therefore I am on a fixed and limited income and do not have money to spare to hand over to Haringey Council. The council tax is high enough.</p> <p>2. As I mention above I cannot work but do not receive a State Pension yet so don't qualify for the concessionary rates for Visitors Permits.</p> <p>3, You are proposing to limit the number of Visitors Day Permits to two at any one time. What is the reason for this and what am I supposed to do for visitors who come to stay for longer than two days?</p> |
| <p>£10 increase to support admin & enforcement</p> | <p>I object to your increasing the parking permit charges.</p> <p>I have never seen a CEO and see no reason why this should cost more than it did last year. Why have your running costs increased? When did you last patrol Grand Avenue? When did you last give out a ticket?</p> <p>It seems more likely you are price gouging as we have no alternative but to pay whatever you ask if we want to be able to park in our borough.</p> <p>Finally, if you are keen on 'more sustainable modes of travel' why are there still no widened pavements or additional cycle lanes to enable social distancing and less use of public transport? Why am I walking down the middle of the road alongside the buses, to get away from all the pedestrians? You don't care about sustainable modes of travel at all, I would argue; you'd just like a bit more cash.</p> |
| <p>£10 increase to support admin & enforcement</p> | <p>* Parking permits – a £10 increase across all existing parking permits to support the significant costs of running, maintaining and enforcing our parking infrastructure. This is unjustifiable as we have not seen any changes regarding the running, maintaining and enforcing our parking infrastructure ... everything is still the same you just increase the costs every year with no changes.</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>£10 increase to support admin & enforcement</p> | <p>I am surprised that you say the costs of running, maintaining the and enforcing the parking infrastructure are so high given that this is all additional revenue that you didn't collect a few years ago..</p> <p>I would also comment on the ease with which your enforcement officers give out tickets, late last year I was given one for one of my tyres being slightly on the kerb, not even on the pavement slab, given that I was parked on a curve in the road the fine was totally unnecessary, and makes my attitude towards Haringey Council very low indeed.</p> <p>I am a strong environmentalist who cycles most places but needs a car for occasional work and family commitments, and I feel this is a poor way to manage parking in the borough, and I would vote against any additional charges particularly at this difficult time for so many.</p> |
| <p>£10 increase to support admin & enforcement</p> | <p>My comment is as follows:</p> <p>By increasing the charge by a flat sum of £10.00, Haringey is penalising most heavily, the cars which produce the lowest emissions. This seems odd. It produces a sliding scale which slides in the wrong direction.</p> <p>Have I misunderstood something? Could you please explain your reasoning?</p> |
| <p>£10 increase to support admin & enforcement</p> | <p>Please could you provide evidence on the benefits that running, maintaining and enforcing your parking infrastructure provides?</p> |
| <p>£10 increase to support admin & enforcement</p> | <p>I live on the archway road. In 2018 my parking permit jumped from £114 to £180 and whilst in part I understand the need to reduce emissions this is a significant jump. You are now proposing a £10 increase which I Would like to understand what it is for. I already cannot park outside my house as it's apparently a different zone, but I renew my permit every year online and print of myself so I think there is very limited administration needed by Haringey that could justify this increase. I oppose this basic £10 increase to all permits.</p> |
| <p>£10 increase to support admin & enforcement</p> | <p>I do not think you should be increasing all parking permits by £10. Surely you should not be charging more for electric and Hybrid cars, otherwise what is the incentive of buying a cleaner fuel car in the borough?</p> <p>You are penalising the cars that have clean fuel!</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>£10 increase to support admin & enforcement</p> | <p>My question is I will be nice to understand with elaboration why all of a sudden there is a need for this and what exactly is needed and where this money will be spent in terms of running and maintaining and more so to enforce the parking infrastructure it would be nice to understand the details of what is involved in each of these processes and where the funding is coming from 360° from grants from the government or from the council tax that people are paying.</p> <p>London is the densest city in the country and we are having parking permits for people you don't see in other cities and towns in UK. Councils in London can pick up so much money and the need to increase makes no sense at all.</p> |
| <p>£10 increase to support admin & enforcement</p> | <p>I strongly oppose to increasing parking permit prices, administration fee and one-street-pay-to-park.</p> <p>The streets are full of large potholes - which are not repaired for months and then only some of them, others still left untouched- tree branches badly affecting the area - you removed tiny, tiny tree using 6 men and 2 cars, but not touching big one?, streets are dark and not safe, a lot of rubbish on the streets, dirty dustbins - who is going to clean them or exchange? - nobody cares.</p> <p>You narrow immensely parking for owners of permit and you want to increase prices - now!! when we are in difficult covid-19 time?</p> |
| <p>2</p> | <p>. £50 surcharge on multicar permits</p> |
| <p>2. £50 surcharge on multicar permits</p> | <p>There is a lack of clarity regarding the way these new surcharge fees will be applied. For example, would an individual who's car is the second in the household and also owns a diesel car be required to pay an overall charge of £130 (£80-Diesel + £50-Second car) or would the charge be the highest surcharge fee (£80 - Diesel)</p> <p>Also will the money collected through these surcharges be ring fenced to be spent on road improvements as it is hard to believe that these charges reflect any real increase to the costs of running the parking scheme as it currently stands.(question)</p> |
| <p>£50 surcharge on multicar permits</p> | <p>I am shocked at these increases especially penalising people for having more than one car. We are living in times where adult children are living at home longer because they cannot afford to buy their own home. So lots of families will have more than one car. Now we are being advised not to use public transport and I am too nervous to ride a bike. It is too far to walk to work and yet I am being penalised financially.</p> <p>A 25% increase in parking fees is just outrageous. They are already expensive. You say this is to stop short journeys. However, I have to take my car as I am unable to carry my shopping.</p> <p>This is just a money-making scheme by Haringey council. You should publish a breakdown of the cost of running resident parking and the amount of money that is paid for permits. Plus, all the money you receive from parking fines. Then residents might understand. I doubt this will happen and the poor driver will be exploited yet again. I strongly object to these price rises.</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>£50 surcharge on multicar permits</p> | <p>Sirs/Madame, I have a lodger who also has a car. Can you tell me who has to pay the £50 surcharge for the extra car?</p> |
| <p>£50 surcharge on multicar permits</p> | <p>Totally disagree with this. We was promised free parking due to the proximity to the stadium and now children are staying home longer we have multiple cars all the kids are working and paying tax and I have always been up to date with our council tax I am a builder so need a van for work and as the wife has a disability, I also have a car so this could end up costing this house hold an extra 130.00 per year We have very little access to services for free we pay for the gym etc. and the wife because I'm working does not get the government help others do once again working class people are being punished for doing right</p> |
| <p>£50 surcharge on multicar permits</p> | <p>Additional parking permits - A £50 surcharge on second and subsequent permits to reduce car ownership, promote active travel and more sustainable modes of travel. Not supported without amendments. Whilst we support the aim of reducing car use and the number of cars on the road, we feel this could unfairly penalise some households who need to have more than one vehicle. There should be some exemptions or concessions applied to this.</p> <p>Diesel fuelled vehicles - An £80 surcharge for diesel fuelled vehicles to highlight the impact of diesel emissions on local air quality and influence cleaner future vehicle choices.</p> <p>Not supported. This is an unnecessary further penalty for diesel car owners who are already in a position where they will have to sell</p> |
| <p>£50 surcharge on multicar permits</p> | <p>Additional parking permits – A £50 surcharge on second and subsequent permits to reduce car ownership, promote active travel and more sustainable modes of travel. Opposed. This discriminates against larger households e.g. where parents or joint householders work and more than one car is needed. It will not achieve the aims you seek to promote as households needing two vehicles will simply have to pay the surcharge. As an example, I cycled to work for the last ten years but my new job is such that travel by public transport is not a sensible option. My wife needs her car as she cannot travel by public trans</p> |
| <p>£50 surcharge on multicar permits</p> | <p>Dear Haringey Council</p> <p>* Additional parking permits – This appears unfair to household with large families, essential you are penalising people for living collectively in a house. How can the allocations for a parking permit be the same for a 2-bed flat and a five-bed household?</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>£50 surcharge on multicar permits</p> | <p>My comments regarding your proposed amendments to parking charges are as follows: Additional Parking Permits - A surcharge of £50 for a second vehicle is excessive. a) It is important to acknowledge that in the age of COVID it will become increasingly difficult to find alternate sustainable modes of travel that are safe for all family members and therefore car travel is still, unfortunately, needed because it is safe. b) The Council does not appear to be making any distinction in charges between cars with lower CO2 emissions, as it did previously, or hybrid/electric cars.</p> |
| <p>£50 surcharge on multicar permits</p> | <p>My opinion is that self-employed individuals should have one vehicle for business uses and one for personal uses because it's not convenient to use one car for both purposes, especially for families with children. I think it's discrimination and requires legal action.</p> |
| <p>£50 surcharge on multicar permits</p> | <p>Thank you sharing the proposed permit changes. However, I don't agree with most of actions that the borough would like to take. Firstly, I think that an increase in permit prices isn't fair, and neither is having to pay £50 for an additional household car. People in my household have to go to work due to the increasing council tax, service charges and sink foundation prices that you charge and increase every year, on top of their mortgage. I'm a key worker and need to use my own car get to different areas of my NHS trust and therefore can't share a car. Living in and being surrounded by flats, it's hard to ever find a parking spot when coming home. Especially on the weekends. So unless families will have designated parking spots, or increased parking hour restrictions so visitors or non-parking permits can't take our spaces, those proposed ideas should be reviewed. Secondly, I don't mean to be offensive, but why s</p> |
| <p>3</p> | <p>£80 diesel surcharge</p> |
| <p>£80 diesel surcharge</p> | <p>As requested I write with regards to the above and would comment/question as follows. Parking Permits. Please expand on how and where the costs of administering the parking infrastructure have increased, specifically as it relates to the AP CPZ. Diesel Fuelled Vehicles Please explain further how a surcharge will highlight the impact of diesel emissions on local air quality? Diesel vehicle owners already pay higher CPZ charges, fuel and road taxes so are likely to be aware of this issue already. If the intention is to target the highest polluting vehicles surely a mileage based charge would be more effective because a diesel vehicle that completes only a few thousand miles a year will produce much less pollution than a mini-cab with a petrol engine? Otherwise the surcharge appears to be nothing more than a poorly veiled additional tax on diesel vehicle owners.</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <p>£80 diesel surcharge</p> | <p>We are due to renew the parking permit for our diesel car in July this year; if the proposals go ahead, would we then be charged the extra £80 in November, or would we be exempt having purchased the permit prior?</p> |
| <p>£80 diesel surcharge</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. You should allow Euro 6 diesel cars without surcharge in line with the rest of London legislation as it's a lot cleaner than old petrol cars. 2. You shouldn't charge residents for owning a diesel car in an event day parking zone by £90 while external drivers get a free pass during game-free days, which is most of the time. If charges are imposed, nobody else should park on my street (diesel or petrol), so I at least I have a cleaner street and air to breathe. 3. Don't restrict visitor permits to two per day. Many people have big families and will be spilling over their parking on our street which is free to park outside of event days, and my kids and I will end up choking on other people's diesel and petrol fumes!!! Also, I should be able to have more than two drivers visiting me or even trades when they're working on my house. 4. Current visitor permits should be exchanged to the new visitor permits completely free of charge. |
| <p>£80 diesel surcharge</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. You should allow Euro 6 diesel cars without surcharge in line with the rest of London as it's a lot cleaner than old petrol cars. 2. You shouldn't charge residents for owning a diesel car in an event day parking zone by £90 while external drivers get a free pass during game-free days, which is most of the time. If charges are imposed, nobody else should park on my street (diesel or petrol), so I at least I have a cleaner street and air to breathe. 3. Don't restrict visitor permits to two per day. Many people have big families and will be spilling over their parking on our street which is free to park outside of event days, and my kids and I will end up choking on other people's diesel and petrol fumes!!! Also, I should be able to have more than two drivers visiting me or even trades when they're working on my house. 4. Current visitor permits should be exchanged to the new visitor permits completely free of charge. |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <p>£80 diesel surcharge</p> | <p>The £80 surcharge on diesel vehicles does not 'influence cleaner future vehicle choices' as claimed, unless it is applied only to new permit applications – i.e. for vehicles that are not currently registered.</p> <p>I have no doubt that I am one of many hundreds of thousands of people around the UK who were effectively misled by a combination of government and the automotive industry into believing that we were doing the right thing from an environmental sustainability point of view in purchasing a diesel car many years ago. We are not wealthy, and do not have the means to change our car in the short to mid-term, not least as the re-sale of trade-in value of our sole family car has been materially impacted upon it coming to light that we were all misled, including as a result of criminal fraud on the part of certain vehicle manufacturers.</p> <p>So, I welcome Haringey's admirable aim to reduce both congestion and pollution, but do not believe that applying the £80 surcharge to a new diesel is quite wrong</p> |
| <p>£80 diesel surcharge</p> | <p>Diesel fuelled vehicles – An £80 surcharge for diesel fuelled vehicles to highlight the impact of diesel emissions on local air quality and influence cleaner future vehicle choices.</p> <p>This seems very unreasonable given the forthcoming changes to the congestion zone - this will disproportionately affect families who are more likely to have larger cars with diesel engines and are invariably the most financially stretched.</p> |
| <p>£80 diesel surcharge</p> | <p>Leave things as they are, stop penalising diesel drivers who might not be able to afford a new vehicle .</p> <p>The latest diesel vehicles are clean and are not penalised when entering The ULEZ , why are you penalising possibly poor and elderly drivers ??????. They may not have blue badges but are not very mobile and need to make short journeys for the daily shop.</p> <p>I have a blue badge and two diesel vehicles; I pay a full parking charge on one of them as the companion badge can only be allowed for one vehicle. Why should I pay more when I can only can drive one at a time?</p> <p>A house split into 3 flats with three cars would only pay the standard fee but The same house as one dwelling would be penalised if they had 3 cars . Once the ULEZ extends many people will be penalised you will make It worse !!!.</p> <p>Don't turn an ordinary necessity in to a cash cow.</p> |
| <p>£80 diesel surcharge</p> | <p>Hi, I object to the increase on the following grounds:</p> <p>B. Modern diesel cars are scientifically shown to be less polluting than many petrol cars . TfL have a check to test any car. So to victimise diesel car owners is discriminatory and probably illegal if your criteria is cleaner air (as modern filters are extremely efficient - and have lower emission ratings than many petrol cars). I do not think your blanket proposal on diesel cars would survive legal challenge.</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <p>£80 diesel surcharge</p> | <p>I feel that the surcharge on diesel fuelled vehicles feels rather excessive. My wife and I recently changed our car ahead of the roll out of the ULEZ expansion. It is still a diesel but fully ULEZ compliant. Surely if this car is suitable for the stringent requirements of the ULEZ (which I am in favour of) then how come it isn't good enough to not warrant additional charges from the council?</p> <p>Also, I don't really understand the move to limit visitor permits to no more than two at a time. What are you hoping to achieve with this move? I don't understand why having more than two permits per household is a problem; they still only get used as and when they are needed and we still pay the same amount for a permit regardless if we have two or twelve. Surely all this is going to mean is that there's more admin for the council as people have to order permits more</p> |
| <p>£80 diesel surcharge</p> | <p>I'm afraid the £80 surcharge for diesel cars is beyond my comprehension, apart from being probably ethically wrong. A surcharge is an extra charge on an existing charge. Which existing charge is this? I pay for resident's parking and my car will occupy no more space than now so no justification there. I pay road tax which is DVLA imposed and out with local authority control so your surcharge cannot apply to that.</p> <p>This attempt at imposition of yet another charge strikes me as being politically motivated and politically correct in its worst form - if not legally contentious. (I also already pay an extra £75 for green waste collection which I thought would have been of benefit to society or commercial interests, not a liability. What happens to that green waste, by the way?)</p> <p>Furthermore, we have had our small diesel car since 2009 when we were encouraged by Government to buy diesel. That is what I mean by its being ethically dubious.</p> |
| <p>£80 diesel surcharge</p> | <p>Please note my objection to the proposed amendments to parking charges and permits, specifically in regard to the £80 increase for diesel vehicles and the £20 administration fee for processing refunds.</p> <p>If someone is in need of a refund I expect they could also ill afford the £20 fee. Please keep the costs as low as you possibly can considering the loss in income many people are experiencing due to the pandemic this year.</p> <p>While I completely understand the importance of reducing emissions from diesel vehicles I would urge you to consider the environmental impact of residents being encouraged to buy new petrol cars in efforts to avoid this charge. It is surely beneficial to the environment for us to keep our current vehicles until they are thoroughly 'used up', regardless of the fuel they use.</p> <p>Could you consider a reduced charge for residents who are re-registering an existing diesel vehicle? I would support the implementation of a high £80 for newly re</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <p>£80 diesel surcharge</p> | <p>I am a London Cab Driver. When I bought my cab I had no choice other than a Diesel engine. As a working vehicle it is also a “second” car as my partner works in an industry where he works unsocial hours so has to travel outside of the hours that public transport operates. I therefore have very little choice but to drive my vehicle, unless I can find £65000 to buy an electric cab. Following COVID where I have earned absolutely no money, I am unlikely to be able to afford to upgrade my cab for several years. As my cab is necessary for my work, can you not consider some sort of reduction in the costs of parking?</p> |
| <p>£80 diesel surcharge</p> | <p>I am looking to buy a car. You have put a blanket charge on diesel cars, what about the ULEZ compliant diesel cars Which have lower emissions than most petrol cars? Can you let me know soon please and it will be influencing what I buy and I need to buy a car soon</p> |
| <p>£80 diesel surcharge</p> | <p>I write to disagree with the diesel surcharge for modern cars as there is an European standard (Euro 6). So if my car is diesel and meets these standards there is no point of applying a surcharge. As it stands cars with these standards are exempt from ULEZ and LEZ charges. Besides that, some of these newer diesel engines have even low emissions than their petrol counterparts. I propose these surcharge should only apply to older diesel engines manufactured about a decade ago not the newer generation integrated with modern technology that permits lower emissions.</p> |
| <p>£80 diesel surcharge</p> | <p>I have just read this e-mail and would like to make the following comment regarding diesel vehicles. I have noticed a number of London authorities adopting a discriminatory approach to all diesel vehicles especially citing harmful emissions as being the main reason for adopting a blanket approach to charging.</p> <p>Will allowance be made for ultra-efficient diesel vehicles that produce lower emissions than petrol cars and that attract a lower road tax duty than equivalent sized non electric vehicles? I feel that adopting a generic approach unfairly penalises emissions-efficient diesel vehicles and owners who adopted a responsible approach to environmental issues</p> |
| <p>£80 diesel surcharge</p> | <p>My comments on the diesel surcharge:</p> <p>I understand and agree with your proposal to "highlight the impact of diesel emissions on local air quality and influence cleaner future vehicle choices." The £80 surcharge, however, seems a heavy penalty for those who have made choices which meet the ULEZ emissions standards: Euro 6 (NOx and PM) for diesel cars, vans and minibuses and other specialist vehicles</p> <p>I strongly oppose, therefore, this decision which is out of keeping with the ULEZ targets. Instead, I would suggest that the surcharge is put on those diesel vehicles that do not meet ULEZ. This would continue to meet the two key intentions of the proposal: to reduce the impact of diesels emissions and encourage more environmental choices. It would also be in keeping with the current way that parking permits are priced according to the emissions that a car produces.</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <p>£80 diesel surcharge</p> | <p>I agree to most things here, other than the additional charge for all diesel cars. I have just bought a ultra-low emission diesel to keep my pollution level low. Therefore any ULEZ diesels should be exempt - I hope this is considered and agreed as sensible and in line with the central London government's policy.</p> |
| <p>£80 diesel surcharge</p> | <p>I've read through this and think it is remarkably unfair. As far as I can tell, it is merely another way of generating income for the council. We have a modern diesel car that is very efficient and complies with ULEZ standards. There isn't currently enough infrastructure or support to justify purchasing an electric car and we are not at an income level where that is currently an option.</p> <p>CPZ has changed nothing for us in the years that we have lived here, except to make it more expensive to park.</p> <p>This whole proposal is highly unpopular, and my family definitely opposes it. In light of the fact that so many of us are suffering financially due to income loss from COVID, I'm amazed that it's being put forward.</p> |
| <p>£80 diesel surcharge</p> | <p>Dear sir/madam,</p> <p>I would like to strongly object to the following points: 1) Increase in cost of parking permits, and such a significant increase for diesel fuelled vehicles.</p> <p>I strongly support measures that discourage diesel vehicles in our area, and that are aimed to change behaviours to make our streets cleaner and safer. However, during a year when so many in Haringey have been subject to so much financial hardship, such significant increases this year would feel tone deaf.</p> <p>In addition, this measure risks having a disproportionate impact on disabled people and those who are medically shielding, for whom a car may be the only safe and accessible form of independent travel for the foreseeable future. The disabled blue badge scheme does not cover a range of people with disabilities and/or support staff.</p> |
| <p>£80 diesel surcharge</p> | <p>Thank you for sharing the proposed changes to the parking regulation in the borough. I am strongly opposed to them for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Last year we sold one of our two diesel cars and replaced it with a low emissions hybrid vehicle because, like most people, we were concerned with the impact of our cars on the environment. As a result of your proposals, we would now have to pay £150 more per year in additional parking charges: £10 per vehicle &#43; £50 charge for the second vehicle &#43; £80 for the diesel car. * If the objective of this exercise is to motivate the polluting car users to switch to cleaner vehicles, then why not make the changes cost neutral, so that you penalise diesel cars and reduce parking charges on newer, less polluting cars? Otherwise, such a sharp rise in charges seems like a cynical way to increase taxes at a worst possible moment |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| <p>£80 diesel surcharge</p> | <p>Whilst I completely understand the need to review charges such as these, it is necessary to do so with some intelligence so as to ensure both fairness and credibility for the end user. There is no scientific logic in the blanket approach currently being proposed for the significant increase in parking charges for all diesel cars, and such an approach attacks both high and low polluting vehicles at the same time. It is simply not true that all diesel engine cars are more polluting than all petrol engine ones.</p> <p>A little research would show councillors that not all diesel powered cars are the same in terms of emissions. Indeed any "Euro 6" compliant Diesel engine will be vastly superior to any pre-Euro 5 petrol engine in this regard and should not be penalised when compared against them. Such a blanket approach will unfairly affect all those who have in good faith replaced their older, higher polluting vehicles with new clean diesel engine cars, in order to comply with</p> |
| <p>£80 diesel surcharge</p> | <p>Dear Cllr Ejiolor, Ms Cunningham and all at Haringey Parking Services,</p> <p>I write to object most vehemently to the punitive and discriminatory amendments you have proposed regarding parking charges and permits.</p> <p>Whilst some of the proposals may indeed have potential merit under different circumstances, the more aggressive measures, including those relating to diesel vehicles, are completely outrageous, and the appalling timing of these proposals which amount to nothing more than an attempted 'cash grab' from the motorist truly beggar belief. It is both offensive and somewhat grotesque that some employees of Haringey Council who have had the good fortune and luxury of being able to continue working over the past few months appear to have spent their time conceiving seemingly draconian and malicious ways to punish and disenfranchise the very residents they should be supporting during this catastrophic period. Many of us work in industries that face an uncertain if not impossible future</p> |
| <p>£80 diesel surcharge</p> | <p>Philip Lane N15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * I do not agree with an £80 surcharge for diesel fuelled vehicles. * I do not agree with a £50 surcharge on second and subsequent permits. * I do not agree with a concessionary age increased from aged 60 to aged 65. * I do not agree with an On-Street Pay to Park and Off Street car parks - a 25% diesel surcharge. |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>£80 diesel surcharge</p> | <p>Midhurst Avenue N10.</p> <p>I object to the proposed increase in charges, particularly the additional fees for second cars and for diesel vehicles. With the introduction of ULEZ charges to our area next year there is no need for the local council to add additional costs for diesel vehicle owners. They will be penalised on a usage basis by ULEZ.</p> <p>It is unfair to penalise households for second vehicles. Many homes have a number of adults residing in them and they should not be penalised compared to single occupancy or single family residences.</p> <p>I hope you will revise your plans to take account of these issues.</p> |
| <p>£80 diesel surcharge</p> | <p>It is with great interest that I have received and read your email about the proposed amendments to parking charges and permits. I am writing to respectfully ask a couple of questions as I didn't see a clear answer in the FAQs.</p> <p>I notice it is proposed that "An £80 surcharge for diesel fuelled vehicles to highlight the impact of diesel emissions on local air quality and influence cleaner future vehicle choices."</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What about those who are Motability diesel fuelled vehicle keepers and who do not choose to have such type of vehicle? How will they be affected by the £80 surcharge increase? 2. Furthermore, you go on : "Consideration was given to exempting Euro 6 diesel compliant vehicles from the proposed diesel surcharge, and in doing so align the surcharge with the Ultra-Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) criteria. However, several cities are taking steps to ban all diesel fuelled vehicles from city centres, and our policies support the view that the use of a |
| <p>4</p> | <p>Surcharge of 25% to discourage short trips</p> |
| <p>Surcharge of 25% to discourage short trips</p> | <p>I would like to object to certain elements of the proposed changes to parking charges. In particular, I object to the proposed 25% surcharge to on-street park to pay areas and off-street car parks to 'discourage short trips within the borough'.</p> <p>We should be encouraging residents to shop locally and support our local high streets. I would go one stage further and say that we should encourage people from outside the borough to visit our high streets and spend money in our local shops, restaurants and pubs. To do this, we have to recognise and acknowledge that a large number of people will only do this if they can drive to the shops/restaurants. Increasing parking charges will discourage residents and others from doing this and what we will see (as has already happened) is a closure of businesses and our high streets being populated with empty outlets and/or a plethora of charity shops as drivers take their custom elsewhere. Have a walk around Crouch End Broadway and Tottenham</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Surcharge of 25% to discourage short trips</p> | <p>Re your proposed 25% Surcharge for street parking - I strongly believe you should think more carefully in balancing between the objectives and effects 'to discourage short trips within the borough' and 'to encourage & assist/support local high street shops by facilitating such shopping trips'.</p> <p>Then my own more personal issues of recovering from major Knee Surgery just last year. Then suffering a Stroke just last month in midst of Covid-19, and rushed to National Neurological Hospital for treatment followed by neck surgery for Carotid Artery, and now in recovery back home with help and encouragement of support teams in Haringey & The Stroke Association. Three Cheers for our wonderful NHS Teams :):):) .</p> <p>I prefer to be encouraged to continue regularly visiting my local shops in Crouch End , Green Lanes etc, rather than being forced to fully rely on a big weekly Sainsbury shop to deal with all our shopping needs. I am not the only one so affected.</p> |
| <p>Surcharge of 25% to discourage short trips</p> | <p>Just emailing to highlight my concerns regarding the parking price increase. Especially the pay to park increase for customers to park in the area. Businesses are already struggling to attract customers and with the price increase this will put off customers even more in these difficult times.</p> <p>Please can reconsider these price increases as businesses are already struggling especially in Turnpike Lane as many shops already have closed down. .</p> |
| <p>Surcharge of 25% to discourage short trips</p> | <p>I gather the council intends to further put pressure on Haringey residents and businesses by ratcheting up the already grotesque parking charges in the borough. The principal effect of this will be to drive more shops out of Crouch End as customers are no longer able to use them.</p> <p>It is none of your business how many vehicles we own or where we take them. It is a free country, and if we want to walk somewhere, we can do so. You don't come into it. Your job is to repair streets and make our lives easier, for all our wealth you are entrusted with.</p> <p>Incidentally, having residents' permits means I use the car more. If I can't leave it be, in my street, it comes with me.</p> |
| <p>Surcharge of 25% to discourage short trips</p> | <p>I live at Tintern Road N22 and I think putting the prices up is to unfair because living in the zone W S we are not even able to park near the shopping centre or the Wood Green station, so in my opinion people who lives outside the Wood Green Zone should be charge differently not only Base of the CO2 emission</p> |
| <p>Surcharge of 25% to discourage short trips</p> | <p>Parking charges for on street parking and off street parking in commercial shopping streets should not be increased. We need to encourage as much shopping in the high street not drive people into shopping centres.</p> |
| <p>5</p> | <p>No more than 2 VPs in use at same time. Daily and hourly?</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>No more than 2 VPs in use at same time. Daily and hourly?</p> | <p>I am writing as Chair of the Southwood Lane Residents Association. A question has been raised about your proposed changes to visitor permits. Your website says: Visitor permits - households would be limited to no more than two daily visitor permits at any one time. Please could you clarify what this means?</p> <p>At the moment we buy visitor permits by the hour, and can buy large batches in one go. This is essential if, for example, we have builders working in our house for a couple of weeks, and need permits every day to park nearby. The implication in your proposal is that we will only be able to buy two daily permits at one time. Does this mean that you can only send two days' worth of permits at one time, and after these have been used we can apply for two more? I find this hard to believe, but it does seem to be what your wording suggests. Or are these daily permits more of a permanent permit that we can allow visitors to use and then return to us to be used again,</p> |
| <p>No more than 2 VPs in use at same time. Daily and hourly?</p> | <p>I live in Hillside Road N15. Recently, I bought a bunch of parking permits especially for maintenance people, or for emergency work people who may need to park their van on the street. Will those permits still do to cover maintenance vans? I am now 70 years old. Please let me know.</p> |
| <p>No more than 2 VPs in use at same time. Daily and hourly?</p> | <p>Regarding the proposals to change the regulations and in particular to Visitor permits – households would be limited to no more than two daily visitor permits at any one time. 1) This does not make sense, it does not say over what time period! Can I for instance order 2 every day or will this be limited to 2 in any one week, month, year?? You need to make this clear as it can take up to 10 days to order online.</p> <p>2) I have 2 children who come regularly to visit and bring my grandchildren and sometimes spend the night or a couple of days, by this limit they would be severely restricted and unwanted intrusion on family life. I suspect this is to cause residents to have to purchase a lot more hourly passes and raise revenue. If this is the case be honest and say so.</p> <p>Leith Road N22</p> |
| <p>No more than 2 VPs in use at same time. Daily and hourly?</p> | <p>I would be against limiting visitors parking; my parents visit regularly and can only do so by car. I would be against any rise in charges for residents. The charge for diesel seems excessive for those drivers who already have a diesel car, bought in good faith. I don't see any reason to change the parking regs we already have in place.</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>No more than 2 VPs in use at same time. Daily and hourly?</p> | <p>I would like to comment on the proposed limit to visitor permits. Visitor permits – households would be limited to no more than two daily visitor permits at any one time. It's a very rare occasion in which someone needs to use more than two daily visitor permits at once, but you are suggesting a limitation that might prevent someone who very rarely uses up a visitor space, from having more than two sets of visitors over for a milestone family gathering after a wedding/funeral etc. Why impose this limit if the space is being paid for? Is this really a problem when the council now needs to limit visitors to a particular address? Alexandra Road, N8</p> |
| <p>No more than 2 VPs in use at same time. Daily and hourly?</p> | <p>Which of the categories below apply to the vehicles of those undertaking work on nearby properties? Southwood Lane, Highgate</p> |
| <p>No more than 2 VPs in use at same time. Daily and hourly?</p> | <p>The limit to only 2 daily visitor permits at any one time feels pointlessly restrictive. You don't always know when you are going to need them and unless you can make the process of getting them to us quicker this doesn't feel workable. Would a limit of 5 be more reasonable?</p> |
| <p>No more than 2 VPs in use at same time. Daily and hourly?</p> | <p>I appreciate that the council need to increase the funds available and some changes are necessary; however I strongly object to several of the proposed changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * The plan to reduce the number of daily permits available at any one time to 2. This is grossly unfair. Many residents of Haringey have family and friend living outside London or off the public transport network. To enable family and friends to visit for gatherings, or to stay a few days, necessitates more than one daily permit. Visitors may also be elderly, have disabilities or small children, all of which present challenges when using public transport. * The £20 administration fee for refunds is very high. Surely the cost should better reflect the time spent in processing the refund? * I agree that that the use of Diesel cars should be discouraged. However, residents who already own diesels should be supported by gradually introducing this |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>No more than 2 VPs in use at same time. Daily and hourly?</p> | <p>With regard to your proposed changes, I would like to object to the restriction on the number of visitor permits per day per household. My wife is self-employed and teaches art from a studio at home. Your proposed restriction on visitor permits would effectively put her out of business (she has up to 4 students at a time) as it would not be economic to teach such small classes as your amendment would allow. This would therefore result in a loss of income to our household.</p> <p>There are no problems finding a park in our street currently, so your proposed restriction would serve no benefit but would render my wife unemployed.</p> <p>We reserve our position as to legal challenge with respect to restraint of trade and loss of income should this element be imposed as currently proposed.</p> <p>I would welcome an opportunity to discuss if you wish to call me</p> <p>Fortis Green Avenue N2</p> |
| <p>No more than 2 VPs in use at same time. Daily and hourly?</p> | <p>I live at Priory Gardens N6. I have read your proposals and I am concerned about the limit on daily visitor permits to two at a time. This would be very difficult to manage if you had builders doing work on your house; in my experience this usually takes more than two days ! Residents need the flexibility to hold multiple daily permits. It is time-consuming to apply for permits on your website and there is always a delay between ordering and delivery. Will residents receive a credit for parking vouchers they hold and what would be the process for claiming it?</p> |
| <p>No more than 2 VPs in use at same time. Daily and hourly?</p> | <p>I don't agree with the proposal to limit houses to no more than 2 visitor permits per day. Due to family living in different areas, when we have a family gathering, this would make this impossible as we would be limited to 2 daily permits.</p> |
| <p>No more than 2 VPs in use at same time. Daily and hourly?</p> | <p>Regarding the proposed changes to parking permits, the meaning of the proposal as follows is unclear:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Visitor permits - households would be limited to no more than two daily visitor permits at any one time. Daily visitor permits would increase to £4 across all CPZ areas. A concessionary rate discount of 50% will be applied to the visitor permit charge for those aged 65 or over, or if registered disabled. <p>Does this mean I can only buy 2 visitor permits at a time? What if I have a family member visiting with a car for 3 days in a row? This would be completely unreasonable, affecting our childcare arrangements (family members who visit regularly for a number of days at a time, to provide childcare for my toddler). Or does it mean that I can only have 2 cars using a visitor permit on the same day? If that is the case, this seems totally reasonable.</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>No more than 2 VPs in use at same time. Daily and hourly?</p> | <p>I have lived on Umfreville road for years and have owned a car for much of these years. I have no issue with paying for a permit and am fine with the increase in cost. I do however have an issue with the potential reduction in visitor permits - at the moment I can order a lot of daily visitor permits which is very helpful for when family are visiting. I have no issue in paying for these. But it seems you are hugely reducing the amount available to households. I think this will be very problematic given the current situation with COVID19, people will be travelling more in cars and less by public transport to keep SAFE. I feel this has been overlooked in your plans. Please let me know if there is anywhere I can escalate this concern.</p> |
| <p>No more than 2 VPs in use at same time. Daily and hourly?</p> | <p>It is not clear what is meant by, "households would be limited to no more than two daily visitor permits at any one time". Does this mean: * you can only order two permits at a time , * you can have a visitor to stay for no more than two days, * you cannot display more than two daily permits at a time, * or you can only have a maximum of two visitors at a time? Clinton Road N15</p> |
| <p>No more than 2 VPs in use at same time. Daily and hourly?</p> | <p>I have a disabled child who has to be educated at home with tutors. This requires between 3 and 5 tutors coming to the house each day plus other visitors such as Camhs, SALT etc. I see there are proposals to limit the number of daily passes, I'm not sure if you plan to also limit one or two hour passes. These are a significant expense for me and something we rely on. I use the companion badge scheme for the family car so as far as I understand I cannot then use the blue badge for visitors. I imagine people with a high requirement for assistance will also need lots of visitors' permits. Is there anything which could be done to accommodate this please?</p> |
| <p>No more than 2 VPs in use at same time. Daily and hourly?</p> | <p>Are you scrapping the one hour and two hour visitor permits and residents will only be able to purchase daily ones? And one home can only use 2 daily permits per day?</p> |
| <p>No more than 2 VPs in use at same time. Daily and hourly?</p> | <p>Whilst an initiative to reduce pollution is to be encouraged certain of these measures will disproportionately inconvenience residents as against the limited benefit they provide. Most notably the limit on daily visitor permits, i.e.: "Visitor permits – households would be limited to no more than two daily visitor permits at any one time. Daily visitor permits would increase to £4 across all CPZ areas. A concessionary rate discount of 50% will be applied to the visitor permit charge for those aged 65 or over, or if registered disabled." will cause genuine difficulties. This policy discriminates against young families, for example a family who wanted to hold a birthday party for a child would almost certainly require more than two permits, both for family travelling distances and local friends. By necessity events including young children need to take place during</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>No more than 2 VPs in use at same time. Daily and hourly?</p> | <p>I think the increased residents' fees seem reasonable, in the scheme of owning a car they are not unfair costs, and I am a car owner myself, so am aware this will affect me. However I HUGELY disagree with the maximum of two daily visitor passes per household at any one time. This is extremely discriminatory to those who need special visitors, and very problematic to those who rely on visitors. When I had my new baby visits from my mother were a lifeline, and with a new one on the way this idea terrifies me. When my friend broke his ankles visits to help him around the house were a lifeline.</p> <p>Those with off street parking in their own front gardens will not be affected and once again it means that those with bigger houses and more money will benefit from visitors where people in flats and smaller accommodation won't, making it discriminatory to people like the elderly who are less likely to live in big houses with off street parking.</p> |
| <p>No more than 2 VPs in use at same time. Daily and hourly?</p> | <p>Hi I've received the proposed changes for parking in the Haringey council. I myself does not live there, but I order the visitors permits on behalf of my parents. I can't believe you are trying to restrict the number of visitors they can only have per day. My parents have 4 adult children some of which have kids of their own which are driving, so if we had a family gathering, does that mean only 2 vehicles are allowed? This borough is getting worse and on top of that when it comes to football matches we have to try and avoid visiting them during that time because they have to provide a permit for that as well, especially if it's a weekend. Everything is getting costly, as they're pensioners plus my dad has dementia. Yes, you do give discounts for them, but why should they have to pay for families or friends to come and visit on their own property that they own. This is getting ridiculous, which is why I've moved out of London in the first place.</p> |
| <p>No more than 2 VPs in use at same time. Daily and hourly?</p> | <p>I HUGELY disagree with the maximum of two daily visitor passes per household at any one time. This is extremely discriminatory to those who need special visitors, and very problematic to those who rely on visitors. When I had my new baby visits from my mother were a lifeline. When my friend broke his ankles visits to help him around the house were a lifeline.</p> <p>Finally those with off street parking in their own front gardens will not be affected and once again it means that those with bigger houses and more money will benefit from visitors where people in flats and smaller accommodation won't making it discriminatory.</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>No more than 2 VPs in use at same time. Daily and hourly?</p> | <p>My household has 6 adults living in it. 4 of which are young persons aged over age 21.</p> <p>We are not in a CPZ, however as a Haringey resident I wish to make comments as I oppose some of the principles of the proposals. The application of permits and surcharges and limits to daily visitor permits on a per household basis is unfair to large households which are far more environmental than multiple small households. Large households with young persons often include those with jobs that can involve late night work or require the person to have car transport. For example, in our house two are key workers in NHS and education. Car insurance restrictions and pricing means that more than 2 young persons are unable to be insured on their own car for any premium and the cost for more than 1 young person Insured on a single car is often prohibitive.</p> <p>Accordingly, many large households have several vehicles but on a per adult basis have less vehicles</p> |
| <p>No more than 2 VPs in use at same time. Daily and hourly?</p> | <p>Do the proposed parking changes mean that the current one-hour visitor vouchers will no longer be available, and that only daily visitor vouchers will be available? It's not made explicit in the consultation documents.</p> <p>Umfreville Rd N4</p> |
| <p>No more than 2 VPs in use at same time. Daily and hourly?</p> | <p>Can you please let me know if there are any changes proposed to the one hour visitor parking permit as these do not seem to be included in this consultation?</p> <p>Warham Road N4 1</p> |
| <p>6</p> | <p>Daily Visitor Permits to increase to £4. What about hourly permits?</p> |
| <p>Daily Visitor Permits to increase to £4. What about hourly permits?</p> | <p>I am writing to ask about the increase in the Visitor Permits. I don't have many visitors with a car so I have a lot of permits from the last time I ordered some. Will these permits still be valid once the new prices come into place? If not, would you refund the ones that have not been used?</p> |
| <p>Daily Visitor Permits to increase to £4. What about hourly permits?</p> | <p>I currently have a few Visitor Parking Permits. I am age 80. Will I still be able to use them if the new proposed charges are agreed?</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Daily Visitor Permits to increase to £4. What about hourly permits?</p> | <p>Please clarify the point in your email yesterday about the increase to the daily visitor permit. The St Lukes CPZ operates from 11.00 to 13.00 and I buy 1 hour visitor permits which are rarely used. You do not mention these. Are you proposing any changes to the one hour visitor permits? Fortismere Avenue London N10</p> |
| <p>Daily Visitor Permits to increase to £4. What about hourly permits?</p> | <p>I would like to object to the proposed increase in parking permit charges, and only allowing 2 visitor permits a day per household will prevent additional visitors on days when family/friends are visiting for occasions such as birthdays, etc. Many areas now only have permit controlled roads.</p> |
| <p>Daily Visitor Permits to increase to £4. What about hourly permits?</p> | <p>I'm a resident on Roslyn road N15, I have some particular concerns regarding your proposed changes. Particularly the escalation of pricing for visitors permits. You also mention that only two daily permits would be issued at a time? Could you please clarify this? When you say only two would be issued at a time what does this mean. We and other residents often require works done to our property eg building for extensions, plumbing or family visiting for more than two days at a time. To restrict us two permits at a time means no building works could go ahead in our area. Nor could any relatives visit us for more than two days at a time. This is unacceptable and without adequate justification.</p> |
| <p>Daily Visitor Permits to increase to £4. What about hourly permits?</p> | <p>I am writing to voice my strong objection to increasing the charges for visitor parking permits. Most of us use these permits for builders and plumbers, not just for guests who could have used public transport or cycled. It is completely unreasonable to tax us for carrying out home improvements or essential repairs (in addition to the VAT we already pay). Please consider issuing a fixed number of free daily parking permits for each household (20 annually would be a good place to start). That would be fair. Or, if you are unwilling to do that, I urge you to scrap the proposed price increase. Melrose Avenue N22</p> |
| <p>Daily Visitor Permits to increase to £4. What about hourly permits?</p> | <p>As far as I can see, the proposals do not state whether there is any change in the hourly as opposed to daily visitor permit costs. Also, they do not say what the limit might be on the number of hourly permits that can be purchased or the number that can be used at one time. This question is of importance for those of us who live in CPZs which have a daily restricted period of two hours. Grand Avenue N10</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Daily Visitor Permits to increase to £4. What about hourly permits?</p> | <p>* Visitor permits – households would be limited to no more than two daily visitor permits at any one time. Daily visitor permits would increase to £4 across all CPZ areas. A concessionary rate discount of 50% will be applied to the visitor permit charge for those aged 65 or over, or if registered disabled. There is no mention of the present hourly visitor permits. Could you let me know if it is the intention to abolish these so that only daily permits can be purchased? Stapleton Hall Road N4</p> |
| <p>Daily Visitor Permits to increase to £4. What about hourly permits?</p> | <p>I see no reference to any visitor permits other than daily ones. Short duration parking is of critical importance. Whether the permission is given by paper permit or digitally, this is a critically important part of residents' parking. Please make clear what your plans are. I do not support the limiting of visitor permits as outlined. Any residents having work done on their house or having visitors stay over should be able to get more than two days' worth at a time. Why not limit the number of permits annually or half-yearly.</p> |
| <p>Daily Visitor Permits to increase to £4. What about hourly permits?</p> | <p>I am shocked to see no mention of the 1hour visitor permit in the charges. My daughter often visits to drop off shopping as I currently do not have a car, does this mean that any visitor including workmen or brief visitors must have a £4 permit? This is wrong and means that for a non-car owner who accesses public transport that the cost of any visit is £4.</p> |
| <p>Daily Visitor Permits to increase to £4. What about hourly permits?</p> | <p>I wanted to write to express my concern over the proposal to increase parking charges on 3 points: (1) Lack of clarity around visitor permits, (2) Removal of 2 hour permits, (3) No provision for parking permits for essential work, (4) Lack of provision for cycling across the borough (1) The wording on the current consultation is confusing in stating that the limit is to 2 permits per day. It is not clear what this means in practice - are we only about to buy 2 at any one time or can we only use 2 on a single day (and how would this be enforced). Due to the time taken to get new permits (usually 3 weeks by post), it would be impractical to order them in groups of 2. More clarity around the process to support this rule is required. (2) We were disappointed to see the removal of the 2 hour permit, which has increased the cost of having visitors for an extended visit (but not a day). This is putting unnecessary taxes on residents without driveways</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Daily Visitor Permits to increase to £4. What about hourly permits?</p> | <p>I live in Southwood Avenue and have been in the Highgate Station CPZ since it started. I have a few comments; 1 £10 price rise. The purpose of the CPZ was to stop congestion in the streets around Highate station. This has largely worked. But it is only a 2 hour zone during weekdays. However, the price for a resident just keeps getting higher every year. I remember when the cost of a permit was £80/year. It is now double that. You have got to stop raising the cost of a permit, without thinking about the impact on residents. I do not believe the infrastructure cost of operating the CPZ has doubled during this period of time- I do not see the area being patrolled more often. This is not a money raising exercise for Haringey. Also the Highgate CPZ only operates for 2 hours a day- so you only have to patrol it between the hours of 10.00am to 12 noon. This price rise is not justified by the CPZ service you offer residents</p> |
| <p>Daily Visitor Permits to increase to £4. What about hourly permits?</p> | <p>When our Woodside parking charges started (January 2017?) our scratch card visitor permits cost about 64p. To increase these over 800% within 4 years is unacceptable. Our 2 hour period of parking restrictions was introduced to stop commuters parking all day. It Has worked and no increase in cost is necessary. It is also unthinkable to introduce changes at a time when people are being urged to avoid public transport if they can to protect those who have no choice but to use public transport and public transport workers who have suffered badly in this pandemic. Your proposed actions are not just immoral but criminal. Finally, the hypocrisy. This is nothing to do with anything other than making money. Everyone is struggling financially including councils. But making poor citizens pay for it is not the way.</p> |
| <p>Daily Visitor Permits to increase to £4. What about hourly permits?</p> | <p>We live in Haringey and have never owned a car, so we are excellent examples of Haringey Councils stated aim of cutting down car ownership and usage across the borough. However never owning a car certainly hasn't saved us from the burden of paying for parking because when friends or family come to visit or we need work done on our home then we have to rush out and buy visitor tickets and as we are not the sort of people who charge our guests for parking we end up out of pocket and acting as unofficial parking wardens for the council. As we exemplify Haringey's stated aims I believe that we and other residents who do not own cars should be given a number of free visitor permits to reward us for helping Haringey council achieve its stated goals - this would mean that Haringey's well wielded stick of raising residents parking charges, charging more for owning more than one car and now applying a diesel penalty would also be tempered with the</p> |
| <p>Daily Visitor Permits to increase to £4. What about hourly permits?</p> | <p>I support, to the best of my ability, my mum who has dementia and who lives in your Borough. Getting there by public transport would take ages so I drive. I basically have no choice. It's a rather blunt tool you are using which affects most harshly people like me who have no choice and without my efforts the local council, GPs, hospitals would have more to do.....but you impact me by doing this.....do you feel that is right ?</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Daily Visitor Permits to increase to £4. What about hourly permits?</p> | <p>Completely against any increase in parking fees for visitors during these trying times. Everyone is isolated. Especially the elderly are lonely. Increasing visitor parking fees will increase the loneliness and isolation.</p> |
| <p>Daily Visitor Permits to increase to £4. What about hourly permits?</p> | <p>I am emailing in regard to the price increases for visitor parking permits. They have doubled in price over the last 2 years and are about to double again. I don't understand why?! I'm not getting paid 4 times my salary from 2 years ago. I totally agree with a slight increase. I totally agree with a rise of £10 for my car permit but the visitors permits is unreasonable. Also I have purchased visitor parking permits which you're saying will now be invalid as of November. I would like to post them back to you and get a full refund. You can't offer a service where on the visitor parking permit it appears to date until many years in the future and now take that away. Ferme Park Road</p> |
| <p>Daily Visitor Permits to increase to £4. What about hourly permits?</p> | <p>Please don't increase Cromwell Avenue Highgate parking permits etc.. they expensive as it is to park on this road as a resident.</p> |
| <p>Daily Visitor Permits to increase to £4. What about hourly permits?</p> | <p>We were very alarmed to read of your proposed price hikes to the parking charges. Having a young family, we rely on having a car to get around and manage the household. Especially in these times we are being discouraged from using public transport and are reliant on having a vehicle. An increase in prices would cause significant hardship to families like ours. We would be especially hard hit by the increased cost of parking permits and visitor permits. We also do not understand the proposal to limit visitor permits to 2 daily permits at any one time. Is this a limit on the number of visitors? We trust you will not implement these proposals.</p> |
| <p>Daily Visitor Permits to increase to £4. What about hourly permits?</p> | <p>I strongly object to these proposals other surrounding areas only have match day restriction we have residential and match day restrictions. It's ridiculous to put prices up when security In the area is not great and roads are not even looked after by the council. To then limit how many visitors we can have in our home at any one time is disgusting we pay our council tax so how dare the council limit how many people with cars can visit us in our own homes? I live in household where 4 working adults all require a car - we pay taxes and none of us claim benefits now we must pay extra to have more than 1 car?! Again a ridiculous and unfair request. In a time of pandemic we are told to social distance this is key to avoid public transport and the council is forcing us to take it putting our health at risk. We already have congestion charges UELZ charges, road tax and permits and now the council wants to put more pressure on us but cannot control the criminals that break</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Daily Visitor Permits to increase to £4. What about hourly permits?</p> | <p>I think resident permits and visitor parking permits for those over 70 and/or have a disability or mental illness should be free. In my experience our elderly and most vulnerable residents often worry unnecessarily and disproportionately about the purchase, value and cost of their permits. A concessionary rate discount of 50% should be applied to the resident and visitor permit charges for those in poorer parts of our borough. If stored visitor scratch cards have visible accidental damage - they should be refunded.</p> <p>I do not agree on a £20 charge for refunds. If people are need of a refund (usually for small amounts of money) they obviously need the money if they seek a refund! A charge makes this unfair on poorer residents. Save time and money make the process easier!</p> |
| <p>Daily Visitor Permits to increase to £4. What about hourly permits?</p> | <p>I disagree with visitor permits being increased. At the very least, non car owning properties should be exempt from the charge as they are already helping to reduce air pollution etc. I feel it is important that households that walk, cycle and/or use public transport are recognised for the benefits their approach makes to our local environment. It may also prove an incentive to others!?</p> |
| <p>Daily Visitor Permits to increase to £4. What about hourly permits?</p> | <p>I am appalled by your proposals to increase parking costs by such large amounts- particularly when we are currently in a pandemic where the use of public transport is not only a really scary thought It is something that our government is telling us not to use. Why oh why are you punishing the car owner- my car is new- I lease hire it and although diesel has 'adblue' which significantly lowers emissions but you'll charge me a significantly higher amount to park my car.</p> <p>Transport in and out of Haringey is not great, nor is it particularly safe yet you are raising the cost of visitor parking... it is pure greed - if the management of your parking procedures costs so much then perhaps you need to look at your systems not charge those that live here more money!</p> |
| <p>Daily Visitor Permits to increase to £4. What about hourly permits?</p> | <p>Parking permits – a £10 increase across all existing parking permits to support the significant costs of running, maintaining and enforcing our parking infrastructure.</p> <p>The above statement is simply not believable. There are NO significant costs in maintaining and enforcing residential parking. I have not noticed any maintenance to our CPZ's for over 10 years, and the enforcers make their money by catching infringers and providing penalty charges. Instead of an increase of £10, I would suggest a decrease by £40 per year, or even scrapping the CPZ's altogether, as they are no longer needed.</p> <p>On-street pay-to-park and off-street car parks – a 25% surcharge to on-street pay-to-park areas and off-street car parks to discourage short trips within the borough. 25% surcharge - Why? People need to make short trips within the borough. This increase is simply obscene, and totally unjustified.</p> <p>Visitor permits – households would be</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Daily Visitor Permits to increase to £4. What about hourly permits?</p> | <p>?I am seriously opposed to limiting daily visitor permits to 2 permits on any application In normal times it can take several weeks for parking permits to be delivered - consequently I buy a dozen or so at once - so that if I have a visitor I have permits available- and don't rely on a speedy service from the Council. This proposed rule will just mean that I have to make many more applications- which will create even longer delays in t</p> |
| <p>Daily Visitor Permits to increase to £4. What about hourly permits?</p> | <p>Thank you for the information about increased charges. We no longer have a car but we have a lot of Visitors' Permits - in my name as aged 80 years. Will we be able to continue to use the permits we already have? Do we need to pay more, or use more permits for the same period? Stapleton Hall Road N4</p> |
| <p>Daily Visitor Permits to increase to £4. What about hourly permits?</p> | <p>Me and my wife live in Lordship lane and we need daily help with shopping and house cleaning therefore I hope you will consider all the residents living along lordship lane and be allowed to buy visitors-permits. Thank you.</p> |
| <p>Daily Visitor Permits to increase to £4. What about hourly permits?</p> | <p>That is a lot more money. For people that work from home and need the visitor parking is a huge increase and adding to already a loss of possible income. For some of people the car is used at weekends or journey that by train or bus would be very expensive. This is a big blow to small businesses again.</p> |
| <p>Daily Visitor Permits to increase to £4. What about hourly permits?</p> | <p>I would like to be able to use the scratch card system and for it to remain as it is currently. £4 per visit is way too expensive. If you are going to increase the first car by £10 and the second car in a household by £50 then visitors permits should remain as they currently are. This represents more than £400 for a family with 2 cars, significantly more if they have diesel. If you look back at the information given to residents when the CPZ was originally set up. We were assured that this level of cost increase would never occur. I feel that this is a stealth tax on residents and based on the state of pavements and roads in my area is not being reinvested. Where will this money be spent?</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|---|---|
| Daily Visitor Permits to increase to £4. What about hourly permits? | <p>NO RISES TO VISITOR'S PARKING PERMITS</p> <p>I noticed there's no named person representing this proposal to reply to which I found odd? I feel maybe the reason being, whoever they are, have no concern or interest for people living in Haringey proposing such extreme price rises for November 2020</p> <p>We have already seen an unlawful gigantic increase in the previous year. A one-hour visitor's permit cost approximately 20 pence in the year 2018. The price for a one hour visitor's permit in 2019 went up to approximately 80 pence, a 75% increase in 12 months. And you propose to raise it again. It's an inhumane proposal in my opinion. I'm sure every Haringey resident shares my view on the extreme inflation we have witnessed in the past year. The reason I am appealing for you not to go ahead with raising the price on visitor's permits is that we have a lot of vulnerable residents who rely upon the public, family, and friends to help and</p> |
| Daily Visitor Permits to increase to £4. What about hourly permits? | <p>Increasing visitors permits to £4 per day is an absolute disgrace. Only 3 months ago did you try to get half my road (Manor road) with more spaces for pay parking when no one is actually using those slots. You're now asking residents to increase own parking fees by £10 and reduce the spaces we can park outside our own homes!!</p> <p>Very angry resident from N22</p> |
| 7 | Companion badge to be replaced by a free resident permit |
| Companion badge to be replaced by a free resident permit | <p>I am writing about the proposed changes to parking permits. My partner is a blue badge holder. Recently her blue badge was stolen from the car by the window being smashed. We have now applied for a companion badge. So will the new residential permit be linked to the individual car in the same way as a companion badge? Sometimes we are not able to park in the disabled bay right outside so will the new permit still work if we are parked somewhere else in the street? Will it still deter theft like the companion badge? And will we get a partial refund as we have only just applied for the companion badge?</p> |
| Companion badge to be replaced by a free resident permit | <p>I wanted to inquire about carer's parking permit. I work full time in care home at Linley Road N17. Can you advise, how can I access to park my car in the area as it requires a permit?</p> |
| Companion badge to be replaced by a free resident permit | <p>I will not support the companion badge removal. It's ok to propose free residential parking for blue badge holders as they have blue badge but removing the companion badge means blue badge holders cannot park within the borough without displaying the badge but blue badge is stolen when displayed. People break the car just to steal the blue badge and this courses damage to the car and stress of reapplying for another badge. I will not support that idea, rather blue badge holders can have free residential parking permit throughout and across the borough. Thanks</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|--|--|
| Companion badge to be replaced by a free resident permit | Please can you clarify the potential changes to the companion badge scheme? My mother currently has a companion badge and uses it around the borough for things like doctors' appointments, shopping etc. Would this be changing? From my understanding of this current proposal you are saying that the companion badge would cease to exist? And that my mother would only be entitled to a free parking permit for the CPZ she currently resides in? This will mean she will have to use her blue badge around the borough and put it at risk of being stolen. The whole point of the companion badge is to limit theft. |
| Companion badge to be replaced by a free resident permit | I am a Haringey resident who is registered disabled. I currently have a companion badge. In the new proposals it is suggested that in future a free resident's permit badge will be used instead. Does that mean that we will have to use our disabled badges when parking outside our zone but still within the borough of Haringey? |
| Companion badge to be replaced by a free resident permit | <p>As a Haringey Blue Badge holder, I would like to comment on the way the parking changes would affect me & other Blue Badge Holders, even though I have only heard about this consultation at second hand from a non-disabled permit holder & not in my own right. * Do you propose to consult Haringey Blue Badge holders as well as other residents? (Equality Act 2010).</p> <p>* Before the Companion Badge scheme was introduced, my Blue Badge was stolen twice, causing me costly damage, stress, loss of mobility and inconvenience. The Companion Badge has been a useful crime prevention measure, protecting some of the most vulnerable people in the Borough, avoiding the need to expose the badge throughout Haringey. It had also reduced the fraudulent use of Blue Badges and the market in stolen Badges.</p> <p>* The greater parking cost and more restrictions will make stolen Blue Badges worth more, and more inviting to steal.</p> <p>* The new disabled residential permit would not avoid the need to</p> |
| Companion badge to be replaced by a free resident permit | My son is a carer for my wife who is 88 years old and a resident in Haringey with Alzheimer's disease, but he is not resident in Haringey. His car is not registered within Haringey so how will he be able to care for her? I would appreciate a reply as this is of great concern to us all if Haringey requires a companion badge scheme which he obviously can't use. |
| Companion badge to be replaced by a free resident permit | I presently display a Companion Badge on my car windscreen. Please clarify how the proposed Residents Permit will identify that I hold a Blue Badge, particularly when my car is parked in a Disabled person's parking bay? |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|---|---|
| Companion badge to be replaced by a free resident permit | Further to your email below - Does this mean she has to do the whole form again???. She is 85 with chronic illnesses and a stair lift, wheelchair - and Haringey Council has provided her with a disabled shower, surely you do not believe she has 'improved' since we last applied?? When is the badge going to come back into force? And where will we go to get an 'expert assessor'!!! |
| Companion badge to be replaced by a free resident permit | I am emailing to ask why you are proposing stopping the Companion Badge scheme ? Having a Companion Badge has been very helpful in this borough and enables me to park anywhere in my CPZ without the need to display my blue badge. Many blue badges are still being stolen with damage to vehicles. Can you let me know the purpose of this change please? |
| Companion badge to be replaced by a free resident permit | I currently hold a Companion badge as I am a Blue badge holder. Do I still have to pay for a residential permit? |
| Companion badge to be replaced by a free resident permit | I will not support the companion badge removal. It's ok to propose free residential parking for blue badge holders as they have blue badge but removing the companion badge means blue badge holders cannot park within the borough without displaying the badge but blue badge is stolen when displayed. People break the car just to steal the blue badge and this courses damage to the car and stress of reapplying for another badge. I will not support that idea, rather blue badge holders can have free residential parking permit throughout and across the borough. Thanks |
| 8 | Admin fee of £20 to cover cost of refunds - No more refunds of scratch cards |
| Admin fee of £20 to cover cost of refunds. (No more refunds of scratch cards} | I don't think you should increase parking permits by £10 as they are unfairly allocated. I live in Sandford Avenue N22 and my parking permit does not cover as many streets as a WG permit. You should even out anomalies so it is fair before increasing prices. I don't even know why we have parking permits: our street is very quiet and nowhere near a tube station or the football stadium. It is unnecessary for Sandford Avenue to have parking permits - it's just a money spinner for the council. I also disagree with limiting Visitor permits to 2 a day. This will not affect us normally but would make family gatherings impossible for special occasions. This seems an unnecessary limitation given that it is such a rare occasion for residents to need more than one a day. Also, if anybody is having work done to their house, it may be necessary on occasion for more than 3 visitor permits a day. This is making life unnecessarily difficult for residents who are already paying |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|---|---|
| Admin fee of £20 to cover cost of refunds. (No more refunds of scratch cards} | Unused parking scratch cards should always be fully refundable, They have been but not used, why should the council keep this – Money? |
| Admin fee of £20 to cover cost of refunds. (No more refunds of scratch cards} | These rises seem very high compared to the rate of inflation. However my main issue is with making the visitor scratch cards non-refundable. I once bought cards from you which only had 2 years left. If you take this step, will you ensure that any cards purchased have at least 5 years on them? |
| Admin fee of £20 to cover cost of refunds. (No more refunds of scratch cards} | I have acquired many visitor parking permits and wish to get them exchange for permits that will be valid into 2021 and further - as the ones I have expire in 2020? If I cannot do this can how can I get them refunded before they are made non-refundable as with what is stated on the email sent to me yesterday regarding "Proposed amendments to parking charges and permits" |
| Admin fee of £20 to cover cost of refunds. (No more refunds of scratch cards} | This smacks of swingeing price gouging of a captive population many of whom, including myself, as a pensioner are not enjoying commensurate income rises and who rely upon having a car for occasional necessary journeys. What are your proposals regarding partially refunding the fee I paid for my current parking permit which was to afford me priority access to my local CPZ parking bays. |
| Admin fee of £20 to cover cost of refunds. (No more refunds of scratch cards} | My wife and I do not have a car. We strongly object to the following elements of the proposed changes: (1) No refund for scratch cards: we have 25 one hour scratch cards and strongly object to these becoming worthless, since we paid for them (2) Cap on daily visitor permits and increase in price: we object to introduce a cap as it would limit the amount of work we could get done to the house with several builders on site. We also object to the increase in price Cromwell Avenue N6 |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Admin fee of £20 to cover cost of refunds. (No more refunds of scratch cards}</p> | <p>Administration Fee for parking permit refunds – the council is proposing a £20 administration fee on processing parking permit refunds. It is also proposed that visitor scratch cards shall become non-refundable.</p> <p>We will have left over a lot of 1hour visitor scratch cards that my partner and I purchased recently and you are telling me monies cannot be refunded on scratch cards, is that right? This does not seem just. If I need to pay £20 for you to process this refund before the date in November that you haven't published yet that is fine but please don't say that the money I have paid on 1 hr scratch card visitors permits I will lose? This isn't right!</p> <p>Please can you respond to this query to make clear our position in regards to getting a refund for these permits that we have already purchased in good faith, as well as let us know what date in November these changes are coming into play?</p> |
| <p>Admin fee of £20 to cover cost of refunds. (No more refunds of scratch cards}</p> | <p>I agree with these proposals except that there should be a facility for people to reclaim money on out of date permits. Particularly the whole-day ones which I only ever use for contractors, but because that's what they are needed for I always like to have one or two in stock. If no major repairs are needed the permits are not needed either and it seems unfair not to be able to get say £8 back when they expire.</p> <p>Sirdar Road, N22</p> |
| <p>Admin fee of £20 to cover cost of refunds. (No more refunds of scratch cards}</p> | <p>I understand the £10 increase to support the significant costs of running, maintaining and enforcing the parking infrastructure. However I do not support an admin fee of £20 to process refunds. You employ administrators specifically to manage parking permits. This should include the issuing of refunds. In no other industry would you ever be charged money for the processing of a refund.</p> |
| <p>Admin fee of £20 to cover cost of refunds. (No more refunds of scratch cards}</p> | <p>I object to the proposed changes:</p> <p>Firstly the visitor permits - I purchased these in February, over £100 worth on the understanding that these will last until 2023. You have sold them to me and now you need to honour that sale. I do not want a refund, I want to use the service I have purchased from you. And furthermore The Consumer Rights act prohibits you from charging an administration fee for refunds on goods.</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|---|---|
| Admin fee of £20 to cover cost of refunds. (No more refunds of scratch cards} | Currently the Haringey visitor parking permits have a “shelf life” which can expire. We cannot understand the rationale for this decision. We feel very strongly that it is unfair & unnecessary. Usually prior to buying these permits we estimate how many we are likely to need during the given time. It is not possible to estimate the number precisely. Any overestimate of permits cannot be redeemed & it leaves us out of pocket. We think the system employed by e.g. Waltham Forest is much better & fairer than Haringey. Visitor permits do not have an expiry date in Waltham Forest. Is it possible to change the current system in Haringey? |
| 9 | Not objecting - I generally support this |
| Not objecting - I generally support this | I am in agreement that we need to look after the environment and that multiple cars per household are not the way to do it. However I think that the issue should go further. I live in Sylvan Avenue N22 but when visiting friends in N15 (near Chestnuts Park) I've seen the public bike racks in the road. What a brilliant idea to encourage cycling, especially for those of us who are put off because we can't store bikes in the house/flat or if it is too difficult to wheel them through the house to outside space. I also think that places to safely lock your bike when shopping and visiting friends etc is vital in terms of encouraging usage. Lampposts etc aren't ideal. I won't go into cycle lanes etc but that is still a bit of an issue too. Cycling is especially good right now as so many people don't want to go on buses while Covid19 is dominating our lives. You've got a real chance to make our borough really cycle friendly and to offer a proper alternative to car |
| Not objecting - I generally support this | I am a resident of Haringey (N22) and am writing to support the suggested increases in parking charges. Haringey needs to do much more to discourage car use and this is one way to do so. |
| Not objecting - I generally support this | I've just read about the proposed changes and I'm all in favour. Anything that makes this borough a healthier place to live! |
| Not objecting - I generally support this | I feel this is the right direction for Haringey and for London as a whole and the council should keep on this path, leading London forward.. Like smoking-everyone used to smoke as the norm on buses, on the tube, trains, at work, at great cost people's health, the NHS and environment—there needs to be a culture change. Car transport causes pollution and subsequently ill health, respiratory problems due to air pollution killing more people than COVID. Road traffic is the biggest cause of accidental injury and death in children and young people and contributes to lack of fitness and obesity overall. It also fuels anti-social behaviours, notably road rage, drug dealing and fly tipping. Cars are also hugely expensive and not having one can contribute to people's pockets significantly, an average saving of around £3K per year. Encouraging walking, cycling and public transport in London is the way forward and can only lead to massive improvements in health, well-being |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|--|---|
| Not objecting - I generally support this | In general these proposals seem sensible moves to reduce the volume of car traffic in the borough. However, if car ownership goes down, residents may need more not fewer visitor permits, as we are more reliant on (e.g.) trade deliveries, hire cars from time to time etc. I don't think increasing charges or reducing access to visitor permits will reduce short hops - as these are presumably done by those outside the borough. |
| Not objecting - I generally support this | To those who put these proposals together, I am very supportive of all of the increases and support the increase in charges fully. Thank you for your proposing these changes and I wish you all the best in convincing residents the this is a good thing for our borough. |
| | |
| Not objecting - I generally support this | <p>I am writing to say that I agree with nearly all the proposals in principle, but a) I think the second car parking permits surcharge should be higher still. b) diesel fuelled vehicles should have a £250 surcharge at the minimum - these vehicles MUST get off the road right away.</p> <p>c) I don't think the daily visitor permits proposal is fair - many people need to use daily permits even when a plumber comes, for example, because the job takes a long time. Also, it is not the decision of the homeowner as to what mode of travel visitors choose to use.</p> <p>It is critical that roads passing schools and nurseries be as free of motor traffic as possible (i.e. buses only). Too many schools and nurseries in the borough suffer illegal levels of NO2 and PMs. Far too many people are dying prematurely, and the difference in air quality during lockdown has been a huge relief, even to those without underlying conditions. We are all breathing more easily, with better air quality</p> |
| Not objecting - I generally support this | <p>I think that it is a good idea to charge diesel cars more, to discourage the use of them within Haringey. Air quality is important and has improved significantly during the CV19 restrictions. Upper Tollington Park is an important road for people getting from Islington to Haringey and Tottenham and vice versa, so this measure would influence what vehicles some people use.</p> <p>Although I only have one car, I am sure that I agree with having to pay a premium for an extra car, though when I lived in Brent, that was very much Brent's approach: they did charge a substantial sum for a second car permit.</p> |
| Not objecting - I generally support this | Agree with proposals and extension of clean air within the north circular. |
| Not objecting - I generally support this | I happily endorse any measure that reduces car use in Haringey. However I don't think the measures go far enough to appreciably change car owners' behaviour. I would substantially increase the proposed surcharges and use that money to provide a viable alternative to personal motorised transport. The borough sorely needs a safe, segregated cycle infrastructure to encourage people away from cars. N4 |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|--|--|
| Not objecting - I generally support this | Good morning. Considering the catastrophic impact of diesel-fuelled vehicles on air quality and related health deterioration and climate change disasters, my suggestion would be to increase the surcharge to a much higher amount, to have a real impact. An £80 surcharge will not deter drivers; while the social, health and environmental costs of air pollution, caused mostly by diesel-fuelled vehicles, are well known and backed by undisputed evidence. Alexandra Park Rd, London N10 |
| Not objecting - I generally support this | I live in a CPZ and have two permits. I would like to support your proposals. I would favour penalising pollution emitting cars and second permits, but the restrictions on visitor permits might be seen as encouraging car ownership in a way, and also as potentially anti-business. You might do some research on who the balance of use - social v business. |
| Not objecting - I generally support this | I think the proposals are acceptable. |
| Not objecting - I generally support this | I would like to offer my thoughts regarding the current parking consultation. I am a resident of Page High, which is the Sanctuary managed estate on top of your Bury Road car park in Wood Green, and I have a Wood Green inner CPZ permit as a driver. I offer my thoughts in response to each point below: * Parking permits - a £10 increase across all existing parking permits to support the significant costs of running, maintaining and enforcing our parking infrastructure. I support this proposal as such a price increase seems broadly in line with rising wage costs. * Additional parking permits - A £50 surcharge on second and subsequent permits to reduce car ownership, promote active travel and more sustainable modes of travel. I support this proposal. |
| Not objecting - I generally support this | Good ideas in general Haringey Council. Surcharges could be a bit more sophisticated and target emissions not just diesel, but principle is good. How about a 'w*nk*r' tax for people with souped-up vehicles and personalised number plates? |
| Not objecting - I generally support this | Thank you for this consultation I live at Flat 5 Wallace Lodge Osborne Road London N4 3SE. I drive. I do not think these fee increases will go far enough to curb excessive car use, and I recognise that parking restrictions are one of the most effective way to reduce car use. With the levels of pollution in London breaching limits frequently please will you consider increasing the fee increases further? |
| Not objecting - I generally support this | I am a car owner and hold a residents parking permit. I fully support the proposed changes described in the consultation. I agree that car owners should pay extra to help meet some of the environmental and other costs of their cars and to encourage a reduction in private car ownership and use. Priory Gardens N6 |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Not objecting - I generally support this</p> | <p>- I generally support all efforts to reduce car ownership and increase in alternative transport modes.</p> <p>- for this to be fully welcomed in the community you need to show that alternatives are being provided, e.g. increased cycle lanes by length and width and numbers so that cyclists can feel safe to switch modes. Bike parking spots also need to be provided for visitors, such as simple hoops installed on existing lampposts. The latter is a simple relatively cheap provision and it is a mistake to think that cyclists need parking only around high streets and transport hubs.</p> <p>- Lastly, whilst I understand the damage diesel fuelled vehicles cause to the environment it is not fair to penalise families who use those as a result of limited alternative options. Whilst we cycle often as a family and I commute daily by bike we are a family of 6 with teenagers and have done plenty of looking into non diesel 7-seater cars for those journeys n</p> |
| <p>Not objecting - I generally support this</p> | <p>Thank You for notify me about the proposed increase in permit prices. However I do not have a problem with the increase in charges, my issue is with the timings, permitted hours being from 8am- 10pm. I cannot get my head or the rational around why the timings are till 10pm. No other borough has these times, due to these timing it is having a negative impact on friends & family visiting and the lack of Pay and Display outside our property. If I do not have any valid visitor permits nobody is able to come. The closest pay and display machine being at the bottom of Hornsey Park Road.</p> <p>I recommend either changing the hours to 8am- 7pm or introducing more machine for Pay and Display or Pay By Phone option. My mother is quite elderly and family and friends cannot come round due to the restrictions. Please do take my ideas into consideration especially in these difficult times and really make a change for the better.</p> |
| <p>Not objecting - I generally support this</p> | <p>My feeling is that the majority are fair, however I disagree with the basic £10 increase where it applies to zero emissions vehicles such as electric vehicles as I think this is the wrong time to be reducing the incentive for people to switch to non-polluting forms of transport.</p> <p>I hope you'll take this into consideration and make it more rather than less financially responsible for people to make the switch to zero emission cars, especially given that many at this time have no other safe means of transport other than private cars.</p> |
| <p>Not objecting - I generally support this</p> | <p>I am a car owner and am more than happy with any increase to charges on cars as they contribute towards global warming.</p> |
| <p>Not objecting - I generally support this</p> | <p>Very good. All excellent points re diesel.</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Not objecting - I generally support this</p> | <p>As a car owner I strongly support the increased charges for the following reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * We are in a climate emergency so drastic measures to discourage fossil fuel use in vehicles are justified. The increased charges, along with measures to encourage walking and cycling (and, when Covid-19 permits, public transport) and the ULEZ will encourage people to change their mode of transport to a more active mode – which would be better for health – or, if a car is still necessary for some journeys, away from diesel engines, and/or to use of electric vehicles. But there are social justice reasons to do this too. * Around 50% of households in Haringey do not own a car * Poorer households are less likely to own a car * But poorer households are more affected by air pollution * Air pollution also exacerbates Covid-19 which itself affects more deprived and BAME communities worse. * The costs of motoring have not risen as much as public transport fares, and in fact the recent dr |
| <p>Not objecting - I generally support this</p> | <p>I'm pleased to see that there will be increases in the residential parking charges in Haringey. I hope that such increases might result in more modest cars, and fewer huge ones, which make driving on our residential streets difficult. It also might discourage households from having more than one car. We are in the midst of a climate emergency, and this will be a signal to residents that our individual actions matter. London is now provided with excellent public transport, which cannot be used safely by everyone during the Covid-19 crisis, but will be there still when this crisis passes. The proposed increases might persuade residents that public transport is the best means of travel. Collingwood Avenue N10</p> |
| <p>Not objecting - I generally support this</p> | <p>I'd like to convey my support for Haringey Council's increases and other changes to parking charges. Discouraging us residents from using our cars is excellent policy, and it will benefit all of us and encourage less polluting forms of transport. Jacksons Lane.</p> |
| <p>Not objecting - I generally support this</p> | <p>I am writing in support of the proposed changes to parking charges and permits. Measures to discourage the use of fossil-fuelled vehicles are justified because of the threat posed by anthropogenic climate change. The increased charges, along with measures to encourage walking and cycling (and, when Covid-19 permits, public transport) and the Mayor of London's ULEZ will hopefully persuade people to change their mode of transport to a more active one (which would be better for their health) or, in those instances a car is still necessary for some journeys or because of the driver's particular employment, to abandon diesel and petrol vehicles in favour of electric ones.</p> <p>Additionally, there are a number of social justice reasons which support the proposed changes. For example, around 50% of households in Haringey do not own a car; poorer households are less likely to own a car in any case; poorer households are also more affected by air pollution, which pr</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|--|--|
| Not objecting - I generally support this | I have read all your proposed amendments to parking charges and permits, and heartily endorse them all. They will help car owners (and I am one) to pay their fair share for the pollution and noise they make, and the space they take up. At the same time, I ask that the council will use the extra income to encourage more active transport, making the streets safer for pedestrians and cyclists, promoting electric vehicles, and helping us all enjoy more "liveable" neighbourhoods. Good luck with these amendments! Warner Road, N8 |
| Not objecting - I generally support this | I fully support the proposed increases in car parking permit costs, and in fact I would support an even higher increase for 2nd car ownership. Excessive car use is blight on Haringey, and has a significant negative impact on quality of life in the borough. I would support increased spending on cycling and walking routes. |
| 10 | Questions and related issues |
| Questions and related issues | I live in a "Event Day" area and the permits for parking by my house is free of any charges for residents. When you sent an email stating that there would be some changes to permits would this include the "Event Day" permits or is it just an increase in the visitor permits? |
| Questions and related issues | But you have never even sent me a permit and still have my funding for it? |
| Questions and related issues | Do people relying on personal transport face increases/charges? |
| Questions and related issues | Can you please confirm the rules for electric vehicle parking in Haringey. |
| Questions and related issues | What does this mean for me as I have already renewed my permit and it expires next March 2021? Frontline staff working in a school. I have a very low carbon emission. Thank you |
| Questions and related issues | As part of this change would you also consider extending the period to Saturdays and Sundays 12:00 to 14:00? |
| Questions and related issues | You have stated that there are "significant costs of running, maintaining and enforcing our parking infrastructure". Therefore to ease this, we suggest changing the restrictions to just ONE hour instead of TWO. Therefore your half the hours of enforcements and costs reduced dramatically, Residents are still protected as external visitors cannot park without a permit. Please keep the costs the same for residents who should not be penalised for living here. This suggestion provides a solution for all parties. An important question we would like to know: Please can you advise what the aim of having a CPZ is? |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <p>Questions and related issues</p> | <p>Response to proposals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I received an email about this after the short consultation period had already begun, how much effort is being made to publicise the consultation considering the large increases proposed? 2. It's not clear if these proposals apply to event day permits. Currently I do not pay anything for my event day permit as it is only necessary due to stadium events, so only needs to be enforced on very limited days. Any cost for this not recouped from tickets should be covered by the football club. I do pay for visitor permits. 3. What does the section about only having two daily visitor permits mean? Surely people are not expected to go through the process to buy visitor permits every time they have used two, or only be allowed two visitors a year?? 4. While I can appreciate that council budgets are overstretched, this is also a time when many people and families are experiencing great financial strain and hardship. To make large increases like this to parking charges |
| <p>Questions and related issues</p> | <p>I am resident at flat in Milton Park, Highgate and will soon need a new parking permit - what's the procedure ? Also to get some resident parking permits</p> |
| <p>Questions and related issues</p> | <p>May I ask that the Council considers allowing Carers a general parking permit for all areas of Haringey. There are hundreds of Carers who have to use their own cars to get around all their patients quickly. Each area has a different time restriction, when permits are required which makes it very expensive. In short would the Council consider giving registered Carers the same permits as are given to Haringey employees which allow them to park anywhere in the Borough at any time? Like District Nurses and Veolia inspectors for example. Time is of the essence for Carers and it is a great bonus to patients to have their care on time. Carers who are forced to use public transport and walking, because of the cost of visitor's permits, waste a lot of valuable care time and energy.</p> |
| <p>Questions and related issues</p> | <p>Thanks. Have emailed them to find out if we have to apply for them or if they will be sent automatically. xxx</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <p>Questions and related issues</p> | <p>I object to most of your new proposals as set out below. You don't have a feedback mechanism so we can know how you take our views into account - bad. you have a simple support, object or other view on the online portal - this doesn't allow us to support some and object to other parts of the proposals - bad</p> <p>£10 increase in permits - it is hard to believe that your direct costs of managing the permits have gone up by £10 per permit – bad 25% increase in on street pay to park to "discourage short distance trips" - where is the evidence that on street parking is used by people for short trips? - bad</p> <p>max of 2 daily visitor permits per household at any one time - this is a terrible idea and will waste my time and your time. What if I have 3 visitors coming? Or one visitor for a week? Do I need to go through the procedure every time I use up my 2nd permit? And you have to take the time to process them every time?- bad. what is your process for responding to our comments?</p> |
| <p>Questions and related issues</p> | <p>Sorry, I also forgot to mention the disproportional approach of the council when it comes to the areas within the borough that have to pay for parking. Why do you not have to have a residents permit in Muswell Hill (where some of the richest demographic of the council live). This area do not have to pay for a permit and therefore are not shouldering any of this cost ! Fair, I don't think so ! Please can I have a response from you that can identify your logic in the matters I have raised, it would be greatly appreciated.</p> |
| <p>Questions and related issues</p> | <p>I cancelled my parking permit and sent the permit back to you in January of this year. I am yet to receive a response and refund.</p> |
| <p>Questions and related issues</p> | <p>Re: proposed £10 increase for a parking permit. Would it be possible to offer a single person discount such as applies to over 65 visitor permits or to Council tax?</p> <p>Re: Visitor permits. If we're being asked to pay more overall, I would ask that there be some way that visitor permits can't be abused. To illustrate what I mean a car has been parked outside my home since just before Christmas. Initially a hand written note was left on the dashboard for parking enforcement stating a resident's permit was awaited. From the beginning of the year it has remained parked without having once been moved, no resident's permit is displayed. It has had a stream of visitor permits which have been variously valid or not. Numerous penalty charge notices were left and paid preventing what I think is abuse of visitor permits to be addressed by removing the car to a pound.</p> |
| <p>Questions and related issues</p> | <p>Do you have any plans to reduce or abolish permit charges for all electric vehicles ? If you are penalising diesel cars, surely you should be encouraging and rewarding all electric drivers ?</p> |
| <p>Questions and related issues</p> | <p>I am still waiting for my blue badge renewal. What's happens when the parking wardens are back to work. My blue badge and parking permit have expired in May.</p> |
| <p>Questions and related issues</p> | <p>Could you tell me what would happen to my existing visitor permits which I purchased?</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Questions and related issues | Can I please get my parking permit refunded? I already cancelled it via the Haringey website over a month ago and I got back a response that for some technical reason they cannot refund. Please send a check then, or food vouchers. Anything |
| Questions and related issues | I live in Rectory Gardens N8. Whilst I am in support of virtually anything the council can do to reduce car usage, I am mindful of neighbours who tutor from home and rely on visitors permits to ensure they can provide for this. There is no mention of hourly permits. Will these still be available at the same price? |
| Questions and related issues | Could you kindly clarify the following? My husband is very disabled due to a stroke but we don't have a disabled bay outside our house. We have applied for one but haven't heard the outcome. Under the new regulations do we not have to pay for a residents parking permit? Will we have something to display on our windscreen so we don't get fined? |
| Questions and related issues | Thanks for this. Will visitor permits which have already been purchased still be valid? |
| Questions and related issues | Good Afternoon, I have just read your email regarding the increases and changes you are going to make to permits and also the parking restrictions. Our daughter is disabled and we have a parking bay, so she is a disabled blue badge holder. I am 76yrs. old, my wife is 75yrs. old, we both have health issues, our Daughter is 50yrs.old and permanently in a wheelchair, so we find it very difficult to get about without the car. The car we have is leased from Motability and is diesel and there is at least another fifteen months to go before the lease expires. I cannot afford to change the car now, and with all other demands you want another £80.00, just like that. Would you also explain in more detail about not being allowed to have more than two daily visitor permits at any one time. Do you mean I cannot buy more than two permits at once, or, cannot use more than two at one time, as in only being allowed two daily visitors? |
| Questions and related issues | I note you have added the word 'use' in relation to proposed visitor parking permit restrictions of two a day. Personally I only have one visitor at any given time but would need to be able to allow them to stay sometimes for more than 48 hours. Therefore I would request that your new measures ensure we can possess multiple visitor parking permits, but only use no more than two concurrently. It would be a great help if parking permits could be ordered online and even better if they could be printed off at home. This would be a big saving to the council although you would need to work out enforcement. Maybe have a unique ID per permit, which once made live on your website would show on parking attendants' systems via a PDF printout with OCR. Warham Road |
| Questions and related issues | Please can you advise what happens to current unused visitors permits under the new proposal? |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <p>Questions and related issues</p> | <p>After the recent permit email I have just realised that my parking permits never arrived. (I have not needed them due to coronavirus but I would still like to have some!) . Please can you advise when I can expect to receive them?</p> <p>Date/Time 24/02/2020 13:50:59</p> |
| <p>Questions and related issues</p> | <p>I am writing to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed parking charges and permits amendments advised in your email to me of 3rd June 2020 for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. I live in Collingwood Avenue, N10 which is included in the St Luke's CPZ. Until the end of 2018, there was no CPZ in our area, and as a result parking outside our homes was free of charge. In the consultation that had took place in 2018, the large majority of residents of Collingwood Avenue voted against the establishment of a CPZ, as most of us deemed it unnecessary. However, the neighbouring roads apparently voted in favour, which put us in an impossible situation, and we were obliged to accept inclusion in the new CPZ, as the resulting overflow of parking needs from those roads on to Collingwood would have overwhelmed our own 'on road' parking facilities. So as from January 2019 we were obliged to pay a substantial figure for parking rights in front of our own home</p> |
| <p>Questions and related issues</p> | <p>Thank you for your email. I have just moved into the area and was unaware that I was a permit holder.</p> <p>Could you please confirm this is the case and outline what this means?</p> |
| <p>Questions and related issues</p> | <p>I'm writing on behalf of my mother, from whose email address this message comes. I am appalled at these sweeping price increases, unfairly targeting people who are already stretched to their limits following loss of work and reduced salaries, and who, in an effort to maintain social distancing and keep themselves and others safe, are more reliant on their personal vehicle than ever.</p> <p>In April, council tax increased by about £50 per month, rents have increased, and salaries have not increased. Your bringing in these huge price changes now is insensitive bordering on cruel. I urge you to rethink these increases, consult with residents and really pay attention to their concerns here. These substantial price and rule changes target lower-income and less able-bodied people disproportionately. They also target immune-compromised people, like my mother, who are scared of taking public transport and have no other options. Those concerns won't disappear in November.</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <p>Questions and related issues</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Kenwood road residents, only recently had the CPZ put in place, therefore any significant price increase is deemed totally unfair, as the residents did express their concerns that the parking time of 10 to 12.00 noon didn't really solve the parking problem here. * We propose that the CPZ should be extended from 08.00 to 18.00 also including the weekend * Cannot agree on any price increase. * Disabled badge holders should be issued a free permit and not have to display their companion badge, totally in agreement with this. <p>I trust you will take my views on board, as this is totally unfair given the lockdown situation, that we cannot freely communicate with neighbours, thus you have placed the residents at a disadvantage.</p> |
| <p>Questions and related issues</p> | <p>Is this run directly by the council or is it outsourced to a private company? If so it should be brought in-house and that would save money and there probably wouldn't have to be rises.</p> |
| <p>Questions and related issues</p> | <p>If you are to enforce such increase prices than restrict the hours of parking as before i.e. 8:30 till 10pm and no free Sundays! You are asking the residents to pay for the privilege to park on their street than anyone with a car should expect to be able to park easily outside of their door! I have no issue in the increases as I need a car to look after my mum. But I do have issues with the parking times as they are not strict enough and Haringey Green Lanes is as busy as Wood Green than why are we not matching their residential parking times as well! I don't see it fair to ask us to pay these prices without some benefits...</p> |
| <p>Questions and related issues</p> | <p>Can you please provide an update with regard the Tottenham Event Day and Tower Gardens Event Day consultation and whether or not changes will be going ahead? I read with interest that the outcome of the consultation was that 70% of respondents see no need to change the current set up, so am interested to know the outcome.</p> |
| <p>Questions and related issues</p> | <p>CPZ was introduced to our street Woodfield Way earlier this year. It is an unnecessary cost as we have not benefited from it in any way. Parking outside our property has never been an issue. I understand it has benefitted some residents but I oppose an increase to the permit cost. Particularly given the current COVID climate when some households are tightening belts and concerned about job security.</p> |
| <p>Questions and related issues</p> | <p>I'm very disappointed and surprise that your team intend to do an amendment to my permit which was original agreed, I was trying to print the permit but the printer wouldn't printer because they was fault, . I'm hoping in view this already agreed can you honour this.</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <p>Questions and related issues</p> | <p>I received the consultation on the proposed amendments to parking charges in the Borough, because I am the householder who buys our permits. You must also ensure you send the consultation to ALL Blue Badge holders in the borough. They will be affected by the proposals but may not be the person who buys permits for their household. It is not clear what the daily allocation of permits will be for each household. What does this mean? * Households would be limited to no more than two daily visitor permits at any one time. I am a psychiatrist, and see patients. I do not use "daily" permits, I buy one hour permits. The change needs to be clarified.</p> |
| <p>Questions and related issues</p> | <p>As a local resident and worker in the community sector in Haringey I feel it important to stress that the actions the council propose will disproportionately impact poorer residents of the borough who are majority BAME. Your own State of the Borough document a few years ago identified that "of all Inner London boroughs, Haringey has the largest proportion that are earning below the London Living wage (32%)" and yet you are now proposing to bring in increased charges on car ownership in the borough. A recent Freedom Of Information request revealed 48% of Haringey residents have no savings or are in debt and therefore these charges will impact those residents most. By bringing in blanket charges across the borough that raises the costs of car ownership for all residents you are making it harder for poorer/BAME residents to own a vehicle in Haringey, which appears to be a discriminatory act.</p> |
| <p>Questions and related issues</p> | <p>HOW INCONSIDERATED THIS COUNCIL IS ALL THIS INCREASES, AND THE ROAD ARE DIRTY, FULL OF POTHOLES, TREES OVERGROWN, PAVEMENTS UNEVEN, ROADS HAVE BEEN REDUCED TRAFFIC IS INCREASED DUE TO REDUCTION OF STREETS, MISSING SIGN - I CAN GO ON AND ON WHY DOESN'T THE COUNCIL JUST SAY WE DO NOT WANT CARS IN ANY AREA AT ALL INSTEAD OF SUCKING UP MONEY ALL THE TIME AND GIVE NOTHING IN RETURN. ALL THE MONEY WE PAY FOR COUNCIL AND THIS IS WHAT WE GET INCREASE REGARDS. A VERY UNHAPPY RESIDENT</p> |
| <p>Questions and related issues</p> | <p>It just seems like the council is on a money grab from the motorist. How can you justify these increases in the Woodside West CPZ? We only have parking for 2 hours a day Mon-Fri 11-1pm? It is a rip off. How am I supposed to get to rural Buckinghamshire every day if I don't have a car????</p> |
| <p>Questions and related issues</p> | <p>If you want to improve the environment why not do something about the insane amount of fly tipping, rubbish thrown in the street and Ducketts common with its crime. All of these situations are instantly back to normal as lockdown eases. Instead you embark on a revenue raising scheme. Please try not to find new ways to penalise the law abiding tax paying community of Haringey and focus on the many who break the rules and make it worse for everyone. The car charges are already astronomical and I see no reason to inflate them. This is a stealth tax which does not improve air quality but would provide the council with more money to waste.</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|--|--|
| Questions and related issues | I have a question. How is my neighbour able to have 3 cars & 2 vans parked on our street all day... Every day? |
| Questions and related issues | Hi - thanks for outlining the proposed new charges for parking and permits. Can you let me know how this new scheme would affect owners of hybrid vehicles? Specifically, the annual cost of a parking permit which currently qualifies for a discount. |
| Questions and related issues | Hi we are at Waltheof Gardens. My question is when actually the permits will start in November 2020 please provide us with the dates if you know |
| Questions and related issues | I'm having some work done when lockdown is over, on my house and so I need some visitors parking permits. How do I go about this please? I don't know how many I need but as many as possible would be good. How do I order them and To whom exactly do I pay ? And how many hours can the building van stay for on my street. And are they for only my street? I live in crouch end. |
| Questions and related issues | I don't object to the price rises in view of the current circumstances. But I would expect a much improved service for the extra charges: 1/ why on earth isn't the payment system moved online as in Islington where you just book visitors' cars on your smartphone when they arrive at your house and pay the appropriate sum? 2/ in the current system, there is nothing between a 1-hour and an all-day permit, which is disgraceful. Most visitor permits are needed for longer than an hour but far less than a whole day so you invariably end up paying for time you don't need. 3/ If the paper system persists, why do the permits have an expiry date? Each permit already has an identification number, so why do they need an expiry date as well? This is a real rip-off. People tend to buy permits in bulk because it's such a palaver doing in by post (they invariably go missing). You then have to attempt to get a refund out of Haringey for unused permits which have passed their expiry |
| 11 | Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now? |
| Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now? | I am dismayed at the measures proposed by Haringey. The current costs and restrictions to motorists are more than enough. Plus, it would be a great step to see a return to the 2 hour parking voucher, instead of just 1 hour. G Childress |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>It is a shameful, ill timed, misjudged and an inappropriate proposal. It will increase the financial burden on residents at the worst possible time when many are already struggling. HC will especially penalise those using their car to shop and help others. You will make living in this borough more and more unpleasant and stressful. My suggestion: put it off for at least a year.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the difference between a surcharge and an increase? 2. I understand the council needs revenues. You have introduced parking charges at Alexandra Palace despite objections. You know full well that people are struggling financially; many have lost jobs or are on reduced wages. This is a colossal misjudgement, out of step with the mood of the people. Those who have a diesel car may not currently be in a position to trade it in for petrol. Many of us are afraid to take public transport |
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>Dear sir/madam, Is it sensible to have a massive increase on the parking just this year, would be possible to wait when we start to see the light at the end of the tunnel?</p> |
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>Objection: Totally the wrong time to increase charges we are still amidst a pandemic! Haringey do not even properly enforce their own restrictions - I have to repeatedly cars/vans parking in CPZ to be tickets but nothing ever happens, how can an increase be justified. If they managed the area properly the revenue would suffice from penalty tickets.</p> |
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>I have read your proposals with dismay. Whilst I appreciate that there is a strain on council finances and the need for all councils to look at increasing sources of revenue, it is a shame that this is an area chosen to extract funds. Furthermore, in the current climate, where the government is recommending greater use of personal transport to stem the pandemic, why is the council making those proposals more difficult to achieve – especially as residents finances are stretched.</p> |
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>I understand the rationale behind increases to charges and permits but I would urge a later introduction of these new charges. Many people are currently having to use a car when they would have previously used public transport. In our household, we have had to welcome an additional person as she can no longer afford to live separately and -as she is pregnant - is in a vulnerable group. She relies on her car to move around safely, having to travel to her school in London Bridge a couple of times a week. The congestion charge has already hit hard. Adding £50 to the existing second car permit charge seems harsh while we are having to alter our behaviour due to COVID19. My partner uses his car to transport equipment for work. Cycling is not an option for people in our household, though we always walk to shops, parks etc.</p> <p>Please consider delaying these new charges until the pandemic is under control or January 2021 at the earliest. People may then feel more confident</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>Great move Haringey Council, just when millions of people are struggling, you come along and rob them, I for one will get involved in any way I can to oppose this and don't give us that ,we are doing it for the environment crap because we know it's just another cash cow for you.</p> |
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>I strongly object to the hike in parking charges you are proposing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - £10 increase on all parking permits is without any justification as you had already increased them at the start of the year. We have not had the benefits of our resident parking for 4 months now- will you be refunding us all? - 25% increase in on street parking is unfair- you may be trying to avoid short trips, but if people are shopping they need their cars. The public transport system isn't good enough to be relied upon and many people will not feel safe crammed onto buses and tubes. you are also severely affecting the small shop keepers who rely on regular customer who want fresh food. - Increasing the daily visitors permits to £4 with no more than 2 per day- how can this be justified? What if you have carers, childcare, live alone. This can only isolate people even more. <p>_ I don't have a diesel, but again the Government advocated diesel vehicles, so people bought them. You can't just expect people to have</p> |
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>I am very disappointed with this kind of proposal. It is always increasing price but the TFL system is very poor and does not support today's life needs. The bus and trains are running already packed and with several delays all the time where the conditions of hygiene are poor. Moreover, in this difficult period also the congestion charges will increase in central London and it is not fair for visitors like family members that they should pay also during the weekend to have a reunion. It is already a difficult time and therefore I ask to avoid this increase.</p> <p>Cobham Road N22</p> |
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>I am horrified at these measures and no doubt see that this is just a way for the council to recoup funds loss due to the current pandemic. If we are taking that into account then you will realise that these measures are going to be detrimental to many households who are already dealing with loss of earning and overall austerity.</p> <p>What will this mean for my own household? Whilst we have one car my son has a company vehicle? Does that mean he'll have to pay an additional £50 for a second vehicle in the household? This is ludicrous. I totally object to these measures and would like my views and voice to be noted and heard.</p> <p>Franklin Street</p> |
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>It is a shameful, ill timed, misjudged and inappropriate proposal. It will be increase the financial burden on residents at the worst possible time when many are already struggling. HC will be especially penalise those using their car to shop and help others. You will make living in this borough more and more unpleasant and stressful.</p> <p>My suggestion: put it off for at least a year</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Object. Where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>During a time of financial crisis and financial uncertainty amongst many of Haringey residents, I am appalled you would propose something like this. Some people have lost their livelihoods and are wondering how they will be able to pay their rent, bills, etc. and you guys are planning on making it worse for all of us. You should be ashamed. A disgusted Haringey tenant</p> |
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>Haringey Council indicates it is proposing to increase parking permit prices and introduce surcharges to diesel fuelled vehicles. In their opinion, these proposed changes will help to reduce parking pressures, congestion, reduce carbon emissions and improve air quality. Haringey have failed to provide in their Consultation proposal any evidence to suggest or support why the increases are necessary. It is not sufficient to say the "proposed changes will help to reduce parking pressures, congestion, reduce carbon emissions and improve air quality".</p> |
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>How do you expect people to be able to afford all these increases especially during the time we are in, not everyone has a high paying job and having a car is essential for a lot of families? Once again this is ridiculous, and I do not agree or accept it. If you had mentioned to anyone that you would be grossly raising the parking price when the parking permit was initially proposed, no one would have opted for it. It absolutely feels like you guys are taking advantage.</p> |
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>Is not right what you are thinking to do, increasing the parking price on this moment. I did not vote for those people who are behind this plan, increasing Parkin charges at this very difficult time and year which all of us been affected by COVID19. I don't know if you have asked all residents if they agree with for the increasing resident parking? A referendum throughout the Haringey is very essential to see what people think. You are talking for parking increases. But truly you have increased the parking charges every year! And you keep increasing no matter what, you keep increasing council tax, but no investment has been done for road or rubbish is collected every fortnight. You keep increasing charges keep increasing, but have you asked yourself? is wages increasing for people to be able to pay the increase charges. So that is the question you have to ask.</p> |
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>The sketchy proposals outlined are obviously an additional form of local taxation. When parking zones were introduced they were sold to residents as a means of ensuring local residents could park without the additional out borough commuters parking. Then we had the reduction of resident parking areas and an increase of business only bays (once again simply a revenue generating scheme reducing the availability of residential parking).</p> <p>I move now to the issue of homes of multiple occupancy; conveniently ignored by policy makers. The frontages of properties can only sustain one parking space outside. If the council were truly interested in reducing car use, then at a stroke they would allow only one resident's permit per frontage. Allowing additional permits per household again supports the contention that the policy is revenue driven and that the suggestion that it has anything to do with the environment a convenient, if unconvincing, fig leaf.</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>I have just read the extortionate list of charges to be added to parking in the borough. I find these charges totally unacceptable. For you to put such a rise in charges forward when so many people have lost their jobs and income is disgraceful. To push people to use an unsafe transport system during a pandemic is grossly incompetent.</p> <p>People will have the right to have as many visitors a day to their place of residence once more restrictions are lifted. Some of us haven't seen family or friends for months and yet you intend to restrict our visitors or service workers to two a day and at an increased charge!</p> <p>I think these proposals are outrageous and greedy from a council that should be helping people in the area rather than demanding more money when people are at their lowest in income and health.</p> <p>It is shameful</p> |
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>I am absolutely appalled that in the midst of a global pandemic and consequent recession, you think it is appropriate to raise what are already expensive parking charges in Haringey. The measures have clearly worked already, with residents being able to park on match days. This is blatant greed and money grabbing from a community that has been struck hard financially. I would like to know who I can speak to in person about this and will be writing to David Lammy.</p> |
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>I completely object to the proposed changes. Since moving here I have gone from no permit, to the introduction of permits and then 2 increases. When the first documents came out it was about pollution and getting more people to use public transport. At the time I drove a large Audi, and my partner a smaller car to travel across London. We have both made changes, she uses public transport every day and buys a monthly pass and I bought the lowest co2 emission hybrid, which is only beaten for emissions by a fully electric car. Since these changes my permit has gone from zero to £31 and my partner's travel card has consistently been increased. In total we have both needed to pay out an extra £70 even though we are taking the advice to support the emission we add to. How can you add charges to people who have taken the advice from your own guidance? Added to this the parking restrictions on my road mean that when I return from work I still struggle to park</p> |
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>How can these new figures be justifiable? I didn't even read a good enough reason but infrastructure, what does that even mean?. Haringey isn't even an affluent area, people don't earn great amounts of money in Haringey, to be spending ridiculous amounts on parking their car outside their own homes, Makes no sense. People have families to look after, kids, let alone the 1000 other things a family may have to deal with. Adding ridiculous amounts to permits and this doesn't seem as though anything has been taken into consideration whatsoever, evident in the fact that there is such a haste to put this in place!. Please reconsider this decision and take more time to hear the people from Haringey's voices!.</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>I think this is absolutely outrageous, especially considering the current climate. Lots of people have lost relatives their jobs and businesses and you are sending emails such as this. Highly insensitive. I strongly suggest you do not put in place the current proposal.</p> |
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>As a resident of Haringey Council for the past year I have to say I find it one of the least helpful and least forward-thinking councils especially when it comes to parking. Where I used to live, we had online permits for both residents and visitors. It was a simple matter without fuss. When I moved here it took multiple calls and emails and then further calls to make payment and then further emails to finally get a permit. When I was looking to purchase a different car, again, incredibly unhelpful as I was not allowed to get a permit in advance as I didn't know specifically what car I would get, but also no procedures were in place to ensure I didn't get a ticket in the meantime. I was simply told the new permit would take several days to be processed and hard luck. Several of my neighbours seem to have the same problem. How is it that no-one in your office has thought about this issue and put a process in place? It beggars belief.</p> |
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>Amidst a global pandemic and national crisis, where many have died, been separated from the ones they love, lost jobs and been furloughed with no idea of when things will improve - the government has encouraged the use of personal transport as it is far safer. Haringey Council feels it is appropriate to punish its residents by raising costs associated with private vehicles. This is not only appalling timing but unthoughtful and essentially a kick in the teeth for everyone that lives in the borough. This does not need to happen; council tax went up last year and it is very likely VAT and income tax will increase. You cannot keep taking from those without work. People need cars to work and punishing them is completely counter intuitive to economic recovery.</p> |
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>I am making several comments about this proposed price hike for parking that I already pay enough for below. We pay enough for permits already. We're already being hammered with the ULEZ - and extension of congestion zone to the north circular. This is just HC cashing in on a pandemic! Go after the manufacturers of cars if you want real change- tell the auto and petrol industry to pay more taxes! Subsidise public transport make it more accessible frequent - pleasant and cheap to travel on public transport, currently it is disgusting on most buses And this new trend of herding people in one way routes around train stations adds to the journey and is pathetic and serves no purpose in social distancing. Do more to make the roads safer to cycle. I would not cycle as an over 50s on these roads. These Extra charges are only going to affect people like me - while the young people you see racing around in a convertible BMW's and Mercedes and selling drugs on the streets</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>This is outrageous, we are paying a higher rate than most boroughs in London. You make enough money in fines and still want us to contribute to this resident parking. The road is not fit for our cars to run. We have been in lockdown for 3 month and no concession has been forth coming. The increase is above inflation rate and everyone is not working at the moment so I can't understand the increase at this time.</p> <p>Langham Road Resident</p> |
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>As a long time resident on St Ann's road, I have not seen any benefits of the parking permit. If you are increasing cost I should see some benefits from this, which even when it was introduced I haven't seen any benefits. Over the last couple of years, I have been writing to you to get a speed bump put in place on the zebra crossing as it is dangerous and I have had push back every time.</p> <p>I would like to understand what I will be getting for the increase and express that I am really against this increase.</p> |
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>Good morning</p> <p>I would like to express my disappointment in regard to the above proposal. I really believe that now more than ever people are straggling with money and as resident is already enough what we pay to park our vehicle outside our property. Parking should be free considering what we pay of council tax therefore I would leave everything as it is.</p> |
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>You are running our society like a dictator. You bring in draconian measures at your pleasure like communists. I have a 4 year old diesel car. I was told diesel was good for low carbon emissions. Then opinion changed and now you want to whack us. Your attitude is that you have an agenda in mind, and you will heavy-handedly apply rules and punishments to the people to force them to follow your agenda to your idea and opinion of climate change. You rule us like the communists do. I wish writing this would help you see how dictatorial your position is and how you stand on our freedoms to force us to comply with your agenda. You personify the dictatorial creep of power running rough-shod over our freedoms.</p> |
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>? I have seen the proposed changes to car permits and would like to say that I think the increase in charges is very steep and unfair on your local residents - people who already pay their council tax. I have an essential school permit, which was due for renewal in March and all paperwork submitted with the payment is currently sitting somewhere in the parking permits office, which I pay for myself as the school does not have the money to fund this. Increases in costs on already stretched school budgets will have a big impact on those schools who do not have any car parking on their school site, but need staff to travel in to secure good staff. Also with the current state of affairs, people are less inclined to travel on public transport.</p> <p>Belmont Junior School, Rusper Road, London N22</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Object. Where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>I understand the need to raise additional funds at a time where local authorities are under immense pressure to deliver its services. However, what I do not see in this consultation is exactly how this additional funding is going to be spent to support existing road users and the more active travellers. As with all council led projects, as I resident and road user I feel this revenue you are generating will be lost on your back-office administration costs. From the council page I cannot see how these funds will be directed and what % you expect to see utilised for each provision you have earmarked. Furthermore, I have raised parking issues before and received no reply from the council.</p> <p>Residents on my street continually place cones and bins on the street to preserve parking spaces. This matter is never dealt with by the council. It is not conducive to the parking environment and makes it difficult for visitors.</p> |
| <p>Object. Where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>This is an Absolute disgrace. Appears to me that as usual, Haringey are targeting the motorist at a time where it is unsafe to travel on buses and tubes. Why do not Haringey become more efficient in recovering the rent arrears and we would be able to get a permit for nothing. Would be better for the council to concentrate on better ways to generate income then using the car owners as a new kind of council tax.</p> |
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>This is an outrageous proposal. I work in a local secondary school, Heartlands' High school to be precise, which is also on Station Road. A majority of our families are on FSM (free school meals) low income, and a car is a safe way to transport their children around and get them off the streets. A car is a luxury item to have for people to do their daily business, to take get out of this borough, which has nothing much to offer for young people from a parent's point of view. Haringey as you know has high poverty and we all want street crimes / domestic violence etc. to be reduced. But you want to increase the cost of parking your car outside your house. Whilst people already pay road tax, council tax, extortionate rent, petrol, insurance. Force people to get on public transport. In your comfortable office you may feel like a few pounds is nothing. But look at the people's lives in the area you want to sting.</p> |
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>I wish to object to the proposed increase across the board for all parking in the borough. I feel we pay high enough prices as it is at the moment, this will only have a negative impact on local business and discourage people from visiting the area. As a resident we are being penalised enough already, please also can you explain this section. Visitor permits – households would be limited to no more than two daily visitor permits at any one time. Daily visitor permits would increase to £4 across all CPZ areas. You have already made it difficult to gauge how many visitor permits one needs in a year having them only valid for one year, now you propose not giving a refund on unused permits. this is blatant robbery.</p> <p>With the huge impact of the Corona Virus we should be doing everything we can now to kick-start the economy and get local business up and running again, this would only increase the burden of extra costs to the local economy.</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>.£10 increase to support administration. I think this ask seems disproportionate, especially when you have not provided current parking revenue generated from fines or demonstrated that there is an overspend within the parking budget. The problem with asking for money for admin is that what is a public service, which we already contribute to through Council tax should be sufficient. We've also seen a lot of people lose jobs due to the pandemic, so this seems particularly insensitive to ask this during the current climate. I would say the same point concerns the 20 admin fee for managing refunds.</p> <p>2. Additional 50 charge for additional car. I think the Councils timing for the Consultation is not right. We're currently in the middle of a pandemic. At the moment many people have been advised to use public transport, for some families this may mean they have to drive to work where they previously would not</p> |
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>Hi. I disagree any extra charge for residents permit. I believe this proposal is very high and I hope my opinion and my voice will stop increasing prices.</p> |
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>I am a front line worker; I work as Specialist Nurse supporting children with chronic health conditions in the local Community. Thus my car is vital to me seeing my patients and my job role. The past three months have been extremely stressful and challenging as you can imagine- and not to forget the emotional impact it has had on NHS workers. I find it utterly disgusting that in this current time of suffering and anguish- that Haringey will be considering all these changes to residential parking permits. Many people have lost their jobs, and I am disappointed that Haringey instead of trying to help their residents, are going to cause and add to their anxiety and deepen their stress. My husband has now lost his job and I am now the breadwinner; which puts financial stress to our current situation. my car is diesel, and as mentioned above it is essential to my role and even more so now during the crisis of Covid-19.</p> |
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>As a young business owner and immigrant living in Haringey borough I would not be able to do my job without my car. The reality is young people can't afford new eco-friendly cars (who's environmental impact is hotly debated topic). Parking is already outrageously expensive and the fact that you are proposing extortionately high administration fees is ludicrous considering how shambolic the administration of Haringey council is, simply look at your google reviews and you'll find that this is a commonly shared view. I firmly believe that the proposals will only serve to exacerbate the already massive problem of youth unemployment and lack of opportunities. This will only serve to create a larger divide between the rich and the poor of Haringey, something I find particularly ironic considering David Lammy's rhetoric. You are part of the problem; the poorest in society will suffer the most from these proposals.</p> |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|--|---|
| Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now? | I think this is a diabolical way to raise money, isn't it enough that I am paying to park outside my house and paying council tax And road tax for the upkeep of the roads that are full of potholes. Sent from my iPhone |
| Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now? | I don't agree with any! Ordinary hard working people just end up paying more money to subsidise everyone else. Just let us drive easier and park easier without tickets to keep us off the roads and save pollution- a lot of time we are driving round trying to find a parking bay! This would also support local high streets - if we can park we can shop! |
| Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now? | Given that there is active discouragement of use of public transport at this time, is this really a sensible moment to penalise private car use ? I am totally against the imposition of any changes until we have more idea of how long and how severe the impact of Covid 19 on public transport will be. This looks like a cynical revenue generating exercise rather than the actions of a concerned and competent local authority |
| Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now? | It sounds like straightforward theft. Will the Council explain in detail how much money it expects to accrue from these measures and how they intend to spend it. Will it be ring fenced for green purposes? |
| Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now? | This proposal is disingenuous and greedy.. I also suspect that decisions on zoning are based on class and race. Why are there greater restrictions in the poorer areas of the borough I.e Tottenham compared to the more well off areas like Muswell Hill? When you introduce zoning to all areas of Muswell Hill I'll consider whether charges should be raised. Your proposal is insidious. I do not agree to the proposal to raise charges |
| Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now? | These proposals are so typically ridiculous and preposterous by the Council. You also charge for cars based on fuel not based on mileage or usage. The government told us to buy diesel and now punish us for following this advice. I am opposed to all of these changes; the permits are too much already for what is provided. The permit times on our road don't even help prevent congestion and encourage driving for us of Park Road Permit. |

Frontline Consultation

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>Firstly, I'm outraged at these proposals. Haringey is a borough with severe poverty issues and to make such increases is to presume your residents can afford this. Whilst I'm in agreement with creating laws to reduce global warming, surely there are ways you could reduce and promote this without directly affecting those who work hard to earn a car.</p> <p>I'm a teacher who works in Barnet, and there are no direct ways to transport there from where I live in Haringey. I work extremely hard and need my car to commute from work. I already struggle to pay monthly finances and sadly you do not run a scheme where a household is permitted a car to park free of charge. Unlike many other councils. I pay so much to park my car on my road already whilst other people have property they can park their car on for free. So how is this fair? Before proposing these changes you need to respect the views of those living in your borough as when these parking restrictions were</p> |
| <p>Object. where's the evidence? Why do it now?</p> | <p>Hi I have received your mail and I think this is a outrage that you will bring in such changes during the pandemic when we are being actively discouraged from using public transport. Surely these changes should be made when it's safer to return to public transport.</p> <p>I myself will always opt to use the train/ buses or walk when possible but in the current circumstances I am being actively discouraged from doing to by the government.</p> <p>I also think before bring in these such measures you need to make it more affordable/ accessible for people to keep bikes in the area as it is very hard to keep your bike in the Haringey area without getting parts stolen, so I think its unrealistic to expect people to be able to accommodate these changes.</p> |
| | |