

AGENDA SUPPLEMENT

Council

To: Councillors Ayre, Baxter, Burton, Clarke, Coles, Crawshaw, Cullwick, Cuthbertson, Douglas, Fenton, Fisher, Healey, Hollyer, Hook, Kent, Kilbane, Knight, Lomas, Mason, Melly, Merrett, Moroney, Myers, Nelson, Nicholls, Orrell, Perrett, Pavlovic, Ravilious, Rose, Rowley (Lord Mayor), Runciman, Smalley, Steels-Walshaw, Steward, Taylor, Vassie, Waller, Wann, Warters, Watson, Waudby, Webb, Wells, Whitcroft, Widdowson and Wilson

Date: Thursday, 12 February 2026

Time: 6.30 pm

Venue: The Guildhall, Coney Street, York, YO1 9QN

The agenda for the above meeting was published on **Wednesday, 4 February 2026**.

An additional document is now available for the following agenda item:

5. Public Participation (Pages 3 - 6)

Written representation submitted by Dr Badham in relation to Recommendations of Executive.

This agenda supplement was published on **Thursday, 12 February 2026**

This page is intentionally left blank

DATE: 11 February 2026

RE: Proposed Parking Charges – Resident Discrimination and PSED Failure

1. DECLARATION OF PROTEST

I, Matthew Badham, formally submit this Notice of Dispute regarding the proposed parking budget as part of Budget Council, Council - Thursday, 12 February 2026 6.30 pm.

I decline to address the public meeting orally on the grounds that Council officials have consistently obfuscated the material information required for a fair democratic hearing and have failed to address the core legal points raised in my formal complaint (Ref: RF-20475).

The original complaint centers on the unsustainable and discriminatory escalation of the Monk Bar parking season ticket costs. Over the last three financial years, the discounted rate has been hiked from £725 to £1,440, with tonight's budget proposing to increase this further to circa £1,512. This rate of increase far outstrips any inflationary or administrative justification and potentially functions as a de facto financial eviction from car ownership for residents in my specific position (it is as high as my total council tax bill!). I originally challenged the disproportionate increase in 2025/26 of over 80% in the council's previous budget and still have not had a satisfactory explanation.

I feel that this budget represents an institutionalisation of a surcharge which is still being disputed by residents. By 'baking in' these 2026/27 rates, the Council is in effect permanently penalising residents of 'low-car' developments who have no other legal parking options, while simultaneously granting a protected, lower rate to residents in identical planning situations who happen to live inside the city walls.

2. GROUNDS OF DISPUTE

A. Failure of the Public Sector Equality Duty (Section 149, Equality Act 2010) The Monitoring Officer's response (dated Feb 2026) incorrectly interprets the PSED as a duty of 'intent' rather than 'impact'; the difference between what a policymaker *meant* to do and what the policy *actually does*. The Council "decoupled" Resident Contracts in May 2025 from Season Tickets, creating a two-tier system where residents of 'low-car' developments have been treated in very different ways as per the table below:

Resident Location	2025/26 Rate
Inside Walls (e.g. BIBA House)	£924 (Discounted)
Outside Walls (e.g. St Johns Mews)	£1,440 (Discounted)

The Council's own EIA on Parking for the increase in 2025/26 ([Annex D, Page 12](#)) explicitly admits a "Negative Impact" on young people and families, yet the Council has provided no mitigation, violating its duty to "advance equality of opportunity". The Council's own EIA admits there was 'no detailed consultation undertaken for users and areas around the car parks'. By their own admission, the Council acted in a state of procedural blindness, failing to identify the presence of protected characteristics before implementing these punitive charges. It seems apparent that the negative impact with other protected characteristics such as pregnancy, maternity, age, and disability were just not part of the EIA.

B. Administrative obfuscation: I live in a "low-car" development which means I am not eligible for ResPark but was still as a CYC resident able to use Season Tickets as a pragmatic alternative to not being able to afford to purchase a car parking space when I bought my first home as part of the 'Help to Buy' scheme. The Highways Department has used the fact I live in a 'low-car' development to advance a 'no-ownership' mandate for raising charges which is not part of the Sustainable Transport Mandate. The wording around 'low-car' developments is consistently focussed on encouraging a reduction in car dependency not car ownership. They have consistently refused to engage with my challenges regarding the procedural inequity and the manifest unfairness of the current charging structure as well as evidence of the arbitrary and inconsistent application of residential parking rates.

C. Rationality and Geographic Discrimination The Council justifies the hike via the Local Transport Strategy's aim to "reduce dependency in the urban core." However, the Council then fails to apply that logic consistently, granting a £645 discount to "urban core" residents who happen to live inside a wall. By grouping my (only viable) residential parking with wider transport priorities, CYC are treating your basic ability to access your home the same way as discretionary travel into the city centre for non-city centre residents which feels wholly unfair. In applying wider transport priorities—intended to manage transient traffic—to the permanent storage of vehicles by residents who have no other legal recourse. A car stationary in a designated car park contributes zero miles to congestion; to penalise its storage as 'discretionary travel' when it is merely to and from the owner's place of residence is irrational and unreasonable.

3. NOTICE OF INTENT

Please take notice that this dispute remains live. I reserve the right to escalate this matter to:

1. **The Local Government Ombudsman** for potential maladministration and injustice.
2. **The External Auditor** regarding the legality of revenue generation based on discriminatory geographic boundaries.
3. **Judicial Review** on the grounds of procedural unfairness and irrationality.

Signed: __M.A. Badham__

Dr Matthew Badham

This page is intentionally left blank