AGENDA SUPPLEMENT

Executive

To:	Councillors Douglas (Chair), Kilbane, Kent, Lomas, Ravilious, Steels-Walshaw, Webb (Vice-Chair), Merrett and Perrett
Date:	Wednesday, 9 September 2026
Time:	4.30 pm
Venue:	West Offices - Station Rise, York YO1 6GA

The agenda for the above meeting was published on **Tuesday, 1 September 2026.** The attached additional documents are now available for the following agenda item:

3. Public Participation (Pages 3 - 10)

Three written representations have been received as follows:

- Two written representations in relation to agenda item 10, Review of CYC community car park and on street parking charges in response to petitions.
- One written representation in relation to agenda item 9, Recycling review.

This agenda supplement was published on **Monday, 7 September 2026**

This page is intentionally left blank

Executive meeting on Wednesday, 9 September 2026

Written representation in relation to agenda item 10, Review of CYC community car park and on-street parking charges in response to petitions

Dear Executive Members,

My comments are personal ones, based on several decades of providing advice on parking strategy, since I led the work on London's first parking strategy in the 1970s.

I support the specific recommendations for use of the Minster Card to reduce the cost of parking in designated community car parks for York residents. However, I am very concerned about the continued lack of clarity on producing a parking strategy for York.

The parking charge increases introduced in city centre car parks in 2025 were wholly appropriate, given the Local Transport Strategy's commitment to a 20% reduction in car use. But it was a serious failure of professional judgment to propose applying the same charge to community car parks. The resulting increases of up to 500% were well in excess of what was justified given the LTS targets, and wholly inconsistent with prevailing professional guidance on parking strategy. Not surprisingly, they created adverse impacts on travel patterns and the local economy, and generated quite unnecessary animosity among the business community.

Had the Council already produced a parking strategy, it would have been clear that these car parks served a different purpose and justified a different charging regime. Officers first indicated to me in 2017 that they intended to produce a parking strategy and, through York Civic Trust, I offered to help. Yet in 2023 we were advised that the work involved would cost £60k, and could not be afforded. Sadly, the Council has now been forced to spend around twice that sum on a report covering just four car parks.

Policies 7.5 and 7.7 of the July 2024 Local Transport Strategy provide an excellent specification for the parking strategy, and the April 2025 Implementation Plan committed the Council to producing it by the end of 2026. Unfortunately, the report to next week's Executive suggests that officers are still unclear as to what is required. Para 23 suggests that the parking strategy will be part of the Kerbside Strategy, which is clearly inappropriate, since at least 80% of parking is off-street. Para 26c suggests that it will be part of the Movement and Place Plan, yet the brief for that, issued in May 2026, makes no reference to parking strategy, and a contract has now been awarded for the work specified in that brief. Para 75 states that "it is anticipated that the strategy will be developed within or alongside the Movement and Place Plan", but offers no certainty as to funding or timescale.

The Council now needs urgently to develop a parking strategy, to avoid any similar inconsistencies in policy in future. It should still be possible to have a strategy in place by spring 2027. I hope that you will now instruct officers to allocate a budget and specify a timetable for producing one.

Tony May

Executive meeting on Wednesday, 9 September 2026

Written representation in relation to agenda item 10, Review of CYC community car park and on-street parking charges in response to petitions – The Groves statutory parking challenge

The below representation is submitted on behalf of the Groves Association

Dear Executive Members,

In almost every regard, CYC ignored our comprehensive statutory parking challenge.

This report shockingly treats a different, much narrower exercise as completion of our challenge. It preserves CYC's existing policy, offers a limited Minster Badge concession and transfers all our unaddressed issues into "future work".

The only challenger from a deprived community, facing a uniquely restrictive parking regime, submitted the broadest statutory challenge and received the narrowest response, ignored almost entirely throughout the process by the Exec Members, management and consultants.

On 17 July 2025, we requested:

"a comprehensive review of all on-street and off-street car parking arrangements and charging in The Groves" expressly including Union Terrace and Monk Bar. More than 745 people supported it, including every business/ institution approached.

The other challengers raised price-focused letters/petitions. Contrary to the statutory process, CYC bundled them with our comprehensive challenge erasing almost everything we submitted.

Section 18 statutory guidance requires a collaborative, location-specific process and an "agreed understanding" between the Council and petitioner about the policies under challenge. It also requires a clear report and an opportunity for the petitioner to respond before councillors make the final decision. Needless to say that didn't happen either.

CYC instead controlled the scope. Despite repeated requests, it never supplied Arup’s Terms of Reference or involved the lead petitioner, the Groves Association or ward councillors in defining the review. CYC never identified the excluded matters, explained its reasons or secured agreement to transfer them elsewhere.

CYC marginalised the Groves’ entire democratic voice. No businesses or institutions received the December circulation. A very limited circulation followed in late January. CYC gave short notice of the 26 March meeting, attended by five people, three from the Groves Association. Meanwhile, officers and Executive members engaged directly with Bishopthorpe Road interests, the ‘real’ issue.

Paragraph 29(c) misdescribes our challenge as a request for “a complete TRO review”. Yet paragraph 34 says CYC focused on charges because the 2025 increases “prompted the petitions”.

That confuses the trigger with the scope. The increases prompted our challenge. Our (ignored) deposited document defined its scope. Almost fourteen months later, the central issues remain uninvestigated and unanswered.

The Groves contains 144 of the 258 identified shared-use spaces, 55.81 per cent of the total. Visitors using these bays remain limited to one hour until 20:00. The area has no community car park. Monk Bar and Union Terrace attract central car-park tariffs, despite being outside the walls. Lord Mayor’s Walk attracts central on-street charges, yet Micklegate does not. Six places of worship lack free Sunday provision as Micklegate and other areas enjoy.

A customer using these bays cannot legally park for an ordinary early evening meal lasting more than one hour.

The Micklegate comparison exposes the inequality. Executive reduced Micklegate and Priory Street to the community rate to allow businesses time to adjust. They permit stays of up to three hours. The ‘community car park’ several hundred places is free all day every day.

Arup expressly identifies free Sunday morning parking on Micklegate and informal free parking around York Mosque as inconsistencies. This report offers no assessment or remedy for the six Groves places of worship.

The proposed Minster Badge discount leaves the one-hour restriction, operating hours, central tariffs and absence of a community car park intact. It also excludes non-resident customers and congregations.

Paragraph 71 extraordinarily nevertheless declares CYC’s arrangements “fair and consistent”. CYC’s own evidence contradicts that conclusion.

Paragraph 75 confirms that the future parking strategy has not started. Future work cannot retrospectively satisfy a statutory challenge accepted in 2025.

The only proper course is for Executive to record that the Groves statutory challenge remains unresolved, apologise, recognise Arup’s work solely as limited evidence about price impacts, require an immediate issue-by-issue review, disclose the Terms of Reference, and give the lead petitioner, the Groves Association and ward councillors a proper opportunity to respond before councillors determine the challenge.

This is a severe procedural and evidential failure with real consequences for a deprived community. CYC’s statutory responsibilities carry the same force whether or not affected residents can afford litigation.

Tracy Ostle
(Chair of the Groves Association)

This page is intentionally left blank

Executive meeting on Wednesday, 9 September 2026

Written representation in relation to agenda item 9, Recycling Review

Dear Executive Members,

The central concern is how far the Recycling Review report falls short across almost every part of the case it purports to present.

Executive is being asked to approve a major redesign of York’s recycling service and recommend up to £2.8 million of additional borrowing, yet Members have not been given the baselines, calculations or analysis needed to take that decision.

The recommendation expressly asks Executive to approve 180L recycling bins “based on the financial business case supporting the project”. That business case is absent from the published papers, nor even in pink.

There is no breakdown of the £2.8 million, assumed asset life, borrowing period, interest-rate assumption, calculation of the £280,000 annual financing charge or total financing cost. The £280,000 is said to be funded through fewer loaders, lower sickness and reduced agency cover, but the report provides no calculation showing how those savings produce a cost-neutral scheme.

There are almost no usable baselines. Members are given no before-and-after figures for crews, loaders, rounds or FTEs, no current agency cost, no sickness cost attributable to recycling-box handling and no estimate of the reduction expected from wheeled bins.

It is also unclear whether the proposed savings overlap with the existing £260,000 Waste optimisation target, now forecast to be delayed until 2027/28. The report is silent on the associated changes to crew working arrangements, including the ending of Task and Finish and the move to four extended working days. These changes affect the same staffing, productivity, sickness and agency costs.

The report’s options analysis is confined to continuing with boxes or introducing wheeled bins. It does not assess the material choices Members are being asked to determine, including 180L against 240L containers, alternative collection frequencies, different household capacities or the financial and recycling consequences of each option.

The report gives no rationale for making 180L the standard. This would make York an extraordinary outlier: we identified no other English authority using two 180L recycling bins with each stream collected only every four weeks. North Yorkshire, CYC's chosen comparator, uses two 240L bins and published the capacity analysis supporting its decision.

York proposes this uniquely low-capacity model after a severe deterioration in its recycling performance. Since 2019/20, York has fallen 71 places among English local authorities, from 102nd to 173rd out of 321. Its recycling rate is now only 40.8%, below the 42.0% England average. CYC says the scheme must increase recycling, and further recyclable materials will enter the collection stream. Yet it provides no target recycling rate, forecast additional tonnage or household-volume analysis showing that 180L will be enough.

WRAP's current good-practice guidance, developed with Defra support and local-authority input for Simpler Recycling, specifies a minimum weekly-equivalent capacity of 60L for paper and card and 60L for metal, plastic and cartons. It also says each recycling stream should be collected at least fortnightly. York proposes 180L for each stream every four weeks, equivalent to only 45L a week, without explaining how this was tested against the guidance.

Larger households remain unresolved. CYC's own consultation found 240L particularly attractive to larger households and high recyclers, yet the equality assessment neither estimates how many will require the larger bin nor assesses the potential disproportionate impact on ethnic-minority households.

These are significant gaps across every major part of the proposal. Members should have the financial business case, the 180L capacity analysis and the missing financial and operational figures before being asked to approve it.

Gwen Swinburn