



Cambridge City Council Licensing Committee

Date: Monday, 9 July 2018

Time: 10.00 am

Venue: Committee Room 1 & 2, The Guildhall, Market Square, Cambridge, CB2 3QJ

Contact: democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk, tel:01223 457000

Agenda

All Members are requested to attend a Licensing & Enforcement Briefing update.

This will take place in Committee Room 1, 9.30am

- 1 Apologies
- 2 Declarations of Interest
- 3 Public Questions
- 4 Minutes (Pages 3 - 14)
- 5 Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy (Pages 15 - 40)
- 6 Livery Implementation Proposals for Hackney Carriage Vehicles (Pages 41 - 94)

Licensing Committee Members: Bird (Chair), Thittala (Vice-Chair), Benstead, Gawthrope, Gehring, Holt, McPherson, McQueen, Moore, Page-Croft, Pippas and Sargeant

Alternates:

Information for the public

The public may record (e.g. film, audio, tweet, blog) meetings which are open to the public. For details go to:

www.cambridge.gov.uk/have-your-say-at-committee-meetings

For full information about committee meetings, committee reports, councillors and the democratic process:

- Website: <http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk>
- Email: democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk
- Phone: 01223 457000

LICENSING COMMITTEE

19 March 2018
10.00 - 11.50 am

Present: Councillors Bird (Chair), Abbott, Gawthrope, Gehring, Holt, McPherson, R. Moore, Pippas, Sinnott and Smart

Councillor Sinnott left after the vote on 18/15/Lic, before item 18/14/Lic was debated

Officers

Environmental Health Manager: Yvonne O'Donnell
Environmental Quality and Growth Team Manager: Jo Dicks
Team Manager (Commercial & Licensing): Karen O'Connor
Legal Advisor: Nathan Mountney
Committee Manager: James Goddard

Present for the Applicant

Technical Officer: Luke Catchpole

Other Persons

Cambridge Licensed Taxis: Andy Vines
Hackney Carriage and Cambridge Taxi Association: Rashel Mohammed
Police Sergeant: Jim Stevenson
Police Constable: Claire Metcalf
Romsey Ward Councillor: Dave Baigent
Trade Representative: Paul Bradley

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

18/9/Lic Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Adey, Benstead and T. Moore.

18/10/Lic Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were made.

18/11/Lic Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 29 January 2018 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

18/12/Lic Public Questions

There were no public questions.

18/13/Lic Re-Ordering Agenda

Under paragraph 4.2.1 of the Council Procedure Rules, the Chair used her discretion to alter the order of the agenda items. However, for ease of the reader, these minutes will follow the order of the agenda.

18/14/Lic Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Ultra-Low and Zero Emission Vehicle Policy

The Committee received a report from the Environmental Health Manager.

The report set out the proposed incentives to support the update of ultra-low and zero emission vehicles within the Hackney Carriage and Private Hire vehicle fleet.

There is a need to reduce polluting emissions to improve poor air quality in City Locations dominated by emissions from buses, taxis and service vehicles. This must be achieved whilst maintaining sufficient levels of access and capacity for travel in the City, for the vehicles using those areas.

The UK government has a long term vision for all new cars and vans to be zero emission by 2040 and for nearly every car and van to be zero emission by 2050. These recommendations fit with national policy.

At Full Council on 22 February 2018, it was agreed that financial support would be committed in order to help effect the change to ultra-low and zero emission licensed vehicles over the next 5 years.

The Officer's report further detailed the proposed implementation scheme in order to encourage an incentivised cost effective shift to ultra-low and zero emission licensed vehicles.

The Environmental Health Manager corrected a typographical error on P18 of her report. #8 "Further to option 7 (above), currently the market does not provide **many** Ultra-low or Zero Emission Wheelchair Accessible Vehicles."

The Committee received representations.

1. Mr Vines raised the following points:
 - i. Expressed concern about setting a date when all new licensed saloon vehicles should be zero or ultra-low emission.
 - ii. Suggested the policy guessed when technology would be in place for vehicles to meet criteria.
 - iii. The taxi fleet did not have any plug-in electric vehicles, but did have hybrid ones that used electric power to travel around the city.
 - iv. Requested the implementation date be deferred as there were no suitable alternative vehicles at present.
 - v. Lots of drivers travelled to the city from other areas. Electric vehicles did not have the range to facilitate this. Hybrid vehicles did.
 - vi. Queried if the proposed exclusion zone would cover all vehicle types or just taxis.
 - vii. Reducing the amount of wheelchair accessible vehicles within the Hackney Carriage Fleet from 65% to 50% seemed a small reduction ie 15%.

The Environmental Quality and Growth Team Manager responded:

- i. Plug-in hybrid vehicles were in development by 20+ companies so future availability would not be an issue.
- ii. Purely electric vehicles that could travel 200 miles on a single charge would also be available soon. They would be in place for the 2020 policy timescale.
- iii. City Council Officers were discussing the vehicle restriction with county partners. The city could only control licensed taxi and private hire vehicles, but hoped to influence others such as buses. The restriction would apply to all vehicle types.

Mr Vines raised the following supplementary points:

- i. Taxi drivers naturally gravitated towards the most efficient vehicles. These were currently hybrids.
- ii. The taxi age limit was 9 years.
- iii. The policy could impact on when vehicles needed to be replaced. Suggested this should be at the end of a vehicles natural life (9 years) rather than having a cut off as a specific year.

The Environmental Quality and Growth Team Manager said the specific cut-off date allowed drivers to plan and forecast their decision making based on the council's 10 year plan.

2. Mr Mohammed raised the following points:
 - i. Referred to recommendation 2.2.7 "To reduce the total number of Wheelchair Accessible Vehicles within the Hackney Carriage Fleet from 65% to 50% (213 to 163) and those 50 plates to be replaced by Zero emission vehicles. Consideration should be sought to review this in 3 years."
 - ii. Most taxis worked out of the railway station.
 - iii. They had to turn away business when people (usually elderly and less mobile) wanted to use wheelchair accessible vehicles.
 - iv. Wheelchair users made a majority of journeys by private hire rather than taxis.

Councillor Bird responded that a range of vehicles to suit all people's needs should be available. 50% of the fleet being wheelchair accessible was acceptable if this covered the level of demand. Disabled people had to wait disproportionately longer for vehicles than other people as there were fewer of these vehicles.

The Environmental Health Manager said she was seeking comments from the taxi trade as to whether 50% of the fleet being wheelchair accessible was acceptable, too many or too few.

3. Mr Bradley raised the following points:
 - i. Replacing taxis with hybrid saloon cars would reduce emissions.
 - ii. Expressed concern about replacing hybrid vehicles with purely electric ones by the proposed cut-off date as current technology did not meet the need.
 - iii. Expressed concern about banning petrol and diesel cars until appropriate alternative (technology) vehicles were in place.

As a supplementary point, Mr Bradley hoped that saloon cars would be more affordable in future.

The Environmental Health Manager said:

- i. The recommendations were for discussion. They were not a policy already in place.
- ii. The policy proposed a 10 year plan. This could be reviewed if technology was not in place in future. However it was expected to be.

The Environmental Health Manager said she appreciated there were very limited options for wheelchair accessible electric cars at present, so

the aim was to start a modal shift by encouraging low emission saloon cars then moving towards other types of vehicles.

The Environmental Quality and Growth Team Manager responded:

- i. There were 2 electric makes of vehicle available at present that were wheelchair accessible. These were mandated for taxis in London.
 - ii. More types of these vehicle were expected in future at more affordable prices. These should be available for the City Council policy proposed deadline for replacing taxis with zero or ultra-low emission vehicles.
4. Councillor Baigent (Romsey Ward Councillor) raised the following points:
- i. Queried percentage taxis contributed towards city pollution levels.
 - ii. Larger vehicles were generally wheelchair accessible. It was proposed to replace these with saloon cars. Not all disabled people used wheelchairs.
 - iii. People had difficulty getting into vehicles with high steps. Saloon cars may address this issue.
 - iv. 2028 was the target date to reduce emissions and pollution by. A review would occur in 2026.
 - v. Queried who would be covered by the vehicle restriction eg Uber.

The Environmental Quality and Growth Team Manager responded:

- i. 15% was the ball park average pollution level from private hire vehicles and hackney carriages. This came predominantly from diesel vehicles.
- ii. If the proposed vehicle restriction was accepted then it would cover all vehicles entering the city, not just city licensed (taxi/private hire) vehicles.
- iii. The aim was to improve air quality. Vehicles that met the city's criteria would not be fined for entering the restricted area. Automatic number plate recognition technology would be used to police the restricted zone.

Councillor Baigent raised the following supplementary points:

- i. Taxis were replaced every 9 years.
- ii. Current ones were unlikely to be hybrids. Could the council extend the policy time limit to allow drivers to replace vehicles nearer the 9 year vehicle age limit based on individual's circumstances.

The Environmental Quality and Growth Team Manager acknowledged the 9 year age limit point. Drivers had 10 years to factor this into their buying decision for replacement vehicles. He recommended imposing a deadline for action.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Supported the report recommendations.
- ii. Public health was being affected by pollution in the city.
- iii. The market and range of vehicles available was changing/improving.
- iv. The deadline for policy implementation could be reviewed to ascertain it was fit for purpose eg appropriate technology being available.
- v. Other European cities had already adopted more radical measures.
- vi. Oxford was already preparing to restrict City Centre Access only to ultra-low and zero emission Licensed Vehicles by 2022.
- vii. Vehicles that did not meet the Cambridge City low emission criteria should be banned. This included cars buses and lorries.
- viii. The city council was looking at suitable low emission or electric vehicles to replace waste vehicles in future.
- ix. The City Council's high standards for vehicles should be promoted as a benchmark for others and to promote branding to encourage use instead of other (lower standard) providers.
- x. It was better for people to travel in the city by taxi rather than private car.
- xi. Expressed concern about the trade-off between disability and pollution. Disabled friendly vehicles were being replaced with lower emission vehicles. Queried if diesel powered wheelchair accessible vehicles would be exempt from the restriction zone if low emission vehicles were not available. Otherwise people would face travel restrictions.
- xii. Accessible vehicles were not always suitable for non-wheelchair users. Alternatives were preferred.
- xiii. Taxis were running their engines whilst stationary ie waiting for trade. This was against the law. Taxi trade representatives present at the meeting were asked to feedback councillors' concerns to other drivers.

In response to Members' questions the Environmental Quality and Growth Team Manager said the following:

- i. The report set out a range of policies officers would like adopted. Councillors would discuss the merits of these prior to approval/refusal. One proposal was that vehicles that did not meet the same criteria as city licensed vehicles would be restricted. The restriction zone would be considered by Greater Cambridge Partnership, but if Members accepted

- the proposal today, it would give officers a mandate to negotiate with the Greater Cambridge Partnership.
- ii. 2020 was suggested as the implementation date rather than 2018 as a courtesy to give the taxi trade forewarning of proposals and allow them to business plan the implementation in line with other measures such as standard livery.
 - iii. The breakdown of pollution constituents was as follows:
 - a. Inner city: 80% derived from vehicles. Of the 80%; 50% came from buses, 15-20% from delivery vehicles, 15-20% from taxis, the remainder came from other sources.
 - b. Ring roads: Buses and taxis were a lower proportion of pollutants.
 - iv. The council was close to meeting its objective about air pollution in the city. A steady improvement had been made in air quality. As the city grew there would be more demand for transport. Greater Cambridge Partnership were looking at transport and congestion issues. For example, bus transport numbers were expected to rise by 60%, and so was the level of pollution if diesel vehicles were used, hence the need for alternative vehicle types.
 - v. The city council could only control/affect vehicles it licensed. Greater Cambridge Partnership were responsible for buses.
 - vi. The running costs for electric vehicles were 3p a mile (whilst charging at home over night), whereas diesel vehicles were 17p a mile. The city council proposed to put in rapid chargers around the city which could give a 80% battery charge in 20 minutes. This would work out at 6p a mile. By charging at home and using one rapid charge the cost of electric vehicles would be less than diesel. The cost of the rapid charge would be factored into service costs to always be below diesel.
 - vii. Rapid chargers were expected to be in place in the city soon. An operator was in place. Work would start early April and finish in September.
 - viii. A new electric saloon vehicle was expected to cost circa £55,000. There were (circa £10,000) discounts available to incentivise the purchase for disabled passengers. Circa £2,500 discounts were available for hybrid cars.
 - ix. It was rare for trade drivers to buy new vehicles. Hopefully second hand vehicles would be cheaper as more low emission and electric vehicles became available. The high purchase price could be offset by lower running costs compared to petrol/diesel vehicles.

In response to Members' questions the Environmental Health Manager said the following:

- i. Referred to the 2016 Licensing Committee report on consultation principles for vehicle types and how many should be disability friendly.
- ii. There had been an on-going trade-off between low emission and accessible vehicles. The demand survey looked at the need for accessible taxis and suggested the number could be reduced from 65% to 50%.
- iii. The recommendations only covered zero emission and ultra-low vehicles, not hybrids as there many types of these that may/not meet criteria set out in the report.
- iv. South Cambridgeshire District Council did not support the city Council low emission vehicle report recommendations as their had different vehicle standards due to the number of long distance journeys for which electric vehicles were currently unsuitable.
- v. Reiterated the report recommendations were options for discussion and approval.
- vi. Said there was no implementation timeline in the recommendations so councillors were referred to table (2.3) of the Officer's report.

The Licensing Committee stated they were happy to follow the timeframe for implementation of incentives.

The Committee:

Unanimously resolved by those present (10 votes to 0):

- i. The following incentives should form part of the environmental considerations in the Hackney Carriage & Private Hire Licensing Policy in order to encourage and reward the uptake of ultra-low and zero emission vehicles within the licensed vehicle fleet as set out in the table in paragraph 3.2.2 (P16-18) of the Officer's report:
 - A licence fee exemption for zero emission vehicles.
 - A licence fee discount for ultra-low emission vehicles.
 - An extended age limit for zero emission vehicles.
 - An extended age limit for ultra-low vehicles.
 - A set date for all New Licensed Saloon vehicles to be ultra-low or zero emission.
 - A set date for all Licensed Saloon Vehicles to be ultra-low or zero emission.
 - To reduce the total number of Wheelchair Accessible Vehicles within the Hackney Carriage Fleet from 65% to 50% (213 to 163) and those 50 plates to be replaced by zero emission vehicles. Consideration should be sought to review this in 3 years.
 - A set date for all Wheelchair Accessible Vehicles to be ultra-low or zero emission as and when the market allows.

- To restrict City Centre Access to ultra-low and zero emission Licensed Vehicles only.
- ii. Agreed the timeframe for implementation of incentives as set out in the table in paragraph 3.2.2 (P16-18) of the Officer's report.

18/15/Lic Review of Cumulative Impact Policy Consultation

The Committee received a report from the Team Manager (Commercial & Licensing).

The report stated the Statement of Licensing Policy was recently reviewed, approved by Licensing Committee on 17 October 2017, and subsequently full Council on 19 October 2017.

The Special Policy on Cumulative Effect (the Cumulative Impact Policy) was contained within the Licensing Policy. During the consultation period Cambridge Constabulary responded to say that based on the figures provided in Appendix 3 of the Statement of Licensing Policy it was questionable whether the Romsey area of Mill Road should remain as part of the Cumulative Impact Area.

Licensing Committee therefore requested officers to undertake a further twelve week formal consultation on whether to remove the Romsey area of Mill Road from the Cumulative Impact Area, or not.

The formal consultation took place between 13 November 2017 and 4 February 2018. Twenty nine responses were received all supporting keeping the existing Cumulative Impact Area (CIA).

The Committee received a representation from Councillor Baigent as a Ward Councillor.

The representation covered the following issues:

- i. There had been a considerable reduction in crime as a result of the CIA so he saw no reason to remove it.
- ii. He supported comments from the police.
- iii. There were many places to buy alcohol in Romsey so the CIA was needed to reduce alcohol related crime.
- iv. More student flats were expected in Mill Road in future. Students drank no more than other people, but the number of residents in the area would increase.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Things were improving due to the CIA, but problems had not been solved, so the CIA should be maintained.
- ii. Romsey was an up and coming area so more dwellings were expected in future. The CIA was needed to mitigate this.
- iii. Mill Road had a good sense of community. The CIA helped this and helped the police to address street drinking. Residents supported the CIA.

Councillor Gehring sought clarification why the police suggested leaving the upper end of Mill Road out of the CIA. Sergeant Stevenson said the police assessment was based on statements of fact. His own view was “if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it”. IE keep the CIA as it.

The Committee:

Members considered the results of the public consultation exercise as summarised in Appendix E of the Officer’s report and **unanimously resolved** the Cumulative Impact Policy should remain as it is.

The meeting ended at 11.50 am

CHAIR

LICENSING COMMITTEE

24 May 2018
1.15 - 1.20 pm

Present: Councillors Bird (Chair), Thittala (Vice-Chair), Benstead, Gawthrope, Gehring, Holt, McPherson, McQueen, R. Moore, Page-Croft, Pippas and Sargeant

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

18/16/Lic Appointment of Sub Committees

The Committee agreed the membership of 4 Sub Committees of 3 members each:

Sub Committee A: Bird, Sargeant, Gehring

Sub Committee B: Gawthrope, Moore, Holt

Sub Committee C: Benstead, McQueen, Pippas

Sub Committee D: McPherson, Thittala, Page-Croft

It was noted that if any member was unable to attend a scheduled Sub Committee they would be substituted by another member of the Committee.

The meeting ended at 1.05 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank

Item

REVIEW AND UPDATE OF THE HACKNEY CARRIAGE & PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING POLICY

To:

Licensing Committee

Report by:

Yvonne O'Donnell, Environmental Health Manager

Tel: 01223 - 457951

E-mail: yvonne.odonnell@cambridge.gov.uk

Wards affected:

All

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 Under the powers conferred to Cambridge City Council under the Town Police Clauses Act 1847 and the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976, (as amended), Cambridge City Council has responsibility for licensing Hackney Carriage, Private Hire and Dual Licence Drivers as well as vehicle proprietors and Private Hire Operators within the City.
- 1.2 The Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing policy (the 'policy') was produced in order to provide the Council, its officers, the trade and the public with appropriate guidelines that put the Council's licensing requirements into practice in a clear and transparent manner.
- 1.3 The current Hackney Carriage & Private Hire Licensing Policy (the 'policy') applies to all drivers, vehicles and operators and was last updated in October 2017.

- 1.4 Subsequent feedback from the trade, and also from officers when imparting information, has highlighted a requirement to review and update minor elements of the policy in order to make specific items clear and understandable.
- 1.5 Officers have reviewed the feedback and have considered the proposed updates, in line with the taxi licensing policy of South Cambridgeshire District Council in order to seek opportunity where the policies can be harmonised.
- 1.6 Members are now requested to review the updated draft policy and determine what, if any, changes should be made to the policy.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 Members of the Licensing Committee are recommended to consider whether or not the following proposed changes are to be made to the Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy:
 - 2.1.1 To stipulate the prohibition of licensing Hackney Carriage or Private Hire Vehicles that are also licensed with other authorities.
 - 2.1.2 To clarify the existing condition relating to licensed Private Hire Vehicle door signs to state that the vehicle must display on the driver and front passenger door, in a prominent position, the name and contact information of the Operator fulfilling the booking.
 - 2.1.3 To reduce the number of Knowledge Test attempts that a new driver applicant can undertake from 4 to 3 so that it aligns with the existing 3 attempts of the Safeguarding Awareness Tests for existing licence holders.

3. Background

- 3.1 Cambridge City Council has responsibility for licensing Hackney Carriage, Private Hire and Dual Licence Drivers as well as vehicle proprietors and Private Hire Operators within the City.

- 3.2 In doing so, Cambridge City Council seeks to promote the following objectives that impact on the Hackney Carriage and Private Hire trades:
- i) The protection of the public;
 - ii) The establishment of professional and respected hackney carriage and private hire trades;
 - iii) Access to an efficient and effective public transport service; and
 - iv) The protection of the environment
- 3.3 Under the powers conferred to Cambridge City Council under the Town Police Clauses Act 1847 and the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976, (as amended), the Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing policy document (the 'policy') was produced in order to provide the Council, and Council Officers, who are required to administer the licensing function, with appropriate guidelines within which to act <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/sites/default/files/hackney-carriage-and-private-hire-licensing-policy.pdf>
- 3.4 The policy is designed to put the Council's licensing requirements into practice and assist in the delivery of a transparent, accountable and efficient licensing service. It additionally, assists in ensuring that both the trade and the public have a document that fully explains the licensing procedures to all parties in a clear and transparent manner.
- 3.5 The Hackney Carriage & Private Hire Licensing Policy was last updated in October 2017.
- 3.6 Since this time feedback from the trade, along with comments from officers when undertaking their duties, has highlighted a requirement for a 'light touch' review and update.
- 3.7 In order to clarify some elements of the policy, and also to make some areas clearer, more understandable and efficient; officers have considered the proposed updates, in line with the taxi licensing policy of

South Cambridgeshire District Council to seek opportunity where the policies can be harmonised.

- 3.8 To stipulate the prohibition of licensing Hackney Carriage or Private Hire Vehicles that are also licensed with other authorities.
- i) Our current policy does not state that a vehicle cannot be licensed with another authority, the conditions attached to vehicle licences state that licence plates must be fixed to the (front and) rear of the vehicle.
 - ii) Public Safety is of paramount importance and within the scope of Taxi Licensing legislation, Cambridge City Council ensures that all vehicles are safe and suitable to be licensed. This is undertaken by mechanical fitness testing of the vehicle, adherence to the age and vehicle specification, training for proprietors and a robust enforcement management system.
 - iii) In order for the City Council to maintain control of the vehicles licensed and, in turn, the safety of the public it is proposed that the City Council will not grant a Hackney Carriage or Private Hire Vehicle Licence for any vehicle already licensed by another authority.
 - iv) The policy should be amended as described in section 12 (extract available at Appendix A) to detail that obtaining a vehicle licence from any other authority automatically invalidates any vehicle licence issued by Cambridge City Council.
 - v) Furthermore, the handbook (extract available at Appendix B) should quantify in Part , Section 18 that no vehicle will be granted a licence if it is licensed by another authority due to the difficulties of meeting the variance of conditions applied in different districts and the enforcement of those conditions in the cases of non-compliance (i.e. signs, meters, suspensions or revocations).
- 3.9 Clarification of the existing condition to state that every Private Hire Vehicle must display on the driver and front passenger door, in a prominent position, the name and contact information of the Operator fulfilling the booking.

- i) Currently, the existing condition states that “*All Private Hire Vehicles must have displayed on their door sign in 1” lettering the words: ‘Private Hire Vehicle – Pre Booked Only’*”.
- ii) There is no specification for the sign to detail which Operator the vehicle is currently working for.
- iii) The policy should be amended as described in section 18 (extract available at Appendix B) to state that licensed Private Hire Vehicles must display on the driver and front passenger door, in a prominent position, the name and contact information of the Operator fulfilling the booking.
- iv) It is worth noting that this condition is applicable and enforced also by South Cambridgeshire District Council and the Private Hire Vehicles that are licensed within that authority.
- v) In addition to this, the condition that is detailed in Appendix B of the Handbook should be revised (as above in iii)) to ensure that it is clear.
- vi) In clarifying this condition, the impact will be positive for the general public and also the trade so that along with vehicles being easily identifiable; should there be any concerns or complaints it can be tracked to the Operator fulfilling the booking. This will also give peace of mind to the public being conveyed in the vehicles.

3.10 To reduce the number of Knowledge Test attempts that a new driver applicant can undertake from 4 down to 3 so that it aligns with the existing 3 attempts of the Safeguarding Awareness Tests for existing licence holders.

- i) The current policy states that in order to commence the new driver application process, an applicant must first register and pass the Knowledge Test and that the test can only be attempted four times within twelve months.
- ii) New applicants must also attend and pass the mandatory safeguarding training. The enforcement management system states that there is a penalty if a licence applicant fails the initial safeguarding training on three occasions.

- iii) The policy should be amended as described in section 39 (extract available at Appendix B) to state that the Knowledge Test can only be attempted three times within 12 months.
- iv) The handbook should be amended also to reflect this change in section 20 (extract available at Appendix B).
- v) In aligning these two elements of the application process it will make the system easier for applicants and also for officers to administer.

3.11 Members are now required to review these items and determine whether what, if any changes, should be made to the Hackney Carriage & Private Hire Licensing Policy.

4. Implications

(a) Financial Implications

Nil.

(b) Staffing Implications

Nil.

(c) Equality and Poverty Implications

An Equality Impact Assessment has not yet been undertaken but will be carried out on the reviewed policy after the consultation process has been completed and prior to any changes to the policy being formally adopted.

(d) Environmental Implications

Nil.

(e) Procurement Implications

Nil.

(f) Community Safety Implications

Cambridge City Council has a duty to provide a safe and secure taxi service. The Council has a responsibility to review, consult and publish the Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy on a regular basis, or it could be believed that the Authority's policy is not sound.

5. Consultation and communication considerations

5.1 Whilst here has not been a formal consultation on these matters, the items have been discussed at the taxi trade forum meeting on 6th April 2018 (Appendix C).

6. Background papers

Background papers used in the preparation of this report:

- (a) Cambridge City Council's Hackney Carriage & Private Hire Taxi Policy
<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/sites/default/files/hackney-carriage-and-private-hire-licensing-policy.pdf>
- (b) Cambridge City Council's Hackney Carriage & Private Hire Handbook
https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/sites/default/files/handbook_december_2017_1.11.pdf

7. Appendices

Appendix A – Draft Extract of Hackney Carriage & Private Hire Licensing Policy.

Appendix B – Draft Extracts of Hackney Carriage & Private Hire Licensing Handbook.

Appendix C – Minutes of Taxi Trade Forum Meeting, 6th April 2018.

9. Inspection of papers

To inspect the background papers or if you have a query on the report please contact:

Victoria Jameson, Licensing, Policy and Administration Team Leader

Tel: 01223 – 457863

E-mail: victoria.jameson@cambridge.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy

Table of Contents

PART 2	VEHICLES
12	Definitions, Specifications and Conditions
18	Signage, Livery and Advertising
PART 3	DRIVERS
39	Knowledge

12.0 DEFINITIONS, SPECIFICATIONS AND CONDITIONS

- 12.1 The main difference between Hackney Carriages and Private Hire vehicles is that Hackney Carriages can be hailed in a public street or hired from a taxi rank.
- 12.2 Private Hire vehicles must be pre-booked in advance through a licensed Private Hire Operator and are not permitted to wait on a rank or be booked directly from a public street.
- 12.3 Should a Private Hire vehicle driver accept a fare which has not been pre-booked through an Operator, he is committing an offence and, if caught, will be subject to relevant enforcement action by the Licensing Authority.
- 12.4 Anyone being conveyed in a Private Hire vehicle which has not been pre-booked may not be covered by the drivers insurance. Proprietors are required to ensure that they fully understand their individual insurance policy.
- 12.5 Once a vehicle is licensed as a Hackney Carriage or Private Hire vehicle, every driver of that vehicle, whether it be used for business or pleasure, must possess the appropriate City Council driver licence.
- 12.56 Local Licensing Authorities have a wide range of discretion over the types of vehicle that they can licence as Hackney Carriage or Private Hire Vehicles.
- 12.7 Cambridge City Council will not grant a Hackney Carriage or Private Hire Vehicle Licence for any vehicle that is already licensed by another authority. Obtaining a vehicle licence from another authority will invalidate any vehicle licence granted by Cambridge city Council.
- 12.68 Government guidance suggests that best practice is for local licensing authorities to adopt the principle of specifying as many different types of vehicle as possible. Licensing Authorities are encouraged to leave it open to the trade to put forward vehicles of their own choice that can be shown to meet basic criteria. In that way, emerging designs for vehicles can be taken into account.
- 12.79 Licensing Authorities are asked to be particularly cautious about specifying only purpose-built Hackney Carriages, with the strict constraint on supply that implies. There are at present only a small number of designs of purpose-built Hackney Carriages. They are, however, encouraged to make use of the “type approval” rules within any specifications they determine.
- 12.810 The Licensing Authority will only license a vehicle as a Hackney Carriage or a Private Hire Vehicle if it complies with European Whole Vehicle (M1) type approval, M1 Low Volume Type Approval or UK National Small Series Type Approval and Individual Vehicle Approval (IVA). These approvals related to wheelchair accessible vehicles/ converted vehicles and not saloon vehicles.
- 12.911 A vehicle will only be licensed as a Private Hire vehicle if it is not of an appearance or design that is considered likely to lead the public to think it is a

licensed Hackney Carriage vehicle.

12.102 The Licensing Authority is empowered to impose such conditions as it considers reasonably necessary in relation to the grant of a Hackney Carriage or Private Hire vehicle licence. Hackney Carriages and Private Hire vehicles provide a service to the public, so it is appropriate to set criteria for the external and internal condition of the vehicle, provided that these are not unreasonably onerous.

12.143 This will also apply to Private Hire vehicles unless they are treated as a “special vehicle”.

12.142 The ‘Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Handbook’ sets out the specification and minimum standards in respect of Hackney Carriages and minimum standards for Private Hire Vehicles. All vehicles presented to the Licensing Authority for licensing and all vehicles whilst licensed must comply with the Authority’s current Hackney Carriage and Private Hire policy, handbook and vehicle testing standards specification.

12.135 The Licensing Authority reserves the right to carry out or require any form of test, examination or assessment as it sees fit to determine the suitability of a vehicle for licensing or to remain a licensed vehicle.

18.0 SIGNAGE, LIVERY AND ADVERTISING

18.1 It is essential that the public should be able to identify and understand the difference between a Hackney Carriage and a Private Hire vehicle.

18.2 Within Cambridge City Council’s area, both Hackney Carriages and Private Hire vehicles will be required to display licence plates on their vehicle. This is a key feature in helping to identify vehicles that are properly licensed:

- i) Hackney Carriage Vehicles have a crest on the side of the vehicle bearing the words ‘Cambridge Hackney Carriage’. They also display a pale blue identification plate on the rear of the vehicle and have a ‘Cambridge Licensed Taxi’ yellow roof sign on the top of the vehicle.
- ii) Private Hire Vehicles do not have a taxi sign or crests. They display pale green front and rear identification plates and must [display door signs which detail the name and contact information of the Operator fulfilling the booking along with notification of ‘Private Hire: Pre-booked only’](#). ~~bear a company door sign stating ‘Private Hire – Pre-booked Only’.~~

18.3 The external licence plate supplied by the Licensing Authority shall be securely fixed to the outside of the vehicle, no temporary fixing is allowed.

18.4 Private Hire vehicles are not be permitted to display roof mounted signs or any signs that include the words “taxi” or “cab” or “for hire”.

18.5 Roof signs fitted to Hackney Carriage vehicles shall be illuminated at all times when the vehicle is available for hire. The sign bearing the word “TAXI” in black lettering on a yellow background on the front and “Cambridge Licensed Taxi Cab” in black lettering on a red background on the back is at all times to be prominently displayed on the roof of the vehicle except:

- i) when the vehicle is on hire for a wedding
- ii) when it is necessary to accommodate passengers luggage by use of a roof rack
- iii) when the vehicle is being used for social, domestic or pleasure purposes.

18.6 The roof sign can also be removed when the vehicle is undergoing maintenance work or is being cleaned, but must be put back on the vehicle before the vehicle is used again for hire and reward.

18.7 In order to ensure that the crests remain prominent and are not compromised by any other advertising the crests should be a minimum of 9.5 inches in diameter if circular in size and 10 inches width and height if square with no background colour, and attached to both the nearside and offside front doors of the vehicle.

18.8 Private Hire vehicles do not permit the display of advertisements. However, limited internal and external advertising may be permitted on hackney carriages in accordance with the Advertising Standards Agency code of practice and provided that the advertising leaves a 20 cm distance from the door crests. Any permission to display advertising will be subject to the prior written approval of the Council although advertisements concerning the following subjects will not normally be approved: -

- i) Political, ethnic, religious, sexual or controversial subjects
- ii) Escort agencies, gambling establishments or massage parlours
- iii) Nude or semi-nude figures
- iv) Tobacco or alcohol
- i) Anything likely to offend public taste

18.9 On 16th October 2017 Members agreed to the addition of a livery requirement for all Hackney Carriage Vehicles. Further guidance can be found in the Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Handbook.

39.0 KNOWLEDGE

39.1 Hackney Carriage and Private Hire drivers need a good working knowledge of the area for which they are licensed, because vehicles can be hired immediately, directly with the driver at hackney carriage stands or on the street in the case of Hackney Carriages and by prior booking through a Private Hire Operator in the case of Private Hire Vehicles. Additionally, it is expected that drivers should be able to communicate with their customers and be able to carry out the basic arithmetic associated with the paying of fares.

39.2 In order to commence the new driver application process an applicant must first register to take a Cambridge City Council Knowledge Test. Only once the Knowledge Test has been passed may they continue with the application process.

39.3 The test can only be attempted ~~three~~[four](#) times within 12 months, and then it is recommended that if applicants wish to reapply, they do so after a break of six months. Additional guidance on the Knowledge Test can be found in the Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Handbook.

This page is intentionally left blank

PART 1	HACKNEY CARRIAGES AND PRIVATE HIRE VEHICLES	
17	Vehicle Unfit for Conveyance of Passengers	25
PART 2	HACKNEY CARRIAGE AND PRIVATE HIRE DRIVER LICENCES	26
20	Safeguarding and Knowledge Tests (SAKT)	28
	APPENDICES	56
Appendix B	Licence Conditions	63

PART 1

HACKNEY CARRIAGES AND PRIVATE HIRE VEHICLES

18. Dual Plating

Cambridge City Council will not grant a Hackney Carriage or Private Hire Vehicle Licence for any vehicle already licensed by another authority.

No vehicle will be granted a licence if it is licensed by another authority due to the difficulties of meeting the variance of conditions applied in different districts and the enforcement of those conditions in the cases of non-compliance (i.e. signs, meters, suspensions or revocations).

Obtaining a vehicle licence from any other authority automatically invalidates any vehicle licence issued by Cambridge City Council.

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0 cm

PART 2

HACKNEY CARRIAGE AND PRIVATE HIRE DRIVER LICENCES

20. Safeguarding and Knowledge Tests (SAKT)

All new applicants for a driver licence must undertake and pass the Safeguarding and Knowledge Tests (SAKT) prior to completing the application process.

The process for becoming a Taxi Driver can be found at **Appendix J**.

A SAKT session will consist of the following:

- Delivery of the Customer Awareness: Safeguarding, Equality and Protection training course;
- Sitting of the Safeguarding Test; and
- Sitting of the Knowledge Test

The tests are administered electronically and the applicant will undertake the test under supervision using a computer. Further information on the tests is available in **Appendix K**. An applicant will only need to sit the Customer Awareness training session once. There is a one-off fee for attending the course. Each applicant may make a maximum of [threefour](#) attempts at passing the tests. Each time the applicant applies to sit the Knowledge Test they must pay the current fee. Further re-sits of the Safeguarding Test are free of charge.

Details of our fees are available in **Appendix F**.

If the applicant fails [threefour](#) tests, their application will be rejected and they are recommended to wait to reapply for a period of 6 months from the date of their last attempt at passing the test.

If after a year from your Safeguarding and Knowledge Test Registration you have not completed all elements then your details will be removed from our system.

Further details on the Safeguarding and Knowledge Tests can be found at **Appendix**

K.

APPENDICES

Appendix B - Licence Conditions

PRIVATE HIRE VEHICLE LICENCE CONDITIONS

Maintenance of Vehicle

The vehicle and all its fittings and equipment shall at all times when the vehicle is in use or available for hire be kept in an efficient, safe, tidy and clean condition and to relevant statutory requirements including in particular those contained in the Motor Vehicles (Constructions and Use) Regulations shall be fully complied with.

Alteration of Vehicle

No material alteration or change in the specification, design, condition or appearance of the vehicle shall be made without the approval of the Council at any time while the licence is in force.

Identification Plate

The plate identifying the vehicle as a Private Hire Vehicle is required to be exhibited on the vehicle pursuant to Section 48(6) of the Local Government (Misc. Provisions) Act 1976 shall be securely fixed to the external front and rear of the vehicle in a conspicuous position and in such manner as to be easily visible by an authorised officer of the Council, or a Police Officer. Fixing kits will be provided for this purpose.

Interior Signs

The proprietor shall cause to be clearly marked and maintained inside the vehicle in such a position as to be clearly visible at all times to persons conveyed therein:

- The number of the licence
- The number of passengers prescribed in the licence
- The name and company address of the operator
- The statement in legible letters at least 1cm high "Complaints should be referred to the proprietor in the first instance, and then if necessary, to the Environmental

Health Manager, Cambridge City Council, Cambridge CB1 0JH quoting all the fact including the number of the Private Hire Vehicle”

- The current fare table applicable to the licensed vehicle in legible lettering not less than 0.6cm high

Safety Equipment

There shall be provided and maintained in good working order in the vehicle at all times when it is in use or available for hire a suitable and efficient fire extinguisher and a suitable first aid kit containing appropriate first aid dressings and appliances.

Signs and Notices

All Private Hire Vehicles ~~must have~~ shall displayed on both their driver and front passenger doors, in a prominent position, the name and contact details of the Operator fulfilling the booking along with a sign in 1” lettering the words: ‘**Private Hire Vehicle – Pre Booked Only**’.

Meters

Meters must comply with Directive 2004/22/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 31 March 2004 on measuring instruments as implemented into UK law by The Measuring Instruments (Taximeters) Regulations 2006, be programmed to calendar control and be sealed by lead or plastic means to meet the required minimum standard.

Meters need to meet the Public Carriage Office specification, be programmed to calendar control and be sealed by lead or plastic means to meet the required minimum standard.

Transfer of Ownership

The Council must be informed of any transfer of plate ownership within 14 days.

Change of Address

The proprietor of the licensed Private Hire Vehicle shall notify the Council in writing of any change of address during the period of the licence within 7 days of such change.

Convictions

The proprietor shall, within seven days, disclose to the Council in writing details of any conviction imposed on him or if the proprietor is a company on any of its directors during the period of the licence.

Surrender of Licence

If the proprietor decides to cease the use of a licensed vehicle for Private Hire purposes, he shall surrender the licence by returning it together with the licence plate (which belongs to Cambridge City Council) to the Environmental Health Manager.

IT IS AN OFFENCE FOR ANY PERSON OTHER THAN A PRIVATE HIRE DRIVER LICENSED BY CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL TO DRIVE A PRIVATE HIRE VEHICLE LICENSED BY CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL.

Cambridge City Taxi Trade Forum Minutes - Friday 6th April 2018

1. Apologies

Cllr Dan Ratcliffe
Cllr Martin Smart
Cllr Markus Gehring
Sgt. Jim Stevenson
David Lines
Paul Bradley
Nasir Uddin

2. Welcome and introductions

Persons present:

Name	Organisation
Yvonne O'Donnell – YOD	Environmental Health Manager, Cambridge City Council (Chair)
Karen O'Connor - KJO	Commercial & Licensing Team Manager, Cambridge City Council
Cllr Gerri Bird – GB	Chair of the Licensing Committee, Councillor for East Chesterton, Cambridge City Council
Cllr Jeremy Benstead – JB	Councillor for Coleridge, Licensing Committee, Cambridge City Council
Cllr Kevin Blencowe – KB	Councillor for Petersfield, Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport, Cambridge City Council
Cllr Valerie Holt – VH	Councillor for Castle, Licensing Committee, Cambridge City Council
Rashel Mohammed – RM	Cambridge Hackney Carriage & Private Hire Association
Andy Vines – AV	Cambridge City Licensed Taxis
Tan St John-Ives - TI	Cambridge City Licensed Taxis

3. Taxi Rank Update (YOD)

- General discussion took place around the Station Road rank and also New Square and the Grafton Centre. YOD and KJO are meeting with the County Council on 9th April to discuss highlighted issues.

4. Business Process Review (YOD)

- Taxi Licensing has been considered as an area within Environmental Health which would benefit from the examination of its current business processes in order to review and improve performance, productivity and quality.

- The current systems in place are due for a review in line with Legislation and Council Policy in order to deliver better value to the customer and provide greater efficiencies within the Licensing Team.
- We will be looking to the trade for their feedback (potentially via a survey) on current systems and areas for improvement. In focussing on customer needs we will be able to improve quality and establish (or re-establish) ownership of processes along with the ability to measure performance and satisfaction.

5. CCTV/ Livery Update (YOD)

- Consultation on the specifics of the CCTV within vehicles and what the livery should be and how it should look has taken place and closed on 26th March.
- YOD shared the results of the consultation and agreed to circulate these with the minutes.
- Results are currently being collated and will form part of, and support, the work currently being undertaken on the Policy, Procedures and Technical Specification.
- Officers are working closely with the Police, our Data Protection specialists and CCTV providers to focus on getting the specification right.
- CCTV is quite a complex area and we want to be sure that we have covered everything we need to legally. The final report with draft policy/ procedures will be taken to July Committee.
- The final Livery proposals will also be presented at July Committee.

6. Committee Reports

- YOD outlined the decisions made on the following report presented to Licensing Committee on the 19th March 2018:

a) Ultra Low Emission Vehicles

- Members of the Licensing Committee determined that the following incentives form part of the Taxi Policy in order to encourage and reward the uptake of Ultra Low and Zero emission vehicles within the licensed fleet:

Item	Option	Rationale	Timeframe/ Implementation
1	Licence Fee Exemption for Zero emission, Vehicles	Full Licence Fee Exemption for Zero Emission Vehicles for up to 5 years, dependent on funding availability.	With effect from 1 April 2018
2	Licence Fee Discount for Ultra-Low Emission Vehicles	50% Licence Fee discount be offered for Ultra-Low emission vehicles for up to 5 years, dependent on funding availability.	With effect from 1 April 2018
3	Extended Age Limit for Zero Emission Vehicles	Zero Emission Vehicles have an age limit of up to 15 years, subject to obtaining Certificate of Compliance every 6 months.	With effect from 1 April 2018
4	Extended Age Limit for Ultra-Low Vehicles	Ultra-Low emission vehicles have an age limit of up to 12 years, subject to obtaining Certificate of Compliance every 6 months.	With effect from 1 April 2018
5	A set date for all new Licensed Saloon Vehicles to be Zero or Ultra-Low Emission	In setting a date after which traditional internal combustion engine vehicles could not be newly registered as a licensed vehicle in Cambridge City would focus proprietors/ potential proprietors to plan for moving to Ultra-Low or Zero emission vehicles.	With effect from 1 April 2020
6	A set date for all Licensed Saloon Vehicles to be Zero or Ultra-Low Emission	Currently the age restrictions on licensed vehicles mean that no vehicle will be licensed if it is over 9 years old. In setting a back stop date where all City licensed saloon vehicles must be Zero or Ultra-Low emission vehicles means that Proprietors have reasonable notice of the change to allow adequate business planning.	By December 2028

- Officers are currently working on the procedures for these changes and guidance is being collated.
- We have prepared correspondence and information to send out to all Proprietors this week which covers technical specification and also an expression of interest application process.

- i) In order to reduce the total % of Wheelchair Accessible Vehicles within the Hackney Carriage Fleet to 50% (a reduction of 50 vehicles) the opportunity to take up a **zero emission saloon** vehicle is being given to all Proprietors of HCV123 to HCV441.
 - ii) Proprietors will need to complete and submit an expression of interest application by Friday 4th May 2018.
 - iii) In the event that the expression of interests exceeds 50 vehicles, priority will be given to those vehicles that are closest to the 9 year age limit.
-
- b) There are a couple of minor changes to the Policy which we will be presenting to July Committee:
 - i) Dual Plating
 - ii) Door Signs

The changes to be made will ensure that the policy is clear and will also take account of, and harmonise with, SCDC Policy.

7. Register of Revocations and Refusals (YOD)

- A National Register of Revocations and Refusals of Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Vehicles is being set up and once live, Local Authorities will be able to access the register and input data about a driver, or to check information about a driver.
- In order to log in and access the data, there will be unique identifiers required as part of the security checking process.
- If there is a match indicating a revocation or refusal, only a generic subject title will be given as a reason.
- Officers will then be able to check further with the Local Authority under GDPR(General Data Protection Regulation)/ Subject Access Request.
- Sign up for the Register is not compulsory as yet, but Daniel Zeichner is sponsoring a Private Members Bill to state the Local Authorities must subscribe to, and use, the register.
- The register is due to launch in May.
- It is anticipated that the system will develop over time.

8. Enforcement Update (KJO)

- KJO updated with the following breakdown of complaints in the last quarter:

Area	Detail	TOTAL
Licensed Vehicles	Complaints received relating to accidents	18
Licensed Vehicles	Complaints received relating to condition of vehicles (e.g. signs missing, dirty vehicle)	22
Licensed Drivers	Complaints around conduct of drivers (including alleged plying for hire)	40
Licensed Drivers	Complaints around driving standards (e.g. parking etc)	31
Licensed Drivers	Complaints received relating to other Licensing Authorities	17
Private Hire Operators	No complaints received	0
General	Information highlighted during application/ renewal process (e.g. points on licence, medical issues)	44
TOTAL		172

- Licensing Sub-Committee Update:

Detail	Outcome
1. Private Hire Operator Renewal Application from Uber	Application granted.
2. Safeguarding issue relating to a licensed driver.	Licence was revoked, although the individual has appealed.
3. Failure to disclose criminal record information at licence renewal	Written warning given to the licence holder
4. New applicant with points on the DVLA licence relating to traffic convictions	Application refused

- Prosecution Update:

Detail	Outcome
1. SCDC driver convicted 5/4 for plying for hire.	Ordered to pay fine, costs and victim surcharge.
2. 3 other plying for hire prosecutions are in progress.	TBC.

12. Any Other Business

- Taxi Card Vouchers** – we have had a request that we remind drivers that not all disabilities are visible and that passengers in possession of Taxi Card Vouchers are given these based on their specific needs. It has been

reported that on a couple of occasions, the vouchers have been refused as 'the passenger did not look disabled'.

Please be advised that this is discrimination and any complaints of such will be taken seriously and dealt with accordingly.

- b) **Alleged plying for hire and use of taxi ranks by Uber** – please be advised that Uber have made some custom configurations to their App in and around Market Square to direct drivers to pick up points away from the Hackney Carriage ranks in those areas.

It is hoped that by removing Uber pick-ups from the proximity of the ranks, this will clear up any tension or confusion.

- c) **Use of Car Horns** – we have received reports of the excessive use of car horns in a particular area within the City. Please be reminded that the unnecessary, and illegal, use of car horns is a road traffic offence enforced by the Police. Furthermore, the City Council expects the highest standard of driving and conduct at all times.
- d) **Processing of Applications** – we have had a few incidents recently where renewals have not been made on time (particularly with vehicles).

As there have been no specific, exceptional circumstances for this tardiness the licence has therefore ceased. This has happened on 3 occasions with Hackney Carriage Vehicles.

Can we remind licence holders that extensions are an absolute exception, not a right and that each case will be assessed individually.

Licence holders are reminded to ensure that they make any necessary appointments and submit applications in good time.

- e) **Idling on taxi ranks** – reported recently by another driver as being a concern. An item will be written in the newsletter which will go out to all licence holders.

Date and Time of Next Meeting

Friday 27th July 2018
2.30pm – 4.00pm
Committee Room 1, The Guildhall

Item

HACKNEY CARRIAGE VEHICLE LIVERY

To:

Licensing Committee

Report by:

Yvonne O'Donnell, Environmental Health Manager

Tel: 01223 - 457951

E-mail: yvonne.odonnell@cambridge.gov.uk

Wards affected:

All

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 Under the powers conferred to Cambridge City Council under the Town Police Clauses Act 1847 and the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976, (as amended), Cambridge City Council has responsibility for licensing Hackney Carriage, Private Hire and Dual Licence Drivers as well as vehicle proprietors and Private Hire Operators within the City.
- 1.2 The current Hackney Carriage & Private Hire Licensing Policy (the 'policy') applies to all drivers, vehicles and operators and was last updated in October 2016
<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/sites/default/files/hackney-carriage-and-private-hire-licensing-policy.pdf>
- 1.3 At Full Licensing Committee on 24th July 2017 Members agreed for a public consultation to be undertaken on the existing Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy. One of the items for consideration was the introduction of a Livery for Hackney Carriage Vehicles.

- 1.4 The consultation took place from 31 July 2017 until 3 September 2017, the results of which can found at Appendix A.
- 1.5 The results of the consultation were presented to Full Licensing Committee on 16th October 2017 where Members resolved (by 10 votes to 0) to the addition of a Livery requirement for Hackney Carriages only.
- 1.6 A further consultation with the trade took place between 1st and 26th March 2018 which focused on vehicle colour, livery style and design along with an implementation plan, the results of which can be found at Appendix B.
- 1.7 Officers reviewed and collated the feedback received and invited members of the Trade (the Trade representatives) to discuss the results further at a meeting on 1st May 2018 (Appendix C).
- 1.8 At the meeting proposals for a livery colour, design and style (along with an implementation plan) were discussed and agreed by those present.
- 1.9 Members are now requested to review the Livery proposals and determine what the Livery for Cambridge City Council Hackney Carriages should be, along with the timescale for implementation.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 Members of the Licensing Committee are recommended to consider and agree the following proposals as a Livery for Hackney Carriage Vehicles:
 - 2.1.1 A silver base colour (as described on the V5 registration document for each vehicle) for all Hackney Carriage Vehicles.
 - 2.1.2 That a 'wrap' of two black gloss stripes, one placed either side of the vehicle (running horizontally from the headlight to the rear light).
 - 2.1.3 That the wrap must be a thickness between 50mm (approximately 2 inches) and 75mm (approximately 3 inches).

2.1.4 That all Hackney Carriage Vehicles will continue to have the Cambridge City Crests either side of the driver doors.

2.1.5 That external advertising on Hackney Carriage Vehicles will only be permitted on the rear of the vehicle.

2.1.6 That internal advertising in Hackney Carriage Vehicles will continue to be permitted as described in the existing policy.

2.1.7 That all Private Hire Vehicles are excluded from being silver.

2.2 Members are recommended to consider and agree the following proposed implementation plan:

2.2.1 For all existing silver (as described on the V5 registration document for each vehicle) Hackney Carriage Vehicles, the full livery requirements will need to be in place at the next vehicle licence renewal. Where there is advertising externally on the vehicle which will not comply with the new Livery specification, the Proprietor/s must make contact with the Licensing Team in the first instance.

2.2.2 For all other Hackney Carriage Vehicles, upon change of vehicle (which may not necessarily be at the next licence renewal), the Proprietor/s will be required to fully comply with the Livery specification.

2.2.3 For all existing silver (as described on the V5 registration document for each vehicle) Private Hire Vehicles, upon change of vehicle (which may not necessarily be at the next licence renewal), the Proprietor/s will be required to obtain and licence a vehicle which is not silver.

2.2.4 That the changes in the policy will take effect from 9th October 2018.

3. Background

3.1 Cambridge City Council has responsibility for licensing Hackney Carriage, Private Hire and Dual Licence Drivers as well as vehicle proprietors and Private Hire Operators within the City.

3.2 In doing so, Cambridge City Council seeks to promote the following objectives that impact on the Hackney Carriage and Private Hire trades:

i) The protection of the public;

- ii) The establishment of professional and respected hackney carriage and private hire trades;
- iii) Access to an efficient and effective public transport service; and
- iv) The protection of the environment

3.3 Currently the Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy allows for any colour of vehicle being licensed as a Hackney Carriage and also, with the agreement of the Council, for the external display of advertising. In many cities, a standard Livery is adopted for Hackney Carriage Vehicles.

3.4 At Licensing Committee on 16th October 2017, Members agreed to the addition of a Livery requirement for all Hackney Carriage Vehicles.

3.5 A standard livery will make it easier for the public to readily identify licensed Hackney Carriage Vehicles which are regulated and safe. It will clearly differentiate between Private Hire and Hackney Carriage Vehicles and will classify the Cambridge City Vehicles which can legitimately trade in the City.

3.6 A standard livery will also improve the appearance of the Hackney Carriage fleet and enhance the image of our City.

3.7 A public consultation initially took place from 31 July 2017 until 3 September 2017 as part of a wider policy consultation, the results of which can be found at Appendix A.

- i) 7 responses were in favour of adding a Livery requirement.
- ii) 18 individual responses were against adding a Livery requirement.
- iii) An additional petition with 219 signatures against a livery standard was submitted.
- iv) Additional comments were received that Cambridge Blue would be expensive as non-standard, and an alternative contrasting colour would be more readily distinguished by visually impaired users.

- 3.8 A further consultation with the trade took place between 1st and 26th March 2018 which sought views and comments on vehicle colour, livery style and design along with an implementation plan.
- 3.9 A total of 105 responses were received and collated and circulated amongst the Trade via the Trade representatives (Appendix B).
- 3.10 A meeting to discuss the results of the consultation took place with members of the Trade on 1st May 2018 (Appendix C). At this meeting the Council and Trade representatives agreed proposals for the Livery and implementation plan.
- 3.11 The proposals for a Livery and timescale for implementation are detailed below:

Hackney Carriage Vehicle (HCV) Colour	SILVER
HCV Livery Design & Placement	2 BLACK STRIPES, ONE EITHER SIDE OF THE VEHICLE
HCV Crests	YES
HCV Advertising	INSIDE & ON THE REAR OF THE VEHICLE ONLY
Private Hire Vehicles (PHV)	CANNOT BE SILVER
Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CURRENT SILVER HCV = AT NEXT LICENCE RENEWAL ▪ OTHER HCV = UPON CHANGE OF VEHICLE ▪ CURRENT SILVER PHV = UPON CHANGE OF VEHICLE
To Take Effect from	9 TH OCTOBER 2018

3.11 Members are now required to consider the proposals for the Livery and Implementation plan and agree what these should be. The Livery will then become part of the Hackney Carriage & Private Hire Licensing Policy.

4. Implications

(a) Financial Implications

Costs for the requirement of a livery will be borne by vehicle proprietors.

(b) Staffing Implications

Nil.

(c) Equality and Poverty Implications

An Equality Impact Assessment has not yet been undertaken but will be carried out on the updated policy.

(d) Environmental Implications

Nil.

(e) Procurement Implications

Nil.

(f) Community Safety Implications

Section 47 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 states that a hackney carriage should be of such a design and appearance or bear such distinguishing marks to clearly identify it as a hackney carriage. Cambridge City Council has a duty to provide a safe and secure taxi service and by implementing a Livery, this will enhance the identification of Hackney Carriage Vehicles and support the legislation.

5. Consultation and communication considerations

5.1 A public consultation initially took place from 31 July 2017 until 3 September 2017 as part of a wider policy consultation (Appendix A).

5.2 A further consultation took place from 1st to 26th March 2018 specifically on the Livery (Appendix B).

5.3 Results of the consultation were distributed to Trade representatives and discussed at a meeting on 1st May 2018 (Appendix C).

6. Background papers

Background papers used in the preparation of this report:

- (a) Cambridge City Council's Hackney Carriage & Private Hire Taxi Policy
<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/sites/default/files/hackney-carriage-and-private-hire-licensing-policy.pdf>
- (b) Cambridge City Council's Hackney Carriage & Private Hire Handbook
https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/sites/default/files/handbook_december_2017_1.11.pdf

7. Appendices

Appendix A – Consultation Responses 2017

Appendix B – Consultation Responses 2018

Appendix C – Minutes from meeting with Trade 1st May 2018

9. Inspection of papers

To inspect the background papers or if you have a query on the report please contact:

Victoria Jameson, Licensing, Policy and Administration Team Leader

Tel: 01223 – 457863

E-mail: victoria.jameson@cambridge.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX A- CONSULTATION RESPONSES – REVIEW OF THE HACKNEY CARRIAGE & PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING POLICY 2017

Response Number	Date Received	Comment	Date Responded	Response
1	02/08/2017	<p>My comments on the Consultation are as follows:</p> <p>5 Livery SUPPORT This would make it easier for residents and visitors to identify Hackney Carriages. This would enable them to be hailed by both residents and, importantly, by tourists and other visitors.</p> <p>7 Rear loading wheelchair accessibility SUPPORT There are types of wheelchair, some are much more easily loaded form a rear lift.</p> <p>My best regards,</p>	08/08/2017	Acknowledgement e-mail sent
2	03/08/2017	<p>Dear Licensing Team, I have looked at the proposals for changing the taxi licensing policy.</p> <p>I have no comments to make, either positive or negative on the stated summary of proposals, except no 6 regarding CCTV. I assume this CCTV is for the interior of the vehicle. I think this should be extended so that there is also the requirement for CCTV of the road ahead and to the nearside ("dash-cam" is the term for the road ahead). There are many reported incidents of cyclists being cut up by taxis or passed far too close as a taxi tries to overtake a cyclist where there is simply no roadspace to allow this to be done safely. This would provide evidence as to whether the account is true in the case of a complaint.</p> <p>I am also deeply disappointed there is no proposed requirement to make drivers undertake a Safe Urban Driving Course, with particular emphasis on the particular conditions in Cambridge, namely very narrow roads and large numbers of cyclists. I note that since 2013, in London, there has been a city-wide initiative to train drivers of light goods and passenger carrying vehicles through an accredited Certificate of Professional Competence (CPC) course called Safe Urban Driving. In particular, Stagecoach London developed its own CPC cycle awareness training, which</p>	23/08/2017 Ack sent 10/08/2017	<p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>I write further to my e-mail to you dated Thursday 10th August 2017.</p> <p>I can confirm all responses received will be put before the Licensing Committee at their next meeting on Monday 16th October 2017.</p> <p>With respect to your comments on 'Safe Urban Driving' I can advise you that the current consultation did not include a specific consideration of such training, however your comment will be fed back to the Committee.</p> <p>I can advise you however, that all licence holders are required to attend and pass a test paper at the end of Cambridge City Council's 'Customer Awareness: Safeguarding, Equality and Protection' training course. At the request of members of the public the course includes</p>

APPENDIX A– CONSULTATION RESPONSES – REVIEW OF THE HACKNEY CARRIAGE & PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING POLICY 2017

		<p>is to be delivered in-house by its driver training team, after working with Cycle Training UK to design and develop the on-road awareness programme.</p> <p>Having looked at the website of the local company Outspoken, it appears they may be able to deliver an appropriate training course.</p> <p>http://www.outspokentraining.co.uk/safe-urban-driving-courses</p> <p>I am sure they can tailor a course to the specific needs of driving (and stopping to load and unload, which can be a particular sparkpoint of conflict and danger) a taxi in both the Historic City Centre and the narrow residential streets of Cambridge.</p> <p>I think Cambridge City Council should take a lead in this matter and compel licensed taxi drivers to undertake Safe Urban Driving Training, as part of its remit to encourage cycling as a replacement to the use of cars within the City and the area around the City.</p> <p>Regards,</p>		<p>elements of cyclist awareness and considerate driving.</p> <p>Once again thank you for your feedback.</p>
3	03/08/2017	<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>I have been reading through the proposals regarding the 'Taxi Policy' and have some questions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Removal of the need for licensed vehicles to carry a First Aid Kit. Q – At present does this mean that all the licensed vehicles carry a First Aid Kit and if so, is it mainly for the Taxi Drivers personal use, or is the onus on them that they are expected to carry out Basic First Aid on their customers? 2. Removal of the need for licensed vehicles to carry a Fire Extinguisher. Q – Again, does this mean that at present all the licensed vehicles carry a Fire Extinguisher? My comment would be that surely it would be a good thing to continue doing, should a low-level incident happen with the driver(s) vehicle, for example: if they are doing a long distance run. 3. Adding a livery requirement for all Hackney Carriage Vehicles: I've noted that "Cambridge Blue" has been suggested, however, after checking some information on a Sight Impairment site, Colour Contrast can be beneficial for 	03/08/2017	<p>Hi</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes all licensed vehicles are required to carry a first aid kit. The intention is for both personal (driver) use and if passengers needed first aid supplies. Drivers are not expected to carry out first aid out on passengers. 2. Yes all licensed vehicles are required to carry a fire extinguisher. 3. I will add your comments to the consultation. 4. It's a decision that I understand has been in place for a long time. Issues with rear loading are as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Getting up and down from kerbs – with side loading the

APPENDIX A- CONSULTATION RESPONSES – REVIEW OF THE HACKNEY CARRIAGE & PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING POLICY 2017

		<p>the Sight Impaired, so perhaps, another contrasting colour should be considered, as there are different levels of sight impairment?</p> <p>4. Allowing rear loading wheelchair accessible vehicles: Why won't the Council licence rear loading wheelchair accessible vehicles?</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you.</p> <p>Kind Regards,</p>		<p>ramp can be placed on the pavement</p> <p>b. Health & safety considerations with passengers being on a rank – ranks are busy places and there will be a minimum amount of space required from the rear of the vehicle to load a passenger and their wheelchair</p> <p>c. Space on taxi ranks is limited</p>								
4	03/08/2017	<p>,</p> <p>I have answered your questions in the table provided, I also have no comment to make on the table of fares.</p> <p>Regards</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="465 837 1272 1445"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td> <p>Removal of the need for licensed vehicles to carry a first aid kit.</p> <p>I support this as drivers are not medically trained to give first aid</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td> <p>Removal of the need for licensed vehicles to carry a fire extinguisher.</p> <p>I support this as drivers and public are advised to not tackle fires</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td> <p>Change of age limits for vehicles:</p> <p>Currently the policy provides that a new vehicle cannot be granted a licence if it is more than 4 years old. Additionally a renewal will not be granted to a vehicle more than 9 years</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			1	<p>Removal of the need for licensed vehicles to carry a first aid kit.</p> <p>I support this as drivers are not medically trained to give first aid</p>	2	<p>Removal of the need for licensed vehicles to carry a fire extinguisher.</p> <p>I support this as drivers and public are advised to not tackle fires</p>	3	<p>Change of age limits for vehicles:</p> <p>Currently the policy provides that a new vehicle cannot be granted a licence if it is more than 4 years old. Additionally a renewal will not be granted to a vehicle more than 9 years</p>	03/08/2017	Acknowledgement e-mail sent
1	<p>Removal of the need for licensed vehicles to carry a first aid kit.</p> <p>I support this as drivers are not medically trained to give first aid</p>											
2	<p>Removal of the need for licensed vehicles to carry a fire extinguisher.</p> <p>I support this as drivers and public are advised to not tackle fires</p>											
3	<p>Change of age limits for vehicles:</p> <p>Currently the policy provides that a new vehicle cannot be granted a licence if it is more than 4 years old. Additionally a renewal will not be granted to a vehicle more than 9 years</p>											

APPENDIX A– CONSULTATION RESPONSES – REVIEW OF THE HACKNEY CARRIAGE & PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING POLICY 2017

		<p>old. It has been suggested that vehicles older than 4 years could be granted a new licence, although the 9 year age limits for renewals should remain.</p> <p>I support this, although I would have to strongly recommend that the 4 year policy should stay for fully petrol and diesel vehicles and should only be available to drivers who wish to licence an electric or hybrid vehicle, as this will make those greener vehicles more affordable and drivers will immediately switch to greener energy vehicles. Electric and Hybrid vehicles do not emit more emissions as they get older as they have no emissions.</p> <p>I also agree keeping the 9 year policy</p>			
	4	<p>Adding a condition attached to the licences of all Hackney Carriage Vehicles to carry a card payment machine and accept debit/credit card payments</p> <p>Again I would support this as many customers now only carry card and not cash, although I believe the drivers may not be able to charge 5% or cover their transaction costs as of January 2018, perhaps this needs discussing as to how drivers will re-coup this loss.</p>			
	5	<p>Adding a livery requirement for all Hackney Carriage Vehicles:</p> <p>This could, for example, be a colour scheme exclusively for Hackney Carriage Vehicles, which would help the public to distinguish between a Hackney Carriage Vehicle and a Private Hire Vehicle. 'Cambridge Blue' has been suggested as a possible option.</p> <p>I disagree with this for two reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The additional expense for the drivers 			

APPENDIX A- CONSULTATION RESPONSES – REVIEW OF THE HACKNEY CARRIAGE & PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING POLICY 2017

		<p>2. If the vehicle is wrapped in Cambridge Blue (as you cannot buy Cambridge blue cars) and the driver sells the vehicle to a member of the public in Cambridge would this not present a safety issue or could the driver be forced to de-wrap it.</p>			
	<p>6</p>	<p>Adding a condition attached to all vehicles licences that CCTV be installed, be kept locked and only accessed by the licensing authority and Police.</p> <p>Again I would have to oppose this idea on the follow grounds</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Expensive 2. What happens if driver needs to access the CCTV on a Friday evening, is he/she unable to work until Monday, or until the council are back to work, currently all these CCTVs override and work on a continuous cycle. 3. The police are always busy and they will never access the CCTV unless it is in there benefit, how would a driver get a police officer to access the CCTV, would they have the right equipment ? 4. Who at the council will be trained, will this be one CCTV company or would the council have the right equipment to deal with all makes and CCTV models. <p>In principle it's a good idea, but it just doesn't work, the police are too busy and the council as well as the police will not keep up with technology, software updates and the devices and or leads needed to access the CCTV, I was once attacked and had this CCTV but when the police were approached no one knew how to access it. The reality is that everyone will install it, no one will be asked to access it for at least 6 or so months something serious will happen a couple of years down the road and no one will be able to access the CCTV, the council will then have a massive headline in the</p>			

APPENDIX A- CONSULTATION RESPONSES – REVIEW OF THE HACKNEY CARRIAGE & PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING POLICY 2017

		<p>paper being criticised.</p> <p>7 Allowing rear loading wheelchair accessible vehicles:</p> <p>Currently the policy provides that all new licensed Hackney Carriages must be side loading; the Council will not licence rear loading wheelchair accessible vehicles.</p> <p>I am worried that this is even being considered, we have no rank space, the past ten years have been about re-limiting and everyone has been going loopy about rank space.</p> <p>So on this I have one question.</p> <p>I am in a wheelchair and approach the rank, how is the driver going to get me in the vehicle ? rear loading wheelchairs need 3 meters space behind, that's almost the length of the rank, is everyone going to reverse off the rank.</p>			
5	06/08/2017	<p>I am objecting to any decision to remove the following</p> <p>Removal of the need for licensed vehicles to carry a first aid kit.</p> <p>Removal of the need for licensed vehicles to carry a fire extinguisher.</p>		07/08/2017	Acknowledgement e-mail sent
6	07/08/2017	<p>Rear loading vehicles</p> <p>Rear loading vehicles should be allowed to be registered as a Hackney carriages.</p> <p>Ramp is much lower and can accommodate large wheelchairs of all types including mobility scooters and they always are face forwarding journey. Also including a passenger on the wheelchair it can take on board up to 4 passengers. With my current large 8 seater I can take wheelchair and max</p>		08/08/2017	Acknowledgement e-mail sent

	<p>2-3 additional passengers and most of the cases the elderly people and disabled walking people can't access it because it is too high. In some cases I have to refuse wheelchairs because they only fit sideways or passengers are too high to get in. Some electric wheelchair users only want to use back loaders because they feel much safer getting in. Many areas in Cambridge are not suitable for side loading wheelchairs simply because they are too narrow for example (drummer street rank, almost every street of mill road area and many more similar in Cambridge) So the rear loading vehicle would be more friendly for most of the passengers using our ranks. Smaller vehicles are not that expensive to replace compared to side loading and are more eco friendly simply because they have smaller engines and are lighter so they produce less CO2.</p> <p>Adding a livery requirement.</p> <p>Livery requirement would be good but not proposed colour of Cambridge blue. None of the taxi making companies are supplying new taxis in that colour and simply this is not available to order.</p> <p>Now the question is if already registered and running taxis will need to be custom painted who is going to cover the cost of it? If the owner then this is another huge cost (we are talking of hundreds of pounds) added to our trade including all the cost what we have to cover to run taxis.</p> <p>So I will not agree to put Livery requirement</p> <p>Card payments</p> <p>Card payments machines in every taxi should be available.</p> <p>CCTV in vehicles</p> <p>Adding a CCTV to be installed in taxis is a good idea. But access only for CCC and Police is a wrong idea. Many taxi drivers are using their vehicles as a personal form of transport after working hours for them and their families. So at least the taxi driver should be allowed to turn it off while not working.</p> <p>Again who is going to cover the cost of installing it in the Taxi? If it's the owner I will not agree with this proposal.</p> <p>It's good to propose some changes to trade because we need it. But if some of these changes will put more cost to run our small businesses then this is wrong and should be looked how to minimise it.</p> <p>.</p> <p>Regards</p>		
--	--	--	--

APPENDIX A– CONSULTATION RESPONSES – REVIEW OF THE HACKNEY CARRIAGE & PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING POLICY 2017

7	08/08/2017	<p>Dear Licensing Team,</p> <p>I have been a critical observer of the taxi trade as part of the local transportation policy in the past. I have often experienced assertive and aggressive behavior among professional drivers, and have often considered how such behavior reflects on our city as a whole and how it deters more people from using healthy and sustainable modes for getting around.</p> <p>I believe the licensing framework offers an essential tool for changing the culture of driving in Cambridge, and to make more space for healthy and sustainable modes on our roadway.</p> <p>I am disappointed that the proposal is lacking the following requirements:</p> <p>1) CCTV requirements: should include a requirement a dash-cam to cover traffic ahead and to document dangerous driving maneuvers. This would provide excellent evidence in the case of a complaint. Access to this footage should not be restricted</p> <p>2) Intermodal Connections: Considering the taxi trade in Cambridge as part of the local mobility system, you will note that up to now the taxi trade has not offered or advertised rates for the transport of bicycles. Many private cars are fitted with bike carriers, and many bike owners have occasion to transport a bike from one place to another. The taxi trade, being part of a integrated transport system, should be required to offer and advertise this service and equip a certain number of cars accordingly</p> <p>And most importantly:</p> <p>3) Driver training: Those who want to earn a living on the roads of Cambridge should be required to show that they know how to drive safely, specially among pedestrians and those on bicycles. Our narrow roads and the large number of cyclists demand that drivers undergo special training. The outcome is not only a driving style which will avoid collisions, but more importantly an driving style which welcomes people of different mobilities onto the roadway. If a driver does not want to undergo this training, he or she should drive his taxi in a different place, not in Cambridge. Since 2013 London has run a city-wide initiative to train drivers of light goods and passenger carrying vehicles through an accredited Certificate of Professional Competence (CPC) course called Safe Urban Driving. There are local providers who can deliver such training programs.</p>	23/08/2017 Ack sent 10/08/2017	<p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>I write further to my e-mail to you dated Thursday 10th August 2017.</p> <p>I can confirm all responses received will be put before the Licensing Committee at their next meeting on Monday 16th October 2017.</p> <p>With respect to your comments on 'Intermodal Connections' and 'Driver Training' I can advise you that the current consultation didn't include a specific consideration of such training, however your comment will be fed back to the Committee.</p> <p>I can advise you however, that all licence holders are required to attend and pass a test paper at the end of Cambridge City Council's 'Customer Awareness: Safeguarding, Equality and Protection' training course. At the request of members of the public the course includes elements of cyclist awareness and considerate driving.</p> <p>Once again thank you for your feedback.</p>
---	------------	--	--------------------------------------	---

APPENDIX A- CONSULTATION RESPONSES – REVIEW OF THE HACKNEY CARRIAGE & PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING POLICY 2017

		Please confirm receipt of these comments and let me know how you will proceed		
8	09/08/2017	<p>I am _____, of _____. I don't have my badge to hand and I can't remember what the number is.</p> <p>I just want to say I am in favour of almost all the proposals on the review letter. I think they are almost all good, especially not having to carry first aid kits and fire extinguishers. In all my years as a taxi driver I have never needed them. The only time it came in handy was when I was out with family and someone cut their finger and I remembered I had some plasters in the first aid kit of my car. But I have never needed it during work. I've even offered customers paracetamol when they said they have a headache and no one ever wanted it!</p> <p>One proposal I am against though is the one about an exclusive colour scheme for Hackney Carriages. This sounds expensive to me and I don't see the benefits. We already have the signs and the crest on the side.</p> <p>Thank you for listening.</p>	10/08/2017	Acknowledgment e-mail sent
9	10/08/2017	<p>Dear _____,</p> <p>Please find attached a response from Cambridgeshire Alliance for Independent Living regarding the current taxi licencing and fare consultations.</p> <p>If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>1 Removal of the need for licensed vehicles to carry a first aid kit.</p>	10/08/2017	Acknowledgment e-mail sent

	<p>CAIL response: We believe that all licenced vehicles should carry first aid kits and that all drivers should be qualified to provide basic first aid assistance. There are many disabilities, such as Epilepsy, where basic first aid may be required.</p> <p>2 Removal of the need for licensed vehicles to carry a fire extinguisher. CAIL response: We believe that all licensed vehicles should be required to carry a fire extinguisher.</p> <p>3 Change of age limits for vehicles: Currently the policy provides that a new vehicle cannot be granted a licence if it is more than 4 years old. Additionally a renewal will not be granted to a vehicle more than 9 years old. It has been suggested that vehicles older than 4 years could be granted a new licence, although the 9 year age limits for renewals should remain. CAIL Response: We have no view on this proposal</p> <p>4 Adding a condition attached to the licences of all Hackney Carriage Vehicles to carry a card payment machine and accept debit/credit card payments CAIL Response: We recognise that this could be more convenient for many people. Please note change in law – http://www.moneysavingexpert.com/news/cards/2017/07/credit-and-debit-card-fees-to-be-banned http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-40648641 Also, how does this fit with using Taxicards?? Could they be used to negate any charges? https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/taxicard</p> <p>5 Adding a livery requirement for all Hackney Carriage Vehicles: This could, for example, be a colour scheme exclusively for Hackney Carriage Vehicles, which would help the public to distinguish between a Hackney Carriage Vehicle and a Private Hire Vehicle. 'Cambridge Blue' has been suggested as a possible option. CAIL Response: This could be useful for certain groups that we work with for example those with Learning Disabilities.</p> <p>6 Adding a condition attached to all vehicles licences that CCTV be installed, be kept locked and only accessed by the licensing authority and Police.</p>		
--	--	--	--

APPENDIX A- CONSULTATION RESPONSES – REVIEW OF THE HACKNEY CARRIAGE & PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING POLICY 2017

		<p>CAIL Response: We believe this is highly important for the safety of passengers and drivers especially for unescorted Adults at Risk of Abuse.</p> <p>7 Allowing rear loading wheelchair accessible vehicles: Currently the policy provides that all new licensed Hackney Carriages must be side loading; the Council will not licence rear loading wheelchair accessible vehicles.</p> <p>CAIL Response: We regularly book licenced vehicles for people with a wide range of disabilities so that they can attend our events. This includes booking transport for people who use wheelchairs. We have booked both side-loading and rear loading vehicles. For people who have more complex health needs or larger wheelchairs there have been issues when side-loading in to a vehicle. People have been required to tilt their heads on the side or to try and crouch down in their wheelchair. Whilst for some people this is possible, for other others it has created difficulties eg drivers attempting to physically push people's heads to the side.</p>		
10	10/08/2017	<p>I must object strongly to these proposals in licence policy.my reasons are listed below, having had some 25 years as hackney carriage driver from around 1975.</p> <p>1/carrying a first aid kit is not a great problem for anybody and could save a life, they have been carried by hackney carriages for many years, so I see why they are complaining about them. They are not in the way , they just sit in the boot doing no harm .</p> <p>2/ The same reason applies as to previous reply.</p> <p>3/The age limits must be strictly adhered to and four years replacement is quite acceptable due to the high mileage taxis do. Or maybe a mileage limit could be set and once that vehicle has reached that mileage then it should be changed. Say 150000 miles to change vehicle, but used vehicles should not be licensed under the 150000 miles due to dubious previous ownership.</p> <p>4/ I see no reason why the council should impose this condition of carrying a</p>	23/08/2017 Ack 10/08/2017	<p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>I write further to my e-mail to you dated Thursday 10th August 2017.</p> <p>I can confirm all responses received will be put before the Licensing Committee at their next meeting on Monday 16th October 2017.</p> <p>With respect to your comments on the return of vehicle plate I can advise you that the current consultation did not include a specific consideration of this, however your comment will be fed back to the Committee.</p> <p>Once again thank you for your feedback.</p>

APPENDIX A- CONSULTATION RESPONSES – REVIEW OF THE HACKNEY CARRIAGE & PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING POLICY 2017

		<p>card payment machine, as it should be up to individual drivers if they wish to take credit card payments. If this is imposed you then come into the realms of the status of the drivers being self employed or employed by the city council. You could end up paying there tax and nhi. Self employed means you have the choice. It could also be open to abuse and fraud from the present drivers out there.</p> <p>5/ painting the hackneys in one colour will not do anything for the trade except add an extra expense and higher fares no doubt, of which I have complained about on the increase link. It will also make the city look shoddy.</p> <p>6/ a licence condition is not required due to the fact that dash cams are widely available and used now by most vehicles. All this will do is add another expense and time to the police and drivers.</p> <p>7/ I do agree with as it should have always been the normal way to unload wheel chairs.</p> <p>I myself would like to add a proposal to the hackney licence and would like the committee to seriously consider this and there options.</p> <p>The city council should make it a requirement that the hackney licence plate is handed back to the council, as it should be and not sold on the open market as is happening and been happening for many years. This practice is unlawful as the licence plate belongs to the city council and the licence, it just leads profiteering in the trade and as it is deregulated now, there is no reason for plates to be sold and drivers paying rent.</p> <p>I would like confirmation that you will consider my proposals and receipt of this email.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

APPENDIX A- CONSULTATION RESPONSES – REVIEW OF THE HACKNEY CARRIAGE & PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING POLICY 2017

11	10/08/2017	Letter	11/08/2017	Acknowledgement e-mail sent.

Commercial & Licensing,
Environmental Services,
Cambridge City Council,
PO Box 700,
Cambridge,
CB1 0JH



7th August 2017

Dear Sirs,

Re: Review of the Hackney Carriage & Private Hire Licensing Policy

Further to the above, I would like to offer my comments on the proposed policy review.

1. Agree strongly.
2. Agree strongly.
3. Agree that the under four year rule should be removed, suggest that in light of the Council's push towards electric vehicles and ULEV that consideration should be put in place to suggest that any vehicle that fits this criteria should be allowed to be used as a PHV or Hackney for a maximum of nine years, thus if a vehicle first becomes a PHV/Hackney that is electric or ULEV when it is say two years old, it be allowed to remain a licensed vehicle for nine years from then. The reasoning for this is these vehicles are more expensive to purchase in the first instance and any changes in emissions policy would not affect them.
4. Currently with the fare card allowing the driver to charge 5% for card payments, a driver having a card machine and then paying around 3% to the card processing company he or she is in profit by 2% and benefits by this. However, it has been stated by central government that additional charges from January next year will be illegal, when this happens drivers will have no incentive to accept card payments and in fact will be worse off if they do.
5. I do not feel a livery would be appropriate, drivers already have considerable expense in the purchase of a vehicle, the fitting of a taxi meter and the license fees. Burdening the driver with an additional cost of potentially respraying the whole vehicle (circa. £2k) is unfair and would reduce the residual value of the vehicle significantly. The new Hybrid TX London Taxi costs around £60k, to then respray the vehicle to a specific colour is quite honestly ridiculous!
6. Installing CCTV into licensed vehicles is another expense that drivers should not have to outlay, the cost of an encrypted CCTV system, in a secure compartment is over £800.00. The only way this could be affordable is if the Council accept a large proportion of the cost of fitting the equipment to the vehicle. A further consideration is how often will the equipment need to be checked to be working correctly, who should carry this out and at what cost to whom?
If the footage is required by the Police or licensing authority, who would be the responsible officer (and fully trained) during the weekend or evening to extract the footage? It is well documented the lack of Police resources especially during the evenings and evenings (the time the recording is most likely of) and Council Officers do not operate an "on call" system.
If the data is held on a SD memory card and is seized by the Police or Council for evidential purposes, who is responsible for replacing the SD card?
7. Rear loading wheelchair accessible vehicles are a practical solution to the prohibitive cost of side loading vehicles.

There is currently significant ill feeling within the trade with drivers from far and wide working in Cambridge for an operator, by adding to this by adding onerous and expensive requirements such as livery and CCTV will further alienate drivers who observe vehicles from other areas who do not have to fulfil these requirements.

Yours faithfully



APPENDIX A- CONSULTATION RESPONSES – REVIEW OF THE HACKNEY CARRIAGE & PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING POLICY 2017

12	11/08/2017	<p>just my opinion</p> <p>1. keep first aid good thing</p> <p>2. yes to carry extinguisher</p> <p>3 would agree to older than 4 years also longer than 9 if can pass council test</p> <p>4 no</p> <p>5 yes</p> <p>6 yes but get help from council fitting and buying</p> <p>7 just side loading</p>	11/08/2017	Acknowledgement e-mail sent.
13	11/08/2017	<p>Hello</p> <p>I have some concerns about proposed changes. Please see below.</p> <p>Proposal 4- adding a condition to Hackney Carriage Vehicles to carry a card payment machine to accept credit/debit cards payments.</p> <p>We are getting jobs from Cambridge to near villages and some of these villages do not have mobile receptions to use debit card readers(such as Papworth Everard where I live). This will lead we get not paid for the job we completed. When there is no backup solution failure of credit card readers it is not fair to force all taxi drivers to accept credit cards.</p> <p>There will be a cost to get credit cards readers and when the card reader is failed we wouldn't be able to work until to get a replacement one. Also, there will be charge backs and be consuming time for administration for credit card payment.</p> <p>Proposal 5- adding a livery requirement for all Hackney Carriage Vehicles.</p> <p>This is another unnecessary cost to taxi drivers. This will not stop Private hires picking passengers from streets. People just think there is another taxi company with Cambridge blue. But it will cost taxi drivers big expense.</p> <p>Proposal 6- I do not think we do have such major criminal problems to install cameras over a thousand of Hackney and Private hire vehicles.</p>	14/08/2017	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>Thank you for your comments, which I will add to the consultation paperwork.</p> <p>I would just like to make you aware that the proposals contained in the consultation were raised entirely by the trade and not by Cambridge City Council. On the 24th July 2017 the Licensing Committee gave permission for the proposals to go out to consult for 5 weeks, which was felt to be an adequate length of time.</p> <p>The consultation information is also available online (featured on our website and Facebook page) so even those individuals who are away can e-mail us to send in their comments.</p> <p>All responses received will be put forward to the Licensing Committee who will meet to review the feedback to the proposals on Monday 16th October 2017.</p>

APPENDIX A- CONSULTATION RESPONSES – REVIEW OF THE HACKNEY CARRIAGE & PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING POLICY 2017

		<p>Also, who will pay for this? I assume you expecting taxi drivers to pay the cost.</p> <p>We are having very difficult times due to economical conditions in the country. Most of your proposals will cost taxi drivers more. We are in a state just about to keep up our vehicles and you are suggesting things which will cost us.</p> <p>I also criticise you to propose all these changes when most taxi drivers are away for holidays. It seems like this is another consultation whatever reply you receive you will go ahead with it.</p> <p>regards</p>		
14	12/08/2017	<p>Dear sir / madam</p> <p>I have some concerns about proposed changes. Please see below.</p> <p>Proposal 4- adding a condition to Hackney Carriage Vehicles to carry a card payment machine to accept credit/debit cards payments.</p> <p>We are getting jobs from Cambridge to near villages and some of these villages do not have mobile receptions to use debit Card readers. This will lead we get not paid for the job we completed. I have been using CCLT card machine and have couple of times problems bad reception and call office to get payments from customer. When there is no backup solution failure of credit card readers it is not fair to force all taxi drivers to accept credit cards. There will be a cost to get credit cards readers and when the card reader is failed we wouldn't be able to work until to get a replacement one. Also, there will be charge backs and be consuming time for administration for credit card payment.</p> <p>Proposal 6- I do not think we do have such major criminal problems to install cameras over a thousand of Hackney and Private hire vehicles. Also, who will pay for this? I assume you expecting taxi drivers to pay the cost.</p>	14/08/2017	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>Thank you for your comments, which I will add to the consultation paperwork.</p> <p>I would just like to make you aware that the proposals contained in the consultation were raised entirely by the trade and not by Cambridge City Council. On the 24th July 2017 the Licensing Committee gave permission for the proposals to go out to consult for 5 weeks, which was felt to be an adequate length of time.</p> <p>The consultation information is also available online (featured on our website and Facebook page) so even those individuals who are away can e-mail us to send in their comments.</p> <p>All responses received will be put forward to the Licensing Committee who will meet to review the feedback to the proposals on Monday 16th October 2017.</p>

APPENDIX A- CONSULTATION RESPONSES – REVIEW OF THE HACKNEY CARRIAGE & PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING POLICY 2017

		<p>Proposal 7- I have been using full time wheelchair accessible mini bus last 3 and half years and only have twice wheelchair jobs from ranks and maybe 3 or 4 times more than 4 passengers on my cab. I think that is really good idea like the other county's small cars wheelchair access from the back. Less emission, dirty sound and exhaust, big mini busses take more space in town and traffic. Good benefit for the drivers for so they do not spend over £40k</p> <p>We are having very difficult times due to economical conditions in the country. Most of your proposals will cost taxi drivers more. We are in a state just about to keep up our vehicles and you are suggesting things which will cost us.</p> <p>I also criticise you to propose all these changes when most taxi drivers are away for holidays. It seems like this is another consultation whatever reply you receive you will go ahead with it.</p> <p>regards</p>		
15	13/08/2017	<p>Dear sir, further to receiving consultation letter I would comment as follows,</p> <p>Points 1 & 2. I see no valid reason why licenced vehicles should carry either a fire extinguisher or a first aid kit as both require the training of the operator to be used correctly so as not to do further damage or injury.</p> <p>Point 3. A vehicle ie a hybrid vehicle 6 plus years old is not as polluting as a new diesel vehicle and as such the age limit you have in place and propose to alter is a nonsense. Vehicles should be judged on vehicle condition and ability to be operated cleanly in regard to emissions.</p> <p>Point 4. As most Hackney carriage drivers already have credit/debit card machines adding this condition would help bring the minority of drivers who refuse to take such card payments into line with the majority who realise that</p>	23/08/2017 Ack 13/08/2017	<p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>I write further to my e-mail to you dated 14th August 2017.</p> <p>The Commercial & Licensing Team Manager would like to address your comments concerning Uber and TfL vehicles.</p> <p>I can confirm that all Uber vehicles that are Cambridge City Council licensed are required to display the same signage as those working for any other operator in the City. In relation to vehicles from other areas (including TfL) they are required to abide by the requirements put on them by their licensing authority, and we are legally unable to require them to keep to</p>

APPENDIX A- CONSULTATION RESPONSES – REVIEW OF THE HACKNEY CARRIAGE & PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING POLICY 2017

		<p>refusing card payments drive custom away.</p> <p>Point 5. As at present Cambridge Hackney carriages display city door crests a differential already exists between them and hire cars, who also should display their respective Hire car door signs which include private hire pre booked only on them.(Apart from Uber and TFL vehicles who do not display any signage which seems to be accepted by the City Council).</p> <p>Perhaps these companies and south Cambs vehicles should be painted the same colour to differentiate them from City Licensed Hackney Carriages who are fully regulated already and have to abide by your rules or risk losing their business. I'm sure they all would be delighted to bear the cost of repainting or wrapping vehicles which are very expensive to purchase already due to your vehicle age limits.</p> <p>Point 6. CCTV be installed, this would only aid the city council and the police in doing a job they should be doing already i.e. enforcement.</p> <p>And as the way the council thinks you would want the vehicle operators to pay the cost of the equipment and installation. NO THANK YOU.</p> <p>Point 7. As an operator of saloon vehicles I do not feel experienced enough to comment on this proposal.</p> <p>I trust the above points will be taken to and put before the Licensing committee at their next meeting.</p> <p>Yours Faithfully</p>		<p>the same signage as Cambridge City vehicles.</p> <p>Once again, thank you for your feedback, which will be reviewed by the Licensing Committee at their next meeting on Monday 16th October 2017.</p>
16	14/08/2017	<p>To the Commercial & Licensing Team,</p> <p>I submit my responses to your consultation of proposed changes to the Licensing Policy.</p> <p><u>1. First aid kit:</u> agree. I am not trained in first aid and the best use I could ever make of it would be</p>	14/08/2017	Acknowledgement e-mail sent

		<p>to hand it to an injured person.</p> <p><u>2. Fire extinguisher:</u> agree. The advice from the Fire Service in the event of a vehicle fire is to immediately remove all occupants to a safe distance - not to risk tackling the fire.</p> <p><u>3. Age limits:</u> partially agree. The limits do not ensure the vehicle is in a satisfactory condition to work as a taxi, and seems arbitrary. Wouldn't a mileage limit be more appropriate? My annual mileage is about 30,000 whereas others might go three times that with correspondingly greater wear and tear.</p> <p><u>4. Card payment machines:</u> strongly agree. London and New York now mandate that card payments be taken and this has been welcomed by the trade after initial resistance to the idea. Most Cambridge hackneys now offer card payment facilities, but some are using it as a way to cherry pick work from the ranks. I support mandatory card facilities in hackney vehicles because that is what customers increasingly want.</p> <p><u>5. Livery requirement:</u> strongly disagree. Hackney carriages are already easily distinguished by their top sign and door crests, and by waiting on a rank. Moreover some hackneys already carry advertising livery. A standard livery would add unnecessary expense to the cost of providing a vehicle in these austere times, and possibly damage its resale value when replaced. Additionally there could be nothing to prevent private hire cars from being the same colour, by chance or deliberately, creating confusion. So it would help neither the trade nor the customers, and most tourists would be unaware of the policy. The best you could say is that is "looks nice" having a rank of vehicles of the same colour.</p> <p><u>6. CCTV installation:</u> partially agree. I am not against the requirement for CCTV but I <i>am</i> against the need for it to be accessible only by the police and licensing authority, which I consider to be intrusive. In quiet times on the ranks drivers sit in each others' cars (particularly in cold weather) and have private conversations, and the idea of being monitored is objectionable. Many hackneys already have CCTV, this would also make it obsolete and need to be replaced.</p> <p><u>7. Rear loading of wheel chairs:</u> partially agree. It is not possible to rear load a wheelchair on a hackney rank. But I support</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

APPENDIX A- CONSULTATION RESPONSES – REVIEW OF THE HACKNEY CARRIAGE & PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING POLICY 2017

		<p>the idea for private hire vehicles, because the chair is loaded facing forward and solves the problem of rotating the chair after a side door entry.</p> <p>Regards,</p>		
17	16/08/2017	I agree to all of your proposals apart from the need to carry a first aid kit.	17/08/2017	Acknowledgement e-mail sent
18	16/08/2017	<p>My comments on the proposed changes are:</p> <p>1. 2. Taxis should carry a first aid kit and a fire extinguisher, as many of us would carry these in our own vehicles.</p> <p>3. Vehicles older than 4 years old should be allowed, with renewal up to 9 years.</p> <p>4. Debit/credit card machine should be available. This is for convenience, financial transparency and safety.</p> <p>5. Yes - Hackney cabs should be more clearly identified eg by Cambridge Blue colour</p> <p>6. Yes - CCTV should be installed and available to police, for the security of drivers and passengers.</p> <p>7. Wheelchair access from the rear should be permissible</p>	17/08/2017	Acknowledgement e-mail sent
19	16/08/2017	<p>Ref: Taxi Policy Review</p> <p>1) first aid kits: - for the availability of first aid emergency responders & police</p> <p>2) Extinguishers:- emergency use & police</p> <p>3) Age limit:- no good reason to refuse - upto 9 years unless with exceptional good reason.</p> <p>4) credit cards:- self employed sole traders to decide for themselves:- to if there losing out.</p> <p>5) livery:- trade costing exercise to the sustainability & impact to the public.</p> <p>6) CCTV:- self employed sole traders to decide for themselves to the benefit of this type of safety equipment.</p> <p>7) Rear loading:- No unless electric.</p>	17/08/2017	Acknowledgement e-mail sent

APPENDIX A- CONSULTATION RESPONSES – REVIEW OF THE HACKNEY CARRIAGE & PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING POLICY 2017

20	17/08/2017	<p>Hi I don't think in cambridge we need livery to distinguish between Hackney and private hire taxi, cambridge is a small town and people are already aware of which taxi is what. Also it's a costly to do livery at lest £2000. Why you want taxi driver to spend that much amount where business is down!! Also no need cctv because lots of taxi already have them! Thanks for listening</p> <p>Please don't make it complicated in cambridge! Keep it simple so no livery neither cctv! Thanks</p>	17/08/2017	Acknowledgement e-mail sent
21	18/08/2017	<p>From Ref: Consultation</p> <p>Proposals</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I have never in 30 years had to use a first aid kit so maybe yes. 2. Never in 30 needed a fire extinguisher either, so yes again. <p>And in both cases above no training has been given so could not be used anyway, Health and safety liabilities etc.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Age of vehicles is about right at no more than 4 years to keep the fleet to a good standard. 4 A good idea for all vehicles but can be costly to process and bank card payments. 5 Livery requirements, To most of the world the difference between a Hackney and a Private Hire car means nothing, a taxi is a taxi. To those of us in the trade we understand the difference and it is for us to obey the rules or be penalized. 6 CCTV for what purpose? To face in the car or to face out towards traffic with sound or Without ? It all sounds a bit big brother. 7 Rear loading would allow for a better choice of vehicles. <p>Note</p>	22/08/2017	<p>From: Sent: 22 August 2017 10:02 To: ' Subject: RE: Taxi Policy</p> <p>Good morning,</p> <p>Thank you for your comments, which I will add to the consultation paperwork.</p> <p>With respect to your comments about vehicles licensed by South Cambridgeshire District Council operating within Cambridge City, I can advise you that Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council are investigating the appropriateness and practicalities of harmonising driver/vehicle conditions and policies between the two licensing authorities.</p> <p>The Licensing Committee will review all feedback received when they next meet on Monday 16th October 2017.</p>

APPENDIX A- CONSULTATION RESPONSES – REVIEW OF THE HACKNEY CARRIAGE & PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING POLICY 2017

Page 70

		Its all very well the City Council having a review to ensure the public has protection using taxi services but if half the fleet driving around the City is not under City rules but South Cambs it is difficult to all sing from the same hymn sheet, discuss !		
22	18/08/2017	1- Removal of the need for licensed vehicles to carry a first aid kit. AGREED 2-Removal of the need for licensed vehicles to carry a fire extinguisher. AGREED 3-Change of age limits for vehicles. AGREED 4-Adding a condition regarding of all hackneys to carry a card payment machine and accept debit/credit cards payments. AGREED 100% WE HAVE TO MOVE WITH TIME PEOPLE USE LESS AND LESS CASH FOR PAYMENTS. 5-Adding a livery requirement for all hackney carriage vehicles (cambridge blue) DISAGREED.PEOPLE CAN EASILY DISTINGUISH BETWEEN A HACKNEY AND A HIRE CAR WITH THE TOP SIGN AND ALL THAT PLUS WHO IS GOING TO PAY FOR REPAINTING THE CAR? 6-cctv be installed and be kept locked and only accessed by the licensing authority and police. DISAGREED THAT MEANS I HAVE BEEN WATCHED 24 HOURS EVEN WHEN I AM USING THE VEHICLE FOR PRIVATE USE WITH MY FAMILY.WHO IS GOING TO PAY FOR THE COST OF INSTALLATION. 7-Allowing rear loading wheelchair accessible vehicles.DISAGREED REMEMBER THEY NEED AT LEAST 3 METER OR MORE FOR LOADING AND UNLOADING	22/08/2017	Acknowledgement e-mail sent
23	21/08/2017	Hi , I'm happy to comment new changes are reasonable.	22/08/2017	Acknowledgement e-mail sent
24	22/08/2017	Thank you. This is no use without the existing fares being shown for comparison..... The 'Cambridge blue' idea is sound. I would favour keeping the requirement for vehicles under 4 years old, for new starts. Why do you suggest a 5% surcharge for debit card payments?	23/08/2017	Good morning, I will add your comments to the consultation paperwork. Please find attached the current fare table, which is also available on our website at: https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/hackney-carriage-and-private-hire . The 5% surcharge for card payments is already on the current fare chart. This was an

APPENDIX A- CONSULTATION RESPONSES – REVIEW OF THE HACKNEY CARRIAGE & PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING POLICY 2017

				extra charge requested by the trade and added to the fare table back in March 2014. As you may be aware, credit and debit card surcharges will be <u>banned</u> in January 2018.
25	22/08/2017	<p>Reply from:</p> <p>You asked for our views/opinion regarding :</p> <p>(1) Removal of the need carry a first aid kit.</p> <p>Having driven daily for almost twenty years I have never required the use of a first aid kit and I am unaware of any other divers finding them selves in a situation where its use has ben required.</p> <p>Not being a trained first aider I would not attempt to use the first aid kit contents on another person choosing instead to offer the kit to the person in need.</p> <p>My concern being that any well meant assistance I might offer could complicate an injury, perhaps worsening the situation.</p> <p>My opinion is that to carry a first aid kit should be a personal choice.</p> <p>Why do we have to carry one , I look forward to your reply.</p> <p>(2) Removal of the need to carry fire extinguisher</p> <p>Two of my family have been employed in the Fire Service.</p> <p>Under no circumstances would I attempt to tackle a vehicle fire using an inadequate hand held device.</p> <p>I would inform the emergency services and keep at a safe distance until they arrive .</p> <p>Under no circumstances should a car bonnet be lifted in an attempt to halt a fire spreading.</p> <p>Attempting to tackle a vehicle fire would place a driver at serious risk of personal injury.</p> <p>Does the council expect a driver to risk his personal safety ?</p> <p>Why do we have to carry one , I look forward to your reply.</p>	23/08/2017	Acknowledgment e-mail sent

	<p>(3) Change Of Vehicle Age Limits</p> <p>The council would like us all to purchase very expensive hybrid or electric vehicles. These vehicles have very high residue value making even 6 year old cars expensive. Should the age limit be increased to a maximum of 6 years at entry and 11 years at exit (too old) more drivers would find this an affordable option.</p> <p>(4) Card Reader : Any driver who does not currently accept card payments is a complete fool , who can afford to turn work away? The option should still be a personal choice regarding card payments because this is self employment , if all drivers were employed by the council then this could be made a license condition. Either way it will always be impossible to enforce.</p> <p>(5) Vehicle Livery</p> <p>This only has effect during daylight hours. Unless a car is illuminous in colour the colour will be impossible to define. The top sign door crests and colour of the vehicles license plate are clearly enough to show the vehicle type. Would the council like us to purchase very expensive hybrid vehicles and then spend several more thousand pounds having a perfectly good vehicle repainted? This does not make sense unless the council is going to pay for this . Anybody who cannot identify a taxi should not be walking the streets unaccompanied.</p> <p>(6) Internal CCTV</p> <p>An invasion of both my own and my passengers Human Rights and daily privacy A simple dash camera fitted often causes concern with some customers regarding privacy whilst they are travelling. An internal camera would deter people from using taxis. would this device be switched off when the vehicle is in the garage for repairs or being used for private use etc? I will take advice from my local Member of Parliament and the European Court Of Human Rights should this go ahead.</p>		
--	---	--	--

APPENDIX A- CONSULTATION RESPONSES – REVIEW OF THE HACKNEY CARRIAGE & PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING POLICY 2017

		<p>I DO NOT want this inside my vehicle I will be unable to drive and work safely with one fitted.</p> <p>(7) No comment.</p> <p>Please send confirmation of this email, also please give dates when this will be discussed should it be an open meeting I will attend.</p> <p>Thank you</p>		
26	22/08/2017	<p>Under item 4, add to the requirement to carry a card machine 'capable of taking contactless payments including Apple Pay'</p>	23/08/2017	Acknowledgment e-mail sent
27	23/08/2017	<p>Dear madam,sir,</p> <p>I thank you for the letter i have received on 4/8/2017,(consutation on the Hackney Carriage policy).</p> <p>"Regarding Summary of Proposals"</p> <p>1- Removal first aid kit.?? my response to that: I disagree to remove my first aid kit, they are very important.. and nobody knows when you going to have and accident minor or major,and they are very important because i have already used it to my passengers like bandages or plasters also headache tablets of course they have to be updated.</p> <p>2- "Removal fire extinguisher"?? Again, i disagree to remove my fire extinguisher as explain as above 1. has to be updated of course. In general i take them as 'Health and Safety' always with me.</p> <p>3- age limit for vehicle. the age limit for the vehicle 9 years is OK by me but it's better to start with a new vehicle in good order,It's not good idea to start with very old vehicle. i agree not to grant vehicle older than 4 years .</p> <p>4- Cash machine in Taxi.??</p>	23/08/2017	Acknowledgement e-mail sent

	<p>I disagree to carry cash machine in my taxi, it's OK for the private hire like Panther, A1, Cambcomb etc those people they need cash machine because they do private hire and Hackney there, is plenty of them myself im independent only Hackney Cambridge council, (if my customers has a visa card i'll take him to cash point with no problem i never had problem with that..(one day i took different people to cash machine to draw some money in the Bank and the Bank decline their cards..??)</p> <p>I don't take cash machine in my Taxi. These groups or members they have private hire (like panther, cambcomb, A1.. and hackney then they should have their card machine with them, not me i am independent only Hackney Cambridge council.</p> <p>5- Change the colour of vehicle.?? I disagree to change my colour the colour i have is fine. Cambridge people are familiar with the Hackney or private hire and if they are not then there are signs (crest) "HACKNEY CARRIAGE VEHICLE" both side and if they want they can add on more sign in front (bonnet) with no problem no waist time. The name they mention they remind me Cambridge blue cheese it's a joke.</p> <p>6- CCTV.?? It's up to the driver if he want CCTV. I never had one and everything it's fine with me and im ok without. It can help in case you have an accident. but kept lock it's BIZARRE??</p> <p>7- Rear loading Wheelchair.?? I disagree with this idea Wheelchair at rear. the Wheelchair must be side loading not rear loading. before they use the ramps they must pay attention for people-safety passing by on the pavement, the people can see you loading a disabled person so they understand that and they give space for you to finish the job with no problem. it's nice to have the disabled inside the taxi where the seats are (in the middle) the disabled can talk to his friend or relations when he is seated in the middle also they can watch him in case something happen to him. I know who come with this idea i think he is chairman or leader i said to him this is stupid idea to put disabled at the back of the car, it's like you put hot food take away at the back..im independent i disagree disabled-wheelchair at rear. and it causes loads other problems they have to think more than that</p> <p>I keep my disabled people with or without wheelchair inside the taxi not rear. stupid idea at rear.</p>		
--	--	--	--

APPENDIX A- CONSULTATION RESPONSES – REVIEW OF THE HACKNEY CARRIAGE & PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING POLICY 2017

		<p>I must stop now i have some work to do .I have to earn some money to pay bills i spent time with this nearly 2 hours.I am independent.</p> <p>kind Regards</p>		
28	25/08/2017	<p>Dear Licensing Team</p> <p>Re: Proposed changes to the taxi licensing policy.</p> <p>Cyclists and pedestrians do not have the benefit of air bags or a steel protective shell around them and their vulnerability should be recognised by reducing the chances of injury. A minority of drivers use their vehicles aggressively to ensure that they proceed without waiting for others. I have personal experience of this kind of driving and when I complained the driver claimed the opposite of what I said. If forward, nearside and backward looking CCTV were to be installed it could benefit not only the driver but also other road users. Disputes could be fairly resolved. In a collision the accounts of each party often differ, CCTV footage could help settle differences rapidly and fairly. A law abiding driver should welcome this kind of evidence and it could also help the licensing authorities identify any drivers who pose a particular risk to the public. The images should only be available to the licensing authorities and the police.</p> <p>I would also support Safe Urban Driving for new drivers so that they can understand the special circumstances of our environment with narrow streets and many pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Best wishes</p>	25/08/2017	<p>Good evening,</p> <p>Thank you for your response, which I will add to the consultation paperwork.</p> <p>With respect to your comments on ‘Safe Urban Driving’ I can advise you that the current consultation did not include a specific consideration of such training, however your comment will be fed back to the Committee.</p> <p>I can advise you however, that all licence holders are required to attend and pass a test paper at the end of Cambridge City Council’s ‘Customer Awareness: Safeguarding, Equality and Protection’ training course. At the request of members of the public the course includes elements of cyclist awareness and considerate driving.</p> <p>The Licensing Committee will review all feedback received at their next meeting on Monday 16th October 2017.</p>
29	25/08/2017		29/08/2017	Acknowledgement e-mail sent

APPENDIX A- CONSULTATION RESPONSES – REVIEW OF THE HACKNEY CARRIAGE & PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING POLICY 2017

		<p>I am totally disagree with that cctv proposal</p> <p>Thank you</p>		
30	25/08/2017	<p>Hello.</p> <p>We don't want to cctv in our taxi because it's cost lot of money to fix it and our city is Much much safe and batter then other city .</p> <p>Thanks Regard.</p>	29/08/2017	Acknowledgement e-mail sent
31	25/08/2017	<p>Good afternoon</p> <p>I generally agree with proposals 1,2,3,4 and 7 but I strongly object to proposals 5 and 6.</p> <p>Not sure what proposal 6 is for, I can only assume it's got something to do with Rotherham and similar cases. We never had any such incidents in Cambridge. Or maybe it's to do with some bad Cambridge hackneys overpricing out of town jobs. We should not suffer collective punishment. Many drivers use there vehicles when not working as private vehicles these cctv's will always be on when our vehicle is on. We don't want our kids/family under continuous watch when our using our vehicle as a family car? We have nothing to hide. We also have a right to privacy when not working. A professional car cctv system that can be locked and automatically turns on when the engine is switched on costs £100s. By time we have it installed by a council authorised installer our total bill will be £700+.</p> <p>Having a cctv should be left as a choice to the driver and not a requirement on our licence.</p> <p>I can see why proposal 5 was thought up but it's a huge cost to us that won't have any success because those illegally plying for hire will still do their mischief! On a busy Saturday night the public just want to get home they dont care if the vehicle is a Cambridge city hackney or not and the law breakers know this.</p> <p>Having to repaint a vehicle or even have it wrapped in a particular colour isn't cheap especially in Cambridge and prices start from £1500.</p> <p>Why should we have to pay for expensive ways to distinguish ourselves from phvs. The council are not fulfilling their duty of policing and prosecuting those illegally plying for hire in the city.</p>	29/08/2017	Acknowledgement e-mail sent

APPENDIX A- CONSULTATION RESPONSES – REVIEW OF THE HACKNEY CARRIAGE & PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING POLICY 2017

		<p>There seems to be concern over southcam hackneys. Most of the south cam hacks have established work in the villages and aren't interested in town. Yes there are a handful of bad apples these were all private hires who used to whip jobs anyway and now have top lights. Whether we have livery or not they will continue their business until they get caught.</p> <p>Both councils need to be stricter in prosecuting these guys.</p> <p>The flood gates we feared that was about to open with Cambridge north station never happened, as the new station seems to be a flop!</p> <p>Remember if we end up with brexit and it delivers the great recession many fear work will dry up very quickly. The last bubble that burst wasn't long ago and it affected us instantly as taxis are a luxury and people cut back on them straight away when struggling for cash. For that reason I think we have to sensible before encouraging the implementation of more costly requirements for our vehicles.</p> <p>£700+ for cctv, £1500+ to repaint car and £1500 loss on add wraps.</p> <p>I wouldn't call a bill in excess of £3700 a benefit nor would I call giving up my basic human right of privacy a benefit.</p> <p>I wouldn't call proposals that could cost £1000s extra every time we replace a vehicle rewarding.</p> <p>If these proposals go ahead they will be implemented around the same time as brexit happens. This could lead to serious financial implications for cab drivers.</p>		
32	26/08/2017	<p>My response to Table of fares and Licensing Policy.</p> <p>Table of fares- Increase very minimal when compared to the recent increases in licensing and badge fees.</p> <p>Licensing Policy review- 1. and 2. I have never had to use a fire extinguisher and only ever had to issue 1 plaster in 30+ years of driving so I think a bit dated and should be removed.</p> <p>3. I don't see why slightly older cars with a lower mileage should not be allowed to be licensed as some of these would potentially be better than a newer car with higher mileage. It could also help a proprietor with costs as other fees and potential proposal costs keep rising rapidly.</p> <p>4. Card machines not a problem with but I don't think it should be a legal</p>	29/08/2017	Acknowledgement e-mail sent

APPENDIX A- CONSULTATION RESPONSES – REVIEW OF THE HACKNEY CARRIAGE & PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING POLICY 2017

		<p>requirement as lots have them now and I am sure they will have to get them when they start to lose out on jobs for not having one.</p> <p>5.The livery requirement was mooted previously and was settled with Cambridge crests which distinguish a Hackney from hire car in my opinion as well as topsigns. The potential costs of this with either a respray or wrap on purchase and another respray or removal of wrap on selling would be a tremendous burden on an owner. I really do not think that this would make any difference to a customer looking for a cab as most know hackneys are on ranks and can be hailed if they have a topsign. The way around this would be to have a strict enforcement code and officers on the street looking for hire cars touting for business (knowing their badge will be taken away if caught) as there seems to be virtually none at the moment and It is absolutely rife. Hackneys are not the cause of the need for distinguishing but you are looking to make them pay for it. The public don't seem to worry about what vehicle they get in as long as they get home - particularly at night so I think the private hire trade is the one who should have the onus upon them not to take the job and therefore leave the job for the legal providers. Colour won't make a difference.</p> <p>6. I think that locked CCTV is a bit draconian and another extra cost for cost for the trade.</p> <p>7.I understood that rear loading wheelchair accessible vehicles were refused before because of the risk of a rear end accident potentially preventing the exit for passengers. Also if loading on a Hackney rank it could cause hold ups and less space for vehicles on the rank as here would be the need for a large gap behind one.</p>		
33	30/08/2017	<p>Anon: annotated copy of consultation document sent in by post</p> <p>1. 'Tick' 2. 'Tick' 3. If you grant a licence to cars say 4, 5, 6 years then they have little time to recoup costs, vehicles are a big expense; also what is the point in retaining an age limit (9 yrs) for a vehicle in possibly (if not used much) in better condition than one heavily used and only half its age. Surely, quality and not 'ageism' should be the criterion – unless we have a councillor variety project</p>	30/08/2017	No response possible

APPENDIX A- CONSULTATION RESPONSES – REVIEW OF THE HACKNEY CARRIAGE & PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING POLICY 2017

		<p>to hand.</p> <p>4. <u>As long as the Council pays for it.</u> These items are: expensive for use sometimes only 1 or 2 times per month; they would be compulsory loss-meter or 'tax'.</p> <p>5. This nonsense was rejected years back in Roger Coey's time.</p> <p>6. Again, who pays?</p> <p>7. Problematic for rank space; also danger from rear-end collision by another vehicle</p>		
34	30/08/2017	<p>Cambridge (Taxi) Drivers Association</p> <p>Covering letter and petitions opposing adoption of CCTV and livery proposals. Please see Appendices C and D for copies of the petition.</p>	05/09/2017	Acknowledgement e-mail sent

To

**Taxi Commercial & Licensing Authority,
Cambridge, England.**

Dear Commercial & Licensing Team,
We as Cambridge City Council Hackney Carriage drivers and Cambs (Taxi) Driver Association (CDA) would like to express our thoughts and opinions together for Cambridge Taxi Policy. Please find below all our opinions:

1. **The First Aid box is important** for drivers as well as passengers so strongly recommended we would like keep it as it is.
2. **Fire extinguishers are important too** but it has been very rarely used. However if everyone decides to remove this our opinions remain the same.
3. **Vehicle age limit** and to put new vehicle more than 4 years older is appropriate **however we are strongly supporting to further consider vehicle age limits beyond 12 years old.** As our councils have their own garage and specialist mechanics/engineers if they decide any vehicle is not fit for purpose can always be taken off from fleet. So its economically beneficial for drivers also there is so many competitors as there is not much work and car prices going up quite dramatically especially Big Hackney Vehicles.
4. **Adding card payment machine is positive for the taxi trade,** However many drivers work for a taxi firm and those firms provide card payment as well, furthermore there are only a small portion of customers who pay by card and cash machines are available. On top adding this condition would add extra maintenance cost and always internet connection which is also costly. **Therefore card payment machine could be an optional.**
5. **Adding colour code for taxi which is also expensive** and it's a very small town and community always ask for good big taxi for variety of reasons for example wedding, funeral service require specific colour! It would be the drivers who may lose some business too! We strongly oppose it.
6. **Adding conditions onto CCTV Cameras would be expensive to install and there would be maintenance costs.** Currently this trade business is going down, drivers have to work hard and work long shifts to get paid. Therefore we strongly disagree with the proposals to have mandatory CCTV
7. **We all agree to introduce rear loading wheel chair Accessible vehicle and small vehicle for Hackney Carriage as it is financially benefited therefore we are supporting this.**

We are responding as a group held under an organisation named **Cambs (Taxi) Driver Association (CDA) which represents for more than 100 taxi drivers Cambridge City Council and South Cambridge District Council taxi drivers.** We established in 2013 based in Cambridge. We are all in agreement for the above and would much appreciate if the above can be considered or at least discussed. We would also highly understand where any concerns are raised and will welcome any feedback.

Please contact us if you need further information regarding this and get us involved any further issue



We look forward to hear soon..

With thanks

Badge No:



Name:



Signature



Date:

30/8/17

(PTO)

APPENDIX A- CONSULTATION RESPONSES – REVIEW OF THE HACKNEY CARRIAGE & PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING POLICY 2017

35	01/09/2017	<p>Hello, In response to your taxi policy review I wanted to suggest that the licence fee should be tiered according to the environmental and health impact of taxis e.g. the lowest fee for electric vehicles, a moderate fee for hybrid vehicles, a high fee for petrol taxis and a very high fee for diesel vehicles. It would also be good to commit to the phase out of petrol/diesel vehicles entirely. I hope this is considered as you amend your taxi policy. Yours sincerely,</p>	05/09/2017	<p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>Thank you for your comments, which I will add to the consultation paperwork. The Licensing Committee will be reviewing all feedback received at their next meeting on Monday 16th October 2017.</p> <p>With respect to variable licence fees I can advise you that although the current consultation did not include a specific consideration on this matter your comment will be fed back to the Committee.</p> <p>I can advise you that when the Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy was subject to a full review last year members agreed to include within the policy a range of different options to encourage vehicle proprietors to buy electric or hybrid vehicles. This includes discounted licence fees. Please see pages 21-26 of the attached for more information. There will most likely be further decisions made on this matter at the January 2018 meeting of the Licensing Committee.</p>
36	03/09/2017	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>I would like to express my preferences regarding the above review :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Vehicle age, providing vehicles 'retire' at the current age, it is the commercial decision of the operator at which age it can become a 'taxi' thus permitting older vehicles should be allowed. It will also allow drivers transferring from other districts to not have to change their otherwise good taxis. I hope this may become necessary if the 2015 deregulation act is amended. 2. CCTV I believe the high cost to the vehicle owner is prohibitive for the solution suggested. CCTV should be encouraged for driver & passenger safety but a sealed £700+ system seems excessive. 3. Uniform livery, I feel it is not necessary for a single vehicle colour / livery 	05/09/2017	<p>Acknowledgment e-mail sent</p>

APPENDIX A– CONSULTATION RESPONSES – REVIEW OF THE HACKNEY CARRIAGE & PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING POLICY 2017

		<p>solution. Hackney Carriages are readily identifiable because of their illuminated top sign and livery will not be effective for night time. Further, commercial advertising is a good form of revenue for some operators and this would be lost.</p> <p>I am ambivalent regarding the other issues.</p> <p>Kind regards</p>		
37	03/09/2017	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>Please find below a submission for your consultation on the proposed changes to Hackney Carriage & Private Hire.</p> <p>1 Removal of the need for licensed vehicles to carry a first aid kit.</p> <p>The Health and Safety (First-Aid) Regulations 1981 require employers to provide adequate and appropriate equipment, facilities and personnel to ensure their employees receive immediate attention if they are injured or taken ill at work. These Regulations apply to all workplaces including those with less than five employees and to the self-employed. Therefore, it is important that a first aid kit is carried for drivers to use the equipment while self-treating themselves.</p> <p>The Regulations do not place a legal duty on employers to make first-aid provision for non-employees such as the public. However, HSE strongly recommends that non-employees are included in an assessment of first-aid needs and that provision is made for them.</p> <p>The current policy states that “the safety and welfare of the public is the overriding principle that will be considered when matters are dealt with under the Policy.”. Should a taxi or private hire vehicle have a passenger who requires some medical attention, the use of first aid is essential in the treatment of others.</p> <p>It is disappointing that the consultation does not contain sufficient details as to why the change in conditions are being sought. There is a lack of background to enable the analysis that would lead to a more informed and constructive appraisal of these items. However, I would hazard a guess that there is a worry from the trade that liabilities may arise by use of a first aid kit</p>	05/09/2017	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>Thank you for your comments, which I will add to the consultation paperwork.</p> <p>I understand that the trade made the request to remove the requirement for the carrying of a first aid kit from licensed vehicles for two reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is a concern drivers may be liable in any potential case of misuse of first aid; and 2. There is strong feeling amongst the trade that first aid kits are seldom used. <p>The Licensing Committee will be reviewing all feedback received at their next meeting on Monday 16th October 2017.</p>

APPENDIX A- CONSULTATION RESPONSES – REVIEW OF THE HACKNEY CARRIAGE & PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING POLICY 2017

		<p>on the public.</p> <p>Firstly, it is important to note that in the UK no one in the UK has ever been sued for administering life-saving First Aid. The liabilities that may arise can only occur should a driver act in a negligent manner, and this is far less likely to occur if the driver is able to access proper equipment, and sufficient guidance. This guidance does not need to be in the form of formal training, but simply a leaflet within the first aid pack would be adequate.</p> <p>Secondly, it should also be noted that no lay-person is /required/ to treat any member of the public - they are under no obligation to do so.</p> <p>Many thanks,</p> <p>Responding on own behalf</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

This page is intentionally left blank

Livery Consultation Responses

What should the base colour of the Hackney Carriage Vehicle be?	Black	White	Silver	Other	Notes
Responses	11	8	77	9	6 - Cambridge Blue 1 - Black and White 1 - Grey 1 - Any colour

If Hackney Carriage Vehicles should have a prescribed base colour, should Private Hire Vehicles be excluded from being that colour?	Yes	No			Notes
Responses	84	20			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not if a colour wrap is used in addition to a City crest - PH vehicles should be allowed to be any colour - Whilst HC vehicles have different licensing arrangements, they should be easily identifiable - The public need to be able to distinguish between PH and HC vehicles - They need to be a uniform colour and display door signs - 24 comments stating that all PH vehicles should be black - 1 comment stating that all PH vehicles should be silver

How much of the Hackney Carriage Vehicle should be 'wrapped'?	Bonnet Only	Boot Only	Side Stripe	Other	Notes
Responses	4	0	89	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2 comments saying no wrap - 1 comment saying a wrap on the roof - 2 comments saying a wrap on the bonnet and boot - 1 comment saying a wrap on the roof and a/b/c pillars - 1 comment saying that the vehicle should be wrapped completely, with a square pattern - 1 comment saying that the vehicle should be entirely Cambridge Blue so that the vehicles become world renowned like New York taxis
What colour/ design should the wrap be?	Black	C/B Blue	Yellow	Other	

Responses	60	7	3	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1 comment stated that there should be no wrap - 1 comment said red - 1 comment said black and yellow - 1 comment said blue - 1 comment said yellow and white - 2 comments said silver - 1 comment stated that they wanted the vehicles to remain the same as they are now - Of the 60 comments that stated the colour should be black 58 of them specified the design as a black stripe down the side of the vehicle
-----------	----	---	---	---	---

Should all HackneyCarriage Vehicles have to display crests on the vehicle?	Yes	No			Notes
Responses	29	72			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If PH vehicles are allowed to have the same colour as HC then the HC vehicles should have a crest - there should be a 'Cambridge Taxi' sign or logo in lieu of a crest

Should advertising still be permitted on Hackney Carriage Vehicles?	Yes	No			Notes

Responses	84	9		<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Of the 84 people that said yes. 44 of them detailed that small door advertisements should be permitted outside the vehicle and adverts and videos be permitted inside the vehicle. - 1 comment stated that only small adverts should be allowed - 1 comment stated that adverts should possibly be allowed, but only small areas on the rear panel or the back of the vehicle only - 1 comment stated that advertising should be in very limited areas - 2 comments stated that advertising should only be permitted inside the vehicle
-----------	----	---	--	---



Livery - Meeting with Trade 1st May 2018

Present:

Environmental Health Manager
Licensing, Policy & Administration Team Leader
CCLT
CCLT
Cambridge Hackney Carriage & Private Hire Association
Cambridge Hackney Carriage & Private Hire Association

Apologies:

Background

- 1.1 Currently the Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy allows for any colour of vehicle being licensed as a Hackney Carriage and also, with agreement of the Licensing Authority, for the external display of advertising. In many cities, a standard livery is adopted for Hackney Carriage Vehicles.
- 1.2 At Licensing Committee on 16th October 2017, Members agreed to the addition of a Livery requirement for all Hackney Carriage Vehicles.
- 1.3 A standard livery will make it easier for the public to readily identify licensed vehicles which are regulated and safe. It will clearly differentiate between Private Hire Vehicles and Hackney Carriages and will classify the Cambridge City Vehicles which can legitimately trade in the City and those from outside which cannot.
- 1.4 In addition to the above, a standard livery will improve the appearance of the Hackney Carriage fleet and enhance the image of our City.

Consultation

- 2.1 Consultation took place between 1st and 26th March 2018 which focused on vehicle colour, livery style and design along with an implementation plan.
- 2.2A total of 105 responses were received. The results of the consultation can be found below:

Q1. What colour should the base colour of the Hackney Carriage Vehicle be?

Answer	Black	White	Silver	Other	No Answer
Total	11	8	77	9	0
Other comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 6 - Cambridge Blue ▪ 1 - Black and White ▪ 1 – Grey ▪ 1 - Any colour 					

Q2. If Hackney Carriage Vehicles should have a prescribed base colour, should Private Hire Vehicles be excluded from being that colour?

Answer	Yes	No	No Answer
Total	84	20	1
Other comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not if a colour wrap is used in addition to a City crest. ▪ PH vehicles should be allowed to be any colour. ▪ Whilst HC vehicles have different licensing arrangements, they should be easily identifiable. ▪ The public need to be able to distinguish between PH and HC vehicles. ▪ They need to be a uniform colour and display door signs. ▪ 24 comments stating that all PH vehicles should be black. ▪ 1 comment stating that all PH vehicles should be silver. 			

Q3. How much of the Hackney Carriage Vehicle should be 'wrapped'?

Answer	Boot	Bonnet	Side Stripe	Other	No Answer
Total	0	4	89	8	4

Other comments:

- 2 comments saying no wrap.
- 1 comment saying a wrap on the roof.
- 2 comments saying a wrap on the bonnet and boot.
- 1 comment saying a wrap on the roof and a/b/c pillars.
- 1 comment saying that the vehicle should be wrapped completely, with a square pattern.
- 1 comment saying that the vehicle should be entirely Cambridge Blue so that the vehicles become world renowned like New York taxis.

Q4. What colour/ design should the 'wrap' be?

Answer	Black	Cambridge Blue	Yellow	Other	No Answer
Total	60	7	3	8	27

Other comments:

- 1 comment stated that there should be no wrap.
- 1 comment said red.
- 1 comment said black and yellow.
- 1 comment said blue.
- 1 comment said yellow and white.
- 2 comments said silver.
- 1 comment stated that they wanted the vehicles to remain the same as they are now.
- Of the 60 comments that stated the colour should be black 58 of them specified the design as a black stripe down the side of the vehicle.

Q5. Should all Hackney Carriage Vehicles have to display crests on the vehicle?

Answer	Yes	No	No Answer
Total	29	72	4
<p>Other comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If PH vehicles are allowed to have the same colour as HC then the HC vehicles should have a crest. • There should be a 'Cambridge Taxi' sign or logo in lieu of a crest 			

Q6. Should advertising still be permitted on Hackney Carriage Vehicles?

Answer	Yes	No	No Answer
Total	84	9	12
<p>Other comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Of the 84 people that said yes. 44 of them detailed that small door advertisements should be permitted outside the vehicle and adverts and videos be permitted inside the vehicle. • 1 comment stated that only small adverts should be allowed. • 1 comment said that adverts should possibly be allowed, but only small areas on the rear panel or the back of the vehicle only. • 1 comment stated that advertising should be in very limited areas. • 2 comments stated that advertising should only be permitted inside the vehicle. 			

2.3 Representatives of the Trade were invited to the meeting today to discuss the findings of the consultation and to explore the preferred colour, design and livery style.

2.4 An open and honest discussion took place between those present and a proposal was drawn up as detailed below.

Discussion with Trade

3.1 At the meeting, the following was proposed:

Hackney Carriage Livery

- A silver base colour (as described on the V5 registration document for each vehicle) for all Hackney Carriage Vehicles.
- That a 'wrap' of two black gloss stripes, one placed either side of the vehicle (running horizontally from the headlight to the rear light).
- That the wrap must be a thickness between 50mm (approximately 2 inches) and 75mm (approximately 3 inches).
- That all Hackney Carriage Vehicles will continue to have the Cambridge City Crests either side of the driver doors.
- That external advertising on Hackney Carriage Vehicles will only be permitted on the rear of the vehicle.
- That internal advertising in Hackney Carriage Vehicles will continue to be permitted as described in the existing policy.

Private Hire Vehicles

- That all Private Hire Vehicles are excluded from being silver.

Implementation

- For all existing silver (as described on the V5 registration document for each vehicle) Hackney Carriage Vehicles, the full livery requirements will need to be in place at the next vehicle licence renewal. Where there is advertising externally on the vehicle which will not comply with the new Livery specification, the Proprietor/s must make contact with the Licensing Team in the first instance.
- For all other Hackney Carriage Vehicles, upon change of vehicle (which may not necessarily be at the next licence renewal), the Proprietor/s will be required to fully comply with the Livery specification.

- For all existing silver (as described on the V5 registration document for each vehicle) Private Hire Vehicles, upon change of vehicle (which may not necessarily be at the next licence renewal), the Proprietor/s will be required to obtain a vehicle which is NOT silver.
- That the changes in the policy will take effect from 9th October 2018.

3.3 For ease of reference a summary is below:

Hackney Carriage Vehicle (HCV) Colour	SILVER
HCV Livery Design & Placement	2 BLACK STRIPES ONE EITHER SIDE OF THE VEHICLE
HCV Crests	YES
HCV Advertising	INSIDE & ON THE REAR OF THE VEHICLE ONLY
Private Hire Vehicles (PHV)	CANNOT BE SILVER
Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CURRENT SILVER HCV = AT NEXT LICENCE RENEWAL ▪ OTHER HCV = UPON CHANGE OF VEHICLE ▪ CURRENT SILVER PHV = UPON CHANGE OF VEHICLE
To Take Effect from	9 TH OCTOBER 2018

Next Steps

4.1 Licensing Committee is on 9th July 2018.