

Item

LIMITING THE NUMBER OF HACKNEY CARRIAGE LICENCES



To:

Licensing Committee

Report by:

Yvonne O'Donnell, Environmental Health Manager

Tel: 01223 - 457951 Email: yvonne.odonnell@cambridge.gov.uk

Wards affected:

All

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Council may, as part of its adopted policy on the licensing of Hackney Carriages (HCV), consider whether to apply a limit on the maximum number of HCV licences which it will issue at any time. However, this power may be exercised only if the Council is satisfied that there is no significant demand for the services of HCVs which is unmet (section 16 Transport Act 1985). The Council has no power to limit the number of Private Hire Vehicle (PHV) licences.
- 1.2 At a meeting on 24th October 2011 the Licensing Committee resolved that a demand survey should be carried out to establish whether or not the current HCV fleet met the demand for HCV services within the district, and additionally to cover accessibility issues and the provision of ranks within the district.
- 1.3 The demand survey was carried out in 2012 but members were concerned that it had not provided a sound evidence base for concluding that there was no unmet demand, due to a lack of engagement by the taxi trade.

- 1.4 At a meeting on 21st July 2014, the Licensing Committee instructed officers to seek a further survey to establish if there is evidence that there is no significant demand that is unmet and to investigate the costs of carrying out such a survey.
- 1.5 On 26th January 2015 Officers brought a report to Licensing Committee asking members to determine whether to adopt a policy of limiting the number of hackney carriage vehicles which it license in the city, and, if so to decide at what level the limit should be set.
- 1.6 Members agreed that a limit should be set at 317 with immediate effect. However, following Committee Officers identified that due to a systems error there were currently 321 Hackney Carriage vehicles licensed with the City. The Director took an urgent decision that the limit should be set at 321 and this was endorsed at Licensing Committee on 23rd March 2015.
- 1.7 At Licensing Committee on 26th January 2015 it was agreed that this policy should be reviewed after 3 years.
- 1.8 On the 20th March 2017 a report was brought to Licensing Committee recommending that Officers procure a company to carry out a further demand survey to establish if there is significant demand for the services of HCVs which is unmet.
- 1.9 Following the tendering process, LSVA was appointed to undertake the survey, which took place between June and November 2017.
- 1.10 The subsequent LVSA report (attached in Appendix A) concludes that there is no significant demand that is unmet. The findings of the report also indicate that further work is required to take forward a balanced view regarding two potentially conflicting and often externally applied pressures on the current licensed vehicle provision in Cambridge City at this time. These cover accessibility and air quality requirements and concerns.
- 1.11 The purpose of this report is to present the findings of the survey as attached in Appendix A and to ask the members of the Licensing Committee to decide whether they are satisfied that there is no significant demand for the services of HCVs within Cambridge which is unmet, and if so, whether to retain a limit on the number of HCV licences that the Council issues. If members decide to retain a limit they must then decide what that limit will be.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 Members are asked, firstly, to determine whether they are satisfied that there is no significant demand for hackney carriages in Cambridge which is unmet.
- 2.2 If Members are not satisfied under 2.1 (and as such they determine that there is significant demand which is unmet), there is no power to impose a limit on the number of HCV licences, and therefore the current limit must be removed.
- 2.3 If Members are satisfied, under 2.1 (and as such they determine that there is no significant demand which is unmet), they may **EITHER** :
 - 2.3.1 Decide to retain a limit on the number of HCV licences which may be issued. If Members decide to retain a limit, they will need to resolve, on the basis of the evidence before them, the number of hackney carriage licences to be allowed. Members must determine if the limit is to:
 - 2.3.1.1 Keep the limit at the existing level of 321.
 - 2.3.1.2 Increase the existing limit. Members must determine what that limit will be and how new licenses will be issued (e.g. first come-first served).
 - 2.3.1.3 Reduce the existing limit. Members must determine what the new limit will be and how this will be achieved.

OR

- 2.3.2 Decide to remove the limit.

3. Background

- 3.1 Cambridge City Council licences both hackney carriages (HCV) and private hire vehicles (PHV) to operate within the city.
- 3.2 HCVs operate from ranks and can be hailed in the street and they can also accept pre-booked fares, either direct or from a licensed operator.
- 3.3 PHVs may only accept pre-booked fares from an operator. However, there is no power for the Council to limit their numbers, nor to regulate those licensed by other Councils and operating in the city.
- 3.4 The Transport Act 1985 allows the Council to limit the number of HCVs it licences, but only if it is satisfied that there is no significant demand for HCVs which is unmet.

3.5 There is currently a limit on the numbers of HCV licences granted by Cambridge City Council of 321.

Review of “demand surveys” conducted since 1990

3.6 The Council operated a policy on limitation up until 2001. Surveys conducted in 1990 and 1993 concluded that the Council should maintain a limit of 120 HCVs.

3.7 Further surveys were carried out in 1995 and 1997 which showed a growth in demand and, in 1995, 5 extra vehicles licences were approved. In 1997 a further 22 vehicle licences were approved bringing the total to 147. Also in 1997 Members asked for a report to remove the limitation on the number of licences issued.

3.8 In 1999 a further survey was carried out which concluded that a further 14 licences should be issued to meet the unmet demand.

3.9 In March 2000 Environment Committee considered a report which recommended approval of an additional 14 licences. Members also voted on a proposal to remove the limit on the number of hackney carriage licences to be issued by the Council in 12 months' time (July 2001). 6 members voted in favour, 6 members voted against. Under the convention at that time, Chairs of committees with an even number of members could not exercise a casting vote and the matter was referred to City Board.

3.10 On the 10th July 2000 City Board referred the matter to full Council for consideration on 20th July 2000. At full Council the decision was made to de-limit the number of HCV licences issued with effect from 1st July 2001, with the continued condition that any new HCV licences issued had to be for wheelchair accessible vehicles, but not necessarily a purpose-built HCV.

3.11 In 2011 the taxi trade requested that a further survey should be carried out and in October 2011 Licensing Committee resolved that the purpose of the demand survey was to establish whether or not the current HCV fleet met the demand for services within the district, and additionally to cover accessibility issues and the position of ranks within the city.

3.12 A demand survey was conducted by CTS Traffic and Transportation Ltd in 2012. Licensing Committee on the 28th January 2013 considered the report and agreed that a full consultation and community engagement programme should be carried out to gather further evidence. Members

were concerned that the report did not provide a sound evidence base due to a lack of engagement by the trade.

- 3.13 On 21st July 2014 Licensing Committee decided to seek a further survey and a specification was drawn up by officers and tenders sought. The tender selected was by CTS, the author of the previous survey. The purpose of the survey was to update the previous survey and, specifically, to undertake a more in-depth consultation with the taxi trade.
- 3.14 The updated survey work was carried out in November 2014 and on the 26th January 2015 at Licensing Committee members took the decision to adopt a policy of limiting the number of HCVs which it will licence in the City to 317 with immediate effect and subsequently 321 under urgent decision powers due to an administrative error.
- 3.15 At Licensing Committee on 26th January 2015 it was agreed that this policy would be reviewed after 3 years.
- 3.16 On the 20th March 2017 Officers brought a report to Licensing Committee recommending that Officers procure a company to carry out a further demand survey to establish if there is significant demand for the services of HCVs which is unmet.
- 3.17 Following Committee decision to seek a further demand survey, a specification was drawn up by Officers and tenders sought. The tenderer selected was LSVA (Licensed Vehicle Surveys and Assessment) which is an amalgamation of the previous survey author, CTS, and Transportation and Vector Consultancy. The specification also required for the survey to investigate the Councils policies in relation to accessibility and air quality.
- 3.18 The survey work took place between June 2017 and November 2017 and the report of the survey is attached as Appendix A.
- 3.19 A review on whether to limit numbers of hackney carriage licences should take place every three years and be subject to local consultation. The funding for it has been incorporated into the hackney carriage vehicles renewal licensing fees from 2018/19

National Policy Position

- 3.20 In March 2010 the Department for Transport issued Best Practice Guidance to assist local authorities in England and Wales that have responsibility for the HCV and PHV trades. The relevant section of the Guidance is provided in Appendix B to this report.

- 3.21 The Guidance is intended to assist licensing authorities but it is only guidance and decisions on any matters remain a matter for the authority concerned. It is for individual licensing authorities to reach their own decisions both on overall policies and on individual licensing matters in the light of their own views of the relevant considerations.
- 3.22 Paragraph 47 of the Guidance says “Most licensing authorities do not impose quantity restrictions; the Department regards that as best practice. Where restrictions are imposed the Department would urge that the matter should be regularly reconsidered”. The Guidance suggests that the matter should be approached in terms of the interests of the travelling public – that is to say, the people who use the taxi services. The Guidance suggests that authorities consider what benefits or disadvantages arise for the travelling public as a result of imposing controls and what benefits or disadvantages arise as a result of applying no limitation on numbers.
- 3.23 Paragraph 48 of the Guidance says that in most cases where quantity restrictions are imposed, vehicle licence plates command a premium, often of tens of thousands of pounds. The Guidance comments that this indicates that there are people who want to enter the taxi market and provide a service to the public but who are being prevented from doing so by the quantity restrictions. The view expressed in the Guidance is that this seems very hard to justify.
- 3.24 At paragraph 49 the Guidance says: “If a local authority does nonetheless take the view that a quantity restriction can be justified in principle, there remains the question of the level at which it should be set, bearing in mind the need to demonstrate that there is no significant unmet demand. This issue is usually addressed by means of a survey; it will be necessary for the local licensing authority to carry out a survey sufficiently frequently to be able to respond to any challenge to the satisfaction of a court. An interval of three years is commonly regarded as the maximum reasonable period between surveys”.
- 3.25 A recommended list of questions for local authorities to address when considering quantity controls is set out at Annex A to the Department for Transport (DfT) Guidance.
- 3.26 In addition, The Law Commission has been considering and consulting on a wide range of potential reforms of the taxi trade as a whole, on behalf of the Government.

3.27 The Law Commission’s final document was issued on 23rd May 2014, in which it made 84 recommendations in relation to the changes in taxi licensing law. Some of the recommendations relevant to this report include Licensing Authorities continuing to have the power to limit the number of taxi vehicles licenced in their area, subject to a statutory public interest test on how this test should apply, and the potential for mandatory disability training for all drivers. The report further recommended that any limit on the number of taxi vehicles, and an accessibility review, should be undertaken at 3 yearly intervals.

3.28 The Government is yet to formally respond to the Law Commission’s recommendations.

Summary of the Findings of the 2017 Demand Survey

3.29 Please refer to the full survey at Appendix A for more detail.

3.30 In terms of the licensed vehicle fleet, most hackney carriage growth was up to 2011, after which there was a drop. There was some growth in the run up to the application of a limit on vehicle numbers, after which numbers have remained stable. The unlimited hackney carriage policy led to a strong decline in private hire vehicle numbers, with this decline continuing.

3.31 The table below outlines the total number of vehicle licence by year:

Year	HCV	PHV	Total
1994	120		
1997	125	281	406
1999	147	352	499
2001	175	325	500
2004	235	236	471
2005	257	209	466
2007	282	135	417
2009	298	199	497
2010	302	197	499
2011	303	211	514
2012	293	217	510
2013	266	179	445
2014	309	179	488
2015	324	178	502
2016	327	153	480
2017	326	147	473

- 3.32 Most drivers are now able to drive both hackney carriage and private hire vehicles. With just under 700 drivers licensed with Cambridge City and 473 vehicles, this suggests a good proportion of potential for vehicle sharing by drivers.
- 3.33 At present any new HCVs have to be wheelchair accessible, with the proportion of vehicles in the fleet that are wheelchair accessible now at 65%. Much of the current levels of wheelchair accessibility results from the need for all new hackney carriages to be wheelchair accessible, although plates 1-121 retain grandfather rights not to adhere to this requirement.

Rank Surveys

- 3.34 Since the last survey, the station rank has been redeveloped with access and egress less easy than it was. Additionally, two new Council ranks have been introduced operating at night only, but only starting in March 2017 they are still developing use.
- 3.35 There were 2 elements to the rank observation programme. The two busiest ranks at St Andrew's Street and the private rail station location were initially observed during June over a period running from Thursday 16th June 2017 through to Sunday 19th June 2017 in both locations. Wider all rank observations were undertaken on Thursday 12 October 2017 through to Sunday 15th October 2017.
- 3.36 The full October rank review covered some 260 hours across all ranks, with a supplementary mid-June set of observations at the two busiest ranks supplementing our understanding of rank demand variation.
- 3.37 Estimates of average weekly passenger demand in 2017 shows the dominance of the station rank, which provides 49% of all passengers; St Andrew's street provides 28%, with Market Square providing 12%. Comparison to 2012 flows suggests the station is now even more dominant. St Andrew's Street has also reduced in usage since 2012, whilst Market Street appears to have increased.
- 3.38 The June two-rank test found increased passenger numbers, which appears to relate to a University event that weekend. Overall consideration of the information collected suggests 2017 flows are probably fairly similar through the year to those observed in 2012, despite significant growth in the area.
- 3.39 In terms of rank usage, St Andrew's Street tends to grow in usage through the day with an overnight peak whilst the station tends to drop

in usage as train service levels reduce. Market Square rank is a key provider of night demand with the new Downing Street rank also making a clear contribution to night demand. Both Friday and Saturday nights see a rise to overnight peaks. However, it is the view of the consultant that demands in Cambridge at this time cannot be considered to be 'peaky' as there are no significant spikes observed in the information.

- 3.40 A key matter was how well the revised layout at the station served very high volumes of passengers. The same was true of the St Andrew's Street rank, with the feeder rank clearly being critical to providing sufficient vehicles there for much of the day.
- 3.41 An industry standard index of significant unmet demand (ISUD) has been developed and used since the initial Government guidance that limits could be applied. Early in the process of developing the index, it was identified that a cut-off point of 80 was the level beneath which unmet demand is not regarded as significant, and that above 80 it would be concluded there is significant unmet demand.
- 3.42 The ISUD calculations draw from various elements of the rank surveys and public consultation exercise. It provides a useful benchmark measure of the level of unmet demand that is present. Appendix C outlines the factors that are taken into account and how it is calculated.
- 3.43 The ISUD calculations in Cambridge do not take into account the activity at the private railway station rank. This is because the issue of permits to operate at the station rank is controlled by the railway company on their private land, and outside the control of the City Council. The Council has no way to ensure that, if more licences are issued the HCVs will be available at this location and hence the exclusion from the calculations in this study. However, it is important that there is an understanding about what is happening at this location as the public rarely differentiate between ranks.
- 3.44 Using all available data from both sets of data collection is a harsh but robust test of unmet demand and its significance. The result of this calculation identified the ISUD factor to be 78.3, just short of the cut-off level of 80 which suggests that the observed unmet demand is just below the level to be regarded as significant.
- 3.45 The overall conclusion from this is the there is currently no unmet demand for hackney carriage in Cambridge City licensing are which could be seen as significant.

3.46 Using the more balanced test based on the October information alone reduces the level of the index significantly to just 1.18, or 2.4 if the station (private) data is excluded (from 78.3). These further calculations add weight to the survey conclusion that the area currently does not have unmet demand which is significant.

Public Consultations

3.47 276 people were interviewed in the streets of the City, with 18% near the railway station. The City sample saw 87% saying that they had used a licensed vehicle in the last 3 months. The station figures suggested 83% of licensed vehicle trips at the station were made by hackney carriage, whilst for the City sample, the proportion by hackney carriage is 46%.

3.48 In terms of operators being contacted, 51% named one company, with that level being 86% at the station. There were two other companies named with 21% and 19% each. This suggests a moderately competitive environment although dominated by one large and two medium operators.

3.49 The level of people telling us they could get a licensed vehicle of a kind that suited them was very high, with 100% of all those interviewed at the station, and 94% within the City sample, saying they always could. 69% would always take the first vehicle available at the rank, 7% would choose an electric powered saloon, 4% an electric powered WAV and 19% a saloon style vehicle.

3.50 There was good knowledge of the ranks and people said they used most of the ranks, although the two main ranks dominated; namely St Andrew's Street and Railway Station rank. The key location for a preferred new rank was at Addenbrooke's hospital.

3.51 The level of people with issues with the hackney carriage service was not significant, at 11%, suggesting a high level of satisfaction. The top issue was delay in getting a taxi. When asked about what would encourage them to use a hackney carriage more frequently, 26% identified the availability of an 'app' they could use to get an hackney carriage. The next two matters were more hackney carriages that could be phoned for and more at lower prices.

3.52 The level of people saying either that they needed a WAV, or knew someone who did was low at 5%.

Stakeholder consultations

- 3.53 The list of stakeholders who were contacted is listed as Appendix 9 to the survey report.
- 3.54 Supermarkets and hotels mainly used private hire services, though two hotels were aware of the station rank.
- 3.55 More pubs were aware of the St Andrew's Street. Most night clubs who responded were aware of ranks, and felt most of their customers did use vehicles from ranks. One was concerned about drivers attitudes to their customers and another felt that phoned for vehicles tended to end up delayed in arriving. Police and taxi marshal views were that there were more than enough vehicles available.

Taxi Trade Consultations

- 3.56 22% of the trade responded to the survey which is very high for this type of survey. A meeting was also held with the trade representatives.
- 3.57 Most respondents drove private hire and hackney carriage vehicles as appropriate at the time, with 87% of drivers holding a dual licence. 21% of the respondents also had South Cambridgeshire drivers' license.
- 3.58 Most drivers worked six days a week, with an average of 47 hours worked per week.
- 3.59 The top reason affecting working hours was 32% wanted to avoid heavy traffic and rush hour, 26% stated they worked at the busiest times, 22% were affected by family commitments, and 6 % they were affected by sharing the vehicle.
- 3.60 79% of respondents owned their own vehicle, with 68% working on the radio circuit; the majority working for the largest company. Drivers had a good knowledge of and provided service to most ranks. 62% stated that they get the majority of their fares from the rank, whilst 6% from hailing and 4% from an 'app'. The responses suggest a high focus in the City is on hackney carriage usage of vehicles.
- 3.61 88% responded that the limit should remain as it contributed to the reduction in pollution, congestion and over ranking.

Air Quality and Accessibility Considerations

- 3.62 The City has given significant consideration to both accessibility and air quality impacts of its hackney carriage and private hire fleet in recent years. A key thrust of the previous removal of the limit on vehicle numbers was to increase the level of WAV style vehicles in the fleet,

which has clearly been achieved. A very recent change allows rear-loading vehicles to widen the options available both to the travelling public and to the drivers in terms of operational flexibility, access standards and cost.

- 3.63 On 8th January 2018 the Licensing Authority received an email from Cambridge Hackney & Private Hire Association requesting that a number of Wheelchair Accessible Vehicles could be exchanged for saloon type vehicles that would be environmentally friendly (see Appendix D). A comment has been made in the report on page 50 in response to this request.
- 3.64 In terms of air quality, the City has benefitted from one of the eight Government funded studies, being published in March 2016. This found that 27.4 % of traffic on King Street was taxis. Key outputs were positive support for the present age limit and for the proposed ANPR control to the city centre area.
- 3.65 Part of the current Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Policy is to encourage the shift to low emission taxis. The policy will incentivise the trade to take up hybrid and electric vehicle options, and it also provides future dates by which all new, and then hackney carriage and private hire licensed vehicles will be low emission style.
- 3.66 The license vehicle industry is currently introducing a number of pure electric, range extended electric and hybrid vehicles that will enable the trade to take advantage of the options available. However, the major concern relates to trust in the new technology as well as the overall initial cost of such vehicles, without corresponding evidence of the quoted lower maintenance and operating costs.
- 3.67 The station rank requires a supplementary permit which means not all vehicles are able to service the busiest rank. The nature of demand from the two main ranks is different, with longer journeys more likely from the station and also with lower occupancy levels.
- 3.68 The evidence is that the number of vehicles focusing on one rank is relatively small, however of those doing so a higher proportion target the St Andrew's Street location rather than the station.
- 3.69 The nature of journey styles and occupancy differences between the ranks could allow for quick wins by using hybrid vehicles, already proven and trusted at the station, whilst focusing the use of pure electric

and range extended electric HCVs on the City Centre ranks which are likely to need higher emission standards.

3.70 Overall, recent developments are moving towards providing options for the City to have both an accessible and an air quality efficient fleet, although higher take up of the more efficient vehicles may not be practical in the early part of the policy implementation whilst proprietors are persuaded of the viability of the options. Rapid chargers are being installed around the city over the next two years, although early adopters will have to bear the risk, yet may gain more benefit, than those who follow. The need to review and monitor options is critical to ensuring sufficient vehicles remain available.

4. Decisions to be made by Members

4.1 Following review of this report and the detailed survey undertaken, members have a number of decisions to make. These are each considered below, and must be determined on the evidence as presented.

4.2 Firstly, members need to determine whether or not they are satisfied that there is significant unmet demand;

4.3 If members are satisfied that there is significant unmet demand then the current limit on numbers of HCV must be lifted as per the legislation requirements. This means that no limit can be imposed and it is removed entirely.

4.4 If members are instead satisfied that there is no significant unmet demand, then there are four possible options

- To remove entirely the current limit on number of HCV licences. This would be a change in policy and an implementation date would need to be agreed.
- To retain the limit at the level currently licensed of 321. This would be a pragmatic approach, allowing the retention of existing licences.
- To set the limit at a level lower than the current number of licences. In order to reduce the number of licences, natural wastage would be required, as and when licences are surrendered, as the only practical way of achieving this, over an indeterminate period.

- To set the limit at a number greater than the current number of HCV licences. As Members will have determined, by this point, that there is no unmet demand that is significant then increasing the numbers may be inappropriate because it will have been accepted that there are currently enough HCVs available.

4.5 In making the above decisions, Members should give full reasons for their decisions, which are based on the evidence before them.

Potential Advantages and Disadvantages of Limit Options

4.6 Potential Benefits of retaining the current limit

- It may assist in limiting the perception that there is little road space for vehicles to wait in the central area
- It may halt the trend towards working longer hours and assist in improving passenger and driver safety
- Driver focus could be on developing the current customer base rather than fighting with each other for trade
- Potential improvement in air quality with the reduction of further HCVs travelling in the City
- Retaining the limit would be supported by the existing cohort of hackney carriage drivers of licensed vehicles

4.7 Potential Disadvantages of retaining the current limit

- Retaining limit may create a market for vehicle licences which would not, necessarily, be in the public interest.
- It may reduce the opportunity for drivers to become plate owners
- There may be a lack of competition between those operating the licensed vehicles which may lead to a fall in standards

4.8 Potential Benefits of imposing unlimited numbers

- It would provide more choice for employment and give opportunities for taxi drivers to become plate owners.
- Potential for a more effective service to the public.
- With a reduced bus service to and from the City during the evening, the policy could contribute towards a significant proportion of the community's needs and enhance the night-time economy

4.9 Potential Disadvantages of imposing unlimited numbers

- It may be necessary to take enforcement action on over ranking at the Drummer Street rank.
- The issue of safety arising from continued increase of working hours by drivers would be relevant as there will be increased competition for work.
- Potential increase in air pollution due to increase in vehicles

Cambridge City Decision-Making Process

- 4.10 The Local Authorities (Functions and Responsibilities) (England) Regulations 2000 define whether responsibility for Council functions rests with the Executive or with the full Council. Regulation 2 and Schedule 2 state that the power to license hackney carriages and private hire vehicles shall not be exercised by the Council's Executive. This licensing function (which includes imposing a limit on numbers) is what is often referred to as a "regulatory function".
- 4.11 The Council has delegated responsibility for most of its regulatory functions to committees. The scheme of delegation in the Council's Constitution places responsibility for this function with the Licensing Committee. The Council has not reserved any aspect of this function to itself and therefore the Committee is entitled to make decisions on the matters raised in this report. In the event of a tied vote, the Chair has a casting vote.
- 4.12 If the Committee is unwilling or unable to take a final decision, it may decide to refer the matter to Civic Affairs (for decision or reference on to full Council) or direct to Council. The matter shall also be referred to Civic Affairs Committee (for decision or reference on to full Council) on the request of the committee spokesperson for a political group, or on the request of any two other members.
- 4.13 Members should give full reasons for decisions made in respect of this report.

5. Implications

(a) Financial Implications

None

(b) Staffing Implications

None

(c) Equality and Poverty Implications

An Equalities Impact Assessment has been carried out as Appendix E

(d) Environmental Implications

If a limit is retained there is a potential for some improvement in air quality with the reduction of HCVs travelling in the City

(e) Procurement Implications

None

(f) Community Safety Implications

None

6. Consultation and communication considerations

6.1 The survey consulted with members of the public, stakeholders and the trade. It also consulted with disability groups. Appendix 9 of the survey report lists the stakeholders who were consulted with and Appendix 7 of the survey report outlines the on street interview results.

7. Background Papers

Law Commission Taxi and Private Hire Services (2014)

http://www.lawcom.gov.uk/app/uploads/2015/03/lc347_taxi-and-private-hire-services.pdf

8. Appendices

- (A) LVSA Demand Survey 2017
- (B) Department of Transport Best Practice Guidance 2010
- (C) Index of Significance unmet demand calculations
- (D) Email from Cambridge Hackney & Private Hire Association
- (E) EQiA

9. Inspection of papers

To inspect the background papers or if you have a query on the report please contact Yvonne O'Donnell, Environmental Health Manager, tel: 01223 - 457951, email: yvonne.odonnell@cambridge.gov.uk.