

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

Response Number	Date Received	Comment	Date Responded	Response
1	02/08/2017	My comments on the Consultation are as follows: 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. 7 Rear loading wheelchair accessibility SUPPORT There are types of wheelchair, some are much more easily loaded from a rear lift. My best regards,	08/08/2017	Acknowledgement e-mail sent
2	03/08/2017	Dear Licensing Team, I have looked at the proposals for changing the taxi licensing policy. 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. 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 is	23/08/2017 Ack sent 10/08/2017	Good afternoon, I write further to my e-mail to you dated Thursday 10th August 2017. I can confirm all responses received will be put before the Licensing Committee at their next meeting on Monday 16th October 2017. 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. 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

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

		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. Having looked at the website of the local company Outspoken, it appears they may be able to deliver an appropriate training course. http://www.outspokentraining.co.uk/safe-urban-driving-courses 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. 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. Regards,		driving. Once again thank you for your feedback.
3	03/08/2017	To Whom It May Concern, I have been reading through the proposals regarding the 'Taxi Policy' and have some questions. 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 the Sight Impaired, so perhaps, another contrasting colour should be considered, as there are different levels of sight impairment?	03/08/2017	Hi 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: a. Getting up and down from kerbs – with side loading the ramp can be placed on the pavement

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

		4. Allowing rear loading wheelchair accessible vehicles: Why won't the Council licence rear loading wheelchair accessible vehicles? I look forward to hearing from you. Kind Regards,		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 c. Space on taxi ranks is limited								
4	03/08/2017	, I have answered your questions in the table provided, I also have no comment to make on the table of fares. Regards <table><tr><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td> Removal of the need for licensed vehicles to carry a first aid kit. I support this as drivers are not medically trained to give first aid </td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td> Removal of the need for licensed vehicles to carry a fire extinguisher. I support this as drivers and public are advised to not tackle fires </td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td> 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 </td></tr></table>			1	Removal of the need for licensed vehicles to carry a first aid kit. I support this as drivers are not medically trained to give first aid	2	Removal of the need for licensed vehicles to carry a fire extinguisher. I support this as drivers and public are advised to not tackle fires	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	03/08/2017	Acknowledgement e-mail sent
1	Removal of the need for licensed vehicles to carry a first aid kit. I support this as drivers are not medically trained to give first aid											
2	Removal of the need for licensed vehicles to carry a fire extinguisher. I support this as drivers and public are advised to not tackle fires											
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											

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

			limits for renewals should remain. 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. I also agree keeping the 9 year policy			
		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 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.			
		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. I disagree with this for two reasons. 1. The additional expense for the drivers 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			

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

			Cambridge would this not present a safety issue or could the driver be forced to de-wrap it.			
		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. Again I would have to oppose this idea on the follow grounds 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. 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 paper being criticised.			
		7	Allowing rear loading wheelchair accessible vehicles: Currently the policy provides that all new licensed Hackney			

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

		Carriages must be side loading; the Council will not licence rear loading wheelchair accessible vehicles. 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. So on this I have one question. 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.			
5	06/08/2017	I am objecting to any decision to remove the following Removal of the need for licensed vehicles to carry a first aid kit. Removal of the need for licensed vehicles to carry a fire extinguisher.		07/08/2017	Acknowledgement e-mail sent
6	07/08/2017	Rear loading vehicles Rear loading vehicles should be allowed to be registered as a Hackney carriages. 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 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		08/08/2017	Acknowledgement e-mail sent

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

		are not suitable for side loading wheelchairs simply because 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 compare to side loading and are more eco friendly simply because they have smaller engines and are lighter so they produce less CO2. Adding a livery requirement. Livery requirement would be good but not proposed colour of Cambridge blue. None of the taxi making company's are supplying new taxis in that colour and simply this is not available to order. 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. So i will not agree to put Livery requirement Card payments Card payments machines in every taxi should be available. CCTV in vehicles Adding a CCTV to be installed in taxis is good idea. But access only for CCC and Police is wrong idea. Many taxi drivers is 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 allow to turn it off while not working. Again who is going to cover the cost of installing it in the Taxi? If its the owner i will not agree with this proposal. Its good to propose some changes to trade because we need it. But if some of this changes will put more cost to run our small businesses then this is wrong and should be looked how to minimise it. . Regards		
7	08/08/2017	Dear Licensing Team, 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	23/08/2017 Ack sent 10/08/2017	Good afternoon, I write further to my e-mail to you dated Thursday 10th August 2017. I can confirm all responses received will be put

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

		people from using healthy and sustainable modes for getting around. 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. I am disappointed that the proposal is lacking the following requirements: 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 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 And most importantly: 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. Please confirm receipt of these comments and let me know how you will proceed		before the Licensing Committee at their next meeting on Monday 16th October 2017. 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. 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. Once again thank you for your feedback.
8	09/08/2017	I am , of . I don't have my badge to hand and I can't remember what the number is.	10/08/2017	Acknowledgment e-mail sent

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

		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! 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. Thank you for listening.		
9	10/08/2017	Dear , Please find attached a response from Cambridgeshire Alliance for Independent Living regarding the current taxi licencing and fare consultations. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. Regards 1 Removal of the need for licensed vehicles to carry a first aid kit. 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. 2 Removal of the need for licensed vehicles to carry a fire extinguisher. CAIL response:	10/08/2017	Acknowledgment e-mail sent

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

		We believe that all licensed vehicles should be required to carry a fire extinguisher. 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 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 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. 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. CAIL Response: We believe this is highly important for the safety of passengers and drivers especially for unescorted Adults at Risk of Abuse. 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. CAIL Response:		
--	--	---	--	--

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

		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.		
10	10/08/2017	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. 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 . 2/ The same reason applies as to previous reply. 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. 4/ I see no reason why the council should impose this condition of carrying a 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. 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.	23/08/2017 Ack 10/08/2017	Good afternoon, I write further to my e-mail to you dated Thursday 10th August 2017. I can confirm all responses received will be put before the Licensing Committee at their next meeting on Monday 16th October 2017. 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. Once again thank you for your feedback.

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

		It will also make the city look shoddy. 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. 7/ I do agree with as it should have always been the normal way to unload wheel chairs. I myself would like to add a proposal to the hackney licence and would like the committee to seriously consider this and there options. 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. I would like confirmation that you will consider my proposals and receipt of this email.		
--	--	---	--	--

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

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

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

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

12	11/08/2017	just my opinion 1. keep first aid good thing 2. yes to carry extinguisher 3 would agree to older than 4 years also longer than 9 if can pass council test 4 no 5 yes 6 yes but get help from council fitting and buying 7 just side loading	11/08/2017	Acknowledgement e-mail sent.
13	11/08/2017	Hello I have some concerns about proposed changes. Please see below. Proposal 4- adding a condition to Hackney Carriage Vehicles to carry a card payment machine to accept credit/debit cards payments. 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. 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. Proposal 5- adding a livery requirement for all Hackney Carriage Vehicles. 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. 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	14/08/2017	Good morning, Thank you for your comments, which I will add to the consultation paperwork. 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. 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. 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.

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

		cost. 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. 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. regards		
14	12/08/2017	Dear sir / madam I have some concerns about proposed changes. Please see below. Proposal 4- adding a condition to Hackney Carriage Vehicles to carry a card payment machine to accept credit/debit cards payments. 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. 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. Proposal 7-	14/08/2017	Good morning, Thank you for your comments, which I will add to the consultation paperwork. 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. 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. 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.

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

		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 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. 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. regards		
15	13/08/2017	Dear sir, further to receiving consultation letter I would comment as follows, 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. 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. 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 refusing card payments drive custom away. Point 5. As at present Cambridge Hackney carriages display city door crests	23/08/2017 Ack 13/08/2017	Good afternoon, I write further to my e-mail to you dated 14th August 2017. The Commercial & Licensing Team Manager would like to address your comments concerning Uber and TfL vehicles. 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 the same signage as Cambridge City vehicles. Once again, thank you for your feedback,

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

		a differential already exists between them and hire cars, who also should display there 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). 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 loosing there business. Im sure they all would be delighted to bare the cost of repainting or wrapping vehicles which are very expensive to purchase already due to your vehicle age limits. 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. 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. Point 7. As an operator of saloon vehicles I do not feel experienced enough to comment on this proposal. I trust the above points will be taken to and put before the Licensing committee at there next meeting. Yours Faithfully		which will be reviewed by the Licensing Committee at their next meeting on Monday 16th October 2017.
16	14/08/2017	To the Commercial & Licensing Team, I submit my reponses to your consultation of proposed changes to the Licensing Policy. <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 to hand it to an injured person. <u>2. Fire extinguisher:</u> agree. The advice from the Fire Service in the event of a vehicle fire is to	14/08/2017	Acknowledgement e-mail sent

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

		immediately remove all occupants to a safe distance - not to risk tackling the fire. <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. <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. <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. <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. <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 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. Regards,		
--	--	---	--	--

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

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

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

20	17/08/2017	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 Please don't make it complicated in cambridge! Keep it simple so no livery neither cctv! Thanks	17/08/2017	Acknowledgement e-mail sent
21	18/08/2017	From Ref: Consultation Proposals 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. And in both cases above no training has been given so could not be used anyway, Health and safety liabilities etc. 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. Note 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 !	22/08/2017	From: Sent: 22 August 2017 10:02 To: ' Subject: RE: Taxi Policy Good morning, Thank you for your comments, which I will add to the consultation paperwork. 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. The Licensing Committee will review all feedback received when they next meet on Monday 16th October 2017.
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	22/08/2017	Acknowledgement e-mail sent

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

		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		
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 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 in January 2018</u>.

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

25	22/08/2017	Reply from: You asked for our views/opinion regarding : (1) Removal of the need carry a first aid kit. 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 drivers finding them selves in a situation where its use has ben required. 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. My concern being that any well meant assistance I might offer could complicate an injury, perhaps worsening the situation. My opinion is that to carry a first aid kit should be a personal choice. Why do we have to carry one , I look forward to your reply. (2) Removal of the need to carry fire extinguisher Two of my family have been employed in the Fire Service. Under no circumstances would I attempt to tackle a vehicle fire using an inadequate hand held device. I would inform the emergency services and keep at a safe distance until they arrive . Under no circumstances should a car bonnet be lifted in an attempt to halt a fire spreading. Attempting to tackle a vehicle fire would place a driver at serious risk of personal injury. Does the council expect a driver to risk his personal safety ? Why do we have to carry one , I look forward to your reply. (3) Change Of Vehicle Age Limits 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.	23/08/2017	Acknowledgment e-mail sent
----	------------	---	------------	----------------------------

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

		(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. (5) Vehicle Livery 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. (6) Internal CCTV 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. I DO NOT want this inside my vehicle I will be unable to drive and work safely with one fitted. (7) No comment. Please send confirmation of this email, also please give dates when this will be discussed should it be an open meeting I will attend. Thank you		
--	--	--	--	--

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

26	22/08/2017	Under item 4, add to the requirement to carry a card machine 'capable of taking contactless payments including Apple Pay'	23/08/2017	Acknowledgment e-mail sent
27	23/08/2017	Dear madam,sir, I thank you for the letter i have received on 4/8/2017,(consutation on the Hackney Carriage policy). "Regarding Summary of Proposals" 1- Removal first aid kid.?? my response to that: I disagree to remove my first aid kid, 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. 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. 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 . 4- Cash machine in Taxi.?? I disagree to carry cash machine in my taxi,it's OK for the private hire like Panther, A1, Cambcamb 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..??) I don't take cash machine in my Taxi. These groups or members they have private hire(like panther,cambcamb,A1.. and hackney then they should have their card machine with them,not me i am independent only Hackney Cambridge council.	23/08/2017	Acknowledgement e-mail sent

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

		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 wait time. The name they mention they remind me Cambridge blue cheese it's a joke. 6- CCTV.?? It's up to the driver if he wants CCTV. I never had one and everything it's fine with me and I'm OK without. It can help in case you have an accident. but keep lock it's BIZARRE?? 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 happens to him.I know who came with this idea I think he is chairman or leader I said to him this is a stupid idea to put disabled at the back of the car,it's like you put hot food take away at the back..I'm independent I disagree disabled-wheelchair at rear.and it causes loads of other problems they have to think more than that I keep my disabled people with or without wheelchair inside the taxi not rear. stupid idea at rear. 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. kind Regards		
--	--	--	--	--

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

28	25/08/2017	Dear Licensing Team Re: Proposed changes to the taxi licensing policy. 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. 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. Best wishes	25/08/2017	Good evening, Thank you for your response, which I will add to the consultation paperwork. 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. 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. The Licensing Committee will review all feedback received at their next meeting on Monday 16th October 2017.
29	25/08/2017	I am totally disagree with that cctv proposal Thank you	29/08/2017	Acknowledgement e-mail sent
30	25/08/2017	Hello. 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 . Thanks Regard.	29/08/2017	Acknowledgement e-mail sent

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

31	25/08/2017	Good afternoon I generally agree with proposals 1,2,3,4 and 7 but I strongly object to proposals 5 and 6. 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+. Having a cctv should be left as a choice to the driver and not a requirement on our licence. 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. 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. 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. 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. Both councils need to be stricter in prosecuting these guys. 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! 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.	29/08/2017	Acknowledgement e-mail sent
----	------------	---	------------	-----------------------------

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

		£700+ for cctv, £1500+ to repaint car and £1500 loss on add wraps. 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. I wouldn't call proposals that could cost £1000s extra every time we replace a vehicle rewarding. 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.		
32	26/08/2017	My response to Table of fares and Licensing Policy. Table of fares- Increase very minimal when compared to the recent increases in licensing and badge fees. 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. 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. 4. Card machines not a problem with but I don't think it should be a legal 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. 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	29/08/2017	Acknowledgement e-mail sent

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

		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. 6. I think that locked CCTV is a bit draconian and another extra cost for cost for the trade. 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.		
33	30/08/2017	Anon: annotated copy of consultation document sent in by post 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 to hand. 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'. 5. This nonsense was rejected years back in Roger Coey's time. 6. Again, who pays? 7. Problematic for rank space; also danger from rear-end collision by another vehicle	30/08/2017	No response possible
34	30/08/2017	Cambridge (Taxi) Drivers Association Covering letter and petitions opposing adoption of CCTV and livery proposals. Please see Appendices C and D for copies of the petition.	05/09/2017	Acknowledgement e-mail sent

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

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

35	01/09/2017	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,	05/09/2017	Good afternoon, 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. 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. 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.
36	03/09/2017	Dear Sirs, I would like to express my preferences regarding the above review : 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 solution. Hackney Carriages are readily identifiable because of their	05/09/2017	Acknowledgment e-mail sent

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

		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. I am ambivalent regarding the other issues. Kind regards		
37	03/09/2017	Dear Sir/Madam, Please find below a submission for your consultation on the proposed changes to Hackney Carriage & Private Hire. 1 Removal of the need for licensed vehicles to carry a first aid kit. 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. 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. 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. 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 on the public.	05/09/2017	Good morning, Thank you for your comments, which I will add to the consultation paperwork. 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: 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. The Licensing Committee will be reviewing all feedback received at their next meeting on Monday 16th October 2017.

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

		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. 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. Many thanks, Responding on own behalf		
--	--	---	--	--