

Appendix B – Consultation responses

63 responses were received as part of the consultation via CitizenLab on the Cambridge City Council website. Of those 63 responses, 53 objected to the charges and 10 did not object to them.

10 of the responses were from members of the public, with 5 of them objecting to the charges and 5 did not object to them.

3 of the responses were from proprietor of licensed vehicles and all 3 objected to the charges.

50 of the responses came from drivers or a combination of driver, proprietor and member of the public. 45 of these objected to the charges, with 5 not objecting to them.

Out of the 63 responses, 41 made comments (which are detailed below). All of these comments came from people that objected to the charges.

Appendix B – Consultation responses

Response Number	Comment
1	<p>Business is already slow and prices are already very high. Addition to this charges the business is suffering from high fuel costs and increasing insurance charges. Car maintenance is also continuously increasing. This charges should be reduced raer than the proposed increase.</p>
2	<p>Whilst taxi drivers received 10.1% meter increase. Some of your charges occur an increase as high as 150%.</p>
3	<p>I object to 150% increase on the one year badge renewal. I can't always afford to pay for 3 years. Being a taxi driver isn't the most lucrative at the moment.</p>
4	<p>In particular 150% increase in 1 year driver badge renewal.</p>
5	<p>150% hike in the 1 year driver licence renewal fee is very steep and will unfairly force people to take the 3 year renewal</p>
6	<p>in a cost of living crisis then everyone needs public authorities to stop adding to the financial burden.</p>
7	<p>Spend a couple of days on a bicycle in Cambridge and you will quickly realise that the current licensing system is not working. I have a negative interaction with a taxi on almost every cycle journey I make in Cambridge, from minor issues like stopping in bike boxes or parking on mandatory cycle tracks, to more serious issues like not checking mirrors before pulling out, dangerously close overtaking and undertaking, and shouts of abuse and aggressive horn honking when I ride in primary position on narrow roads. I have even been hit twice by dangerous taxi drivers (thankfully no hospital visits needed so far). Collectively, a minority of reckless taxi drivers have created a very stressful and dangerous road environment, such that I now find it hard to travel around Cambridge without feeling the adrenaline that comes with the memories of all the awful incidents and abuse I have had to deal with on specific roads.</p> <p>Fixing this requires a serious change to the current licensing model, and I don't see how this can happen without a serious change in funding[1]. The big problem with the current model is it is very difficult for cyclists to provide evidence of abuse or dangerous driving unless they have invested in an expensive camera mounted on their handlebars. My collision reports resulted in the drivers simply lying in their statements and only informal warnings issued.</p> <p>I think we need to increase the licencing fees so that taxis can be properly monitored. For example, if we required every</p>

Appendix B – Consultation responses

	<p>taxi to run a dashcam we could use that as evidence if a cyclist reports a bad incident, as well as randomly requesting footage for monitoring purposes (and there would need to be very steep fines for failure to provide footage). Or the council could randomly take taxis undercover and appropriately punish any that drivers that drive or park illegally.</p> <p>Please, councillors, I urge you: use this opportunity to take action before someone else gets hurt.</p> <p>[1] Note: The best solution, of course, is to rebuild all our roads such that taxis and cars only share space on residential streets that have physically enforced 20mph speed limits. As this would take about 30 years to implement, I think enforcement is the best interim solution.</p>
8	1 year license, 150 % increase
9	There is no need for increase. Business is down and with cost of living crises it is difficult to make an ends meet.
10	There was no option to ask a question so I'm having to list it as an objection. The use of zero emissions cars is incentivised by making it cheaper to run a taxi if it's zero emissions. My question is, would it also be possible to incentivise having a wheelchair accessible vehicle (WAV) in the same way? I understand that there are not many models that are both WAVs and low/zero emissions. This is causing some issues in London, where black cabs have to be wheelchair accessible but the ULEZ charge is pushing for low/zero emission vehicles which is not easily compatible. The best option would be a zero emissions WAV in my view, but that not seeming to be an option, would it be possible to incentivise being either zero emissions or a WAV? It is near impossible to find a WAV taxi in Cambridge, leaving wheelchair users waiting hours to go places that others can visit immediately.
11	Rises should be in line with inflation but proposed increases are far beyond as much as 150% increases, this is not justified.
12	Price increase too high while the trade is struggling to survive
13	Price rise is too much
14	Hard to afford

Appendix B – Consultation responses

15	The prices are far too high as proposed for no reason whatsoever!.. it's absolutely preposterous!
16	Price increase unreasonable considering current state of trade and working conditions
17	No necessary
18	We are already struggling with high prices in everything. If this price list go live, it will effect us deeply.
19	Too expensive you guys making this trade a laughing stock. Its not a share market the price up is ridiculous
20	Not justified to increase charges at this rate.
21	Too early price increasing
22	We are not earning enough for that change
23	We too are facing living cost and our income is significantly down.
24	Simple it's expensive no need for the increase with the cost of living so high. The council still didn't publish any budget to justify the increase
25	Living costs
26	excessive increases considering the financial difficulties people are facing.insensitive and a lack of care or understanding to how stressed people are.

Appendix B – Consultation responses

27	"Have you done the 'BUDGET FORECAST!?' If so, why hasn't it been published or is not part of the survey? If you haven't, how do you justify the increase, and why is the increase necessary?"
28	Too much not to be able to carry on working with these increases
29	Charges too high, certainly given this current period of time
30	Expensive increase 150% is just something crazy
31	Everything is going rapidly, but our income. When is enough is enough.
32	I object to 150% 1 year driver licence renewal. That is discrimination of order drivers who need to renew licence every year. Please read equality act.
33	Every year the expenses for driver keeps going up while our earning are going down. Also an increase of 150% is absurd.
34	High inflation
35	Excessive increase does not justify with local income
36	Costs keep rising but income is decreasing
37	Cost of living crisis
38	Already expensive

Appendix B – Consultation responses

39	Please don't increase the fee as we are struggling already due to cctv and etc
40	<p>Subject: Objection to Proposed Increase in Admin Prices for Taxi Drivers</p> <p>Dear Council Representative's,</p> <p>I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposed increase in administrative prices for fees and charges imposed on taxi drivers in Cambridge. While I understand the necessity for occasional adjustments, the proposed hike appears unjustified and burdensome on an already struggling industry.</p> <p>Taxi drivers play a crucial role in our community by providing an essential transportation service. The proposed increase in admin fees would unduly impact their livelihoods, making it harder for them to sustain their businesses. Such a move could lead to adverse consequences, including financial hardship, reduced service quality, and potential job losses within the taxi industry.</p> <p>Moreover, a sudden and significant rise in administrative costs without commensurate improvements in services raises concerns about transparency and accountability. It is imperative that any fee adjustments are justified with a clear explanation of how the additional funds will be utilised to benefit both drivers and passengers.</p> <p>I urge the council to reconsider this proposal and explore alternative measures that do not disproportionately burden taxi drivers. Collaborative discussions with stakeholders, including taxi associations, can help identify solutions that strike a fair balance between the council's financial needs and the sustainability of the taxi industry.</p> <p>I appreciate your attention to this matter and trust that you will consider the broader impact of the proposed admin fee increase on our community.</p>
41	<p>Well above inflation & hitting poorest the most. Not caring for the poorest financially & instead designed to punish the low/middle income families.</p>

Appendix B – Consultation responses