

Changes to the Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy

To:

General Purposes and Licensing Committee 7th September 2026

Report by:

Yvonne O'Donnell, Strategic Environmental Health and Public Safety Lead

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

Wards affected:

All

Director Approval: Director Sam Scharf confirms that the report author has sought the advice of all appropriate colleagues and given due regard to that advice; that the equalities impacts and other implications of the recommended decisions have been assessed and accurately presented in the report; and that they are content for the report to be put to the Executive Councillor for decision.

1.	Recommendations
1.1	It is recommended that the Committee approve the following: 1. Policy changes: 1.1. Increasing the maximum duration of newly granted driver licence from 12 months to 36 months. 1.2. Requiring drivers to complete safeguarding training as part of each licence renewal application. 1.3. Requiring safeguarding training certificates to be dated within three months of application for new driver applications and within three months of licence start date for renewals. 1.4. Requiring non-driver vehicle proprietors and operators to complete safeguarding training every three years as part of their non-driver proprietor registration.

	1.5. Retaining the existing exemption for Hackney Carriage licence plates 1 to 121 and allowing those plates to be assigned to non-wheelchair accessible vehicles, including where a plate has been surrendered or revoked. (these vehicles will be required to meet the councils current zero and ultra-low emissions requirements) 1.6. Requiring proprietors seeking to licence an imported ULEV to provide official evidence of the vehicle's CO₂ emissions. 1.7. Refusing to licence an imported ULEV where the Council cannot verify its CO₂ emissions or where satisfactory evidence demonstrating emissions of 75g/km CO₂ or below has not been provided. 1.8. Requiring applicants and licence holders who have lived or resided outside the UK for three months or more within the five years preceding an application or renewal to provide an appropriate certificate of good conduct. 1.9. Accepting alternative evidence where an applicant or licence holder is unable to obtain a certificate of good conduct, subject to satisfactory evidence that reasonable attempts have been made to obtain the certificate. Changes are highlighted within policy as per tracked changes in Appendix A. 2. Implementation date for changes: 2.1. With immediate effect. 3. Non- substantive amendments to policy. 3.1 Delegated authority for officers to make minor, non-substance amendments to policy, where required to maintain the accuracy and clarity of the document. This is general housekeeping changes such as corrections/updates to legislation, terminology, formatting and administrative details.
2.	Purpose and reason for the report
2.1	Cambridge City Council, as a Licensing Authority is responsible for the licensing of Hackney Carriage and Private Hire drivers, vehicles and operators within its licensing area.

2.2	The Council reviews its licensing policies to ensure that they remain proportionate, effective and appropriate to current operational requirements.
2.3	Any proposed changes to the Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy may have an impact on both the licensed trade and members of the public. A consultation must therefore be completed before any proposed changes, which would have an impact on the trade or members of the public, are made and the outcome reported to Members for consideration and approval before the proposed policy changes are adopted.
3.	Alternative options considered
3.1	Consultations have been carried out on the potential changes, and the results have been analysed and options proposed have been considered before making the recommendations in this report.
4.	Background and key issues
4.1	The Council's Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy is subject to ongoing review to ensure it remains up to date, effective and aligned with current legislation, statutory guidance and best practice.
4.2	During the administration and determination of licensing applications, officers may identify areas where the policy would benefit from clarification, amendment or further development.
4.3	This can arise because of changes in statutory guidance, emerging issues within the licensed trade, operational experience, or circumstances that are not currently addressed within the policy.
4.4	The proposed amendments set out in this report seek to ensure the policy remains fit for purpose, supports public safety, and provides greater clarity and transparency for licence

	holders, applicants, officers and members of the public.
4.5	The proposals have also been considered against the principle of proportionality. The DfT Best Practice Guidance recognises that licensing authorities should avoid unnecessary regulatory burdens and should consider whether the same safety and public-interest outcomes can be achieved through less burdensome means.
4.6	A public consultation was undertaken, and results are attached to report as Appendix B.
4.7	Extension of newly granted driver licences to 36 months.
4.7.1	The current policy (Section 33.1) limits newly granted driver licences to a maximum period of 12 months.
4.7.2	It is proposed that the maximum duration of a newly granted driver licence be increased from 12 to 36 months.
4.7.3	The change would align the maximum duration of a first licence with the maximum duration already available for subsequent driver licences under the Council's current policy.
4.7.4	The Statutory taxi and private hire vehicles standards (2022), statutory guidance details, The Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 (as amended) sets a standard length at 3 years for taxi and private hire vehicle drivers. Any shorter duration licence should only be issued when the licensing authority thinks it is appropriate in the specific circumstances of the case. The Guidance also states that concerns regarding suitability during a longer licence period can be mitigated through regular interim checks.
4.7.5	The proposed change is therefore consistent with Guidance and would bring the initial licence period into line with the maximum period already available to established drivers.

4.7.7	The change would also reduce the administrative burden for both licensed drivers and the Council, while retaining the Council's ability to take appropriate licensing action where circumstances arise that affect a driver's suitability or right to hold a licence.
4.7.8	The proposal does not remove the requirement for drivers to continue to comply with the Council's licensing requirements throughout the period of their licence.
4.7.9	Relevant checks required as part of holding a licence will continue to be conducted. These include DBS checks every six months and DVLA checks, together with the driver's existing obligations to notify the Council of relevant changes in circumstances.
4.7.1 0	Of the nine consultation responses received, five did not support the proposal, two supported it and two respondents were unsure.
4.7.1 1	One respondent proposed that newly licensed drivers should remain subject to a longer probationary period with annual licence renewals before becoming eligible for a longer licence duration, stating the council could monitor compliance during this time.
4.7.1 2	Officers have considered these comments. In increasing the maximum length to 36 months, the council will perform the same interim checks already established for 36-month licences currently in place. If concerns arise these will be dealt with in line with council policy and enforcement procedures.
4.7.1 3	The DfT Statutory Guidance specifically recognises that the risk of an offence being committed and not notified can arise during a shorter licence period as well as a longer one and identifies regular interim checks as a means of mitigating that risk.
4.7.1 4	Officers therefore consider that extending the maximum duration of newly granted driver licences is proportionate because it reduces unnecessary administrative renewal activity without removing the Council's ability to monitor compliance and suitability throughout the licence period
4.8	Safeguarding training
4.8.1	Drivers
4.8.1.	It is proposed that drivers be required to complete safeguarding training as part of every

1	licence renewal application.
4.8.1. 2	The current policy (Section 24.3) already requires safeguarding awareness and training. New applicants must undertake safeguarding training as part of the application process.
4.8.1. 3	Following the initial safeguarding training, drivers are required to complete a safeguarding refresher every three years. However, as the initial licence is currently for a 12 month period it has come that if a driver then renews his licence, and choses a 3 year licence, the refresher is then required mid licence.
4.8.1. 4	As a result, by waiting for the next renewal to complete their safeguarding training, the 3 year refresher training cycle is not being maintained. One option previously explored was contacting licence holders at safeguarding expiry mid licence, however the practicality of this would be challenging.
4.8.1. 5	The proposed approach is intended to ensure that safeguarding knowledge remains current and continues to form part of the driver's ongoing licensing obligations. Aligning the safeguarding training requirement with the licence application and renewal process will ensure that drivers are able to demonstrate up-to-date safeguarding knowledge at each application stage.
4.8.1. 6	The Council's consultation asked whether drivers should complete safeguarding training as part of every licence renewal application.
4.8.1. 7	Of the nine consultation responses received, five did not support the proposal, three supported it and one respondent was unsure.
4.8.1. 8	The responses opposing the proposal included concerns that repeat training could become a routine or administrative exercise, that existing three-year refresher training was sufficient, and that additional training could create an unnecessary cost for drivers.
4.8.1. 9	Responses supporting the proposal emphasised the safeguarding responsibilities of drivers and the fact that drivers regularly transport vulnerable members of the public. One response also raised concerns regarding drivers refusing to carry wheelchair users and the importance of ensuring that drivers understand their responsibilities towards passengers.

4.8.1. 10	Officers have considered these differing views. The proposal does not introduce safeguarding training as a new requirement for existing drivers; rather, it changes the point at which the existing three year refresher requirement is completed so that it is aligned with the licence renewal process.
4.8.1. 11	Officers recognise the concern that safeguarding training should remain meaningful and should not become a purely administrative exercise. Training content should therefore remain relevant and focused on the practical safeguarding responsibilities of licensed drivers.
4.8.1. 12	The proposal also provides a clearer and more consistent administrative process by linking the safeguarding requirement to the licence renewal process rather than requiring separate contact with drivers during the licence period.
4.8.1. 13	At present, the Council licenses 499 hackney carriage and private hire drivers. Of these, 436 hold a three-year driver licence, 28 hold a one-year licence, six hold licences of less than one year in duration (typically issued to align with right to work requirements), and 29 are new drivers holding an initial one-year licence.
4.8.1. 14	The current driver licence fee structure is as follows: • New driver licence (1 year): £300 • Driver licence renewal (1 year): £225 • Driver licence renewal (3 years): £270
4.8.1. 15	Drivers are currently required to complete the Taxi Safeguarding and Disability Awareness Course, which is delivered by an external provider at a cost of £45 per delegate.
4.8.1. 16	The proposed change will primarily affect drivers who elect to hold a one-year driver licence, as they will be required to complete safeguarding training at each licence renewal.
4.8.2	Validity of safeguarding certificates

4.8.2. 1	It is proposed that safeguarding certificates submitted in support of a new application or renewal must be dated within three months of the relevant application or licence start date, as applicable.
4.8.2. 2	This is intended to ensure that the safeguarding training relied upon for licensing purposes is recent and provides a consistent approach to the timing of safeguarding training.
4.8.2. 3	For new driver applications, the safeguarding certificate must be dated within three months of the application date. For renewal applications, the safeguarding certificate must be dated within three months of the licence start date.
4.8.2. 4	The current process accepts safeguarding training certificates that are up to 12 months old. If this approach were to continue, a driver could rely on a safeguarding certificate obtained up to 12 months before their initial application and would not be required to undertake further training until their next renewal, resulting in a gap of up to four years between safeguarding training courses.
4.8.2. 5	Consultation asked if safeguarding certificates must be dated within 3 months of the application or renewal.
4.8.2. 6	Of the nine consultation responses received, five supported the proposal, two did not support it and two respondents were unsure.
4.8.2. 7	Those supporting the proposal considered that recent safeguarding training should be in place before a licence is renewed and that three months provides enough time.
4.8.2. 8	The concerns raised included whether safeguarding guidance changes frequently enough to justify the requirement and whether the existing system was sufficient.
4.8.2. 9	Officers consider that the proposal is proportionate because it does not require training to be undertaken every three months. Rather, it establishes a three-month period within which the required training certificate must have been issued before the relevant application or licence start date.
4.8.2. 10	Due to the differences between the new driver and renewal process, officers propose that safeguarding certificates should be dated within three months of the application date for

	new driver applications and within three months of the licence start date for renewal applications.
4.8.3	Non-driver proprietors and operators
4.8.3.1	It is proposed that vehicle proprietors and operators who are not drivers complete safeguarding training every three years as part of their non-driver proprietor registration.
4.8.3.2	The current policy (section 24 and 45) already requires proprietors and operators who are not licensed drivers to undertake a Basic Disclosure on application and annually thereafter. In addition to safeguarding training at initial application.
4.8.3.3	While such individuals do not undertake driving duties, they may have responsibilities within the licensed taxi and private hire environment, including the management and oversight of drivers and licensed vehicles.
4.8.3.4	A three-year safeguarding training cycle is considered proportionate and provides a consistent period for maintaining safeguarding awareness.
4.8.3.5	Of the ten consultation responses received for this question, 6 did not support the proposal and four supported it.
4.8.3.6	Those opposing the proposal primarily considered that non-driver proprietors and operators do not have direct contact with passengers and therefore do not require regular safeguarding training. One respondent requested an alternative approach suggesting aligning safeguarding training with 5 year operator renewals
4.8.3.7	Those supporting the proposal considered that proprietors and operators are involved in the operation of the licensed trade and should understand safeguarding to oversee their fleets and improving working culture.
4.8.3.8	Officers recognise that non-driver proprietors and operators do not undertake the same role as licensed drivers. However, their responsibilities may include the recruitment, management and oversight of drivers and the operation of licensed vehicles.
4.8.3.9	Officers therefore consider that a three-year safeguarding training requirement is proportionate to the role of non-driver proprietors and operators. The requirement is not

	intended to suggest that such individuals have the same passenger facing responsibilities as drivers, but to ensure that all those within the licensing trade have an appropriate understanding of safeguarding.
4.8.3. 10	Officers consider that maintaining regular safeguarding training for those involved in the taxi and private hire licensing trade is an important component in supporting the trades wider safeguarding responsibilities.
4.9	Hackney Carriage plates 1–121 – existing exemption
4.9.1	Hackney Carriage licence plates 1–121 currently benefit from an exemption which permits the licensing of vehicles that are non - wheelchair accessible. Section 15.6 of the policy.
4.9.2	The proposed policy is to retain this existing arrangement.
4.9.3	It is further proposed that, where one of these licences is surrendered or revoked, the plate may continue to be assigned for use with a non-wheelchair accessible vehicle. (These vehicles will be required to adhere to the council's current vehicle standards policy for non-wheelchair accessible vehicle type vehicles being zero or ultra-low emissions).
4.9.4	The purpose of retaining the arrangement is to preserve the existing position for the affected licence plates rather than creating a requirement for those plates to transition to wheelchair accessible vehicles, because of surrender or revocation.
4.9.5	The DfT Best Practice Guidance recognises the importance of an accessible fleet but also states that licensing authorities should understand the demand for mixed fleets in their area and ensure that they have the right mix of vehicles. The Guidance specifically recognises that some wheelchair accessible vehicle designs may not be suitable for some ambulant disabled passengers.
4.9.6	The consultation specifically sought views on whether the exemption should continue and whether a surrendered or revoked plate should continue to be capable of assignment to a non-wheelchair accessible vehicle.
4.9.7	Of the nine responses received, five supported the proposal, three opposed it and one respondent was unsure.
4.9.8	Those opposing the proposal raised concerns about the availability of wheelchair

	accessible vehicles and the impact that maintaining non-wheelchair accessible vehicles may have on disabled passengers. One respondent referred to the Council's January 2026 survey and expressed concern about a shortage of accessible vehicles in the city.
4.9.9	Those supporting the proposal referred to the historic status of plates 1–121 and the need to maintain a mixed fleet. Responses also highlighted that not all passengers who have mobility difficulties are wheelchair users and that some elderly or frail passengers may find wheelchair accessible vehicles more difficult to access.
4.9.1 0	Officers have considered these differing views and recognise that the availability of wheelchair accessible vehicles is an important consideration in determining the appropriate composition of the Hackney Carriage fleet.
4.9.1 1	The proposal does not extend the exemption to additional licence plates and does not remove any existing wheelchair accessible vehicles from the fleet.
4.9.1 2	Based on the current licensed Hackney Carriage fleet of 270 vehicles, the proposed arrangement would result in: • 109 Hackney Carriage plates allocated to non-wheelchair accessible vehicles (40.4% of HCV fleet); • 111 Hackney Carriage plates allocated to wheelchair accessible vehicles (41.1% of HCV fleet); and • 50 Hackney Carriage plates allocated to zero-emission saloon vehicles (18.5% of HCV fleet). Please note: there are currently 9 vacant WAV plates available to be licenced (these are included in the figures above).
4.9.1 3	The Council's current policy recognises both accessibility and the importance of providing a sufficient number of vehicles available to the public. The DfT Best Practice Guidance similarly recommends that authorities assess the demand for wheelchair accessible vehicles and consider the wider mix of vehicle types available.
4.9.1 4	Officers therefore consider that the retention of the existing exemption should be considered as part of the wider fleet composition rather than in isolation from the number

	of wheelchair accessible vehicles already licensed.
4.9.1 5	Officers consider that maintaining a mixed vehicle fleet provides choice for passengers with differing needs, including passengers who require wheelchair accessible vehicles and passengers who may have mobility difficulties but are not wheelchair users.
4.9.1 6	Officers acknowledge the concerns raised regarding wheelchair accessibility and recommend that these concerns continue to inform the Council's wider consideration of accessibility and the availability of wheelchair accessible vehicles within both the Hackney Carriage and Private Hire sectors.
4.10	Imported Ultra-Low Emission Vehicles
4.10. 1	The Council's vehicle licensing policy (Section 29) requires all newly licensed saloon vehicles to be ultra-low emission or zero-emission vehicles. - Ultra-low emission vehicles (ULEVs) are plug-in hybrid or extended-range electric vehicles with CO₂ emissions of 75g/km or less. - Zero-emission vehicles are electric-only or fuel-cell vehicles.
4.10. 2	The current policy recognises that low-emission vehicles can have a positive environmental impact and that the Council's licensing regime should support improvements in air quality.
4.10. 3	A specific issue has been identified in relation to imported ULEVs. In some cases, imported plug-in hybrid vehicles are recorded on GOV.UK vehicle records as having CO ₂ emissions of 0g/km.
4.10. 4	Whilst this information appears to indicate compliance with the Council's policy requirements, officers have identified that, where emissions data has not been collected or transferred during the import process, a value of 0g/km may be recorded by default and may not accurately reflect the vehicle's actual emissions.
4.10. 5	To address this issue, it is proposed that proprietors seeking to licence an imported ULEV be required to provide official evidence confirming the vehicle's CO ₂ emissions.
4.10. 6	Of the nine consultation responses received, five did not support the proposal and four supported it.

4.10. 7	Those opposing the proposal generally considered that the relevant emissions information was already available through vehicle registration documents, MOT records or GOV.UK vehicle information services. Some respondents considered that the additional requirement would create an unnecessary burden for proprietors.
4.10. 8	Those supporting the proposal considered that a consistent approach should be applied and that requiring evidence would prevent potential loopholes in the Council's emissions requirements.
4.10. 9	Officers acknowledge that emissions information may be available through GOV.UK records and vehicle documentation. However, the issue identified by officers is that, in some cases involving imported vehicles, the information recorded on those systems may not accurately reflect the vehicle's actual emissions where the relevant data was not collected or transferred during the import process.
4.10. 10	The proposal is therefore not intended to duplicate reliable information unnecessarily. It is intended to address circumstances where the information available to the Council cannot reliably demonstrate compliance with the Council's existing emissions requirement.
4.10. 11	Officers consider that it is reasonable and proportionate to require the proprietor to provide reliable evidence where the Council cannot otherwise verify compliance. The requirement is limited to imported ULEVs where the available information does not reliably establish the vehicle's emissions.
4.10. 12	A further consultation question asked whether imported ULEVs should not be licensed where the Council cannot verify the vehicle's CO ₂ emissions, or where satisfactory evidence is not provided to demonstrate emissions of 75g/km CO ₂ or below.
4.10. 13	Of the nine consultation responses received, six did not support the proposal, two supported it and one respondent was unsure.
4.10. 14	The principal concern raised was that proprietors may be unable to provide evidence where the Council itself cannot verify the emissions, with one respondents suggesting

	that vehicle manufacturers GOV.UK records should be sufficient. One respondent suggested that an emissions test could be used.
4.10.15	Officers consider that the Council must be satisfied that a vehicle meets its licensing requirements before granting a licence. The Council should not rely on a recorded emissions figure where officers have identified that the figure may not accurately represent the vehicle's actual emissions.
4.10.16	The proposal does not introduce a new emissions threshold; it applies the Council's existing requirement that newly licensed ULEVs must meet the Council's defined emissions standard.
4.10.17	Officers therefore consider that refusing to licence an imported ULEV where compliance cannot be reliably demonstrated is a proportionate and necessary approach to ensure consistent application of the Council's existing vehicle licensing standards.
4.11	Applicants and licence holders who have lived outside the UK
4.11.1	It is proposed that an applicant or licence holder who has lived or resided outside the United Kingdom for three months or more during the five years preceding an application or renewal should provide a certificate of good conduct from the relevant embassy or consulate covering the relevant period.
4.11.2	The current policy states: Section 36 <i>"Applicants who have lived out of the UK for any period of time within the five years prior to their application or renewal must obtain a certificate of good conduct from the relevant embassy or consulate covering that period. The certificate of good conduct must be authenticated, translated and sealed by the relevant embassy or consulate."</i>
4.11.3	Section 4.10 of the Statutory Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Standards guidance advises licensing authorities to <i>"seek or require applicants to provide where possible criminal records information or a certificate of good character from overseas"</i> where an applicant has spent an extended period living abroad, which the guidance describes as a period of three months or more.
4.11.4	Officers therefore propose amending the current policy so that a certificate of good conduct is only required where an applicant has lived or resided outside the UK for three

	months or more within the five years preceding an application or renewal.
4.11. 5	Consultation asked if respondents agreed with this proposal. Of the nine consultation responses received, four supported the proposed requirement, four opposed it and one respondent was unsure.
4.11. 6	Those supporting the proposal considered that an individual may have committed an offence while living abroad and that the Council should obtain appropriate information to protect the public.
4.11. 7	Those opposing the proposal raised concerns about the relevance of overseas matters, noted that DBS checks are already completed and suggesting this proposal should only apply to new applications.
4.11. 8	Officers recognise these concerns. However, an enhanced DBS check does not necessarily provide information about an individual's conduct while resident outside the UK. The proposed requirement is intended to address this potential gap.
4.11. 9	Officers also propose that; where a certificate of good conduct cannot genuinely be obtained, the applicant or licence holder should provide: - a sworn declaration; - a character reference; and - evidence demonstrating that reasonable attempts have been made to obtain the certificate.
4.11. 10	The consultation proposed the above alternative evidence requirements where a certificate of good conduct cannot be obtained.
4.11. 11	Of the nine responses received, five opposed the proposal, two supported it and two respondents were unsure.

4.11.12	Respondents raised concerns about the evidential value of the alternative documents, whether a licence should be granted without the required certificate, and whether the requirement should apply to existing licence holders. Supporters considered the approach reasonable given that some jurisdictions may not issue certificates.
4.11.13	Officers acknowledge that alternative evidence may not provide the same assurance as an official certificate. However, refusing an application solely because a particular jurisdiction cannot or will not issue a certificate could create an absolute barrier to licensing specific people.
4.11.14	Alternative evidence would therefore not automatically satisfy the Council's requirements. Officers would assess its reliability, relevance and authenticity and determine whether sufficient information is available to assess the individual's suitability to hold a licence. The applicant would first need to demonstrate that reasonable attempts had been made to obtain the certificate.
4.11.15	Officers consider that this approach is consistent with the Council's existing fit and proper person assessment, which allows relevant information to be considered on its merits.
4.11.16	Officers recommend the proposed three-month threshold and the alternative evidence provisions where a certificate of good conduct genuinely cannot be obtained. This provides a proportionate balance between safeguarding and fairness, while recognising the practical differences between overseas countries and jurisdictions.
4.12	Minor policy amendments
4.12.1	Officers propose a minor change to section 7.2 of the policy.
4.12.2	At present any changes to the policy must be agreed by Committee members. Officers propose delegated authority to officers to make minor, non-substantive amendments to the policy, where required to maintain accuracy and clarity of document. These changes are standard housekeeping changes such as corrections/updates to legislation, terminology, formatting and administrative details.
4.12.	Any amendments made under this delegated authority should not alter the policy intent,

3	objectives or requirements.
5.	Corporate plan
5.1	The proposed amendments support the Council's Corporate Plan by contributing to a safe, sustainable and inclusive city. The proposals support public safety through safeguarding and fit and proper person requirements, support environmental objectives through the application of existing ULEV requirements, and support accessibility through consideration of the appropriate balance and composition of the Hackney Carriage fleet.
6.	Consultation, engagement and communication
6.1	A public consultation took place from Monday 6 July 2026 to Sunday 2 August 2026. A total of nine responses were received.
7.	Anticipated outcomes, benefits or impact
7.1	The proposed changes will ensure the Council's Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing policy remains in line with issued guidance and is appropriate and suitable to the current environment maintaining interests of public safety.
8.	Implications
8.1	Relevant risks
	Public safety and safeguarding Extending the duration of a newly granted driver licence could create a perception that the Council has reduced oversight of new drivers. This risk is mitigated by continuing

	DBS Update Service checks, DVLA checks, notification requirements and the Council's existing enforcement powers throughout the licence period. Accessibility Maintaining the exemption for plates 1–121 could be perceived as reducing the availability of wheelchair accessible vehicles. This risk is addressed by considering the proposal alongside the existing composition of the fleet, the number of wheelchair accessible vehicles currently licensed and the Council's wider equality and accessibility duties. Environmental Permitting an imported ULEV to be licensed where its emissions cannot reliably be established could undermine the Council's existing emissions policy. The proposed evidence requirement is intended to mitigate this risk. Equality The Certificate of Good Conduct requirements could disadvantage applicants from jurisdictions/countries where certificates of good conduct are difficult or impossible to obtain. The proposed alternative evidence provisions are intended to mitigate this risk while retaining appropriate safeguarding controls.
	Financial Implications
8.2	Increasing the maximum duration of newly granted driver licences from 12 months to 36 months may reduce the frequency of renewal applications and associated administrative processing for both drivers and officers. In addition, the current fee charged for new one year licences, will be charged for new three year licences. The new fee will be calculated and consulted on later in 2026, as part of the Taxi and Private hire licensing fees consultation. The new fee will be introduced on 1st April 2027. As taxi licensing is self-funding any surplus or deficit will be

	balanced in future years. The financial impact is expected to be limited. Any reduction in licensing fee income associated with fewer renewal applications would correspond with reduction in administrative processing requirements. The proposed safeguarding, Certificate of Good Conduct documentation and imported ULEV requirements may result in some additional administrative activity. Officers consider that these costs can be managed within existing resources.
	Legal Implications
8.3	The guidance issued is not legally binding, the guidance is primarily intended to assist licensing authorities, but it is only guidance and does not intend to give a definitive statement of law; any decisions made by an authority remain a matter for that authority.
	Equalities and socio-economic Implications
8.4	An Equality Impact Assessment has been undertaken and is included at Appendix C. The accessibility implications of retaining the exemption for plates 1–121 have been specifically considered. The DfT Best Practice Guidance states that licensing authorities should understand demand for accessible services and ensure that the appropriate mix of vehicles is available. The council will therefore continue to monitor demand. The overseas Certificate of Good Conduct will be applied having regard to individual circumstances, particularly where certificates or evidence is difficult or impossible to obtain from a particular country or jurisdiction.
	Net Zero Carbon, Climate Change and Environmental implications

8.5	Ensuring that imported ULEVs meet the Council's existing emissions requirements supports the Council's environmental objectives and helps ensure that vehicles licensed under the policy meet the intended emissions standards.
	Procurement Implications
8.6	None
	Community Safety Implications
8.7	The proposed changes are intended to enhance public safety. Officers acknowledge that alternative evidence may present a risk of misuse; however, such evidence will only be accepted where satisfactory proof has been provided that a certificate of good conduct cannot be obtained. Officers will assess the authenticity and reliability of all supporting documentation before determining whether the licensing requirements have been met.
	Other Relevant Implications
8.8	No other significant implications have been identified.
9.	Background documents Used to prepare this report, in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985
9.1	1. Cambridge City Council's Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy 2. Statutory taxi and private hire vehicle standards - GOV.UK 3. Taxi and private hire vehicle licensing best practice guidance for licensing authorities in England - GOV.UK
10.	Appendices

10.1	Appendix A – Tracked changes to policy Appendix B – Consultation responses Appendix C – EqiA
	To inspect the background papers or if you have a query on the report please contact Wangari Njiiri, Environmental Health and Licensing Support Team Leader, wangari.njiiri@cambridge.gov.uk