

Consultation responses

1. Do you agree with extending the maximum duration of newly granted driver licences from 12 months (1 year) to 36 months (three years)?

No – 5

Yes – 2

Not sure – 2

2. Do you agree that drivers should complete safeguarding training as part of every licence renewal application?

No – 5

Yes – 3

Not sure – 1

Response	Additional comments
No	Just once is enough!
	Newly licensed* drivers should remain subject to a probationary period before being granted a longer licence duration. A five-year probationary period, with annual licence renewals during this time, would allow the licensing authority to monitor standards, compliance, customer service, and any relevant enforcement issues. After successfully completing this period without significant concerns, drivers should be able to apply for a longer licence duration. Safeguarding Training Safeguarding training is an important part of the taxi and private hire licensing system, and all drivers should understand their responsibilities in protecting vulnerable passengers. However, requiring experienced and long-term licensed drivers to complete the same safeguarding training at every licence renewal risks turning an important subject into a routine compliance exercise rather than meaningful learning. I believe safeguarding training should be mandatory for all new drivers and should form part of a structured probationary period, with annual licence renewals during the first five years. This would allow the licensing authority to ensure that new drivers understand and maintain the required standards. After successfully completing the probationary period, experienced drivers should continue to receive safeguarding reminders and updates through licence renewals, written guidance,
No	

Appendix B – Consultation responses

	communications, and relevant awareness materials instead of requiring them to have a certificate. This would help keep safeguarding at the forefront without reducing it to a repetitive tick-box exercise. Safeguarding is too important to become simply an administrative requirement. The aim should be to develop a culture where drivers actively understand their role, recognise concerns, and willingly contribute to protecting children, vulnerable adults, and passengers, rather than completing training only because it is required by the licensing authority.
No	Because you havent said which license,if it's vehicle license we would have to do it every year which is too expensive
No	This would be add to extra costs for the driver and it doesn't seem to be cost effective. The current system is good enough.
No	when you completed once why do we need it to complete again every 3 years
Not sure	Every 3 years its enoughdont need every year
Yes	They take into their de facto care some of our most vulnerable citizens, whether this be the elderly or intoxicated students
Yes	Public safety and confidence
Yes	A large number of Hackney Carriage drivers are regularly refusing to carry wheelchair users despite holding WAV licenses. It is important to make sure all drivers have undergone training to ensure they are aware of their responsibilities towards their customers.

3. Do you agree that safeguarding certificates must be dated within 3 months of the application or renewal?

No – 2

Yes – 5

Not sure – 2

Response	Additional comments
No	Safeguard in guidelines doesn't change every three months so it's not necessarily to do every three months or every year or every new renewal. It's not necessarily.
No	Current system is sufficient
Not sure	Not sure
Not sure	Honestly I dont understand what do you mean here? if it means the driver need to obtain it after 3 months of application it is ok for me
Yes	New drivers should have it with every renewal application.
Yes	3 montgs its enough time
Yes	We owe it to our citizens to ensure the highest level of care
Yes	Public safety and confidence
Yes	A license should not be renewed without recent training being in place

4. Do you agree that vehicle proprietors and operators who are not drivers, should complete safeguarding training every three years?

No – 6

Yes – 4

Response	Additional comments
No	***** strongly supports robust safeguarding standards, and we agree in principle that regular safeguarding training for non-driver vehicle proprietors and operators is a valuable requirement. Protecting the public must always be a top priority. We urge the Council to adopt a pragmatic and proportionate approach to implementation. Many operators and proprietors hold licenses (driver, vehicle or operator licenses) across multiple local authorities. Where a proprietor or operator has already satisfactorily completed safeguarding training of equivalent rigour and content under another licensing authority, requiring that training to be duplicated adds administrative and financial burden without a corresponding improvement in safeguarding outcomes.. We respectfully ask that Cambridge City Council accept valid, equivalent safeguarding training certificates completed through other licensing authorities or trusted organisations such as e Barnardo's or Green Penny. Furthermore, under the current proposals, Company Directors would be required to renew their safeguarding training every three years, meaning the training renewal cycle would run out of step with, and effectively require renewal twice within, the life of a licence itself. We would welcome the opportunity for the Council to adopt a more proportionate model. In particular, we suggest that the Council should consider aligning the safeguarding training renewal cycle for Company Directors and other non-driver proprietors and operators with the five-year PHOL renewal cycle, save where a specific safeguarding concern or a material change in personnel arises that would warrant earlier refresher training.
No	They are not working physically in the system so they never need that guidelines
No	They have no contact with passengers so no.
No	They are not dealing with public
No	They don't interact with the public
No	if they arent drivers why should they do it regularly, however they should do it once because of their responsibility as managers of taxi drivers
Yes	Because they're involved in the business

Appendix B – Consultation responses

Yes	They need to understand safeguarding in order to oversee it in their fleets
Yes	Public safety and confidence. Improved working culture.
Yes	Yes, it is currently difficult as wheelchair users to book a taxi as operators are also not aware of legislation regarding the Equality Act and regularly refuse to send the correct vehicles or refuse carriage of wheelchairs. Veezu refuse to discipline or train operators voluntarily despite multiple complaints.

5. Hackney Carriage licence plates 1–121 currently have an exemption that allows them to use non-wheelchair accessible vehicles. Should this exemption continue, and should a plate that is surrendered or revoked continue to be assigned for use with a non-wheelchair accessible vehicle?

No – 3

Yes – 5

Not sure – 1

No	Disability access is a major argument for taxi use of bus lanes and other traffic -limited zones. They should fulfill this obligation to gain such privileges
No	These vehicles are needed for the elderly and non wheelchair chair user disabled individuals
No	The council's own survey conducted January 2026 shows that a majority of wheelchair users feel there is a shortage of accessible vehicles in the city. It would be irresponsible to continue to reduce the number of WAV licenses available when there is a chronic shortage of vehicles in the city and wheelchair users cannot adequately access transport. An Equality Impact Assessment ought to be conducted before further reducing access to accessible transport. The number of vehicles should be increased, and measures should be taken by the council to encourage drivers to sign up as PHVs to allow wheelchair users to more easily pre-book transport.
Not sure	Will leave this to a more technically minded people to answer
Yes	N/A
Yes	Yes The existing exemption for Hackney Carriage licence plates 1–121 should continue, as these plates have historic status and drivers operating under this arrangement should be allowed to continue operating as usual. Any surrendered or revoked vehicle licence associated with these plates should not be reassigned to any new vehicle. The local taxi trade is already suffering significant pressure due to the huge growth of app-based private hire operators, including multinational companies with financial resources that the traditional local taxi trade cannot realistically compete with. Wheelchair users should have reliable access to suitable transport.

Appendix B – Consultation responses

	In practice, many wheelchair accessible vehicle journeys are pre-booked and requested at the passenger's location rather than through taxi ranks. Therefore, increasing WAV availability within private hire fleets could significantly improve accessibility without unnecessarily reducing the existing Hackney Carriage fleet. A balanced approach should protect historic taxi rights, maintain a sustainable local taxi trade, and ensure that accessibility needs are properly addressed across the wider licensed transport sector.
Yes	They have grandfather rights which should be honoured also not everyone can get in a multi seater wheelchair vehicle
Yes	Its ok
Yes	The town need non WAV vehicles as well, Many old or fragile customers, who are not disabled themselves, can't use WAV cars, they are too high for them, secondly wav cars consume too much fuel so there should be a balance between WAV and small nonWAV vehicles.

6. Do you agree that proprietors wishing to licence an imported Ultra-Low Emission Vehicle (ULEV) should be required to provide official evidence of the vehicle's CO₂ emissions?

No – 5

Yes – 4

Response	Additional comments
No	This is just extra burden on drivers.
No	Because it will already be on the log book
No	No need Co2 emission numbers are available on mot check on gov.uk
No	Assume the information is on the log book
No	ULEV are already known by the papers of the vehicle, a driver can't provide more
Yes	All requirements has to be standardized
Yes	Prevent loopholes
Yes	Trust but verify approach is best practice
Yes	This seems like a sensible proposal

7. Do you agree that imported ULEVs should not be licensed where the Council cannot verify the vehicle's CO₂ emissions, or where satisfactory evidence is not provided to demonstrate emissions of 75 g/km CO₂ or below?

No – 6

Yes – 2

Not sure – 1

Response	Additional comments
No	Procedure shouldn't be that difficult
No	No
No	Just give it an emissions test
No	They can check on gov uk
No	Makes sense
No	If council cant verify the ULEV how can a driver can prove it? Car companies are providing these and it should be enough for the council
Not sure	Agree with the premise but if an imported vehicle is, for example, clearly an EV, the it should be fine
Yes	Consistent rules with non-imported vehicles. Close potential loophole
Yes	Evidence should be obtained of this requirement before licensing

8. Do you agree that applicants who have lived outside the UK for three months or more within the five years prior to an application or renewal should be required to provide a certificate of good conduct covering that period?

No –4

Yes – 4

Not sure – 1

Response	Additional comments
No	Anything outside of the UK it's can not subject of Cambridge Council
No	This should only apply to new applications.
No	You do Dbs checks already
No	why is that? How can a driver can get this?
Not sure	Only if such a document is provided by a meaningful authority.
Yes	Because they could have committed an offence abroad

Appendix B – Consultation responses

Yes	We owe this to our people to keep them safe
Yes	I agree but for some countries this might be impossible to obtain so it would be unfair on the driver
Yes	Yes, all drivers should provide evidence of good conduct, wherever their previous place of residence, in order to reassure customers of their safety when taking a HCV in Cambridge

9. Do you agree that where a certificate of good conduct cannot be obtained, applicants should be required to provide a sworn declaration, a character reference, and evidence that reasonable attempts were made to obtain the certificate?

No – 5

Yes – 2

Not sure – 2

Response	Additional comments
No	N/A
No	Must Not for existing drivers.
No	They shouldn't get a license if they can't provide it
No	Such document is unlikely to be meaningful
No	A driver who working for 5, 10 or more years as a taxi taxi drivers has already proved his good conduct through DBS checks and regular control by the council. Just for going 3 months abroad doesnt change this reality. It would be humiliating to ask the driver to prove that he/she is a good person after every long trip
Not sure	Dont need in my opinion
Not sure	I am unsure whether a license should be granted if such a certificate cannot be obtained
Yes	We owe it to our community to set the bar high while being understanding not all jurisdictions will be able to provide such a certificate
Yes	Makes sense