

Appendix B: Consultation responses

Did you know that 42% of assistance dog owners were refused entry to a taxi or minicab during a one-year period because of their dog? The charity Guide Dogs wants this to stop, and so do I.

These refusals are not only illegal, they also knock people's confidence and stop them doing the everyday things that most people take for granted. People with sight loss rely on taxis and minicabs to help them live the lives they choose.

I understand that North Hertfordshire District Council already has a zero tolerance policy towards access refusal from taxi and minicab drivers.

I believe that disability equality training will further help drivers understand the rights and needs of disabled people. I therefore ask that you make it a requirement that all taxi and minicab drivers take part in disability equality training.

Please can you work with the licensing team to ensure that training is put in place?

I would be grateful if you could keep me updated on your progress.

Yours sincerely,

Matt Alexander

Recently released figures show an increase in the number of Hackney Carriage and Private Hire operators refusing to carry passengers accompanied by Guide or other Assistance Dogs. Under the Equality Act 2010 drivers are required to carry these people and their dogs. Some Local Authorities are taking legal action against drivers who refuse to comply with the legislation.

I don't have specific figures for the NHDC area, but in all probability, it is happening. May I therefore respectfully suggest that your Forum provides the perfect opportunity to remind Companies and drivers of their legal responsibilities.

Yours faithfully,

Harry Wright

Hi i trust all is well,

with reference to the policy My objection is of having no top signs on private hire vehicles and with specific colours will only make it difficult to obtain the right vehicle and costly as well.

Specially with what I've noticed there will be only a few to choose from if we had limited colours.

I'm a firm believer if it's working why try to fix it!.

Wheelchair vehicles are in high demand or can be so if there was a vehicle to my liking but the colour was not in line with the policy then that can just cause frustration.

I hope you understand.

Kind regards

Steve

Appendix B: Consultation responses



**BUTLER
MELTAX®**

Correspondence address:

10a The Moor, Melbourn,
Royston, SG8 6ED

📞 01763 244444 Bookings

📞 01763 212223 Bookings

📞 01763 262924

✉ bookings@butlerscarservices.co.uk

meltaxsales@hotmail.co.uk

🌐 www.butlermeltax.co.uk

3rd January 2018

To: North Herts District Council

Response to Draft Policy

This is our response to the draft policy based on fairness to the public also the fairness and cost to the drivers and operators.

2.5 Maximum age of Vehicle -

2.5.6 Option 2 – We would like to think this could be Hybrid vehicles to begin with.

2.5 Maximum age of vehicle - Option 2

2.6 Vehicle Testing - Option 2

2.7 Vehicle Type – first choice Option 6 second choice Option 4

2.8 Signage - Option 2

2.9 Livery – Option 1

2.26 Meters - Option 1

5.7 Disclosure & Baring services - Option 2

7.3 Hackney Carriage fare setting Principles - Option 5

Appendix B: Consultation responses

I have read the new policy with some interest, mostly unchanged but here are my comments.

2.5.2 Option 2

2.5.5 I feel that private hire vehicles, should be the same as Hackney with regards to age.

2.5.6 I feel that another option should be that vehicles have a minimum BHP rating, rather than a minimum cubic capacity.

2.6.7

Do the council now employ trained mechanics/ Vehicle technicians? If not, then how can you offer an educated reason for failing to issue a license on the grounds of an advisory notice on an MOT?

2.6.11 option 2

2.7.3 Option 6

2.8.4 Option 2

2.9.1 Option 1

2.16.1 Can you provide an example of "Sufficient space"?

5.5.2 The following could be added, Except where the council has failed to supply the new plate within 5 working days. Given the fact that the application is submitted 1 month in advance.

7.3 Option 4

8.13.2 "innocent until proven guilty"?

C.6.1 Historically, some wheelchair users are asking drivers to lift their legs into the car as they are unable to, presumably if we are to do this, then the passenger then complains of being injured during the course of being helped into the taxi, the driver is then open to a charge of assault. At that point, the driver then falls foul of the points system D.10 in particular item 5 and 13. A more sensible method would be to assist "walking" wheelchair users, those that need a little help. As you are working towards 10% of hackney carriages, this should easily be accommodated.

Hopefully this feedback request is not just a case of lip service.

Regards

Neil Huxley

Appendix B: Consultation responses

Melvyn Day Tinys Taxis Ltd Response Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy Consultation

P4 Environmental Considerations

P5 2.5.6 Option 1 or 2 both seem fine to me, my only concern is in these times of cost restraints where would the funds come from to subsidise these vehicles, I like Option two as it makes for a level playing field.

Page 5 & 6 Maximum Age of Vehicles

Option 1 is ok BUT I support Option 2 as again it makes for a level playing field PLUS the more the two types of vehicles can be aligned the clearer and simpler the Policy will be.

Page 6-8 Vehicle Testing

P7-8 2.6.11 Prefer Option 4 provide both tests have the option to be carried out at the same Mot station but ideally two in each town though just one would also give choice options as we could go to a neighbouring town if we wished, but the Certificate of Compliance should be undertaken by the same facilities to avoid two fees.

Do not support options 1 or 3 as 1 requires two visits and two fees thereby incurring extra cost and time penalties, 3 could also require two visits meaning the same penalties as 1.

Do not support option 2 as although obviously most convenient and cheapest for Trade I am concerned about Mates Deals! And inconsistent standards.

****If push came to shove and option 4 was not going to win the day I would vote for Option 1****

Page 8-10 Vehicle Type

Option 1 is ok as also includes a reasonable assurance that W.C.A.V numbers will increase and or at the very least not continue to reduce also should **NOT** Exclude P.H.V from being W.A.V as this option appears to do as some P.H.O may wish to choose W.A.V and they should **NOT** be deterred.

P9-10 7.2-7.3 Prefer Option 2 as it includes a reasonable assurance that W.C.A.V numbers will increase and or at the very least not continue to reduce though believe the percentage set before allowing None W.A.V to be licenced should be 15 or even 20% also should **NOT** Exclude P.H.V from being W.A.V as this option also appears to do.

Option 3 Do not support as should not start forcing P.H.V into being W.A.V until their number match or exceed Hackneys as this could unfairly restrict the number of new P.H.V and I also believe that Hackneys should have around 15% W.A.V before starting on the private hire trade.

Option 4 Good Idea But with the very likely future trend being towards electric Vehicles New None W.A.V including EV should not be issued until Taxi W.A.V numbers reach at least 10% also should **NOT** Exclude P.H.V from being W.A.V as this option also appears to do.

Option 5 DO NOT Support as it will open the flood gates for another free for all and as proven in past and present times very much to the detriment of the existing trade and Absolutely **NO HOPE** of even maintaining existing W.A.V and certainly no chance of increasing W.A.V

Best regards, Mel.