

# Notice of Meeting

---

## Licensing Committee

**Tuesday, 30th March, 2010 at 6.30 pm**  
in Council Chamber Council Offices  
Market Street Newbury

Date of despatch of Agenda: Monday, 22 March 2010

For further information about this Agenda, or to inspect any background documents referred to in Part I reports, please contact Jessica Broom on e-mail:

Further information and Minutes are also available on the Council's website at [www.westberks.gov.uk](http://www.westberks.gov.uk)



## Agenda - Licensing Committee to be held on Tuesday, 30 March 2010 (continued)

**To:** Councillors Peter Argyle, Jeff Beck, Paul Bryant, Billy Drummond, Adrian Edwards, Geoff Findlay, Manohar Gopal, Owen Jeffery, Tony Linden (Chair), Mollie Lock, Gwen Mason (Vice-Chair), Andrew Rowles, Ieuan Tuck and Quentin Webb

**Substitutes:** Councillors

---

# Agenda

## Part I

	<b>Page No.</b>
1 <b>Apologies</b> To receive apologies for inability to attend the meeting (if any).	
2 <b>Minutes</b> To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting of this Committee held on 8 <sup>th</sup> September 2009.	1 - 8
3 <b>Declarations of Interest</b> To receive any Declarations of Interest from Members.	
4 <b>Hackney Carriage Licensing</b> Purpose: To discuss the outcome of the Taxi Working Group Report on taxi services in West Berkshire	9 - 22
5 <b>Taxi Tariff 2010/11</b> Purpose: To inform members of an application for a taxi tariff increase for 2010/11	23 - 32
6 <b>Licensing Training</b>  Purpose: To discuss licensing training	Verbal Report

Andy Day  
Head of Policy and Communication

West Berkshire Council is committed to equality of opportunity. We will treat everyone with respect, regardless of race, disability, gender, age, religion or sexual orientation.

If you require this information in a different format, such as audio tape, or in another language, please ask an English speaker to contact Moira Fraser on telephone (01635) 519045, who will be able to help.



**LICENSING COMMITTEE****MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON  
8<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2009**

Councillors Present : Tony Linden (*Chairman*) (P), Peter Argyle (AP), Jeff Beck (P), Paul Bryant (P), Billy Drummond (AP), Adrian Edwards (P), Geoff Findlay (P), Manohar Gopal (P), Owen Jeffery (AP), Mollie Lock (P), Gwen Mason (*Vice-Chairman*) (P), Andrew Rowles (AP), Ieuan Tuck (P), Quentin Webb (P)

Officers Present: Brian Leahy (Senior Licensing Officer), Sarah Clarke (Senior Solicitor), Paul Anstey (Environmental Health & Licensing Manager), Valerie Witton (Access Officer), Jessica Broom (Principal Policy Officer)

**PART I****8. APOLOGIES.**

Apologies for absence were received by Councillors Andrew Rowles, Owen Jeffery, Peter Argyle and Billy Drummond.

**9. MINUTES.**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 23 February 2009 were approved as true and correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the following amendments:

- (1) A large number of grammatical and spelling errors were picked up throughout the minutes and as such the minutes from the meeting on the 14<sup>th</sup> May have been amended to correct these errors.
- (2) **Item 7, page 2.** In the first paragraph it should be made clear that the licenses were issued in 2008/09 and not already in place.
- (3) **Item 7, page 3, paragraph 4.** That it be made clear that drug seizures had not been made from door staff but that door staff themselves had made the seizures. Also that staff members had been making reports to the Police not receiving reports from the Police.
- (4) **Item 7, page 4.** Councillor Beck clarified paragraph 7 with the following statement:

On Friday 22 May 2009, a meeting was held in the West Berkshire District Council Offices, located at Faraday Road, Newbury, with West Berkshire Hackney Carriage Association Members' David Oram, Bill Annetts, and Mark Townsend, together with West Berkshire District Council Officers Brian Leahy and Mark Cole, along with Councillor Jeff Beck.

An 'Operational Understanding' was reached with regard to the taxis informal use of the Wharf Road Coach Park and the Museum Wharf Car Park, for taxis waiting prior to joining the 'side by side waiting rank' adjacent to the museum.

## 10. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

There were no declarations of interest received, however Councillor Beck stated that he had been lobbied on item 4 of the agenda but the Committee agreed this was a similar situation for all Members.

Sarah Clarke stated that she had received a letter from Matt Castle of Dolphin Taxis but that it would have to be disregarded by the Committee due to not having been received within 5 working days of the Committee meeting.

## 11. HACKNEY CARRIAGE LICENSING

Brian Leahy presented agenda item 4. The purpose of the report was to consider a request from the Taxi Association and others to limit the number of taxis operating in West Berkshire as well as to consider a request from the Taxi Association to abolish the two taxi operating zones. The report covered three key issues that were important in the consideration of any decisions made:

- (1) Delimitation (Capping)
- (2) De-zoning, and
- (3) Disabled access to taxis

Requests had been received from West Berkshire Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Operators Association, Bluebird Cars and CABCO for the Council to consider ways in which new vehicle licences could be refused (capped) or restricted due to the economic downturn and financial problems experienced by the trade.

A submission had also been received from Dolphin Cars, suggesting that capping would be a retrograde step as there was still unmet demand in the district in their opinion.

Key points from the report included:

- In order to prove there was or was not significant unmet demand throughout West Berkshire a thorough survey would need to be undertaken which would need to be contracted out.
- Legally there are 2 taxi zones in West Berkshire, although there was currently a suspension on these and it might now be prudent to abolish these.
- Conditions were put in place following a meeting of the Committee in March 2005 to provide for disabled access to taxis, however, although the numbers of accessible vehicles had increased and the situation improved, in meetings with the trade association and disability access groups, it was clear that conditions might not be robust enough to ensure equality for all.

In response to questions from Councillors Webb and Findlay, Sarah Clarke clarified that the Council would be able to abolish the 2 operating zones due to a recent statutory instrument; however it would need to introduce new byelaws in order to do so – it would not be possible to simply attach conditions to the current byelaws.

The current byelaws were signed off in 1992 and might now need changing. Current byelaws would therefore need to be abolished before the introduction of new ones.

Currently the Council would still need to obtain the Secretary of State's approval to create new byelaws. These would need to be provisionally approved, then go out to consultation and then gain final approval from the Secretary of State, all of which would take approximately 6 months.

In response to further questions from Councillors Webb and Findlay, Brian Leahy confirmed that a general road worthiness test was carried out on vehicles prior to licensing with further checks being required twice per year for vehicles between 6 and 8 years of age and three times a year for vehicles over 8 years old. Road stops were also carried out with the Police.

Whether or not the cinema would have an affect in terms of increasing taxi use was yet to be determined and extra spaces had been provided outside of the cinema – it had been determined in consultation with the planning department and the contractors that 5 spaces would be appropriate. Currently there were 17 official taxi spaces in Newbury.

Valerie Witton addressed the committee to explain that she would offer disability awareness training to all drivers on a rolling basis and would want this to be a condition of licensing. Brian Leahy stated that he had held a meeting with the Association on this topic and it was welcomed however it was not a condition that could be put on an actual license. It was suggested that this was put into a separate paper to be brought back to the committee at a later date as it was not on the agenda for the current meeting.

Members took a vote to suspend Standing Orders in accordance with paragraph 7.6.2 final bullet point of the Constitution to allow members of the public to speak in accordance with paragraph 7.12.4 of the Constitution.

Kevin Archibald, Operations Manager at CABCO addressed the Committee regarding the letter that was submitted as Appendix C in the agenda. The current economic climate and the town centre works for the new cinema had put a strain on the incomes of those in the trade. The costs of carrying out a survey would come back to the trade and he suspected that a further survey would need to be carried out in a few years' time when the economic climate had changed again and an increase in numbers was needed. It was believed that the way forward would be to look at tightening the conditions to enter into the trade thus managing the numbers entering into the trade. Some vehicles were not in good condition yet passed the current test. These higher standards would attract people to using taxis and be a benefit in general to the area. CABCO would also support holding a moratorium on licenses until the new legislation had been received from government later this year.

In response to questions from Councillors Linden, Beck and Bryant and Brian Leahy, Kevin Archibald clarified the following points:

- CABCO currently held 58 vehicles;
- That CABCO agreed that the correct action to take was in accordance with paragraphs 3.32, 3.33 and 3.34 of the report;
- That CABCO believed it was fairly common for councils to require, as stated in paragraph 3.3.2 of the report, that 1<sup>st</sup> time applicants provide a brand new wheelchair vehicle;
- That CABCO had high standards and did not want to see a two-tiered system in West Berkshire or a lowering of the start up level which would demean the taxi trade, as there were always start up costs with any business.
- A third of CABCO fleet had disabled access.

Brian Leahy, in clarification, explained that the majority of the CABCO fleet were saloon cars which were not required to have disabled access. Members had set the

standard of disabled accessibility for all new taxis and the cost of a black cab type taxi could cost as much as £30k. The non-black cab custom manufactured taxis were also reasonably expensive at new. It was appropriate to have a mixed fleet, however this would mean that there would not be a level playing field for those wanting to enter the trade. If it was the intention of the Committee to look into capping by way of condition of new vehicles, it would be necessary to also look at the condition of current vehicle that might not be compliant.

Regarding van conversions, Brian Leahy explained that they did not accept 'home made' conversions and that a certificate of proper conversion was required. Many vehicles had been refused for non-compliance with the standard. The Council would not licence any vehicle which was considered to be unsafe or which was not professionally converted for disabled access.

Councillor Findlay commented that this was not the inference that had come across in a recent Kick FM interview and that he was concerned that they would be seen to be capping from a 'back door route'.

Richard Brown, Vice-Chairman of West Berkshire Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Operators Association addressed the Committee regarding the letter that was submitted as Appendix A in the agenda. There were currently very cheap ways of entering into the trade and he did not consider that this was conducive to the provision of a quality service in Newbury. The Association was in favour of undertaking a survey as detailed in 11.3 of the report as well as to go ahead with the abolition of the 2 zones as outlined in 11.5.

Sarah Clarke clarified with Richard Brown that the Association was not in favour of brand new vehicles only as CABCO had stated at their recent Committee meeting. The Committee had agreed on vehicles of up to 3 years of age at a cost of around £12-16K.

In response to questions from Councillor Bryant, Richard Brown explained that a cheap way of entering into the trade could include the conversion of a van with disabled access that was not of high standard. Brian Leahy confirmed that this would be the Fiat Diablo vans which were factory converted to take wheelchairs in the back via rear-loading. The Access Officer, Valerie Witton did have some issues with these vans and this could be a consideration to include in any survey that was carried out as stated in 11.3 of the report. Councillor Bryant stated that he considered the costs of entering into the trade and the standards of vehicles to be two separate issues.

Richard Brown confirmed that the Association wanted further consultation to be carried out before any decision was made.

Brian Leahy informed the Committee that they had a number of options to consider and they might wish to form a working party to do so. The Department for Transport paper due in November was expected to lay down standards some of which might be mandatory and some optional.

Sarah Clarke stated that the Committee might want to review the byelaws and could then impose Disability Discrimination Act training with appropriate byelaws and conditions. A timetable for doing so with proposals for new byelaws could be brought back to a meeting of the Committee. More detail would be needed regarding the abolishing of the 2 zones.

In response to a question from Councillor Linden, Richard Brown confirmed that the Association currently represented 24 members.

Members took a vote to re-introduce Standing Orders in accordance with paragraph 7.6.2 final bullet point of the Constitution.

Councillor Findlay proposed that the Committee undertake the consultation, take the necessary legal advice and abolish the zoning, create new byelaws and then remove the existing byelaws.

Sarah Clarke clarified that the disabled access conditions were a separate issue to the zoning and byelaws and would be dealt with by different procedures. Brian Leahy added that byelaws were the only controlling influence the Council had over taxi drivers. The need for DDA training could be introduced when the new byelaws were put forward.

Councillor Webb clarified that what Councillor Findlay had proposed took into account paragraphs 3.3.2, 3.3.3 and 3.3.4 of the report.

Sarah Clarke added that the proposal was to consult on all three matters of capping, zoning and disabled access.

Councillor Lock agreed that a full consultation was required in order to reach all those affected by the decisions.

Members voted in agreement of forming a working party of 5 Members with officer support and advice in order to take the consultation forward.

**Resolved that:**

A working party including Councillors Linden, Mason, Findlay, Beck and Tuck would form to take forward a full consultation on the three issues of capping, zoning and disabled access.

## **12. PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING – OPERATOR'S LICENCES**

Brian Leahy presented agenda item 5. The purpose of the report was to consider only issuing private hire operator's licences to persons/companies who operate from a base in West Berkshire.

Currently all the existing private hire operator licences, with one exception, were issued to persons or companies whose address lay within West Berkshire. The one exception related to a business which was forced through a compulsory purchase order to relocate to a base approximately 500 metres within the Reading borough.

Licensing officers had found that where an operating base was outside the enforcement jurisdiction of this council it was difficult to determine which of their records were pertinent to West Berkshire.

In response to questions from Councillors Edwards and Webb, Brian Leahy confirmed that an application for a licence from someone living in Highclere would not be accepted and that it was illegal to move premises to outside the West Berkshire area without a valid licence to operate private hire.

In response to a question from Councillor Findlay, Sarah Clarke confirmed that a new regulation could be agreed from a particular date.

Councillor Beck stated that he did not think that exceptions should be allowed and that the operator in question should be advised of the situation and at renewal of their license they should be located within West Berkshire. Sarah Clarke stated that this would not be the case as this was a new regulation but all new applicants would be required to abide by this.

Kevin Archibald and Richard Brown were in agreement with the recommendation in the report.

**Resolved that:**

The recommendation in the report be accepted on condition that the condition would apply from 8<sup>th</sup> September 2009.

**13. PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING – CRB CHECKING**

Brian Leahy presented agenda item 6. The purpose of the report was to consider the introduction of Criminal Record Checks (CRB's) for private hire operators.

The Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 requires that all applicants for a private hire operator's licence had to be deemed to be 'fit and proper'.

Currently in West Berkshire, applicants for a private hire driver's licence are checked by the Criminal Records Bureau but those persons applying for an operator's licence and their staff are not. Many councils have taken the view that as the operator is the person taking the booking and they could be party to sensitive information such as bookings taken for holidays, they should be subject to CRB checks as well.

Councillor Findlay enquired as to the situation regarding operators of Hackney Carriages. Brian Leahy explained that Hackney Carriages do not require an operator and are therefore were not within the scope of this recommendation. Private hire vehicles must, by law, take bookings.

Councillor Edwards stated that he believed that just because a person had a conviction this should prohibit him/her from getting a job. He wondered where the Council would stand should a person appeal and be successful. He believed that this was excessive and stated that many other staff would also have information on when people were away on holidays, such as Viola staff. Also, what was the case when a foreign national had a conviction?

In response Sarah Clarke stated that a set of standards could be put in place which would determine the relevance of a conviction, for example, a conviction of theft could be deemed relevant but one of speeding, not. It was only possible to regulate what was legally allowed and as Hackney Carriages did not have operators, it would not be possible to regulate on this matter.

Brian Leahy explained that there were also provisions in place to enable checking of foreign nationals and that this had been done, for example, with regard to a person who originated from a small village in Pakistan. EU members could also be CRB checked. It was not possible to refuse a licence for a driver unless they were deemed not to be 'fit and proper' and he believed that this should also be the case for operators.

In response to a question from Councillor Bryant, Brian Leahy explained that booking sheets that Hackney Carriage operators use were not within the remit of licensing. Richard Brown stated that this was covered by data protection and that it would not be possible to obtain this information from their operators.

Members took a vote to suspend Standing Orders in accordance with paragraph 7.6.2 final bullet point of the Constitution to allow members of the public to speak in accordance with paragraph 7.12.4 of the Constitution.



A member of the taxi trade, Mr Cox, stated that if the regulation did not include all taxi companies then there was little point in the regulation as all companies had access to this type of information.

Kevin Archibald stated that taxis used for private hire journeys did take bookings as well. His company did also have Hackney Carriages but employees did have strict conditions of employment and the Data Protection Act did offer confidentiality of this information. He was of the opinion that CRB checking was a step too far.

Richard Brown stated that he agreed with CRB checking but that Hackney Carriage hire should be included and should cover any employee handling personal information, which did also include credit card details.

Brian Leahy stated that these were all valid points and he did not dispute anything that had been said, however it was not possible for them to change the law. There was no provision under Hackney Carriage legislation to make this regulation apply. Sarah Clarke stated that she felt this was still an appropriate test to move forward with and Brian Leahy confirmed that the majority of other local authorities did extend CRB checks to operators. He had not found one local authority from a check of 30-40 that did not perform these checks.

Councillor Beck asked whether this could be done on a voluntary basis and Sarah Clarke responded that this would be difficult to then enforce.

Members took a vote to re-introduce Standing Orders in accordance with paragraph 7.6.2 final bullet point of the Constitution.

Councillor Beck proposed to go ahead with the recommendations in the report and Members voted in favour of doing so with 1 Member voting against the proposal and 1 Member abstaining.

**Resolved that:**

The CRB checking of private hire operators be approved.

*(The meeting commenced at 6.30 p.m. and closed at 8.40 p.m.)*

**CHAIRMAN** .....

**Date of Signature:** .....

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 4

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Hackney Carriage Licensing</b>
<b>Report to be considered by:</b>	Licensing
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	30 March 2010
<b>Forward Plan Ref:</b>	

**Purpose of Report:** To discuss the outcome of the Taxi Working Group Report on taxi services in West Berkshire

**Recommended Action:** To consider the report and options provided

**Reason for decision to be taken:** Referral from Licensing Committee 8 September 2009

**Other options considered:** None

**Key background documentation:** Licensing Committee Report dated 8 September 2009  
DfT consultations and guidance

The proposals contained in this report will help to achieve the following Council Plan Priority(ies):

- CPP1 – Support our communities through the economic recession** – to alleviate the impact on different communities and individuals who find themselves out of work and/or disadvantaged
- CPP2 – Raise levels of educational achievement** – improving school performance levels
- CPP3 – Reduce West Berkshire’s carbon footprint** – to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in West Berkshire and contribute to waste management, green travel, transportation and energy efficiency

The proposals will also help achieve the following Council Plan Theme(s):

- CPT1 - Better Roads and Transport**
- CPT2 - Thriving Town Centres**
- CPT3 - Affordable Housing**
- CPT4 - High Quality Planning**
- CPT5 - Cleaner and Greener**
- CPT6 - Vibrant Villages**
- CPT7 - Safer and Stronger Communities**
- CPT8 - A Healthier Life**
- CPT9 - Successful Schools and Learning**
- CPT10 - Promoting Independence**
- CPT11 - Protecting Vulnerable People**
- CPT12 - Including Everyone**
- CPT13 - Value for Money**
- CPT14 - Effective People**
- CPT15 - Putting Customers First**
- CPT16 - Excellent Performance Management**

The proposals contained in this report will help to achieve the above Council Plan Priorities and Themes by:  
 Providing a transport environment which goes towards meeting the needs of operators and users whilst acknowledging that there is no perfect solution to suit all.

Portfolio Member Details	
<b>Name &amp; Telephone No.:</b>	Councillor Hilary Cole - Tel (01635) 248542
<b>E-mail Address:</b>	hcole@westberks.gov.uk
<b>Date Portfolio Member agreed report:</b>	17 March 2010

Contact Officer Details	
<b>Name:</b>	Brian Leahy
<b>Job Title:</b>	Senior Licensing Officer
<b>Tel. No.:</b>	01635 519209
<b>E-mail Address:</b>	bleahy@westberks.gov.uk

### Implications

- Policy:** Although the Council has an existing policy for the issuing of taxi vehicle licences, conditions of vehicle suitability and driver application conditions, these may be revisited from time to time as legislation or social changes occur.
- Financial:** There may be financial implications for the council should certain of the proposals be adopted. However at this time, none.
- Personnel:** None: however there could be increased work implications for officers should certain proposals be adopted.
- Legal/Procurement:** The Council has a duty to licence hackney carriage vehicles. There are procurement implications for the re-tendering process for vehicle inspections. This process has already been started.
- Property:** None
- Risk Management:** None
- Equalities Impact Assessment:** None
- Corporate Board's View:** N/A  
to be completed after the Corporate Board meeting

**NOTE: The section below does not need to be completed if your report will not progress beyond Corporate or Management Board.**

<b>Is this item subject to call-in?</b>	Yes: <input type="checkbox"/>	No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If not subject to call-in please put a cross in the appropriate box:		
The item is due to be referred to Council for final approval		<input type="checkbox"/>

Delays in implementation could have serious financial implications for the Council	<input type="checkbox"/>
Delays in implementation could compromise the Council's position	<input type="checkbox"/>
Considered or reviewed by Overview and Scrutiny Commission or associated Task Groups within preceding six months	<input type="checkbox"/>
Item is Urgent Key Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>

## **1. Introduction**

- 1.1 West Berkshire Council is the licensing authority for the purpose of hackney carriage licensing under the Town Police Clauses Act 1847 and the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976.
- 1.2 At the Licensing Committee on the 8<sup>th</sup> September, Members considered a number of suggestions put forward by the trade associations and others, to limit the numbers of taxis being licensed by the Council, and other associated matters. Members are strongly recommended to re-read that report in conjunction with this document.
- 1.3 Members determined to set up a working group to look at the trade's proposals and other issues relating to taxis which had progressed from earlier committee meetings.

## **2. Working Group Outcomes**

- 2.1 The group considered all of the items discussed at the 8<sup>th</sup> September meeting and a number of other issues that were found to link with the trades requests and the Council's aspirations, particularly in respect of disabled access to taxis. The main areas to which the group gave consideration were, training, vehicle capping, vehicle testing, fees, age limits and vehicle specifications

## **3. Training**

- 3.1 Officers have offered broad spectrum disabled access training on a voluntary basis to all drivers and proprietors via the November and March Taxi Trade Newsletters. The training will be carried out in house by Steve Doel, the Council's Senior Transport Services Officer and Val Witton the Council's Access Officer. There will be no initial cost other than officer time to the Council by introducing this training. Team managers have approved the officer time. At the time of writing this report take up from the trade was 8 members of the associations however few other volunteers have come forward.
- 3.2 Initially officers of the Licensing Team, officers of the West Berkshire Hackney Carriage & Private Hire Operators Association and those of the CABCO Association (13 persons in total ) will undergo training as a starter to the programme.
- 3.3 A number of councils are now requiring drivers to be trained to NVQ Level 2 Road Passenger Vehicle Driving and/or The Driving Standards Agency and in some cases a BTech for drivers. West Berkshire Council have participated in the government funded Train to Gain NVQ Level 2 Road Passenger Transport Vehicle Driving and have three drivers qualified and 8 currently undergoing training with completion anticipated for April 2010. This training was voluntary however a government incentive in the form of a cash payment was available to drivers. It should be noted that the cash incentive scheme is no longer available.

## **4. Vehicles/Capping, control measures etc**

- 4.1 Most LA's **do not** impose quantity restrictions on the numbers of vehicles. **The Department for Transport regards this as best practice in its publication, Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Licensing: Best Practice Guide, as does the Office of Fair Trading.** The latest DfT report on Taxi and Private Hire Best Practice Guidance has now been published and has been considered in writing this report. Using this guidance and having reference to the DfT Consultation analysis report "Improving Access to Taxis", officers have advised the working group as to how best Members could consider the requests from the trade and in which areas, should they feel minded to do so.
- 4.2 It has been suggested by the trade that control measures to limit the number of new taxis and older vehicles being licensed, should be considered. This could include a return to the age policy, a higher specification for disabled access taxis, a mileage policy for new licences and for renewals, frequency and scope of mechanical testing and not least, a consideration for vehicles which meet a set criteria for fuel emissions.
- 4.3 The legislation gives LA's a wide range of discretion over the types and specification of vehicles it will licence as taxis. Some authorities specify conditions that, in practice, can only be met by purpose built vehicles, but the majority licence a range of vehicles.
- 4.4 Normally, the best practice is for LA's to adopt the principles of specifying as many types of vehicle as possible. The LA may set down a range of general criteria leaving it open to the trade to put forward vehicles which meet this criteria. In this way new types of vehicles brought onto the market will not have to be considered in isolation.

## 5. Frequency of test

- 5.1 The legal requirement is for vehicles to be subjected to an MOT test or its equivalent once per year. Hackney Carriages are required to have an MOT by the anniversary of the first year of the vehicle being registered however Private Hire vehicle MOT's remain at the initial three year anniversary of first registration. The Act allows for vehicles to be tested at the Council's discretion not more than three times per year notwithstanding the annual MOT. WBC require testing at the following intervals at a service garage chosen, through a tendering process, by the Council;

Vehicles up to 6 years of age	Once per year
Vehicles between 6 and 8 years of age	Twice per year
Vehicles over 8 years of age	Three times per year

- 5.2 However, at the moment, these tests are not the equivalent of the MOT but are more cosmetic, dealing only with those items set out in Appendix A to this report. It is possible that a more robust test may be worthy of considering and has in fact been asked for by the trade. However this is unlikely to have much impact on the aims of the trade in reducing vehicle numbers. The current contract for inspection expires at the end of June 2010 and officers are consulting the trade further as to what they would wish to see from the annual test. There are clear merits in having the test address more strongly, those mechanical checks required by a standard

MOT however this is likely to increase costs to the trade and is still subject to consultation.

## 6. Increase Fees

- 6.1 This is a very emotive area and will be unpopular with a large proportion of the trade if fees are raised across the board. Members may wish however to recommend that officers consider a scale of fees which allows for renewals to be at a reduced rate whilst demanding a higher fee for new vehicles and possibly drivers. This would have to be subject to a cost analysis exercise as there would be budget implications and it is in no way certain to deter persons from applying, even if this were the Council's aim. Members are reminded that the latest DfT guidance for Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Licensing - Best Practice Guidance makes it clear that Councils should ask themselves whether its costs to the trade are really commensurate with the benefits that a policy is meant to achieve. It goes further to say that "licensing requirements which are unduly stringent will tend unreasonably to restrict the supply of taxi and PHV services, by putting up the cost of operation or otherwise restricting entry to the trade". If however a fee reduction were to be considered the Council could also include a scheme towards achieving its aims of reducing its carbon footprint through offering a fee incentive to vehicles which have a reduced level of CO2 emissions.

## 7. Impose an age limit on vehicles

- 7.1 At the present time the council accept any vehicle for a new licence which is wheelchair accessible. It can be of any age and as long as it meets the mechanical and cosmetic standards required it will be successfully licensed. As Members are aware there are no restrictions on numbers or types of wheelchair accessible vehicles nor does the Council have a set standard specification for such vehicles. Members may consider it prudent to adopt a specification which allows only vehicles to be licensed which are deemed, following pre adoption consultation with representatives of disability access groups, the trade and the public, to be fit for purpose. **It is important to note that where a vehicle meets the Council's licensing standards it cannot be refused a licence.**
- 7.2 It has been suggested that an age limit be imposed on vehicles outside of which a licence will be refused. Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 section 47 allows for a council to attach such conditions to the grant of a Proprietors (Vehicle) Licence as the Council may consider reasonably necessary. There is sufficient case law to indicate that the introduction of an age policy, if properly applied and consulted upon, could withstand a legal challenge.
- 7.3 At the Licensing Committee meeting on the 8<sup>th</sup> September 2009 the trade submitted papers which suggested some of the following;
- 7.3.1 1<sup>st</sup> time applicants should provide a brand new vehicle to a wheelchair specification determined by the Council.
- 7.3.2 All taxis licensed as above, should be refused a renewed licence once the vehicle is presented for renewal and is over 5 years old.



7.3.2 All taxis regardless of licensing specification, wheelchair access, swivel seat or protected status should be refused a renewed licence if over 8 years at the time of application for renewal.

7.3.4 In any case, where applicable, when a replacement vehicle is presented it should be no older than 5 years from the date of first registration and have no more than 100,000 miles on the clock.

7.3.5 Additionally, officers suggested that no vehicle conversions for wheelchair accessibility should be licensed. That is to say, only vehicles which are initially manufactured to a wheelchair/disability standard should be considered. It is important to note that although the Council's current disability conditions only apply to wheelchair and swivel seat access there are other disabilities which should be provided for in any public service transport policy.

7.3.6 The current licensed age status of taxis as of 17<sup>th</sup> March 2010 (by year) was;

<b>Year first reg</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>% of total</b>
1996	1	.5
1997	1	.5
1998	1	.5
1999	2	1.1
2000	11	5.8
2001	8	4.2
2002	15	8.0
2003	22	11.6
2004	35	18.6
2005	34	18.0
2006	21	11.1
2007	21	11.1
2008	10	5.3
2009	7	3.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.00</b>

7.3.7 If vehicles over 8 years old were to be refused a licence at next renewal, 24 taxis would require to be replaced with a vehicle under 5 years of age ( this figure represents 12.69% of the current fleet ).

7.3.8 This does not mean to say that if age limit conditions as suggested above were in place 24 vehicles would be removed from the fleet, as the number of persons wishing to provide a newer vehicle are unknown.

7.3.9 Figures for wheelchair accessible vehicles and swivel seats as at 17<sup>th</sup> March 2010 are as follows:

<b>Year first reg</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Swivel Seat</b>	<b>Wheelchair</b>
1996	1	0	1
1997	1	0	1

1998	1	0	1
1999	1	1	0
2000	6	6	0
2001	7	4	3
2002	8	5	3
2003	11	8	3
2004	17	7	10
2005	15	8	7
2006	11	2	9
2007	15	1	14
2008	10	0	10
2009	4	0	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>66</b>

7.3.10 The number of wheelchair accessible vehicles and swivel seated vehicles together, against the fleet total is 57%.

## **8. Adopt an extensive physical and mechanical standard for taxis**

- 8.1 Although the Council has a standard set of vehicle conditions they are mainly those taken from Byelaws or traditional conditions which have been in place for some considerable time, with minor amendments being made over the years.
- 8.2 Members can consider a total review of these conditions and include modern specifications taken from appropriate guidance (DfT, DIPTAC (Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee) etc) and by adopting current best practice. In particular the issue of wheelchair accessibility in taxis could be addressed, in that there have been comments from wheelchair users and disability access groups and advisors, that some of the currently licensed taxis are not fit for purpose despite being able to accommodate a wheelchair user in situ. There is also a generally accepted view that vehicles fitted with swivel seats are of little use to most disabled persons due to the swivel seat being unfit for most purposes and are uncomfortable and difficult to access for able bodied persons. This review, if Members decide it necessary, could change the Council's taxi disabled access policy to better accommodate all disabilities and ensure that only vehicles which meet an exacting standard could be licensed, this would apply to both disabled accessible vehicles and those vehicles which currently hold protected status by having a swivel seat fitted. However, the trade view may well differ from this as there is a perception amongst the trade that the mix of vehicles currently weighing in the favour of disabled access, as can be seen at 7.3.10, is disproportionate.
- 8.3 Members should be aware that any change of conditions must be for the right reasons i.e. that they are necessary and proportionate to meet all demands of the Council, the trade and the taxi using public. If such a review were to be suggested, officers must warn that the work would have to be included within the current team framework and would take some considerable time to complete.

## **9. Members Options and Recommendations**

### **9.1 Training**

- 9.1.1 Members approve as a requirement for an application for a Hackney Carriage Driver's Licence, under section 46 of the Town Police Clause Act 1847 the following: "All first time applicants for a driver's licence must provide a certificate of competence in disabled access training, issued by a training body approved by the Council, prior to any application being considered".

Officers recommend that this condition, if adopted, applies to all new licences applied for from 1 April 2010. Note:- the trade associations, the West Berkshire Disability Alliance and the Council's Access Officer have been consulted upon this item.

- 9.1.2 Members approve a condition for applications for all Hackney Carriage Driver's Licence renewals, under section 46 of the Town Police Clauses Act 1847 as follows; "A requirement of application is that all applicants must provide a certificate of competence in disabled access training, issued by a training body approved by the Council, prior to any application being considered".

Officers recommend that this condition, if adopted, applies to all applications for a licence from 1 November 2010. Note:- the trade associations, the West Berkshire Disability Alliance and the Council's Access Officer have been consulted upon this item however a definitive date for implementation was not specifically addressed.

OR

- 9.1.3 Members approve a condition for all applications for Hackney Carriage Driver's licences, (renewals and new licences) as follows; "A requirement of application is that all applicants must have achieved either NVQ Level 2 Road Passenger Vehicle Driving, VRQ BTECH training or appropriate modules of the Driving Standards Agency Hackney Carriage/Private Hire Test".

Officers recommend that this condition, if adopted, applies to all applications for a licence from 1 April 2011. Note:- it is recommended that if this item is approved, it be in principle, so that further consultation can be undertaken with hackney carriage licence holders due to some personal costs being incurred on the part of the applicant.

### **9.2 Vehicles**

- 9.2.1 Members to approve a condition on all disabled access vehicle licences as follows; "The vehicle to which this licence applies may only be driven by a person who has achieved either NVQ Level 2 Road Passenger Vehicle Driving, VRQ BTECH training or appropriate modules of the Driving Standards Agency Hackney Carriage/Private Hire Test".

Officers recommend that this condition, if adopted, applies to all applications for a licence from 1 April 2011. Note; it is recommended that if this item is approved, it be in principle, so that further consultation can be undertaken with hackney carriage vehicle licence holders, due to the possibility of some personal costs being

incurred. **Note: In considering this item Members should be aware that there may be an approach from the trade for some financial assistance in adopting this type of training, which will have budget implications.**

OR

- 9.2.2 Approve a condition on all disabled access vehicle licences as follows; “The vehicle to which this licence applies may only be driven by a person who has attended a course approved by the Council, in disabled access training”.

Officers recommend that this condition, if adopted, applies to all disabled access vehicles including those with swivel seats, from 1 November 2010. Note:- the trade associations, the West Berkshire Disability Alliance and the Council’s Access Officer have been consulted upon this item however a definitive date for implementation was not specifically addressed.

- 9.2.3 Retain the frequency of council vehicle test (5.1 above) (subject to there being no changes to the age policy (9.2.5 refers). If changes to the policy were made then the frequency of test would have to be reviewed) but upgrade the test to include important mechanical inspections as required by a standard MOT, meter seal test and to run a measured mile. These additional items, if this option is adopted, to be included in the specification which goes out to tender for the new contract applicable from 1 July 2010. There are likely to be increased costs to the trade from garages contracted to do this additional work. As previously stated consultation with trade associations are ongoing regarding these specifications.

However

- 9.2.4 Members have the option to adopt the following policy as an alternative or select individual items for implementation or further consultation;

- 9.2.5 Impose an age limit on vehicles. Options are as follows;

9.2.5.1 11<sup>st</sup> time applicants should provide a brand new vehicle to a wheelchair specification determined by the Council.

9.2.5.2 All taxis licensed as above, should be refused a renewed licence once the vehicle is presented for renewal and is over 5 years old.

9.2.5.3 All taxis regardless of licensing specification, wheelchair access, swivel seat or protected status should be refused a renewed licence if over 8 years at the time of renewal.

9.2.5.4 In any case, where applicable, when a replacement vehicle is presented it should be no older than 5 years from the date of first registration.

9.2.5.5 No vehicle conversions for wheelchair accessibility should be licensed. That is to say, only vehicles which are initially manufactured from new, to a wheelchair/disability standard should be considered. It is important to note that although the Council’s current disability conditions only apply to wheelchair and swivel seat access there are other disabilities which should be provided for in any

public service transport policy. Although these options in 9.2.5 have been the subject of a previous report, officers recommend that a full trade consultation be carried out and the item brought back to committee for decision in September 2010

9.2.6 Adopt a condition which determines that all swivel seated vehicles are unsuitable for licensing as hackney carriages in that they are unfit for purpose, from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2012. In considering this proposal Members are reminded of the Judges' comments following an appeal in 2004 against replacing some saloon cars with disabled access facilities. "the operation of the swivel seats leaves a lot to be desired and did very little in achieving easy access to the vehicle and would be greatly detrimental to the comfort of passengers being carried in it". Officers recommend that if this option were to be adopted that replacement vehicles can only be licensed if they meet the full wheelchair accessibility standard.

## 10. Fee Incentives

Officers to do further exploratory work on applying a scale of fees which gives a financial incentive to those persons who acquire and licence low emission vehicles and possibly to allow for a reduced fee for those persons who licence a wheelchair accessible vehicle in place of a vehicle with a swivel seat prior to 1 April 2012 (if 9.2.6 is adopted).

## 11. Conclusion

11.1 Officers have been prepared to listen to the trade in general in writing this report however it should be noted that despite advertising some of the above in the latest newsletter only the trade associations have responded formally.

## 12. Appendices:

Appendix A – Council test inspection pro forma

**Local Stakeholders:** West Berkshire Hackney Carriage Vehicle Proprietors (vehicle) Licence holders. CABCO Members Association. Disability Alliance and other representatives of the disabled, elderly and infirm. Members of the public.

**Officers Consulted:** Steve Doel, Valerie Witton

**Trade Union:** None

## APPENDIX A



## TAXI & PRIVATE HIRE VEHICLE INSPECTION FORM

<b>Date:</b> .....	<b>Inspector:</b> .....	<b>Job No:</b> .....
-----------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------

Vehicle/Plate Owner: .....	Licence No: .....	Reg. No: .....	
<b>Vehicle Details:</b>			
Veh Make/Model: .....	Vin No: .....		
Engine Capacity: .....	Passenger Seating Capacity: .....		
Speedometer Reading: .....			
<b>Vehicle Inspection: Condition of:</b>			
	<b>G = Good</b> <b>Y = Yes</b>	<b>S = Serviceable</b> <b>N = No</b>	<b>P = Poor</b>
	<b>G/S/P</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>G/S/P Y/N</b>
Bodywork			Registration plates
Bumpers			Paintwork
Steering & drive shaft gaiters			Interior fittings & fabrics
Cleanliness of Vehicle (internally & externally)			Headlining
Spare tyre (jack & brace or approved alternative)			
<b>Items to be Tested / Checked:</b>	<b>G/S/P</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>G/S/P Y/N</b>
Fire Extinguisher (fitted & in date)			External & Internal mirrors
Darkened Glass windows/screens			Additional Lights
First Aid Kit			Doors locks & hinges etc.
Advertising signage			Boot lid, tailgate etc.
No. & condition of seats (free movement of)			West Berks logo/ roof & door signs (Hackney Carriage only)
Swivel Seat Fitted			Speedometer
Wheelchair accessible			Licence plate (renewals)
Ramps & restraints (disabled access vehicles)			Luggage restraint straps, nets etc. (estate cars)
Roof sign light			Emissions (Interim Inspections)
Meter & Seal (Taxis only)			
<b>THIS VEHICLE IS (SUITABLE / UNSUITABLE) FOR USE AS A HACKNEY CARRIAGE / PRIVATE HIRE</b>			
<b>Vehicle Inspector:</b> .....		<b>Date:</b> .....	
Office Use			



This page is intentionally left blank



<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Taxi Tariff 2010/11</b>
<b>Report to be considered by:</b>	Licensing
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	30 March 2010
<b>Forward Plan Ref:</b>	

**Purpose of Report:** To inform members of an application for a taxi tariff increase for 2010/11

**Recommended Action:** Approval

**Reason for decision to be taken:** Although there is no legal requirement for the Council to set a tariff, traditionally a maximum tariff to be charged has been approved by the appropriate committee

**Other options considered:** To keep the current tariff or agree a tariff that Members decide is appropriate if different from the trades proposals.

**Key background documentation:** OfT Report on taxi services

The proposals contained in this report will help to achieve the following Council Plan Priority(ies):

- CPP1 – Support our communities through the economic recession** – to alleviate the impact on different communities and individuals who find themselves out of work and/or disadvantaged
- CPP2 – Raise levels of educational achievement** – improving school performance levels
- CPP3 – Reduce West Berkshire’s carbon footprint** – to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in West Berkshire and contribute to waste management, green travel, transportation and energy efficiency

The proposals will also help achieve the following Council Plan Theme(s):

- CPT1 - Better Roads and Transport**
- CPT2 - Thriving Town Centres**
- CPT3 - Affordable Housing**
- CPT4 - High Quality Planning**
- CPT5 - Cleaner and Greener**
- CPT6 - Vibrant Villages**
- CPT7 - Safer and Stronger Communities**
- CPT8 - A Healthier Life**
- CPT9 - Successful Schools and Learning**
- CPT10 - Promoting Independence**
- CPT11 - Protecting Vulnerable People**
- CPT12 - Including Everyone**
- CPT13 - Value for Money**
- CPT14 - Effective People**
- CPT15 - Putting Customers First**
- CPT16 - Excellent Performance Management**

The proposals contained in this report will help to achieve the above Council Plan Priorities and Themes by:  
Ensuring that the tariff charged does not exceed the maximum agreed thus protecting the taxi using public from overcharging and by creating a consistent approach to charging for taxi operators and drivers.

Portfolio Member Details	
<b>Name &amp; Telephone No.:</b>	Councillor Hilary Cole - Tel (01635) 248542
<b>E-mail Address:</b>	hcole@westberks.gov.uk
<b>Date Portfolio Member agreed report:</b>	19 March 2010

Contact Officer Details	
<b>Name:</b>	Brian Leahy
<b>Job Title:</b>	Senior Licensing Officer
<b>Tel. No.:</b>	01635 519209
<b>E-mail Address:</b>	bleahy@westberks.gov.uk

## Implications

<b>Policy:</b>	There is no established policy on this subject except that the Council has opted in the past to set a maximum tariff. Legally it is not obliged to do so. There are no legal barriers to reviewing a tariff change more than once per year
<b>Financial:</b>	The cost of advertising any change of tariff in a locally circulating newspaper is approximately £380. This cost will be met from the existing budget for the West Berkshire's Licensing Service.
<b>Personnel:</b>	None
<b>Legal/Procurement:</b>	Any change to the taxi tariff must be advertised, by notice, in a locally circulating newspaper setting out the table of fares or the variation thereof and specifying the period, which shall not be less than 14 days from the date of the publication of the notice, within which and the manner in which objections to the table of fares or variation can be made.
<b>Property:</b>	None
<b>Risk Management:</b>	None
<b>Equalities Impact Assessment:</b>	None
<b>Corporate Board's View:</b>	to be completed after the Corporate Board meeting

***NOTE: The section below does not need to be completed if your report will not progress beyond Corporate or Management Board.***

<b>Is this item subject to call-in?</b>	Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No: <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>If not subject to call-in please put a cross in the appropriate box:</p> <p>The item is due to be referred to Council for final approval <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Delays in implementation could have serious financial implications for the Council <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Delays in implementation could compromise the Council's position <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Considered or reviewed by Overview and Scrutiny Commission or associated Task Groups within preceding six months <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Item is Urgent Key Decision <input type="checkbox"/></p>		

# Executive Summary

---

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 Councils are not obliged to set a maximum taxi fare for their area but may do so if they wish. In the past, West Berkshire Council and its predecessor have set a maximum taxi fare structure. It is usually reviewed annually to commence as soon as possible at the start of the new financial year.
- 1.2 Although not a recommended action, Members have the option to not set a tariff at all, relying instead on market forces to establish the going rate and at the same time promoting competition. The taxi trade, through the West Berkshire Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Operators Association and the CABCO Association, are opposed to such a proposal citing potential threats from the public as the main reason, along with the possibility of unscrupulous drivers charging unreasonable fares. The local police are also not in favour of such a move for similar reasons.
- 1.3 The taxi trade representatives have also said in the past that having a maximum tariff set by the Council helps to deflect criticism of apparently high fares. Currently, the fare regime for the district is staged at 52 in a national council league table of 380 authorities. The national average fare at one mile is currently £3.40 with West Berkshire standing at £3.90. The flag tariff is currently, nationally £2.51 and locally £2.50.
- 1.4 Neighbouring councils fares are as follows;

At one mile		at flag
Reading	£4.00	£2.20
Wokingham	£4.00	£3.00
Bracknell	£4.00	£3.00
Slough	£4.00	£3.00
Vale oWH	£4.10	£3.50
Swindon	£4.30	£2.90
Windsor & M	£3.40	£2.60
Basingstoke & Deane	£4.00	£2.80

## 2. Annual Review 2009/10

- 2.1 The annual review applicable from April 2008 allowed for an increase of approximately 2.5% to become effective from the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2008 until 31 March 2009, or thereabouts. Members will recall a further review of the tariff carried out in June 2008 where an increase of £0.50p was allowed at flag, to compensate for the rapid increase in fuel prices since the annual review taking effect in April 2008.
- 2.2 At the 2009 Licensing Committee when the tariff was considered, the trade asked for the .50 pence surcharge to remain with no further increase being added for the 2009/10 financial year. Members agreed to this proposal.

- 2.3 Cabco have written to the Council on behalf of themselves and the West Berkshire Hackney Carriage & Private Hire Operator's Association, letter dated 11<sup>th</sup> February 2010 and shown as Appendix A, outlining their case for an increase of tariff for 2010/11.
- 2.4 Members may wish to suspend standing orders and invite trade representatives to address the committee to further explain their request.

### **3. The Office of Fair Trading Report**

The report does not recommend that Councils remove pricing restrictions for taxis. It recognises that whilst there are some good reasons for deregulating fares, on balance, those for applying controls are stronger. Overall, the OFT believes that fare deregulation will lead to higher charges. The report makes clear that when setting fares the Council should make it clear that the fare set, is the maximum that can be charged. This statement is shown on the tariff card issued to all vehicle proprietors.

- 3.1 A copy of the OFT report is available at the OFT web site at, <http://www.oft.gov/Market+Studies.taxi.htm>

### **4. Taxi Fares for 2009/10**

- 4.1 The current taxi fares/tariff set by this authority are shown at appendix B to this report.

### **Appendices**

Appendix A – Letter from Cabco & West Berkshire Hackney Carriage & Private Hire Association.

Appendix B – Tariff card applicable from 2 July 2008 to present

## Appendix A

---

Mr Brian Leahy  
Senior Licensing Officer  
West Berkshire Council  
Council Offices  
Faraday Road  
Newbury  
Berkshire  
RG14 2AF

11<sup>th</sup> February 2010

Dear Mr Leahy,

Setting of the maximum chargeable fares for Hackney Carriages W.E.F the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2010

The members of the above mentioned association and the West Berkshire Taxi Association have instructed me to apply to you for an increase in charges.

Our application is as follows:

- 1) Initial distance not exceeding 450 yards or part thereof  
Initial waiting time 120 seconds or a combination of time and distance £ 2.50
- 2) For each subsequent 90 yards completed or part thereof. 10p.
- 3) For every period of 18 seconds or part thereof. 10p

The associations also propose a small change in the premium rate charged for the early hours of new years day, details of which are shown in the attached revised tariff card.

The above proposals represent an increase of 20p on the average West Berkshire taxi fare, and would be the first increase since May 2008.

In calculating our increase we have used the formula agreed and set out by the TGWU and the Public Carriage Office. Calculations are based on the following criteria,

1. The average cost of providing a vehicle. (In this case a Ford Mondeo and London Taxi). Calculations are based on 4 different methods.
  - a) Purchase new and run for 6 years.
  - b) Purchase new and run for 3 years.
  - c) Purchase at 3 years and run for 6 years.
  - d) Lease.

2. Vehicle Spares:

basket of 15 components is taken into account, along with tyre costs from 3 manufactures.

A

3. Garaging and Servicing:

These are divided into property derived costs (rent, rates, heating, lighting), using the Hillier-Parker rent index for industrial premises and labour derived costs using the TGWU National Joint Council for the Motor Retail Repair Industry's Minimum rates of pay index.

4. Fuel costs:

The price of derv per gallon is taken from the Petroleum Times Energy Source, and assumes typical consumption of 25 miles to the gallon.

5. Insurance:

Three insurance companies provide quotes; this figure is then averaged out.

6. Miscellaneous costs:

- 1) Licence fees
- 2) Class 2 NI contributions
- 3) MOT

7. Earnings:

As taxi fares comprise taxi drivers main income the formula takes account of earnings as 45% Of the overall calculation for a fares increase. The earnings figure is derived from the average earnings index for the whole economy.

We would be obliged if you could consider the above and arrange for the appropriate Committee to consider our application at their earliest convenient meeting in order that the proposed increase can be implemented from the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2010.

We will be pleased to have a representative at the committee meeting to answer any questions councillors might have.

Yours faithfully,



Mr R.Nemeth

For and on behalf of the Cabco Owners and Drivers Association and the West Berkshire Hackney Carriage Owners Association

## Appendix B



### Hackney Carriages - Table of Fares effective from 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2008

**Customers should be aware that these charges are the MAXIMUM to be charged and any lesser fare negotiated prior to commencement of the journey.**

The meter may be engaged in the hired time mode at the agreed booking time.  
(Local Government ( Miscellaneous Provisions ) Act 1976 sec 67)

#### Tariff 1

applies between the hours of 0600 and 2200 Monday to Saturday, other than Bank or Public Holidays or Christmas Day

Initial distance not exceeding 478 metres or part thereof

Initial waiting time 120 seconds or a combination of time and distance	<b>£2.50</b>
For each subsequent 86 metres completed or part thereof	<b>10p</b>
Waiting time; for every period of 20 seconds or part thereof	<b>10p</b>

**Tariff 2**

applies for any hiring when the journey commences between 22.00hrs and 06.00hrs, including Sundays, Bank Holidays or Public Holidays other than Christmas day.  
For any hiring when the journey commences between 19.00hrs and midnight on Christmas Eve or New Years Eve.  
For any journey with 5 or more passengers taking place between 06:00hrs and 22:00hrs

Initial distance not exceeding 478 metres or part thereof	
Initial waiting time 120 seconds or a combination of time and distance	<b>£3.00</b>
For each subsequent 86 metres or part thereof	<b>15p</b>
Waiting time; for every period of 20 seconds or part thereof	<b>15p</b>

**Tariff 3**

Applies for any hiring when the journey commences on Christmas day until 06.00hrs on Boxing day

Initial distance not exceeding 478 metres or part thereof	
Initial waiting time 120 seconds or a combination of time and distance	<b>£4.00</b>
For each subsequent 86 metres completed or part thereof	<b>20p</b>
Waiting time; for every period of 20 seconds or part thereof	<b>20p</b>

**Booking fee ( By prior arrangement only)**

If a Hackney Carriage is booked by phone a booking fee may be charged but only by prior arrangement. .

**Fouling will be charged for.**

**London Congestion charge will be applied for journeys within the charge zone**





This page is intentionally left blank