

Draft Licensing Policy for Hackney Carriage and Private Hire

APPENDIX FOR THE CONSULTATION REPORT

Appendices A and B for the Draft Licensing Policy for Hackney Carriage and Private Hire consultation report, including the engagement communication and the survey with full results. The report and appendices are available to view on our [South Oxfordshire](#) or [Vale of White Horse](#) websites.

MAY 2021

CONTENTS

APPENDIX A – ENGAGEMENT COMMUNICATION	2
APPENDIX B – SURVEY AND FULL RESULTS	4



Note: Any personal information supplied to us within the comments that could identify anyone has been redacted and will not be shared or published in the main consultation report or this appendix. Further information on data protection is available in our general consultation's privacy statement on our [South](#) or [Vale](#) website; some comments received were blank responses; some spelling, grammatical and punctual errors in the original comments raised were corrected in the main consultation report; a full list of unedited comments can be found in this appendix.

APPENDIX A – ENGAGEMENT COMMUNICATION

A copy of the email notification sent out is below. The text was adapted for the letter sent to those who opted to receive postal notifications.

Subject: Please let us know what you think of our proposed new Licensing Policy for taxis and minicabs

Dear [NAME]

We are developing a new Taxi Licensing Policy to promote the highest possible standards with the aim to:

- protect the public
- maintain and develop professional and respected hackney carriage and private hire trades
- ensure an efficient and quality local transport service
- encourage environmental sustainability.

We are responsible for licensing private hire (minicab) vehicles, drivers and operators; we also license hackney carriage (taxi) vehicles and drivers in South Oxfordshire and the Vale of White Horse districts. We would like to know what you think of our draft new **Licensing Policy for Hackney Carriage and Private Hire**, which sets out how we propose to regulate hackney carriages and private hire vehicles across the districts.

We have created a new draft policy by reviewing and updating our previous policy to include more robust safety measures as well as changes to help us support our corporate priorities of tackling the climate emergency and building healthy communities. The new draft policy also includes changes required due to updated government legislation.

Before giving us your comments, you can find out more on our websites, which include a summary of the changes we have made to the old policy: [South Oxfordshire](#) and [Vale of White Horse](#).

The consultation will run for six-weeks from **10 February until midnight on Wednesday 24 March 2021**.

How to take part

- Complete the online survey **by using this link:** [SURVEYLINK]

Note that this is a unique link just for you and is tied to your email address. If you would like to forward this message to anybody else, please refer them to the [public link to the survey](#).

What happens next

Once the consultation period is complete, a summary of the responses received will be provided to the licensing committees with a final version of the policy for consideration. We will publish the revised policy on our websites.

We look forward to hearing your views.

Yours sincerely

Laura Driscoll
Licensing Team Leader
South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils

If you have any queries about the consultation process or require any of the consultation materials in an alternative format (for example: large print, Braille, audio, email, Easy Read or alternative languages) please email haveyoursay@southandvale.gov.uk or call 01235 422425.

Opt out: If you do not wish to receive emails like this from us, please click the link below, and you can be removed from our consultation mailing list. Please note, we may still need to contact you for certain consultations if we have a legal obligation to do so: <https://survey.southandvale.gov.uk/s/pleaseremovemydetails/>

Data protection: Please refer to our privacy policy regarding how your personal data is used for this consultation, available on the consultation page of our websites: [South Oxfordshire](#) or [Vale of White Horse](#). If you would like to know more about the council's data protection registration or to find out about your personal data, please visit our websites: [South Oxfordshire](#) or [Vale of White Horse](#).

APPENDIX B – SURVEY AND FULL RESULTS

Including quantitative data and full list of comments received

A copy of the survey introduction is below.

This section includes the quantitative data. Not all respondents answered so percentages given represent responses to each question.

A full list of unedited comments can also be found below. Some spelling, grammatical and punctuation errors in the original comments raised were corrected in the main body of the consultation report but remain unedited here.

Any personal information supplied to us within the comments that could identify anyone has been removed and will not be shared or published in the report or appendices.

All survey questions are included for reference.

Survey Introduction

Taxi licensing in your area: have your say



Introduction

Draft Licensing Policy for Hackney Carriage and Private Hire

We want to know what you think of some changes we're proposing to make to the taxi licensing policy for South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse.

We're responsible for licensing private hire (minicab) vehicles, drivers and operators. We also license hackney carriage (taxi) vehicles and drivers. We would like to know what you think of our new draft taxi licensing policy which sets out how we propose to regulate taxis and private hire vehicles across the South Oxfordshire and Vale of

White Horse districts.

To create the new draft policy, we have reviewed and updated our previous policy. The new version includes more robust safety measures as well as changes to help us support our corporate priorities of tackling the climate emergency and building healthy communities.

Some of the changes we have made are to reflect changes in legislation and guidance since the policy was last reviewed. We have also taken into account the Department for Transport's (DfT) Statutory Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Standards, which were published in July 2020.

Let us know what you think

We'd like to hear your thoughts on the new draft policy, which aims to promote the highest possible standards to keep the public safe. We aim to:

- protect the public;
- maintain and develop professional and respected hackney carriage and private hire trades;
- ensure an efficient and quality local transport service; and
- encourage environmental sustainability.

This survey will ask for your views on the proposed new policy. We have also included an extra question about closed circuit television (CCTV) in licensed vehicles, which includes private hire vehicles (minicabs) and hackney carriage vehicles (taxis), which is not covered in the policy.

Before you begin, please feel free to read this summary of changes we have made to the old policy, which also explains the reasons for the changes. Some of the changes we have made to the new policy are required by government legislation – you can read a summary of these changes on our website - see website links below.

We have not proposed any specific level of tariff for South Oxfordshire at this stage (Vale of White Horse already has a tariff). If the licensing committee decides that a tariff is to be introduced, there would be a separate conversation with hackney carriage proprietors in South Oxfordshire to ask for their views on setting the new tariff. Any proposed tariff would be advertised before being introduced (in accordance with section 65 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976).

Find out more

You can find out more information in the following documents, available on our websites, South Oxfordshire or Vale of White Horse:

- Proposed new taxi licensing policy
- Summary of changes we have made to the old policy
- Statutory Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Standards

- Our corporate priorities

The consultation will run for six weeks from 10 February and the deadline for completing the survey is **midnight on Wednesday 24 March 2021**.

Accessing the documents

Please review the documents online where possible. Our offices on Milton Park are currently closed due to Covid-19 restrictions. Please call the licensing team on 01235 422556 or email them on licensing@southoxon.gov.uk, for South Oxfordshire or licensing.unit@whitehorsedc.gov.uk for Vale of White Horse if you need help reviewing the documents or taking part in the consultation. If you require the documents in an alternative format (for example large print, Braille, audio, email, Easy Read and alternative languages), please email haveyoursay@southandvale.gov.uk or call 01235 422425.

What happens next?

After the consultation period ends, we will collate and review all of your responses and update the policy where appropriate. The Licensing Committees at South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils will then consider the consultation report and a final version of the policy. If approved by the committees, the new policy will take effect – we currently expect this to happen in June 2021. We will publish the new policy on our websites along with the consultation report, and delete the original consultation responses

Queries?

If you have any queries about this survey please email haveyoursay@southandvale.gov.uk or call 01235 422425.

If you have any questions about taxi licensing, please email licensing@southoxon.gov.uk for South Oxfordshire licensing.unit@whitehorsedc.gov.uk for Vale of White Horse or call 01235 422556.

Personal details

If you are responding as a member of the public or as a licensed driver, you are not required to provide your name, trading name or contact details. Any personal information you provide to the council within your comments that could identify you will not be published in the consultation report. If you are responding in your capacity as a councillor or council officer, we ask you to provide the name of your council, and if you are responding on behalf of an organisation or business, we ask you to provide its name - the summary report will include this information. Further information on data protection is available in our privacy statement.

By clicking 'next page' you confirm you are happy for your response to be used in the survey analysis and results. The survey should take around 20 minutes to complete, and a save and continue option is available so that you can come

back to a partially completed survey. Your responses may be included as valid answers, even if you do not click 'finish' at the end of the survey.

Taxi licensing proposals

Summary

A summary of proposed changes is below. **Section A** covers proposed changes from the Department of Transport's 'statutory standards'. **Section B** covers other proposed changes to the policy. You will be given the opportunity to provide comments on the proposed policies in the survey.

There are also some changes we have had to make to bring the policy in line with current legislation. We also added a section with general guidance on application processes and determination. You can find out what these are on our websites - see links below.

Section A: Proposed changes from the Department for Transport's 'Statutory Standards'

Some of the changes we have made to the policy include more robust safety measures based on a document called Statutory Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Standards, which the Department for Transport (DfT) published in July 2020. We are expected to make these changes unless there is '*a compelling local reason not to*'.

The proposed policy changes include:

- suitability to hold a licence (including DBS checks, national register, fit and proper, criminal standards, reporting convictions, etc);
- safeguarding;
- operator requirements;
- complaints about licence holders.

Section B: Other proposed changes to the policy

The new version of the policy includes other changes to develop and maintain professional and respected hackney carriage and private hire trades and to ensure an efficient and quality local transport service. It will also help us support our corporate priorities of tackling the climate emergency and building healthy communities.

- Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) and Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency (DVLA) checks
- Driver standards
- Drivers
- Enforcement
- General
- Operators
- Vehicle criteria

More information:

You can read the summary of changes we have made to the old policy, look at the proposed new policy and other consultation documents, and find out more about taxi licensing on our websites: South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse.

Survey: including quantitative results and a full list of all comments received

A little bit about you...

To help us to better understand responses to this survey, and see if we are reaching a wide variety of people, please can you tell us about yourself.

Q1. Are you responding as:										Response Percent	Response Total
1	an individual/member of the public								69.23%	126	
2	a business or organisation/community group								0.55%	1	
3	a district, county or town/parish councillor								3.85%	7	
4	a district, county or town/parish officer								2.20%	4	
5	a driver or proprietor licensed by the district council								15.93%	29	
6	an operator licensed by the district council								2.75%	5	
7	Other (please specify):								5.49%	10	
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	2.25	Std. Deviation	2	Satisfaction Rate	20.88	answered	182	
	Maximum	7	Variance	4	Std. Error	0.15		skipped	0		
Other (please specify): (10)											
1	Chairperson of customer representative group										
2	Email response										
3	Email response										
4	Email response										
5	Email response										
6	Email response										
7	Email response										

Q1. Are you responding as:

		Response Percent	Response Total
8	Email response		
9	Email response		
10	Email response		

Q2. Which district do you live in?

			Response Percent	Response Total				
1	South Oxfordshire		58.73%	74				
2	Vale of White Horse		34.92%	44				
3	Neither, but I use taxis in the districts		3.97%	5				
4	Neither, but I have other interests in the districts		2.38%	3				
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	1.5	answered	126		
	Maximum	4	Variance	0.47			Std. Deviation	0.69
					Std. Error	0.06	Satisfaction Rate	16.67

Q3. What is the name of the business or organisation/community group you are representing? Or what council are you representing?

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	12
1	Swyncombe Parish Council		
2	Share If Ltd		
3	SODC		
4	Wallingford Town Council		
5	not applicable		
6	THAME TOWN COUNCIL		
7	Wantage Town Council		
8	Thame		
9	Thame Town Council		

Q3. What is the name of the business or organisation/community group you are representing? Or what council are you representing?

		Response Percent	Response Total
10	Wheatley Parish Council		
11	Oxfordshire County Council - Supported Transport Services		
12	Vale of White Horse District and Cumnor Parish Councils		
		answered	12
		skipped	170

Q4. Where is the business based? Tick all that apply.

		Response Percent	Response Total					
1	South Oxfordshire		58.33% 7					
2	Vale of White Horse		33.33% 4					
3	Based out of districts (but trade within South and Vale)		8.33% 1					
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	1.5	Std. Deviation	0.65	answered	12
	Maximum	3	Variance	0.42	Std. Error	0.19	skipped	170

Q5. Which district council are you licensed by?

		Response Percent	Response Total					
1	South Oxfordshire		89.66% 26					
2	Vale of White Horse		13.79% 4					
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	1.13	Std. Deviation	0.34	answered	29
	Maximum	2	Variance	0.12	Std. Error	0.06	skipped	153

Q6. Which district do you live in?

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	South Oxfordshire		41.38% 12
2	Vale of White Horse		3.45% 1
3	Neither, I live outside of these districts		55.17% 16

Q6. Which district do you live in?

									Response Percent	Response Total
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	2.14	Std. Deviation	0.97	Satisfaction Rate	56.9	answered	29
	Maximum	3	Variance	0.95	Std. Error	0.18				

If you live outside of the districts, please tell us which district or local authority you live in: (15)

1	I live in greater leys, but have been licensed by the vale for 19 years
2	Oxford
3	Reading
4	berkshire
5	Oxford
6	Cherwell, Oxfordshire.
7	Slough
8	Cherwell
9	Reding
10	Oxford City
11	Bicester
12	Buckinghamshire
13	West berkshire
14	High wycombe
15	We have offices in Didcot, Newbury, and Oxford

Q7. Please provide either your name, or your operator trading name:

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	26
1			
2			
3	Henley Taxi		
4			
5			
6			

Q7. Please provide either your name, or your operator trading name:

		Response Percent	Response Total
7			
8			
9			
10			
11	Chiltern car		
12			
13	N/a		
14			
15	(Go Green Taxis)		
16			
17			
18	001		
19	001 taxis		
20	Butla cars		
21			
22			
23			
24	Bobs taxis		
25	Go Green Taxis Ltd		
26			
		answered	26
		skipped	156

Q8. Which district council provides your operator licence?

		Response Percent	Response Total							
1	South Oxfordshire	100.00%	8							
2	Vale of White Horse	0.00%	0							
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	1	Std. Deviation	0	Satisfaction Rate	0	answered	8
	Maximum	1	Variance	0	Std. Error	0			skipped	174

Q9. Please provide either your name, or your operator trading name:				
			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question		100.00%	8
	1	Ra cars		
	2	Lightway Services Ltd		
	3	Chrissie's Cabs		
	4	Henley cars		
	5			
	6	Driving Miss Daisy Didcot		
	7			
	8	Pryors Corporate Travel		
			answered	8
			skipped	174

Section A: Proposed changes from the Department for Transport's 'Statutory Standards'

You can provide your comments about the proposed changes to the taxi policy that come from the Department for Transport's 'Statutory Standards' in this section.

We are expected to make these changes unless there is what the government calls 'a *compelling local reason not to*'. If you disagree with any of the proposed policies, you will have the opportunity to tell us your *compelling local reason* for us to consider.

The proposed policy changes include:

- suitability to hold a licence (including DBS checks, national register, fit and proper, criminal standards, reporting convictions, etc);
- safeguarding;
- operator requirements;
- complaints about licence holders.

More information on each proposed policy, including the reasoning for introducing it, is on our websites, South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse.

Suitability to hold a licence

Q10. These DfT 'Statutory Standards' policies are around suitability to hold a licence (including Disclosure and Barring Service [DBS] checks, national register, fit and proper, criminal standards, reporting convictions, etc).

You can find out more information on our website: South Oxfordshire or Vale of White Horse. How far do you agree or disagree with proposed policy changes below?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No comment	Response Total
National register of refusals and revocations (section 3.11) Added reference to the national register of refusals and revocations (NR3) which will be used to share information and check new applicants and existing licence holders	48.9% (89)	38.5% (70)	3.8% (7)	1.1% (2)	0.5% (1)	7.1% (13)	182
Guidance on determining suitability (section 4.1 and Appendix F) Added a section to confirm introduction of new guidance on determining suitability for all licence holders	47.3% (86)	37.9% (69)	4.9% (9)	1.1% (2)	0.5% (1)	8.2% (15)	182
Fitness and propriety section (section 4.2) Added a section to explain fitness and propriety to hold a licence in more detail	48.4% (88)	36.8% (67)	6.6% (12)	1.6% (3)	0.0% (0)	6.6% (12)	182
Reporting convictions and offences (section 4.4) All licence holders must report all new convictions, cautions, etc in writing within 48 hours	59.3% (108)	25.3% (46)	6.0% (11)	3.3% (6)	0.5% (1)	5.5% (10)	182
						answered	182
						skipped	0

Q11. continued from above.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No comment	Email response	Response Total
Reporting arrests and charges (section 4.5) All licence holders must inform the council if they are arrested, formally interviewed as a suspect or charged with an offence by the Police	63.2% (115)	19.2% (35)	4.4% (8)	3.3% (6)	3.3% (6)	6.6% (12)	0.0% (0)	182
Vehicle proprietor DBS checks (section 7.5) Added requirement for vehicle proprietors not currently	55.6% (100)	28.3% (51)	7.2% (13)	2.8% (5)	0.6% (1)	5.0% (9)	0.6% (1)	180

Q11. continued from above.								
	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No comment	Email response	Response Total
licensed to provide a basic DBS disclosure on application								
Driver DBS checks (section 8.14) No driver's licences will be issued or renewed without a current enhanced DBS disclosure or one checked through the Update service	60.2% (109)	24.3% (44)	5.0% (9)	3.3% (6)	0.6% (1)	6.6% (12)	0.0% (0)	181
DBS Update service (section 8.16) All drivers must sign up for and maintain their annual payments to the DBS Update Service. Failure to do so may result in suspension of the licence	49.5% (90)	29.1% (53)	7.7% (14)	3.3% (6)	4.9% (9)	5.5% (10)	0.0% (0)	182
							answered	182
							skipped	0

Matrix Charts

Q10.1. National register of refusals and revocations (section 3.11) Added reference to the national register of refusals and revocations (NR3) which will be used to share information and check new applicants and existing licence holders								Response Percent	Response Total	
1	Strongly agree							48.9%	89	
2	Agree							38.5%	70	
3	Neither agree nor disagree							3.8%	7	
4	Disagree							1.1%	2	
5	Strongly disagree							0.5%	1	
6	No comment							7.1%	13	
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	1.87	Std. Deviation	1.32	Satisfaction Rate	17.47	answered	182
	Maximum	6	Variance	1.75	Std. Error	0.1				

Q10.2. Guidance on determining suitability (section 4.1 and Appendix F) Added a section to confirm introduction of new guidance on determining suitability for all licence holders								Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree							47.3%	86
2	Agree							37.9%	69
3	Neither agree nor disagree							4.9%	9
4	Disagree							1.1%	2

Q10.2. Guidance on determining suitability (section 4.1 and Appendix F) Added a section to confirm introduction of new guidance on determining suitability for all licence holders									Response Percent	Response Total
5	Strongly disagree								0.5%	1
6	No comment								8.2%	15
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	1.95	Std. Deviation	1.39	Satisfaction Rate	18.9	answered	182
	Maximum	6	Variance	1.93	Std. Error	0.1				

Q10.3. Fitness and propriety section (section 4.2) Added a section to explain fitness and propriety to hold a licence in more detail									Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree								48.4%	88
2	Agree								36.8%	67
3	Neither agree nor disagree								6.6%	12
4	Disagree								1.6%	3
5	Strongly disagree								0.0%	0
6	No comment								6.6%	12
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	1.88	Std. Deviation	1.29	Satisfaction Rate	17.58	answered	182
	Maximum	6	Variance	1.66	Std. Error	0.1				

Q10.4. Reporting convictions and offences (section 4.4) All licence holders must report all new convictions, cautions, etc in writing within 48 hours									Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree								59.3%	108
2	Agree								25.3%	46
3	Neither agree nor disagree								6.0%	11
4	Disagree								3.3%	6
5	Strongly disagree								0.5%	1
6	No comment								5.5%	10
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	1.77	Std. Deviation	1.29	Satisfaction Rate	15.38	answered	182
	Maximum	6	Variance	1.66	Std. Error	0.1				

Q11.1. Reporting arrests and charges (section 4.5) All licence holders must inform the council if they are arrested, formally interviewed as a suspect or charged with an offence by the Police									Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree								63.2%	115

Q11.1. Reporting arrests and charges (section 4.5) All licence holders must inform the council if they are arrested, formally interviewed as a suspect or charged with an offence by the Police								Response Percent	Response Total	
2	Agree							19.2%	35	
3	Neither agree nor disagree							4.4%	8	
4	Disagree							3.3%	6	
5	Strongly disagree							3.3%	6	
6	No comment							6.6%	12	
7	Email response							0.0%	0	
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	1.84	Std. Deviation	1.46	Satisfaction Rate	14.01	answered	182
	Maximum	6	Variance	2.13	Std. Error	0.11				

Q11.2. Vehicle proprietor DBS checks (section 7.5) Added requirement for vehicle proprietors not currently licensed to provide a basic DBS disclosure on application								Response Percent	Response Total	
1	Strongly agree							55.6%	100	
2	Agree							28.3%	51	
3	Neither agree nor disagree							7.2%	13	
4	Disagree							2.8%	5	
5	Strongly disagree							0.6%	1	
6	No comment							5.0%	9	
7	Email response							0.6%	1	
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	1.82	Std. Deviation	1.3	Satisfaction Rate	13.61	answered	180
	Maximum	7	Variance	1.69	Std. Error	0.1				

Q11.3. Driver DBS checks (section 8.14) No driver's licences will be issued or renewed without a current enhanced DBS disclosure or one checked through the Update service								Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree							60.2%	109
2	Agree							24.3%	44
3	Neither agree nor disagree							5.0%	9
4	Disagree							3.3%	6
5	Strongly disagree							0.6%	1
6	No comment							6.6%	12
7	Email response							0.0%	0

Q11.3. Driver DBS checks (section 8.14) No driver's licences will be issued or renewed without a current enhanced DBS disclosure or one checked through the Update service									Response Percent	Response Total
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	1.8	Std. Deviation	1.36	Satisfaction Rate	13.26	answered	181
	Maximum	6	Variance	1.85	Std. Error	0.1				

Q11.4. DBS Update service (section 8.16) All drivers must sign up for and maintain their annual payments to the DBS Update Service. Failure to do so may result in suspension of the licence									Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree								49.5%	90
2	Agree								29.1%	53
3	Neither agree nor disagree								7.7%	14
4	Disagree								3.3%	6
5	Strongly disagree								4.9%	9
6	No comment								5.5%	10
7	Email response								0.0%	0
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	2.02	Std. Deviation	1.42	Satisfaction Rate	16.94	answered	182
	Maximum	6	Variance	2.03	Std. Error	0.11				

Q12. You have disagreed with the proposed policy change below. If you believe there is a 'compelling local reason' we should not make this change, please tell us your compelling local reason for us to consider.

National register of refusals and revocations (section 3.11)

Summary of change: Added reference to the national register of refusals and revocations (NR3) which will be used to share information and check new applicants and existing licence holders.

			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question		100.00%	2
1	Make things easy for drivers as they safer more then anyone these days			
2	I feel you are simply forcing drivers out the trade by using public safety as a mechanism to get dirty diesel of the road to obtain a future carbon target. There are thousand of jobs safely completed every day by honest drivers. A few bad apples and councils want to go mad and bash every driver over the head with a mallet. Far too many costs are being passed on to drivers for all this nonsense. The industry cannot afford it.			
			answered	2
			skipped	180

Q13. You have disagreed with the proposed policy change below. If you believe there is a ‘compelling local reason’ we should not make this change, please tell us your compelling local reason for us to consider.

Guidance on determining suitability (section 4.1 and Appendix F)

Summary of change: Added a section to confirm introduction of new guidance on determining suitability for all licence holders.

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	2
1	No need add New section		
2	Councils are going too far and stepping over a line here. Public safety is a fig leaf to get dirty diesel of the road		
		answered	2
		skipped	180

Q14. You have disagreed with the proposed policy change below. If you believe there is a ‘compelling local reason’ we should not make this change, please tell us your compelling local reason for us to consider.

Fitness and propriety section (section 4.2)

Summary of change: Added a section to explain fitness and propriety to hold a licence in more detail.

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	2
1	Don t need to be fit to Drive just need to be healthy		
2	Taxi industry is under attack		
		answered	2
		skipped	180

Q15. You have disagreed with the proposed policy change below. If you believe there is a 'compelling local reason' we should not make this change, please tell us your compelling local reason for us to consider.

Reporting convictions and offences (section 4.4)

Summary of change: All licence holders must report all new convictions, cautions, etc in writing within 48 hours.

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	5
1	48 hours is not a sufficiently long period of time in which to make the a report bearing in mind that Taxi driver can work long hours and may not hve access to or be familiar with on-line procedures. The time specified should ideally cover a week-end (i.e. 7 days) so that the driver should have sufficient leisure time in which to make the report.		
2	should be at least 72 hours just to give licence holder enough time to get in touch.		
3	I think the time frame should be within a week not 48 hours		
4	48 hours is a small window. Let's not forget the council is only open 5 days a week. If the conviction or offence is received on a Friday afternoon you won't be there to receive the information within the 48 hours. Some drivers who are not internet savvy would have to either physically attend or call your offices to report this and you wouldn't be there.		
5	So if a driver forgets to report a parking fine he/she could lose livelihood ?		
		answered	5
		skipped	177

Q16. You have disagreed with the proposed policy change below. If you believe there is a 'compelling local reason' we should not make this change, please tell us your compelling local reason for us to consider.

Reporting arrests and charges (section 4.5)

Summary of change: All licence holders must inform the council if they are arrested, formally interviewed as a suspect or charged with an offence by the Police.

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	6
1	It should be up to the driver to register for update service if they don't then they have to wait until new DBS comes before their license issued		
2	I disagree , with informing the council of arrest unless i am charged or convicted , a man is innocent until proven guilty , The Police may arrest you for anything and this will be wrongly taken into effect on the drivers record		
3	Charged with an offence I agree with		

Q16. You have disagreed with the proposed policy change below. If you believe there is a 'compelling local reason' we should not make this change, please tell us your compelling local reason for us to consider.

Reporting arrests and charges (section 4.5)

Summary of change: All licence holders must inform the council if they are arrested, formally interviewed as a suspect or charged with an offence by the Police.

		Response Percent	Response Total
4	I believe in innocent until proved guilty. While I accept that if arrested or charged it may be acceptable to have to report it to the licensing authority, being formally interviewed as a suspect in my opinion is a step too far.		
5	Being arrested or interviewed, or even charged, has no bearing on any person and is not relevant at all. These are very separate issues to being convicted of an offence. This is not a compelling local reason as such, but nevertheless I do not believe this would be a just provision.		
6	The police should inform you as they should know occupation by a national register they could check		
		answered	6
		skipped	176

Q17. You have disagreed with the proposed policy change below. If you believe there is a 'compelling local reason' we should not make this change, please tell us your compelling local reason for us to consider.

Vehicle proprietor DBS checks (section 7.5)

Summary of change: Added requirement for vehicle proprietors not currently licensed to provide a basic DBS disclosure on application.

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	3
1	Why should a renter go through all those hoops. More needless money to DBS service. Pushing drivers overheads up even more		
2	It doesn't clarify how a limited company owning a vehicle and renting it to a driver would be accommodated.		
3	Admin note: this response has been manually entered into this survey for data analysis purposes, as it was submitted in an email format: 7.5 Where the proprietor is trading as a limited company the council will require the directors and company secretary to provide basic DBS disclosures. This acknowledges limited company ownership that is not addressed in 7.1. Whilst fully accepting checks are required, the suggestion of all directors and co sec to undertake a DBS is onerous. Company Secretaries are often not connected with the day-to-day management of a		

Q17. You have disagreed with the proposed policy change below. If you believe there is a 'compelling local reason' we should not make this change, please tell us your compelling local reason for us to consider.

Vehicle proprietor DBS checks (section 7.5)

Summary of change: Added requirement for vehicle proprietors not currently licensed to provide a basic DBS disclosure on application.

		Response Percent	Response Total
	business at all. Some companies can have extensive lists of directors. As fleets get considerably larger this becomes more impractical.		
	It would be more manageable if the council asked for one or two 'named persons' to take responsibility on the company's behalf. The road haulage, coach and bus industries have a CPC (certificate of professional competence) qualified person who carries responsibility. Our industry needs to move to a similar status.		
		answered	3
		skipped	179

Q18. You have disagreed with the proposed policy change below. If you believe there is a 'compelling local reason' we should not make this change, please tell us your compelling local reason for us to consider.

Driver DBS checks (section 8.14)

Summary of change: No driver's licences will be issued or renewed without a current enhanced DBS disclosure or one checked through the Update service.

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	5
1	Just a simple check		
2	You pay for it not a problem.		
3	I would like to see a standard of Disability Awareness Training set by this policy update e.g. a full days DAT and manual handling to a recognised standard. Refreshed every 3 years and a removal from the approved list for a period of time for any driver refusing to apply this training in practice or refusing to train.		
4	why is the initial DBS just basic and not enhanced DBS?		
5	What if there is undue delay on a renewal, not caused by the applicants error?		
		answered	5
		skipped	177

Q19. You have disagreed with the proposed policy change below. If you believe there is a 'compelling local reason' we should not make this change, please tell us your compelling local reason for us to consider.

DBS Update service (section 8.16)

Summary of change: All drivers must sign up for and maintain their annual payments to the DBS Update Service. Failure to do so may result in suspension of the licence.

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	9
1	Not everyone will sign up to it,		
2	This should be a choice it shouldn't be made mandatory. Update service is a choice.		
3	Need to be renew without Any payments		
4	All taxi drivers have had a difficult year , not at all helped by the council , they should not have to pay another feeto keep DBS updated , if council requires a random DBS check council should pay for it		
5	Unnecessary		
6	Not everyone can afford the on line registration process		
7	Some older people are not 100% confident with computers.		
8	More overheads.		
9	In my personal opinion it is extreme step to suspend a licence for not maintaining DBS Update service because sometimes there are issues with the card or payment or forgetting as well.so please you can request the particular person to get another DBS as soon as possible but without suspending just a warning is enough. Thank you		
		answered	9
		skipped	173

Safeguarding

Q20. These DfT 'Statutory Standards' policies are around safeguarding. You can find out more information on our website: South Oxfordshire or Vale of White Horse. How far do you agree or disagree with proposed policy changes below?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No comment	Response Total
Driver safeguarding training (section 8.33-8.34) All applicants for a driver's licence will be required to pass safeguarding training before a licence will be granted, and once passed the training must be re-taken every 3 years	45.6% (83)	28.6% (52)	11.0% (20)	5.5% (10)	2.7% (5)	6.6% (12)	182

Q20. These DfT 'Statutory Standards' policies are around safeguarding. You can find out more information on our website: South Oxfordshire or Vale of White Horse. How far do you agree or disagree with proposed policy changes below?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No comment	Response Total
Advice on safeguarding (Appendix H) New section added with advice on Safeguarding	42.3% (77)	30.2% (55)	15.9% (29)	2.2% (4)	1.6% (3)	7.7% (14)	182
						answered	182
						skipped	0

Matrix Charts

Q20.1. Driver safeguarding training (section 8.33-8.34) All applicants for a driver's licence will be required to pass safeguarding training before a licence will be granted, and once passed the training must be re-taken every 3 years								Response Percent	Response Total	
1	Strongly agree							45.6%	83	
2	Agree							28.6%	52	
3	Neither agree nor disagree							11.0%	20	
4	Disagree							5.5%	10	
5	Strongly disagree							2.7%	5	
6	No comment							6.6%	12	
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	2.11	Std. Deviation	1.44	Satisfaction Rate	22.2	answered	182
	Maximum	6	Variance	2.08	Std. Error	0.11				

Q20.2. Advice on safeguarding (Appendix H) New section added with advice on Safeguarding								Response Percent	Response Total	
1	Strongly agree							42.3%	77	
2	Agree							30.2%	55	
3	Neither agree nor disagree							15.9%	29	
4	Disagree							2.2%	4	
5	Strongly disagree							1.6%	3	
6	No comment							7.7%	14	
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	2.14	Std. Deviation	1.42	Satisfaction Rate	22.75	answered	182
	Maximum	6	Variance	2.03	Std. Error	0.11				

Q21. You have disagreed with the proposed policy change below. If you believe there is a 'compelling local reason' we should not make this change, please tell us your compelling local reason for us to consider.

Driver safeguarding training (section 8.33-8.34)

Summary of change: All applicants for a driver's licence will be required to pass safeguarding training before a licence will be granted, and once passed the training must be re-taken every 3 years.

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	11
1	Will this apply to new drivers only? Or all drivers?		
2	Safeguarding is pretty basic why would you need retraining every 3 years. This should only be done on new applications.		
3	Once you have passed your safeguarding test , if there is no complaint from the member s of public , you should not have to waste extra time and money retraining . This sounds like a council trying to make business for itself or its friends		
4	Just another course that people will have to pay for with no end result.		
5	Think the safeguarding training is a good idea but not too happy if this involves so much of an extra cost to the applicant - is it free?		
6	Once driver pass license then it's done you guys make things complicated and stressful for driver		
7	all applicants MUST pass safeguarding training before the licence is granted but no need to be re taken every 3 years		
8	Another money making jobs for the boys scenario. The majority of honest drivers are mindful do the job correctly and use common sense. Drivers don't need a £400 pound course of umpteen modules of stretched out nonsense to take an OAP round a corner with three bags of shopping		
9	Doing the same training every 3 years seems excessive. Having done the training it was extremely basic and not something I would consider needs repeating every 3 years.		
10	Its. Ot necessary to take every 3 years! This just feeling like you're in high school		
11	Three years is excessive. Every five years would be acceptable.		
		answered	11
		skipped	171

Q22. You have disagreed with the proposed policy change below. If you believe there is a 'compelling local reason' we should not make this change, please tell us your compelling local reason for us to consider.

Advice on safeguarding (Appendix H)

Summary of change: New section added with advice on Safeguarding.

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	4
1	Common sense that's all that needed		
2	As previous comment re cost		
3	The drivers already know		
4	My point is not necessary to take every 3 years		
		answered	4
		skipped	178

Operator requirements

Q23. These DfT 'Statutory Standards' policies are around operator requirements. You can find out more information on our website: South Oxfordshire or Vale of White Horse. How far do you agree or disagree with proposed policy changes below?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No comment	Email response	Response Total
Operator DBS checks (section 9.3-9.5) Amend basic DBS requirement for private hire operators to confirm the DBS disclosure is valid for 1 month. Those operators who are already licensed drivers are exempt from the requirement to provide a basic DBS. In the case of companies, we may also require the directors and company secretary to provide a Basic DBS each	40.1% (73)	33.5% (61)	12.6% (23)	3.3% (6)	2.7% (5)	7.1% (13)	0.5% (1)	182
Operator staff checks (section 9.6) Private hire operators should keep a register of all staff who have access to booking information, must obtain basic DBS disclosures for all such staff and must have a written policy on employing ex-offenders	54.4% (99)	29.1% (53)	5.5% (10)	2.2% (4)	2.7% (5)	5.5% (10)	0.5% (1)	182
Operator safeguarding training (section 9.18-9.20) All applicants for a private hire operator's licence and all staff taking bookings and dispatching work will be required to pass safeguarding training before a licence will be granted, and once passed the training must be re-taken every 3 years	48.4% (88)	25.8% (47)	11.5% (21)	3.8% (7)	3.8% (7)	6.6% (12)	0.0% (0)	182

Q23. These DfT 'Statutory Standards' policies are around operator requirements. You can find out more information on our website: South Oxfordshire or Vale of White Horse. How far do you agree or disagree with proposed policy changes below?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No comment	Email response	Response Total
Advice on use of PSVs (section 9.26) Advice for private hire operators about use of PSVs (public service vehicles – these are vehicles with nine to 16 passenger seats) and PCV (passenger carrying vehicle) drivers	44.0% (80)	27.5% (50)	18.1% (33)	0.0% (0)	1.6% (3)	8.8% (16)	0.0% (0)	182
							answered	182
							skipped	0

Matrix Charts

Q23.1. Operator DBS checks (section 9.3-9.5) Amend basic DBS requirement for private hire operators to confirm the DBS disclosure is valid for 1 month. Those operators who are already licensed drivers are exempt from the requirement to provide a basic DBS. In the case of companies, we may also require the directors and company secretary to provide a Basic DBS each								Response Percent	Response Total	
1	Strongly agree							40.1%	73	
2	Agree							33.5%	61	
3	Neither agree nor disagree							12.6%	23	
4	Disagree							3.3%	6	
5	Strongly disagree							2.7%	5	
6	No comment							7.1%	13	
7	Email response							0.5%	1	
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	2.19	Std. Deviation	1.47	Satisfaction Rate	19.78	answered	182
	Maximum	7	Variance	2.15	Std. Error	0.11				

Q23.2. Operator staff checks (section 9.6) Private hire operators should keep a register of all staff who have access to booking information, must obtain basic DBS disclosures for all such staff and must have a written policy on employing ex-offenders								Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree							54.4%	99
2	Agree							29.1%	53
3	Neither agree nor disagree							5.5%	10
4	Disagree							2.2%	4
5	Strongly disagree							2.7%	5

Q23.2. Operator staff checks (section 9.6) Private hire operators should keep a register of all staff who have access to booking information, must obtain basic DBS disclosures for all such staff and must have a written policy on employing ex-offenders								Response Percent	Response Total	
6	No comment							5.5%	10	
7	Email response							0.5%	1	
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	1.88	Std. Deviation	1.39	Satisfaction Rate	14.74	answered	182
	Maximum	7	Variance	1.94	Std. Error	0.1				

Q23.3. Operator safeguarding training (section 9.18-9.20) All applicants for a private hire operator's licence and all staff taking bookings and dispatching work will be required to pass safeguarding training before a licence will be granted, and once passed the training must be re-taken every 3 years								Response Percent	Response Total	
1	Strongly agree							48.4%	88	
2	Agree							25.8%	47	
3	Neither agree nor disagree							11.5%	21	
4	Disagree							3.8%	7	
5	Strongly disagree							3.8%	7	
6	No comment							6.6%	12	
7	Email response							0.0%	0	
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	2.09	Std. Deviation	1.46	Satisfaction Rate	18.13	answered	182
	Maximum	6	Variance	2.15	Std. Error	0.11				

Q23.4. Advice on use of PSVs (section 9.26) Advice for private hire operators about use of PSVs (public service vehicles – these are vehicles with nine to 16 passenger seats) and PCV (passenger carrying vehicle) drivers								Response Percent	Response Total	
1	Strongly agree							44.0%	80	
2	Agree							27.5%	50	
3	Neither agree nor disagree							18.1%	33	
4	Disagree							0.0%	0	
5	Strongly disagree							1.6%	3	
6	No comment							8.8%	16	
7	Email response							0.0%	0	
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	2.14	Std. Deviation	1.47	Satisfaction Rate	19.05	answered	182
	Maximum	6	Variance	2.16	Std. Error	0.11				

Q24. You have disagreed with the proposed policy change below. If you believe there is a 'compelling local reason' we should not make this change, please tell us your compelling local reason for us to consider.

Operator DBS checks (section 9.3-9.5)

Summary of change: Amend basic DBS requirement for private hire operators to confirm the DBS disclosure is valid for 1 month, those operators who are already licensed drivers are exempt from the requirement to provide a basic DBS and that in the case of companies, the council may also require the directors and company secretary to provide a Basic DBS each.

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	10
1	All drivers should have DBS including existing.		
2	I have absolutely no idea what this means. I suggest a rewrite in plain English.		
3	I pressed the wrong button but could not go back and change. It should have been agreed.		
4	I might have misunderstood this sentence. As I read it , I understand that operators who are already licensed drivers are exempt from the requirement to provide DBS... This leaves a loophole- in my view.		
5	This just seems like more costs, admin and paperwork for no real benefit. Firstly as a company director I have zero contact with any of our customers. Secondly how is running a taxi company any different to any other company such as a delivery company or a retail chain. Why are you suggesting that taxi company proprietors are criminals and need checking up on. Let's say for example I did end up with a conviction, what will then be the action taken? Will the council close down the business and put all the employees out of work? This wouldn't happen to a delivery company so why a taxi company? Please provide any reasoning or examples of why you would need to DBS check a company director and what would be the result of a conviction on the company.		
6	More Unneeded nonsense. No wonder mental health stress and anxiety is on the rise with bureaucratic councils interfering everywhere under the guise of public safety. Creating all these complications. Where where you in the 1980,s. Was that decade crime free		
7	Ongoing DBS checks should be held/ made by all drivers		
8	I dont see why the Directors of a company would need to do a DBS, as a licensed driver as well as a director I do not see this as an issue but there is no reference to what the outcome would be should a director get a criminal conviction. I would want to understand what the outcome would be should a co-director of my company for example should get have an issue.. Not enough detail basically of outcomes.		
9	Operators should take an enhanced DBS		
10	Admin note: this response has been manually entered into this survey for data analysis purposes, as it was submitted in an email format: 9.3 Operator DBS We strongly believe that the licensed operator should be subject to an enhanced DBS, in line with licenced drivers and vehicle proprietors.		
		answered	10

Q24. You have disagreed with the proposed policy change below. If you believe there is a 'compelling local reason' we should not make this change, please tell us your compelling local reason for us to consider.

Operator DBS checks (section 9.3-9.5)

Summary of change: Amend basic DBS requirement for private hire operators to confirm the DBS disclosure is valid for 1 month, those operators who are already licensed drivers are exempt from the requirement to provide a basic DBS and that in the case of companies, the council may also require the directors and company secretary to provide a Basic DBS each.

	Response Percent	Response Total
	skipped	172

Q25. You have disagreed with the proposed policy change below. If you believe there is a 'compelling local reason' we should not make this change, please tell us your compelling local reason for us to consider.

Operator staff checks (section 9.6)

Summary of change: Private hire operators should keep a register of all staff who have access to booking information, must obtain basic DBS disclosures for all such staff and must have a written policy on employing ex-offenders.

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	8
1	The operators will be helping people back from their previous life style so should be up to them who they employ not council.		
2	Have the council had problems in this area or is this just another red tape area for the council to make life harder for the taxi trade?		
3	Most private hire drivers are one man bands. Because of all the paperwork the big boys have folded through costs.		
4	How is ordering a taxi any different to ordering a pizza or a new shirt? Card details, name and address would have to be taken for both transactions. I accept that fraud is a possibility in both cases and let's be clear, fraud can still be committed by an individual who hasn't yet got a conviction. Why are you singling out the taxi industry. Just seems like yet more admin, costs and paperwork for no real benefit to the public. Are you guys just sat there dreaming up ways to waste tax payers money and tangle up as many people in red tape as possible?		
5	See previous answer		
6	As booking staff are not coming into physical contact with vulnerable clients is there really a need for them to have DBS checks with the extra expense that comes with it. However there should be a written policy regarding ex-offenders and DBS checks for them.		
7	Not all practical. Operators are outsourcing telephony services, either to overseas providers or out of hour call centres.		

Q25. You have disagreed with the proposed policy change below. If you believe there is a 'compelling local reason' we should not make this change, please tell us your compelling local reason for us to consider.

Operator staff checks (section 9.6)

Summary of change: Private hire operators should keep a register of all staff who have access to booking information, must obtain basic DBS disclosures for all such staff and must have a written policy on employing ex-offenders.

		Response Percent	Response Total
	Operators may soon move to app only booking. Would you want the software engineer to do a DBS?		
8	<p>Admin note: this response has been manually entered into this survey for data analysis purposes, as it was submitted in an email format:</p> <p>9.6 Booking staff DBS We accept the reasoning behind this development but wish to raise the following observations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why annual DBS when 3 years is acceptable for drivers? • In the new world 'outsourcing' of call centre activities is commonplace in the industry, with many large companies now using overseas suppliers. How does the council propose to deal with an operator following this path? • Our own company is considering engaging a remotely based controller for 'out of hours work', this could be in Scotland, Devon or Brazil. <p>Technology has moved on massively from the laws governing our trade. Booking apps, the cloud, remote working is transforming the industry. It is not beyond comprehension that you will have operators in this district very soon who do not answer the phone to take bookings. Will you want the software engineer to do a DBS?</p>		
		answered	8
		skipped	174

Q26. You have disagreed with the proposed policy change below. If you believe there is a 'compelling local reason' we should not make this change, please tell us your compelling local reason for us to consider.

Operator safeguarding training

(section 9.18-9.20) Summary of change: All applicants for a private hire operator's licence and all staff taking bookings and dispatching work will be required to pass safeguarding training before a licence will be granted, and once passed the training must be re-taken every 3 years.

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	9
1	Why is this implemented? Have the council had issues in this area and if yes then has the council got evidence to this effect? Seems like more red tape		

Q26. You have disagreed with the proposed policy change below. If you believe there is a 'compelling local reason' we should not make this change, please tell us your compelling local reason for us to consider.

Operator safeguarding training

(section 9.18-9.20) Summary of change: All applicants for a private hire operator's licence and all staff taking bookings and dispatching work will be required to pass safeguarding training before a licence will be granted, and once passed the training must be re-taken every 3 years.

		Response Percent	Response Total
2	Again , this is just an attempt at job creation at the expense of taxi drivers		
3	Waste of our time and money		
4	Again, should not be an extra cost on the operator - fine if free.		
5	Yet more red tape and wasted tax payer money. It already takes you guys months to process driver applications, you're already under staffed for the tasks you have and you're planning on taking on more work? It's already hard to get staff due to the massive regulatory requirements and low pay of these jobs. Yet more barriers is not going to help serve the public, your making it harder to serve the public. How many more weeks of delay will this pointless policy add to your already ridiculously long waiting times to get a private hire operators licence?		
6	See previous answers		
7	Again - everyone doing safeguarding training every 3 years is a huge undertaking and cost especially considering the fairly heavy staff turnover in these sort of minimum wage call centre roles. No mention of how apps such as Uber who operate out of the Netherlands I believe taking bookings which they then pass on to local operators through the Autocab system. Would all members of Ubers staff also be required to undertake this. We just want a level playing ground. It cant be one rule for local companies with extra red tape and cost and another for large international tech companies who exploit tax loop holes to get significant price advantage already.		
8	Having taken safeguarding twice the training documents were exactly same If it needs doing every 3 years the training should be update regularly aswell So understand doing it once but not every 3 years		
9	As per DBS requirement.		
		answered	9
		skipped	173

Q27. You have disagreed with the proposed policy change below. If you believe there is a 'compelling local reason' we should not make this change, please tell us your compelling local reason for us to consider.

Advice on use of PSVs (section 9.26)

Summary of change: Advice for private hire operators about use of PSVs (public service vehicles – these are vehicles with nine to 16 passenger seats) and PCV (passenger carrying vehicle) drivers.

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	1

Q27. You have disagreed with the proposed policy change below. If you believe there is a 'compelling local reason' we should not make this change, please tell us your compelling local reason for us to consider.

Advice on use of PSVs (section 9.26)

Summary of change: Advice for private hire operators about use of PSVs (public service vehicles – these are vehicles with nine to 16 passenger seats) and PCV (passenger carrying vehicle) drivers.

	Response Percent	Response Total
1 See previous answers		
	answered	1
	skipped	181

Complaints about licence holders

Q28. This DfT 'Statutory Standards' policy is around complaints about licence holders. You can find out more information on our website: South Oxfordshire or Vale of White Horse. How far do you agree or disagree with proposed policy change below?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No comment	Email response	Response Total
Information for passengers on complaints (section 6.5, Appendix A para 12 and Appendix B para 15) Added new requirement for vehicles to display information for passengers on how to complain directly to the licensing authority	45.1% (82)	32.4% (59)	8.8% (16)	2.7% (5)	3.3% (6)	7.1% (13)	0.5% (1)	182
							answered	182
							skipped	0

Matrix Charts

Q28.1. Information for passengers on complaints (section 6.5, Appendix A para 12 and Appendix B para 15) Added new requirement for vehicles to display information for passengers on how to complain directly to the licensing authority			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		45.1%	82
2	Agree		32.4%	59
3	Neither agree nor disagree		8.8%	16
4	Disagree		2.7%	5
5	Strongly disagree		3.3%	6
6	No comment		7.1%	13

Q28.1. Information for passengers on complaints (section 6.5, Appendix A para 12 and Appendix B para 15) Added new requirement for vehicles to display information for passengers on how to complain directly to the licensing authority								Response Percent	Response Total	
7	Email response							0.5%	1	
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	2.1	Std. Deviation	1.49	Satisfaction Rate	18.41	answered	182
	Maximum	7	Variance	2.21	Std. Error	0.11				

Q29. You have disagreed with the proposed policy change below. If you believe there is a 'compelling local reason' we should not make this change, please tell us your compelling local reason for us to consider.

Information for passengers on complaints (section 6.5, Appendix A para 12 and Appendix B para 15)

Summary of change: Added new requirement for vehicles to display information for passengers on how to complain directly to the licensing authority.

			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question		100.00%	10
1	Why does the council deem this necessary? If the customer needs to make a complaint they can ask the driver how this can be done. The council is already burdening the driver enough with red tape.			
2	More unnecessary paperwork Most people would go elsewhere next time.			
3	No need for this at all, a genuine passenger who has an issue will know or will find how to contact the licensing authority or a driver will guide them in that direction. Opportunists customers will use it to make fake claims hence wasting driver time, loss of earnings and undue stress.			
4	I feel that if a passenger has a complaint about a driver they must take it up with the drivers employer. If the driver is the sole operator, then yes a complaint must be lodged with the Licensing Dept.			
5	I think it's a stupid idea but I actually want you to do it. Can't wait till you get a load of people complaining their taxi was 5 minutes late. You're only going to waste more of your time and our tax payers money. Anyone who has a real grievance already gets in contact with you. There are already many existing ways to find out how to complain to the governing body, citizens advice, Google etc			
6	We live in a world of serial complainers. They know how to complain. A sticker or notice ain't gonna help them.			
7	This has the potential to create issues where issues do not exist. Without recording equipment which we are banned from using we will not be able to prove our drivers position. I would suggest if we have recording equipment allowed for driver safety then I would have no issue but I'm aware of many occasions of passengers being abusive to a driver often whilst drunk and then complaining when the driver may not want to take them somewhere. I would want more driver safety rather than passenger complaint avenues.			
8	Provided that the role of the Council in licensing is clearly displayed in the vehicle, it should not be necessary to publicise how to complain, otherwise the council may be dealing with trivial complaints.			

Q29. You have disagreed with the proposed policy change below. If you believe there is a 'compelling local reason' we should not make this change, please tell us your compelling local reason for us to consider.

Information for passengers on complaints (section 6.5, Appendix A para 12 and Appendix B para 15)

Summary of change: Added new requirement for vehicles to display information for passengers on how to complain directly to the licensing authority.

		Response Percent	Response Total
9	you provide not detail of the design, size of signage and where it should be displayed.		
10	Admin note: this response has been manually entered into this survey for data analysis purposes, as it was submitted in an email format. 6.5 all vehicles... display information... on how to make complaints? Is there an exemption for Executive service licensed private hire vehicles? Will the exemption be linked to plate exemption?		
		answered	10
		skipped	172

Other comments

Q30. Do you have any additional comments on the proposed new policies in Section A ('statutory standards' changes) that you would like us to consider?

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	59
1	Should be applied across the board to every person not just new.		
2	I'm not convinced the compulsory and on-going Safeguarding training is an essential requirement for Taxi drivers. It sounds like an instance of Political Correctness.		
3	no		
4	No		
5	Excellent proposals		
6	Help drivers a bit more, listen to them, the recent pandemic has affect the work of the drivers maybe consider some sort of grant		
7	Fair pricing policy to be included and transparent. If any special rates apply due to certain situations, such as bank holidays, or during certain hours of operation (such as between 1am-5am) these should be clearly indicated.		
8	no		
9	It maybe in another section - but "Covid" secure operations should form part of the minimum requirements		

Q30. Do you have any additional comments on the proposed new policies in Section A ('statutory standards' changes) that you would like us to consider?

		Response Percent	Response Total
10	No		
11	NO		
12	No		
13	Drivers should pass the Institute of Advanced Motorists advanced driving test or, at least, some specialist driving test acceptable to police drivers.		
14	.		
15	<p>1)Disability Awareness and Safeguarding training should be coordinated with County Council to avoid the need for duplicate course attendance.</p> <p>2)Vehicle licence plating (PH & Hackney Carriage) factory fitted standard tinting need to be allowed, its unclear if this is the case in the revised policy.</p> <p>3)The phrase 'in writing' needs to explicitly include email contact, especially given the need to resort some things to licencing authority within 48 hours.</p>		
16	No		
17	No.		
18	No		
19	Important that requirements are placed on operators as they are for individual licence holders. This seems to have been tightened here which is good. The Operators have an equal duty of care for those using their services, howsoever delivered.		
20	None		
21	No		
22	No		
23	<p>Not sure whether Section A but think the 5.2 two weeks absence reporting is rather over-onerous and heavy handed - operators will be careful to keep their license up to date so the two weeks to notify is rather overdoing it re absences.</p> <p>Section 8.23-24 - who carries out the driving assessment is not clear - and is there a complaints procedure if operator disagrees with result?</p>		
24	None		
25	NO		
26	No.		
27	no		

Q30. Do you have any additional comments on the proposed new policies in Section A ('statutory standards' changes) that you would like us to consider?

		Response Percent	Response Total
28	001 cabs have an 01235 number that looks like they are now based in Abingdon but the car comes out from Oxford and they have no local knowledge. The call centre did not know where Malthouse surgery was to go for my jab.		
29	I gather this will not enable UBER to operate in this area. I imagine this will be unpopular to some and might be seen as going against the time. I do not agree with the Gig economy aspect of UBER. However it would be a competition to the licensed carriers that would keep prices in check. Especially in rural areas where taxi's are , increasingly, providing vital links where public transport has been cut. What I mean to say is that, Taxis should perhaps be subsidised to offer cheaper transport for those who don't have access to public transport.		
30	Seem to make sense		
31	Not sure why 7.5 refers to a basic DBS check whereas 8.14 refers to Enhanced DBS Check. Why not always go for the 'Enhanced'?		
32	Clear pricing policies CCTV to protect both the driver and customers The safety of the customer should be number 1 priority, equally opportunity, non racist		
33	I think this is a really good update to your current standards and would feel a lot safer using a taxi service if I knew all drivers had DBS checks		
34	Drivers should have knowledge of the area, the amount of times I have had to direct drivers to my destination is not acceptable. I pay for a service and experience which some times I do not get		
35	None		
36	Are there perhaps too many taxis in Henley who park temporarily in public car parks using up valuable spaces without paying for a ticket? Taxis also run their engines when stationary, this has to stop		
37	Yeah don't just introduce more red tape unless you can produce actual evidence that it is going to improve the service. Also bear in mind you are just putting up more barriers for the people who actually have to provide the service with each piece of tape. This ultimately will mean prices for the service have to increase.		
38	The councils need to seriously consider removing the roof box on your licensed taxi vehicles if and when they operate outside their district line. It creates confusion and there is a safety issue. Many of my friends whilst out in Oxford city think they can legitimately hire your licensed vehicles from the streets of Oxford prior to booking. So in my opinion, these roof (taxi) boxes need to be removed.		
39	Yes stop attacking the taxi industry or you will not have any drivers at all. Or maybe that's the agenda		
40	Photos of driver with licence credentials / details available to be seen by passengers. Spot checks to ensure the driver is who he is supposed to be.		
41	no		

Q30. Do you have any additional comments on the proposed new policies in Section A ('statutory standards' changes) that you would like us to consider?

		Response Percent	Response Total
42	I believe that all taxi drivers should be only allowed to operate after strict checks on their safety with young female passengers.		
43	no		
44	please consider having a rule that all taxi drivers waiting on the High Street in Thame live within a 5 mile radius. At the moment they come from all over, and it is very difficult to track down the appropriate licensing authority when making a complaint despite having the licence number, as I know to my cost. I don't use Thame taxis at the moment as I don't feel safe in them. Having local drivers would make it much easier to control that rules, regulations - and correct home addresses!! - are adhered to.		
45	No		
46	No		
47	ok		
48	No		
49	I believe that these changes are over due. The taxi companies will no doubt say that any costs they incur as a result of the changes will have to be passed onto their customers. However I believe that any firm/individual has a 'duty of care', so should already be well down this path already. It is also worth mentioning that taxi fares in South Oxfordshire are already expensive when compared with e.g. Swindon or Banbury. From my perspective there appears to be an omission. After 20.00 hours spare taxis from Oxford are being sent down to Didcot station to ply their trade. The vehicles appears to be of reasonable quality, but the driver just represent a body who who knows where the peddles on the floor are. On numerous occasions I have had to guide the driver to my house because they were clueless about even the primary road network even in in Didcot. Although they possessed a Satnav in the taxi this was a faulty unit, and was therefore just for show. These were licensed vehicle, but when I left them often wonder how they would themselves get home. I can only assume they were a mate of a mate of a mate of someone in Oxford. I am a bloke so personal security was not an issue; but now when ever possible i will personally pick my wife from the Didcot/Reading/Oxford stations, so that my wife does not have to play 'Russian Roulette' with her safety.		
50	Taxis operate in town centres and as such can emit too much pollution especially when idling. Requirement to go to electric should be stated		
51	No		
52	Storage of taxis and private hire vehicles when not in use must be on drivers or owners land to reduce nuisance to residents. Safeguarding and passenger safety must always be paramount and drivers need to show impartiality and be aware that they need to behave in an exemplary manner at all times, including social media.		
53	Wheatley Parish Council full support policies that increas the safety of its community		
54	No, thank you.		
55	ALL DRIVERS MUST BE REGISTERED AND RECORDED AS IN CONTROL OF EACH VEHICLE USED. IF A COMPLAINT IS MADE IT IS ABLE TO BE RECORDED AGAUNST A PERSON IN CHARGE OF THE VEHICLE AT THE TIME OF COMPLAINT. MANY HIRE VEHICLES ARE IN USE		

Q30. Do you have any additional comments on the proposed new policies in Section A ('statutory standards' changes) that you would like us to consider?

		Response Percent	Response Total
	24 HOURS A DAY EACH DRIVER MUST SIGN TO SAY THEY HAVE TAKEN CONTROL OF THAT CAR. EVERY DRIVER MUST HAVE A UK PHOTO DRIVERS LICENCE .		
56	As an officer from Oxford-shire County Council who works closely under the Joint Operational framework (JOF) with South and Vale licensing, I am strongly in support of the proposed new policies in Section A which will further align the County in aligning DBS and safeguarding procedures and measures to further ensure the safety of the public.		
57	We are also fully supportive of having a DBS for staff and safe-guarings training however this would only be worth at inception of contract and if any major changes/updates are made. Even then we would suggest that updated resources be made available online instead of taking the minimum of 4 hours time for minor updates. I would even suggest it is more efficient to provide web logins that require quarterly module completions, within a deadline otherwise the applicant would be marked as non compliant.		
58	Happy to see the hard work undertaken by the team come to fruition.		
59	No Thank you		
		answered	59
		skipped	123

Section B: Other proposed changes to the policy

You can provide your comments about other proposed changes to the policy in this section.

The new version of the policy includes other changes to develop and maintain professional and respected hackney carriage and private hire trades and to ensure an efficient and quality local transport service. It will also help us support our corporate priorities of tackling the climate emergency and building healthy communities.

The proposed policy changes include:

- DBS and DVLA checks
- Driver standards
- Drivers
- Enforcement
- General

- Operators
- Vehicle criteria

More information on each proposed policy, including the reasoning for introducing it, is on our websites, South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse.

DBS and DVLA checks

These proposed policy changes are around Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks and Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency (DVLA) checks.

DBS registered body requirements (section 8.15): Applicants must obtain their DBS disclosure through the relevant council. If an applicant provides a DBS disclosure from another registered body, that body is unable to pass on any ‘soft information’ disclosed under separate cover, and such information is also not available through the DBS Update Service.

Random DBS check (section 8.17): If a driver is given notice to undertake a random DBS check by the council, they must provide all relevant documentation within 14 days of the request. Failure to do so may result in suspension of the licence. This is being reduced from the current requirement which is 28 days.

DVLA checks (section 8.18): Updated section in respect of DVLA checks to reflect change in check procedure, clarify that DVLA photocard must be current and valid and introduce ability for council to undertake random DVLA checks to identify any undisclosed offences.

You can find out more information on our website: South Oxfordshire or Vale of White Horse.

Q31. How far do you agree or disagree with the proposed policy changes above overall? If you agree with any of the changes more than others, you can let us know using the comment box below.

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree	42.44%	73
2	Agree	40.70%	70
3	Neither agree nor disagree	6.98%	12
4	Disagree	5.23%	9
5	Strongly disagree	2.33%	4
6	No comment	2.33%	4
Minimum		1	Mean
Std. Deviation		1.13	Satisfaction Rate
		18.26	answered
			skipped
			172
			10

Q31. How far do you agree or disagree with the proposed policy changes above overall? If you agree with any of the changes more than others, you can let us know using the comment box below.

						Response Percent	Response Total
Statistics	Maximum	6	Variance	1.28	Std. Error	0.09	

Q32. If you agree with any of the policy changes above more than others, please let us know using the comment box below and include the name of the policy change you are commenting on.

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	25
1	Passenger safety and protection is paramount.		
2	(Nil)		
3	.		
4	I agree with everything except reducing the time allowed from 28 to 14 days		
5	What's wrong with 28 days?		
6	These changes seem to be essential and I was surprised they were not current requirements. Well done.		
7	None		
8	28 days period is already a reasonable time. They can provide the relevant documents in this time to council office, these include identity documents etc not the DBS itself as sometimes they take too much time and driver have their licence suspended and losing their earnings because of this.		
9	N.A		
10	All equally important.		
11	Agree with all of them. More regulation needed		
12	CCTV		
13	The 14 day response time might cause issues in some cases.		
14	Random DBS check - why 14 days to provide documents? Can this be reduced to 7?		
15	I wish you would stop trying to crack a walnut with a 1000 pound hammer. Must be lovely to be a council official sit and make up all these rules. Keep busy whilst collecting tax paid wages and having zero empathy for how hard it is for an honest driver to stay compliant on the road		
16	section 8.18		
17	Im not fussed, ultimately reducing time limits etc may focus minds, if there is a legitimate reason why this may not be possible (holiday for 2 weeks for example) I would hope this would be taken into consideration. If not I would disagree and say 28 days seems reasonable. Random checks I have no issue with as long as at the councils cost.		

Q32. If you agree with any of the policy changes above more than others, please let us know using the comment box below and include the name of the policy change you are commenting on.

		Response Percent	Response Total
18	Random DVLA and DBS checks are an excellent idea		
19	8.15 - all information should provided in a transparent way - so called so information could be prejudiciary		
20	I strongly agree with all safeguarding checks on previous convictions and DBs checks on all drivers as quite often there will be vulnerable young women in the cab late at night.		
21	i note that there are changes regarding vehicle emissions in the summary, but these are not mentioned in the survey. As technology advances, these important standards will need updating.		
22	Please see previous comment/observations		
23	I do not agree with the reduction to 14days for random DBS check info to be provided to the licensing authority. Surely this would rely solely on the DBS check to be completed and returned to the applicant in a shorter period which may not happen resulting in the DBS check being sent to the authority late.		
24	THE CHECKS THAT ARE PROPOSED ARE NEEDED TO PROTECT BOTH PUBLIC AND DRIVERS.		
25	All of these policies are crucial in ensuring that safeguarding the public is accomplished.		
		answered	25
		skipped	157

Driver standards

These proposed policy changes are around driver standards.

Drivers revoked or refused elsewhere (section 4.3): Any applicants who have had a licence revoked or application refused by any local authority will not be licensed for a minimum of 5 years after the date of revocation or refusal.

Diabetes and medicals guidance (section 8.8-8.9): Drivers with diabetes managed by insulin, a sulphonylurea or a glinide will require a specialist annual medical. Licence holders must advise the licensing team in writing within 7 days of any change in their medical condition that may affect their driving capabilities.

Failure to declare matters on applications (section 8.12): Applicants must declare any pending court cases or hearings, and the details of any licences previously held, suspended or revoked. Failure to disclose any information and the making of false declarations will be considered to be an act of dishonesty and may result in the application being refused or licence revoked.

DVLA disqualifications (section 8.22): New driver licence applicants who have been

disqualified from driving due to motoring offences must have held a full clean licence for 12 months before they can apply.

Practical driving assessments (section 8.23-8.24): Requirement for all new driver licence applicants to pass a practical driving assessment before a licence is granted.

Disability awareness training (section 8.31-8.32): All applicants for a driver's licence will be required to pass disability awareness training before a licence will be granted. Once passed, the training must be re-taken every 3 years.

You can find out more information on our website: South Oxfordshire or Vale of White Horse.

Q33. How far do you agree or disagree with the proposed policy changes above overall? If you agree with any of the changes more than others, you can let us know using the comment box below.

		Response Percent	Response Total							
1	Strongly agree		50.00% 86							
2	Agree		31.98% 55							
3	Neither agree nor disagree		9.30% 16							
4	Disagree		4.07% 7							
5	Strongly disagree		4.07% 7							
6	No comment		0.58% 1							
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	1.82	Std. Deviation	1.09	Satisfaction Rate	16.4	answered	172
	Maximum	6	Variance	1.18	Std. Error	0.08			skipped	10

Q34. If you agree with any of the policy changes above more than others, please let us know using the comment box below and include the name of the policy change you are commenting on.

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	36
1	All of them		
2	I Disagree with the requirement for drivers to undergo awareness training every 3 years. After the initial training I should imagine that on-the-job encounters with disabled passengers would be sufficient to keep whatever special considerations are necessary. It doesn't seem very likely that a new class of disability would arise that required driver re-training.		
3	All excellent proposals		
4	Any driver that has held a badge for 10 years or more should be considered grandfather rights		

Q34. If you agree with any of the policy changes above more than others, please let us know using the comment box below and include the name of the policy change you are commenting on.

		Response Percent	Response Total
5	Disability awareness I strongly agree with. Discrimination against those with disabilities, including hidden disabilities, simply isn't acceptable.		
6	It is vital that taxi drivers are good drivers as assessed by the police		
7	.		
8	I strongly disagree with the driver having to retake disability awareness training every 3 years , unless there are complaints from the public about that specific driver		
9	Waste of time and our money retaking every 3 years.		
10	In corporate life I have encountered incidents for which risk these offer stronger mitigations. Well done.		
11	Drivers revoked a licence by others. This may depend on the reason for revoking. I would not say yes in every circumstance but if a serious reason such as fraud or criminality then revoking the licence should be for 10 years in my opinion.		
12	8.23-8.24 Requirement for all new applicants to pass a practical driving assessment before a licence is granted: The appalling standard of driving exhibited by so many taxi drivers in and around Oxford is a cause of current concern, presumably drivers already are checked to confirm they are holders of a valid UK driving licence? If this is the case then it seems there needs to be periodic testing/re-training to ensure that driving standards are maintained - a one-off test at first licence grant may be insufficient.		
13	None		
14	Who carries out the driving assessment, is it costly, and is there an appeal procedure?		
15	If someone has refused and revoked a licence elsewhere and they apply for a licence to another council they should be allowed to have the licence if they fulfill the new council requirements for a new licence. If someone disqualified by the DVLA, they should be able to apply/get a taxi/PH licence next day their disqualification lifted by DVLA. Waiting for on more year is too harsh. Practical driving assessment for new driver is ok. Disability awareness training is ok for new driver but there is no need for new training after 3 years unless council provide it free of charge and every 5 years.		
16	N.A		
17	The DVLA have already passed the driver, why do they need to be tested again by the Local Authority. also is this going to be a paid for test again on top of the other compliance items such as Knowledge test?		
18	DVLA Disqualifications: Disagree with this - if they have served their sentence then should be OK to drive and NOT wait 12 months. With increasing surveillance to catch drivers making a mistake, it can be very easy for a professional driver to rack up points on their licence to the point where they are disqualified - so to bar them for a further 12 months is unfair.		
19	Disability awareness, especially regarding assistance dogs.		

Q34. If you agree with any of the policy changes above more than others, please let us know using the comment box below and include the name of the policy change you are commenting on.

		Response Percent	Response Total
20	If a driver has been disqualified 12 months seems too short a time for them to be able to apply to be a driver		
21	Again, very good updates to your existing policy		
22	All important issues		
23	What if you don't know you have diabetes. Is that another way to lose licence retrospectively		
24	Practical driving assessment		
25	section 8.31-8.32, section 8.23-8.24, section 8.22		
26	My issues are solely around the practical driving test. This has already been done and we are creating extra work load and slowing down an already slow process. If you have a driving license then you have already been approved to drive on the roads in a car. There is no good reason to do this again otherwise we run the risk of having to re do this re do that every 5 minutes. Where would you draw the line... every 3 years, every year, every month, every week.....		
27	The above where requirements of the drivers. What about the vehicles? All vehicles should be accessible by all disabled people. No taxi driver should be allowed to prevent anyone with an Assistance Dog from using the taxi.		
28	Why has diabetes been singled out as an area for specific surveillance, there must be equal risk for other medical conditions.		
29	8.23-8.24		
30	Drivers revoked or refused elsewhere		
31	Practical driving assessments in my view a waste of time and money. I have had many driving assessments in my 45 year driving career and felt that none of them really helped me drive any better than I was already except for one that taught me how to drive economically in the truck I was driving at the time which did stay with me.		
32	Most make sense Not clear on section involving revocation if you tot up 12 council points does this mean you cant work for 5 years		
33	To ban an applicant because another council has refused them a licence, without looking at the evidence is against the principle of natural justice. Driver assessments deliver little benefit, but simply give another third party the opportunity to profit from the trade. The council fail to consider other options. Disability awareness every 5 years would suffice.		
34	As a potential passenger I will feel reassured that my taxi driver has met stringent standards.		
35	Admin note: this response has been manually entered into this survey for data analysis purposes, as it was submitted in an email format: 1. The proposal to allow a taxi driver to resume driving a taxi in South Oxfordshire after only one year of		

Q34. If you agree with any of the policy changes above more than others, please let us know using the comment box below and include the name of the policy change you are commenting on.

		Response Percent	Response Total
	<p>driving with a clean licence following a disqualification to drive a motor vehicle does not adequately safeguard the public using licensed taxis and HCs. In the UK drivers are disqualified from driving only in very extreme circumstances, and are disqualified only when all other penalties for motoring offences have been considered inadequate, either as a result of accumulating the maximum number of penalty points due to repeated motoring offences or as a result of committing a very serious offence which requires that the public are protected by the removal of the driver's licence. A Disqualified Driver is a potentially dangerous driver and the period of one year of driving with a clean licence following the end of a period of disqualification is too short a period to serve as an indicator that the driver is safe to drive a taxi or HC. This period should be extended to three years of driving with a clean licence before resuming driving of a taxi or HC.</p> <p>2. While it is correct that documentary evidence from the Home Office of the applicant's right to work in the UK is required to accompany any application for a licence to operate or drive a taxi or HC in South Oxfordshire, it would be highly desirable that the applicant is also sufficiently fluent in spoken English to be able to communicate effectively and unambiguously with passengers and customers, so the production of a recognised certificate of competency in Spoken English should be required for all those applicants who are not already UK Citizens or hold UK Visas granting them "indefinite leave to remain in the UK", as those persons will already have passed the Home Office approved test in Spoken English at the required level, which is provided for the Home Office by the IELTS (International English Language Testing System).</p>		
36	<p>Admin note: this response has been manually entered into this survey for data analysis purposes, as it was submitted in an email format.</p> <p>4.3 Applicants who have had a licence revoked or an application refused by the councils or any other local authority will not be licensed for a minimum of 5 years after the date of the revocation or refusal.</p> <p>Is this legal? To accept a decision made by three councillors in another licensing authority at face value, without giving it any consideration to the evidence in front of you, barring a licence holder from the trade for 5 years appears a draconian restriction on their human rights. Surely an applicant is entitled to natural justice?</p> <p>7.19 The council will give careful consideration to incentives to increase the number of disabled access vehicles within the district.</p> <p>It is important to clarify 'disabled access vehicle'. We assume that you intend this to mean wheelchair accessible vehicles (the passenger travels in their wheelchair during the journey). Whilst these vehicles serve a particularly useful purpose for wheelchair users, there is an extremely high risk involved in the activity. We are not aware that any wheelchair manufacturer is prepared to certify that their chairs are fit to travel in. Our own experience is that drivers are placed at high risk to personal injury whilst offering assistance.</p> <p>The council should consider introducing a specific training course to educate drivers in best practice whilst driving such a vehicle, with particular focus on driver/passenger safety and maintaining passenger dignity.</p> <p>It is also important for the council to acknowledge that a large proportion of disabled travellers find wheelchair accessible vehicles more difficult to use than standard saloons or MPVs.</p>		

Q34. If you agree with any of the policy changes above more than others, please let us know using the comment box below and include the name of the policy change you are commenting on.

	Response Percent	Response Total
<p>8.23 Practical driving assessment</p> <p>We believe that this another layer of bureaucracy, giving a third-party organisation an opportunity to profit from our trade.</p> <p>We believe that there is no evidence to suggest that it will result in better drivers joining the trade.</p> <p>Alternatives measures would provide more impact. These can include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A requirement for all licenced vehicles to have an operational dashcam installed in their car that the council can retrieve data from. • Enhance mechanical spot checks by the council of licensed vehicles, with particularly focus on tyre safety, an area that we have concerns about. <p>8.32 Driver Disability Awareness Training</p> <p>We believe every three years is excessive and adding to the administrative burden of licensed drivers. We feel that the requirement should be for renewal every 5 years. We note that 5 years is the requirement for operators.</p>		
	answered	36
	skipped	146

Drivers

This proposed policy change is around drivers.

New driver licence conditions (Appendix E): Updated driver licence conditions to reflect policy changes, not to allow vehicle engines to idle, not to 'tout' for business and to detail requirements in respect of assistance dogs and wheelchair users.

You can find out more information on our website: South Oxfordshire or Vale of White Horse.

Q35. How far do you agree or disagree with the proposed policy change above?

			Response Percent	Response Total						
1	Strongly agree		47.37%	81						
2	Agree		35.67%	61						
3	Neither agree nor disagree		10.53%	18						
4	Disagree		3.51%	6						
5	Strongly disagree		2.34%	4						
6	No comment		0.58%	1						
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	1.8	Std. Deviation	0.99	Satisfaction Rate	15.91	answered	171
	Maximum	6	Variance	0.98	Std. Error	0.08			skipped	11

Q36. If you have any comments on the policy change above, please let us know using the comment box below.

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	29
1	no		
2	All excellent proposals		
3	Engines will idle when the weather conditions are bad, due to the cold, more should be done to STOP touting, to many drivers do it, and when you confront them they get aggressive		
4	If the driver is sitting in the coke in his car how is he to keep warm what are you doing to help them ?		
5	.		
6	None		
7	You will not be able to police the touting of business. This happens now and there will nothing you can do about it.		
8	Sometimes engines have to be left idle due to weather conditions, its a H&S issue, driver can't be expected to sit on the rank for 2-3 hours to wait for a fare in freezing cold weather!		
9	All equally important.		
10	Add requirement for test of knowledge of Highway Code, particularly when the code is updated. There are substantial changes to the code being considered by government. These changes are intended to protect vulnerable road users.		
11	Especially about not idling. As well as wheelchair users, anyone with mobility issues		
12	No Idling ! totally agree.		

Q36. If you have any comments on the policy change above, please let us know using the comment box below.

		Response Percent	Response Total
13	Also an issue about waiting idly bumped up on footpaths, on double yellow lines etc. especially in the area of High Street Abingdon by the war memorial. Taxi drivers must adhere to the highway code, and respect both other road users and pedestrians.		
14	Yes, there is far too much engine idling on Hart Street and at Henley railway station		
15	disabled passengers should get the best possible experience when travelling, the proposed policies should include detailed instructions for taxi drivers so that passengers inside the taxi and other road users outside the taxi stay safe at all times. A taxi that is unloading disabled persons will take longer and require more space		
16	So you are asking drivers to sit on a rank in the freezing cold? How long does a vehicle have to be sat with the engine on the be considered "Idle"? If the taxi is waiting outside of the customers house must the engine be switched off even if the wait could be as short as 30 seconds? Are you expecting customers to get into a freezing cold car if it has been sat on the rank with no engine running for the heaters to work? Please define "tout" for work, is asking a person that comes near your taxi if they would like a taxi "touting" for work? What if you are parked on a taxi rank? Do you know how hard it is to get someone to take a taxi that doesn't want one? Surely the very nature of a "Hackney Carriage" is "touting" for work. They position themselves where it is likely they will be flagged down.		
17	Common sense. You have a department thats aim to catch rule breakers.		
18	All drivers must be required to take blind dogs and disabled persons		
19	Non idling is essential		
20	to detail requirements in respect of assistance dogs and wheelchair users.		
21	Sorry I have to strongly Disagree! Anyone who approves this I would ask to sit on a rank in a car in -3 degrees temperatures and tell me how long you would actually survive..... It is dangerous! I co own go green taxis, we believe in Green Principles but not where it leads to risk of death! I could never support this.		
22	Absolutely no engine idling polluting the pavement near shops.		
23	It is fundamental to make clear to all drivers that they must switch off engines whilst waiting. Taxis in Thame frequently have their car engines idling. Members of the public should be aware that this is unacceptable and can report drivers who do this.		
24	Drivers may need to allow engines to idle to run air conditioning.		
25	With regards to vehicles idling while waiting on a rank to trade. Drivers cannot be expected to sit the their cabs with no heat and something should be provided for them similar to the types found in London...		
26	ALL THESE THINGS MUST BE IN PLACE BEFORE ANY DRIVER IS IN CONTACT WITH THE PUBLIC		
27	Improving the environment is a key target for the council and many residents. The welfare of passengers with a disability must not be compromised		
28	Admin note: this response has been manually entered into this survey for data analysis purposes, as it was submitted in an email format:		

Q36. If you have any comments on the policy change above, please let us know using the comment box below.

		Response Percent	Response Total
	1.A clear policy prohibiting engine idling when waiting for fares. The dangers of this to the community and the drivers are well attested.		
29	Admin note: this response has been manually entered into this survey for data analysis purposes, as it was submitted in an email format. keep engine switch off after 1 minute		
		answered	29
		skipped	153

Enforcement

These proposed policy changes are around enforcement.

Immediate licence revocations (section 4.6): Added a section to clarify the types of situation where a licence may be immediately revoked.

Guidance on enforcement (section 6.3 and 6.4): Updated enforcement section with examples of the scale of actions and detail the responsibilities of licence holders to comply with requests from authorised officers.

Updated penalty points system (Appendix G): The penalty points system has been expanded and updated so that it now applies to all licence holders. A system for review of points without the need to refer to the Taxi Licensing Panel has been added. This is to ensure that the Panel can address more serious matters.

You can find out more information on our website: South Oxfordshire or Vale of White Horse.

Q37. How far do you agree or disagree with the proposed policy changes above overall? If you agree with any of the changes more than others, you can let us know using the comment box below.

			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		40.70%	70
2	Agree		35.47%	61
3	Neither agree nor disagree		17.44%	30
4	Disagree		1.16%	2

Q37. How far do you agree or disagree with the proposed policy changes above overall? If you agree with any of the changes more than others, you can let us know using the comment box below.

									Response Percent	Response Total
5	Strongly disagree								2.91%	5
6	No comment								2.33%	4
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	1.97	Std. Deviation	1.12	Satisfaction Rate	19.42	answered	172
	Maximum	6	Variance	1.26	Std. Error	0.09			skipped	10

Q38. If you agree with any of the policy changes above more than others, please let us know using the comment box below and include the name of the policy change you are commenting on.

			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question		100.00%	16
1	Excellent proposals			
2	Maybe the enforcement officer should be seen more, or the drivers could be given enforcement powers to stop private vehicles from parking on taxi ranks			
3	.			
4	I need more information on the revised points system.			
5	Drivers convicted of driving under the influence of drink or drugs should not be able to obtain a licence at all in my opinion.			
6	None			
7	All equally important.			
8	Slight worry that these regulations turn Taxis into a mobile union...maybe?			
9	Guidance on enforcement: this is very hollow. Guidance doesn't go far enough			
10	Generally I agree but think that the Taxi Licensing Panel should not be bye-passed.			
11	Here's a Novel idea. But out of the drivers life's. Deal with each case on its merit. Root out the bad dishonest drivers then your left with honest drivers who live a stress free uncomplicated life and don't have to deal with every bit of crap the council throw at them			
12	Appendix G is there a reviewprocess to ensure consistence and a level playing field			
13	POINTS ARE ONLY PLACED ON LICENCE IF THERE WAS WRONGDOING ,ANY ENDORSEMENT MUST DEBAR ANY DRIVER FROM CONTACT WITH GENERAL PUBLIC			
14	I approve of streamlining the adjudication of points based infringements.			
15	Admin note: this response has been manually entered into this survey for data analysis purposes, as it was submitted in an email format:			

Q38. If you agree with any of the policy changes above more than others, please let us know using the comment box below and include the name of the policy change you are commenting on.

		Response Percent	Response Total
	This email is regarding the new policies coming into effect on the 24th. Most of the drivers and myself are not happy with the new laws and term and conditions, which are unfair to both the Hackney carriage and the private hire drivers. The New Point system is unfair as it doesn't account for people who are under the influence of alcohol or drugs (mainly alcohol) abuse the drivers mainly verbally but occasionally physically, and these people will be free to abuse the system. Many people can't afford to pay their bills due to the fact that there is no business due to repeated national lockdowns and to top it all off, the new system will harm people already weakened financially due to lockdowns. The fact that people will have to have a English test despite having a CRB is also unfair.		
16	Admin note: this response has been manually entered into this survey for data analysis purposes, as it was submitted in an email format. too many points given to drivers		
		answered	16
		skipped	166

General

These proposed policy changes are around general changes.

Guidance on incomplete applications (section 3.3): Any application that is not completed within 6 months may be treated as withdrawn. This is to ensure all evidence and checks (e.g. DBS and medical) remain valid.

Updating email addresses (section 5.1): Add a requirement for all licence holders to update any changes of email address to allow greater use of email contact.

Notification of holidays (section 5.2): Recommendation that licence holders confirm if they are going away for more than 2 weeks, to help avoid unnecessary suspension of licences where items expire while licence holders are away.

Guidance on knowledge tests (section 8.27-8.30): Amendments to knowledge test section to allow for use of third party providers for delivery of tests, reduce the number of times an applicant may sit a test in a 12 month period to prevent repeated failures blocking spaces for new candidates, introduce a minimum cancellation period, and add guidance for candidates with a disability.

E-cigarettes and vaping (Appendix A para 17 and Appendix B para 18): Drivers and passengers will not be allowed to use electronic cigarettes or so called 'vaping' equipment in licensed vehicles. The risks from 'vaping' are still unknown and unnecessary exposure can be avoided.

Lost property (Appendix A para 34 and Appendix B para 41): The proprietor or driver of a licensed vehicle must report any lost property found in the vehicle to Thames Valley Police in accordance with current procedures, if they are unable to contact the passenger directly. Change in lost property procedure at Thames Valley Police.

HCs (hackney carriages) to record pre-booked journeys (Appendix A para 39-40): Introduce requirement for hackney carriage proprietors to record all pre-booked journey details and make such details available for inspection. This is to ensure checks can be made that vehicles are operating in line with policy and to assist in respect of investigations into complaints and similar matters.

You can find out more information on our website: South Oxfordshire or Vale of White Horse.

Q39. How far do you agree or disagree with the proposed policy changes above overall? If you agree with any of the changes more than others, you can let us know using the comment box below.

		Response Percent	Response Total							
1	Strongly agree		41.28% 71							
2	Agree		40.70% 70							
3	Neither agree nor disagree		9.88% 17							
4	Disagree		4.07% 7							
5	Strongly disagree		2.91% 5							
6	No comment		1.16% 2							
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	1.9	Std. Deviation	1.05	Satisfaction Rate	18.02	answered	172
	Maximum	6	Variance	1.11	Std. Error	0.08				

Q40. If you agree with any of the policy changes above more than others, please let us know using the comment box below and include the name of the policy change you are commenting on.

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	23
1	I strongly agree with the barring of vaping from licensed vehicles and the reporting of lost property to the police.		
2	All excellent proposals		
3	Why should Hackney carriages keep a record of pre bookings, not everyone has an email address or access to a computer		
4	Hackney carriage is not a private hire vehicle so bookings should not be recorded		

Q40. If you agree with any of the policy changes above more than others, please let us know using the comment box below and include the name of the policy change you are commenting on.

		Response Percent	Response Total
5	Strongly agree on E-cigarettes		
6	.		
7	I think the need to notify when away for more then 2 weeks is too excessive. it should be 4 weeks		
8	All good changes. The requirement to notify longer holidays is important where we have many drivers whose family ties are overseas.		
9	None		
10	I agree with all of them		
11	5.2 Notification if going away for more than two weeks rather heavy-handed and over-officious and bureaucratic - operators will know if their license is due for renewal! Perhaps make this 6 weeks?		
12	5.2 seems an unnecessary burden... with little benefit to users.		
13	notification of a two weeks away period is too much. more like 4 weeks away might be ideal in my opinion		
14	All equally important.		
15	I think you should make a commitment to completing all new and existing tax drivers licenses within a time frame to ensure you are providing a good service to us! Have you actually researched vaping? Can you show the evidence to show it is harmful and thus should be banned? Is this just based on the fact it looks like smoking? Sugary drinks have certified research that shows they are bad for your health will these also be banned from taxis? Surely children being exposed to the brands in the vehicle could tempt them to try one and thus be bad for their health. Where is this nanny state going to end?!		
16	See previous answer. By now an honest driver will be looking for a gun or a rope reading all these proposed changes		
17	Holiday notification for 2 weeks too short. 4 weeks more realistic		
18	Incomplete applications - why not reduce to 3 months?		
19	Notification of holidays (section 5.2) I think this is unnecessary, This is like school kids that we have to inform the council that we are going away. This is going to be another worry added before going anywhere it will add your work as well. Because if the person is on holidays and vehicle compliance expires it is going to suspended anyway. I can't see why the driver have to tell you he is going on holiday.		
20	Stopping vaping and e cig good		
21	Agree with all changes, would even be inclined for the time frame in 3.3 to be less than 6 months		
22	There is no legal obligation for hackney carriage operators to record details of a pre-booked fare. You are overstepping the Miscellaneous Provisions Act.		

Q40. If you agree with any of the policy changes above more than others, please let us know using the comment box below and include the name of the policy change you are commenting on.

		Response Percent	Response Total
23	<p>Admin note: this response has been manually entered into this survey for data analysis purposes, as it was submitted in an email format:</p> <p>39 Hackney carriage proprietors must keep records of any pre-booked work in a suitable book or on a computer or any other recordable device. What is the legal standing for this condition? LG(MP) A 1976 clearly sets out the requirement for Private Hire Operators to keep records of bookings, but it places no legal requirement on Hackney Carriage Operators to do so.</p> <p>Whilst we accept that it is logical and would fully support that any operator accepting 'advance bookings' (those not made directly to the driver at the time of travel, thus a hail) should be a licenced operator, whether despatching HC or PH, there is no legal basis for you to introduce this condition.</p>		
		answered	23
		skipped	159

Operators

These proposed policy changes are around operators.

Knowledge test for operators (section 9.9): Requires all new private hire operator licence applicants to pass the knowledge test (except those already licensed as drivers who have taken the test). This aims to ensure operators have sufficient knowledge of the area, laws and legislation.

Disability awareness training (section 9.15-9.17): All applicants for a private hire operator's licence and all staff taking bookings and dispatching work will be required to pass disability awareness training before a licence will be granted. Once passed, the training must be re-taken every 3 years.

Public liability insurance requirements (section 9.22): Add requirement for private hire operators with a premises open to the public to have minimum £5m public liability insurance.

Guidance on moving to new base (section 9.24): Private hire operators who propose to change their base must obtain, prior to commencing taking bookings, a licence to operate from the new address.

Trading names (section 9.27): A private hire operator shall only use trading or company name(s) that are included on the operator licence, or other trading name(s) approved by the council in writing.

New operator licence conditions (Appendix D): Added a separate section for private

hire operator licence conditions. This includes new requirements to report complaints to the council, guidance on bookings with assistance dogs and the use of approved trading names.

You can find out more information on our website: South Oxfordshire or Vale of White Horse.

Q41. How far do you agree or disagree with the proposed policy changes above overall? If you agree with any of the changes more than others, you can let us know using the comment box below.

		Response Percent	Response Total							
1	Strongly agree		45.56% 77							
2	Agree		37.87% 64							
3	Neither agree nor disagree		8.28% 14							
4	Disagree		3.55% 6							
5	Strongly disagree		2.96% 5							
6	No comment		1.78% 3							
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	1.86	Std. Deviation	1.1	Satisfaction Rate	17.16	answered	169
	Maximum	6	Variance	1.21	Std. Error	0.08				

Q42. If you agree with any of the policy changes above more than others, please let us know using the comment box below and include the name of the policy change you are commenting on.

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	25
1	I have already given my views on the need to undergo repeated Disability training in a prior section (I don't see the necessity for it).		
2	Excellent proposals		
3	Public liability insurance should be £10 million		
4	.		
5	I disagree , once again with the Disability awareness training having to be renewed every 3 years without complaint		
6	5m public liability This would go through our car insurance and would push premiums up even more. I don't think my Insurance goes up to that amount even if I wanted it		
7	These all seem essential to me.		

Q42. If you agree with any of the policy changes above more than others, please let us know using the comment box below and include the name of the policy change you are commenting on.

		Response Percent	Response Total
8	Trading names (section 9.27): A private hire operator shall only use trading or company name(s) that are included on the operator licence, or other trading name(s) approved by the council in writing. Very important in order for members of the public to understand who they are dealing with.		
9	None		
10	Disability awareness training should not have to be at the operator's cost - makes working uneconomic. The £5m cost for insurance is ridiculous for what are usually very small offices and again makes any operation of such uneconomic. Perhaps £1m better - public will after all only be in a small waiting room if even that!		
11	i feel only drivers must be the ones taking knowledge test as well as disability & safeguarding training leaving out admin staff. how ever everyone who handles passenger details should have enhanced DBS		
12	Knowledge test for operators: Not sure what "sufficient knowledge of the area" means. Hopefully it is only at a superficial level as most of the knowledge comes from the SatNav - so don't necessarily agree with this		
13	All equally important.		
14	Put measures in place to avoid phoenixing of companies		
15	Disability awareness		
16	Can you please remove map reading from the knowledge test. The rest should be reflective of the actual job. I don't know a single taxi driver who carries a map. No one does anymore, almost everyone has a smart phone now and I would bet 100% of taxi drivers have a smart phone with Google maps. Mapping software has removed the need for a large part of the knowledge tests. Please get with the times and actually change part of your policy that is in urgent need of updating. Sufficient knowledge of the area needs only be access to a smart phone, it would be much better to ask that a mandatory piece of equipment is a smart phone with maps and a safe mount in the vehicle. Not having to bring a map will also cut down on paper and be environmentally friendlier. Disability awareness training for admin staff or call centre agents? Every 3 years??? Back to wasting time and tax payers money again! Please, what are the new disabilities discovered in the last 3 years? Once is enough and you know it, people don't just forget that some people need extra assistance.		
17	Strongly disagree to everything. Absolutely shocked at how far you are prepared to go with out realising or caring about the consequences.		
18	Sat nav equipment renders local knowledge redundant		
19	I think the knowledge test is pointless in an age when everyone has maps on their smartphones. I also think disability training is pointless - let the market decide.		
20	section 9.15-9.17 a standard of this training should be set by SODC		
21	I only disagree with the every 3 years on the disability awareness training. It was so basic its not required every 3 years.		

Q42. If you agree with any of the policy changes above more than others, please let us know using the comment box below and include the name of the policy change you are commenting on.

		Response Percent	Response Total
22	Taking a test is one way of ensuring disability awareness, but there must be other methods.		
23	A		
24	see my written response		
25	<p>Admin note: this response has been manually entered into this survey for data analysis purposes, as it was submitted in an email format:</p> <p>9.9 Operator Knowledge tests Who in the Uber organisation would you require to take a knowledge test if they applied for a licence in South Oxfordshire? The licensed operator could be a limited company, who would have to take a knowledge test here. Many directors of limited companies are not involved in the day-to-day management of the operation and can even live abroad.</p> <p>9.17/9.20 Booking staff Disability awareness/Safeguarding What is your justification for booking staff to undertake these two courses? Your notes reference the Oxfordshire Joint Operating Framework stating that drivers should fully understand their responsibilities. You do not mention booking staff in your reasoning.</p> <p>This appears to be you simply adding another level of bureaucracy to our businesses with no definable benefit.</p>		
		answered	25
		skipped	157

Vehicle criteria

These proposed policy changes are around vehicle criteria.

Vehicles licensed elsewhere (section 7.4): Clarify that vehicles will only be considered for licensing if they are not already licensed by another licensing authority. A vehicle will only be licensed by one authority at a time as two plates would be confusing for the public.

Vehicles that have been written off (section 7.13): The councils will not license vehicles that have been classified as category 'A' (whole vehicle to be crushed), 'B' (body shell to be crushed) or 'S' write offs (structural damage). This is to ensure all vehicles are of a high quality and meet the original, statutory safety standards.

Vehicle emissions requirements by 2022 and 2026 (section 7.17): From 1 April 2022 proprietors will be required to have vehicles of at least Euro 4 standard to renew their licence; and Euro 4, Euro 6 or zero-emission capable to receive a new licence. From 1 April 2026, proprietors will be required to have vehicles of at least Euro 6

standard to receive a new or renewed licence. This is with a view to the aspiration for all licensed vehicles to be zero carbon by 2030 at the latest in response to the Climate Emergency declared by both councils.

Approval of adverts on vehicles (section 7.31 and Appendix J): Allows for the councils to introduce an approval system for advertisements on licensed vehicles, with a fee to cover the cost of considering any such applications.

Compliance test requirements (section 7.47): Where a temporary vehicle licence has been granted due to the original vehicle being subject to accident damage or mechanical breakdown, a new compliance certificate will be required for the previous vehicle. This is to ensure vehicles returning to use after repair are mechanically fit to be used as licensed vehicles.

Removal of minimum engine capacity (Appendix A and Appendix B para 1): Removed minimum engine capacity to reflect modern automotive technology and reduced vehicle emissions, allow for solely-electric vehicles to be licensed.

Clarification of tinted windows requirements (Appendix A and Appendix B - Para 2): Amended tinted windows specification and require all licensed vehicles (except PHVs with a plate exemption) to comply with the tint requirement. Existing licensed vehicles with factory/manufacture tinted glass will be allowed to continue being licensed, but those with a tinted film fitted will need to have the film removed from the vehicle.

Taximeter requirements (Appendix A para 5 and Appendix B para 6): Clarify that meters should be tested for two tariffs over the measured mile, waiting time charge tested when the vehicle is stationary, and all meters to have an intact tamper proof seal.

Items to be carried in the vehicle (Appendix A para 6 and Appendix B para 7): The requirement to carry a bulb kit and fire extinguisher have been removed. All equipment must now be marked with the vehicle plate number to ensure that it remains in the nominated vehicle at all times.

Setting a tariff in South Oxfordshire (Appendix A para 18): Both councils will set a maximum hackney carriage tariff. Setting a maximum tariff protects the public and ensures consistency while still allowing competition between companies. New style meters reduce fraud risks. Only four councils in the country do not set a tariff.

You can find out more information on our website: South Oxfordshire or Vale of White Horse.

Q43. How far do you agree or disagree with the proposed policy changes above overall? If you agree with any of the changes more than others, you can let us know using the comment box below.

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		45.35% 78
2	Agree		35.47% 61
3	Neither agree nor disagree		8.14% 14
4	Disagree		5.23% 9
5	Strongly disagree		4.65% 8
6	No comment		1.16% 2
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean 1.92
	Maximum	6	Variance 1.34
		Std. Deviation 1.16	Satisfaction Rate 18.37
		Std. Error 0.09	answered 172
			skipped 10

Q44. If you agree with any of the policy changes above more than others, please let us know using the comment box below and include the name of the policy change you are commenting on.

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	53
1	Excellent proposals		
2	Not everyone will be able to afford to buy a car that could meet the emission requirements, especially due to the current pandemic, unless the council will give drivers a grant to buy said vehicle		
3	Where operators are on the border of one district and another - flexibility to operate either side of the border should be ensured		
4	Climate change is the biggest economically damaging scam of all time. It's communism, pure and simple. With all these extra regulations the taxi trade doesn't need communists like Greta Thunberg and her World Economic Forum chums such as Prince Charles telling them what engine to use. Green = Communist = Economic Decline & Damage.		
5	Vehicle emissions requirements should not be increased. The validity of a climate change emergency is disputed.		
6	.		
7	It's important that all normally tinted windows fitted in the factory when built are acceptable.		
8	Bulb kits are a waste of time , who is going to change a bulb at 2am in the morning. Most bulbs require daylight and normally a mechanic with tools.		

Q44. If you agree with any of the policy changes above more than others, please let us know using the comment box below and include the name of the policy change you are commenting on.

		Response Percent	Response Total
	Absolute nonsense Regarding marking equipment not necessary		
9	Given casual observation of some of the vehicles which seem to be employed on these services, tightening of any requirements must be a good thing. Idling on stands, particularly at stations where many taxis/phv congregate is very bad practice.		
10	Stringent testing of tariff charges should be monthly.		
11	None		
12	Regarding vehicle emissions; there appears to be no encouragement for operators to use electric and/or hybrid vehicles.		
13	section 7.7 requiring vehicles to be compliant with Euro 4 standards is a bit weak, as any Euro 4 vehicle has to be registered after 1 1 2006, so by the time this is effective 1 4 2022, the vehicle could be 16 years old. I think Euro 6 standards, effective 1 9 15 should be used, any vehicle would by 1 4 22 be at least 6 years old; any vehicle older than 6 years may not be suitable for taxi use for other reasons.		
14	In regard to tinted windows whom already have should not removed as some cars were bought which was already tinted instead of removing should have CCTV installed.		
15	Items to be carried in the vehicle: What exactly is the definition of a bulb kit? I suspect to carry spare LED or Xenon bulbs would be impractical and dangerous to allow the operator to change them on the roadside. Some of the ""bulbs"" should only be changed at a garage and so to make the operator carry them is pointless and a waste of money		
16	All equally important.		
17	Euro 6 requirement should be mandatory by 2024 for all vehicles		
18	Can zero emission vehicles have lower fees to encourage take up		
19	Very happy to see you responding to the climate emergency with the change to vehicle emissions and removal of min engine capacity to allow for electric vehicles.		
20	Not so sure about the advertising approval from Councils needed and fee being paid. The advertising could help the taxi recoup some of the costs that they will incur through these regulations. A 'sweetener' (?) The council to benefit from this is going too far -in my view. As the advertising would be on a car, it would be mobile. Setting tariffs ...see point about subsidised trips where public transport has been cut. especially in Rural areas		
21	Taxi tariffs there should be an appeal process for overcharging		
22	I don't agree with the Council setting a maximum tariff. Market forces will determine what customers will pay.		
23	section 7.17 - Good to see, reduction in vehicle emissions to improve local air quality		
24	It's about time the council sets a fare tariff for the meter.		

Q44. If you agree with any of the policy changes above more than others, please let us know using the comment box below and include the name of the policy change you are commenting on.

		Response Percent	Response Total
25	<p>Please clarify what you mean by "adverts in n vehicles" does this include the company name, the vehicles name or brand? Is this to allow another company to pay to advertise on the taxi?</p> <p>"Compliance testing" after damage or repair. Please clarify where the line is. Will vehicles need a new compliance after window screen wipers have been replaced? Brake pads? A tyre change? A bumper being replaced? At what point do you see the repair being big enough to require a new compliance check?</p> <p>A. Setting a tariff is fine in principle but how will you calculate the ever changing costs of doing business. Fuel prices, insurance charges, minimum wage increases, inflation, local rent prices for housing, new technology such as EV cars to keep up with the councils emissions targets. Basically every cost is rising all the time. How do you propose to keep up to date will the cost of providing the service? Getting tariffs changed is also an expensive and time consuming activity how often do you propose to assess and change tariffs. Will you be removing the customers choice by having a tariff. A set tariff will only drive the quality of the service down.</p> <p>B. By having a set tariff you will cut off villagers, it will be impossible for a hackney carriage to provide a service for a journey such as blewbury to Aston, the fare will just be too low to warrant going out all that way without a call out fee. You could demand that drivers work for less than minimum wage if that's your prerogative but you won't have many drivers for long if that's the case. Yes a private hire vehicle could pick up that fare but as you know, there aren't many about. Why you ask because most drivers need the flexibility to do both Hackney fares and private hire fares with call out fees. Our geography is unique, we don't have big enough settlements or demand for services to make either private hire or Hackney work really well. Wedding venues and hotels will suffer greatly from the reduced availability of service. Lains barn is a good example, out in the middle of nowhere and if thier customers aren't travelling to a major town with taxis stationed there, they won't be able to get any service. Harwell laboratory to many local hotels or restaurants in villages will just be completely unviable for the pittance of a fare the driver will receive without a call out fee. The reality is drivers will likely be forced into doing these jobs for less than minimum wage to make an, already happy, customer happy.</p> <p>C. Who is even moaning about this? Who actually wants a tariff? Is this just another exercise for the council to increase red tape where none is required? Is the council just feeling like the odd one out? What is so wrong with the current system that it needs changing? If this is a couple of people moaning about prices being expensive then I'm sorry to have to point out that every single item and service has those few people moaning about prices.</p> <p>D. Will the council guarantee a minimum wage to its licences drivers? The council has a duty to serve the public and as members of the public, whose lively goods depend on the pricing decision of the council, we demand we are also served. Taking decisions that make us work for less than minimum wage is modern slavery, not great headlines for any council to face in the papers.</p>		
26	<p>Vehicle emissions requirements don't go far enough. All licensed vehicles must meet the euro 6 requirement by April 2022. Considering most licensed vehicles operate or are seen to operate in and around Oxford, they should not contribute to the harmful emission levels in Oxford.</p>		
27	<p>Why should the Copuncil get a fee because some Company wants to advertise on a taxi? Furthermore it does seem as if the Council is simly wanting to legislate overmuch. The matter e.g. of spare bulbs and fire extinguishers should, surely, be left to common sense.</p>		

Q44. If you agree with any of the policy changes above more than others, please let us know using the comment box below and include the name of the policy change you are commenting on.

		Response Percent	Response Total
28	Getting bored now		
29	Don't agree with 7.4 or 7.13, both of which could restrict a driver's earnings		
30	I think a fire extinguisher should still be carried		
31	<p>im deeply concerned about the proposed pricing policy.</p> <p>Vale Of White Horse has had a tariff since 2014 and to date this has not changed. Even writing this I can not believe im writing it! During this 7 year period pretty much every cost of doing business has increased as well as minimum wage.</p> <p>In 2014 the minimum wage was £6.31 PH In 2021 the minimum wage stands at just under £9 per hour</p> <p>I assure you that the drivers in 2014 were not all purchasing mansions in Frilford Heath and driving Italian sports cars due to the massive margins that they were given by the council and I know that since this time many drivers have significantly fallen behind minimum wage, to date no checks and balances have been put in place by Vale to ensure this does not happen. I have made this point many times that without an algorithm that takes into consideration the many factors of which one is minimum wage that go into running a taxi company or indeed a single hackney carriage car, its impossible to set a fair pricing policy at council level. Luckily capitalism does take care of price as if anyone sets their prices too high then they are no longer used whilst if others set them low then they run the risk of going bust.</p> <p>I know this was never the intention but I think ultimately and inadvertently the council have been responsible for pushing many drivers into poverty and forcing them into accepting below minimum wage and today I speak for those who feel they do not have a voice. I know this to be a fact having spoken to many in abingdon and Wantage about this and asking why they do nothing about it. The reality is and the answer is "the council dont care about us, in fact they target us when we complain and nothing will change". Many fear backlash something I know is not unfounded as I experienced a huge increase in stop and checking of our cars when I raise valid points with Shankar (head of licensing) in 2018.... It is this that has created a terrible "us and them" culture which I personally feel helps no one! On a very personal note it makes me so sad to know that drivers feel that unengaged with those that create the rules and it really is a Rulers Rule environment where not even democracy really matters as who votes for councillors based around taxi policy... No one. When the person setting the rules can control your income, take away your licence there is a serious power imbalance and this does not serve anyone.</p> <p>In addition its my understand that the council operates an unless you complain we wont change it policy when it comes to pricing and this was confirmed to me today. I think this is an unacceptable way to set rules! Im sorry but your relying on people your overseeing to rise up before you offer any pay increase, all the time not having to ask for payrises yourself as its given annually !!! Such terrible double standards and It really upsets me that its been allowed to happen and the effect its had on some people.</p>		
32	Vehicles licensed elsewhere - does the public really look at this?? Why shouldn't a vehicle be licensed elsewhere??		

Q44. If you agree with any of the policy changes above more than others, please let us know using the comment box below and include the name of the policy change you are commenting on.

		Response Percent	Response Total
	Vehicle emissions - is this realistic??		
33	7.31 - why should the council be approving adverts? they just need to comply with normal advertising standards		
34	Setting maximum tariffs is essential as there are some operators currently in Thame who will take advantage of vulnerable people and charge more accordingly.		
35	(Appendix A para 6 and Appendix B para 7 I think all should carry bulb kit fitting tools fire extinguisher and spare wheel/ puncture kit		
36	Euro 6 is failing to provide enough insurance against illegal air quality levels. Electric should be mentioned as the ideal for town centres. Cars that idle as soon as they stop can be considered. Idling can be made an on the spot offence so parking attendants can deal with endorsement.		
37	Being mindful of Air Pollution. Please add that drivers are NOT ALLOWED to idle their engines whilst waiting, either at a taxi rank or when collecting someone.		
38	Strongly agree with this -> Vehicle emissions requirements by 2022 and 2026		
39	Drivers revoked or refused elsewhere		
40	The vehicle emissions criteria should be tighter and come in at an earlier stage for diesel vehicles, in particular, owing to their generation of significantly worse air pollution (especially NOx). Euro 4 diesel vehicles should be removed from taxi eligibility at a much faster rate than proposed. I suggest that from April 2022 Euro 6 as a minimum should be required for all renewal and new licences. This is in line with the requirements for London's ULEZ and links with the Oxford City Council's ambitions for NO2 reduction targets by 2025. This would enable a significant stride forward for SODC's action on air quality with a view to actually meeting the Air Quality Action Plan points. Additionally, the proposed plan on emission reductions does not fulfill the intention of a Climate Emergency declaration.		
41	Setting a max tariff would need to be updated on a regular basis to take into consideration increases in fuel and servicing and other rises in costs proposed by the council.		
42	Re emissions requirements: these should be altered far sooner: from April 22 Euro 6 minimum even for renewal, and from April 26 zero-emission only, even for renewal. The timetable presented is far too slow regarding decarbonisation.		
43	Vehicles that have been written off (section 7.13): Category S should be allowed. I want to give you a scenario. I bought a vehicle worth 9K and someone bump into the car and i have a broken bumper or light or just a dent and it is plated vehicle. I am legally bound to report to council and I am not going to drive the car which is not road worthy I want my vehicle to be repaired and it will only get repaired if it is economical. and its category get changed am I still be allowed to use the car if not I am loosing out. It is not easy to keep buying a new car get meter fixed MOT and everything adds up. Please look into it. Thank you		

Q44. If you agree with any of the policy changes above more than others, please let us know using the comment box below and include the name of the policy change you are commenting on.

		Response Percent	Response Total
44	What rates are being considered fir tarriffs		
45	<p>As you are aware, we operate from the following areas/towns, meaning that when starting or ending the journey inside of these locations we do not charge what is known as a 'call-out charge'. Didcot, Milton Park, Harwell, E/W Hagbourne, Wallingford, Abingdon, Wantage & Oxford</p> <p>For journeys that start/finish outside of these areas that we often get called to, but that are not worth having a Driver permanently located, such as Goring to Moulsoford we would charge from the nearest operating area ie. Wallingford to Goring to Moulsoford using the Pricing structure.</p> <p>The implications of restricting cross border working particularly for Operators such as us, who operate multi-licensed fleets is that it is unclear how a Call Out can be charged and could leave customers unable to book taxis as none operate in their village.</p> <p>For Example A VOWH driver could pick up a local customer in Wantage, drive them to their destination in Henley on Thames and drop off. On their way back to the VOWH they receive a booking from Wallingford to Didcot</p> <p>How would any proposals cover a call out fee? Would this be calculated from the nearest VOWH area or would the bookings system need to overlook those drivers which would have a disastrous impact on dead miles and therefore carbon footprint and driver earnings. Or in the event one of our customers books in a SODC area such as Sandford Upon Thames which is usually most environmentally serviced from a VOWH area such as Abingdon or Botley how would call out fees be viewed.</p> <p>We calculate the pricing on our system, using the shortest possible route, and quote each price to the Customer so the Drivers, when undertaking pre-booked journeys, do not have to use the meter. This means that our Customers are always aware of the price they should be paying and it also allows the Driver to take alternative quicker routes, (that are longer mileage), due to traffic without the price affecting the passenger.</p> <p>With regards to the new proposed tariff changes, we would like to understand what charges the operator can charge on top of the tariff fare. I.e. Are they allowed to charge a booking fee if agreed with the passenger for journeys booked by phone instead of by App?</p> <p>The tariff set for Vale of White Horse was last updated in 2014, which I think we can agree is not in line with inflation over the last 7 years. We feel that the new tariff should be open for consultation at the same time as the Licensing fees are assessed.</p>		
46	see my written response.		
47	These changes pr.ovide improvements on previous requirements		
48	<p>I strongly agree with this section apart from the council setting the tariff.</p> <p>There was a public consultation the last time the licencing policy was reviewed and it was very apparent that the public was in favour for the operator to set the tariff rather than the council to set it.</p> <p>If the council does go ahead with this policy chance will they consider a tiered tariff for vehicles taking more than the basic 4 passengers (5 to 8 in a vehicle equivalent to 2 vehicles) and will they have</p>		

Q44. If you agree with any of the policy changes above more than others, please let us know using the comment box below and include the name of the policy change you are commenting on.

		Response Percent	Response Total
	dialogue with the taxi operators to come to a mutually agreed tariff as the operators knows what their running costs are to keep the highest standard possible.		
49	<p>Admin note: this response has been manually entered into this survey for data analysis purposes, as it was submitted in an email format:</p> <p>3. The change to the regulation which no longer requires a taxi or HC to carry a fire extinguisher is perhaps unwise, because although the Fire & Rescue Service advice is always to prioritise driver and passengers exiting a vehicle which is on fire, and not to attempt to fight the fire with extinguishers, in road traffic accidents which crush car bodies so that the doors will not open to permit emergency evacuation, the provision of a fire extinguisher for any occupants trapped in a burning taxi could be a life-saver.</p>		
50	<p>Admin note: this response has been manually entered into this survey for data analysis purposes, as it was submitted in an email format:</p> <p>We are not heavy taxi users or involved in the sector, so not qualified to complete a full survey.</p> <p>However, please record our support for your measures to address climate change in the policy. Thank you.</p>		
51	<p>Admin note: this response has been manually entered into this survey for data analysis purposes, as it was submitted in an email format:</p> <p>2.A positive encouragement for drivers to switch to electric vehicles – which would involve some level of support for EV charging points in suitable locations.</p>		
52	<p>Admin note: this response has been manually entered into this survey for data analysis purposes, as it was submitted in an email format.</p> <p>changing to newer vehicles</p>		
53	<p>Admin note: this response has been manually entered into this survey for data analysis purposes, as it was submitted in an email format.</p> <p>Introduction of tariff controls in South Oxfordshire</p> <p>The new policy sets out, for the first time, the introduction of council-imposed tariff controls on hundreds of small business operators, who have been running their businesses in South Oxfordshire for many years.</p> <p>For a council to start to start dictating to local businesses the maximum that they can charge for a service is a massive imposition on the business owner and their employees.</p> <p>You could surely expect the council to do three particularly important things before taking such a decision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make the announcement clear and transparent to the businesses involved. • Set out what the price structure would be and a clear policy for ongoing review. • Provide reasonable justification for imposing the control. 		

Q44. If you agree with any of the policy changes above more than others, please let us know using the comment box below and include the name of the policy change you are commenting on.

Response Percent	Response Total
---------------------	-------------------

South Oxfordshire's licencing team have had no advance official engagement with the trade regarding this change. And now they fail to clearly mention this radical change anywhere in their 'list of changes' attached to the draft policy. This seems incredibly disingenuous on their behalf.

The Licencing team have not stated what the tariff will be and have declined approaches from Pryors to discuss how they intend to reach that decision. This really is a 'Brexit' scenario, where you are expected to vote for something, but we cannot tell you what it is you are voting for.

South Oxfordshire is a hugely different district to neighbouring urban authorities. We have lower levels of demand and population density. This means that the drivers incur greater dead mileage and a smaller volume of bookings than you would find in a metropolitan area.

Comparing taxis services in Oxford City or Reading with those in SODC would be like comparing a McDonalds meal and a fine dining restaurant. So please do not offer us metropolitan prices as 'suitable' for the service that we will be expected to provide.

Our neighbours, Vale of the White Horse has only had one increase in the last the last 15 years (2014) and drivers are still expected to provide a service comparable to 8 years ago.

Why is this proposal being made?
The only justification offered seems 'everyone else does it'. But that has been the case for 45 years now.

Do the licencing team have high levels of complaints about fare extortion inside the district? And we do not mean fares charged from Henley Regatta to London, as the council cannot control these even with tariff control. What is the evidence?

What other options have they considered other than strangling business operators' option to offer an enhanced service?

If you are launching 'market controls' then why not have a full discussion on the subject, including other 'tools', such as number capping?

The impact of introducing tariff control, how it will affect the structure of the trade!
South Oxfordshire has remarkably little 'rank work'. The two busiest ranks in the District (Didcot Parkway and Hart Street Henley) are both on the edge of the district, with a high proportion of the fares from these locations 'going out of district' and beyond the council's control.

We estimate that less than 1% of the district's licenced hackney carriages survive purely on rank hails alone. To be commercially viable you need alternative work sources, such as telephone bookings and school contracts.

We confidently predict that many of the Hackneys (those which actually operate within the district) will migrate to Private Hire licences. With a minimal percentage of their income from 'hailed' sources, they are likely to move away from the imposition of the council deciding their rates. This change will mean less available capacity to serve taxi ranks in the district at peak times (closing time on Saturday evening

Q44. If you agree with any of the policy changes above more than others, please let us know using the comment box below and include the name of the policy change you are commenting on.

	Response Percent	Response Total
<p>etc), leading to the creation of a typical ‘metropolitan area’ problem, Private Hire vehicles plying illegally.</p> <p>Rural services will be particularly affected. A customer in Dorchester on Thames who wishes to travel to Clifton Hampden surgery will typically ring an operator from Didcot or Wallingford. These operators will be reluctant to accept the booking, if by law they are only allowed to charge for three passenger miles and not the positioning miles as well.</p> <p>Tariff control also directly impacts on operators who employ their drivers (PAYE), rather than engaging self-employed agents. Using employed drivers results in 20% of the fare being VAT, which will make employing drivers unsustainable if this must be included in the ‘maximum tariff’.</p> <p>At Pryors, we have been aware the licencing team’s desire to unify the policies for over a decade, to achieve this would involve the introduction of tariff control. It has always been our plan to withdraw from providing Hackney Carriage vehicles when this happened. Unfortunately, the Covid pandemic brought forward that decision before the new policy was launched. But the Pryor family will not be licencing any further Hackney Carriages once this policy is launched.</p> <p>How should tariff control work? When the council does introduce its tariff control, we ask that the council engages with the trade and finds out how many hours drivers are typically having to work and how little money that they are actually making.</p> <p>Regular tariff reviews are essential and should be clearly set out in the policy, with it prescribed how those reviews are undertaken. Transport for London has developed a cost index, that analyses the movement in the actual costs of being a taxi operator. It then uses this index to inform TfL when annually reviewing tariffs. We strongly believe that South Oxfordshire should commit to following this cost index, and review prices accordingly every year.</p> <p>Flag of convenience For many years now South Oxfordshire and Vale hackney licences have been a ‘flag of convenience’ for licenced drivers who want to work on private hire circuits in neighbouring urban areas but choose to be licenced as hackney carriage vehicle/driver in these/this district because of the lower restrictions on applications.</p> <p>The result of this is a heavily bloated number of licences held within South Oxfordshire, completely disproportionate to the district’s size and market.</p> <p>The licencing team thus has capacity issues, which causes delays and problems for locally based operators. It also means that the ‘personal’ nature of the relationship between the licencing team and their genuine ‘clients’ is lost. Enforcement capability is predominantly utilised focusing on South Oxfordshire’s licence taxis ‘out of district’ activities.</p> <p>In recent years, the council have introduced ‘box ticking’ exercises to make it appear that they were acting on this matter, but it really is time that South Oxfordshire and Vale got to grips with this problem and stopped people avoiding the licencing procedure in the area that they wish to operate.</p> <p>The licencing team cannot possibly offer effective monitoring of drivers/vehicles that are ‘out of district’</p>		

Q44. If you agree with any of the policy changes above more than others, please let us know using the comment box below and include the name of the policy change you are commenting on.

	Response Percent	Response Total
<p>for 95% of their working day.</p> <p>8.26 Knowledge tests Will the council be introducing a joint test covering both districts?</p> <p>6(PH 7). Equipment... a spare wheel for immediate use.... Hi Viz equipment</p> <p>A high percentage of modern vehicles no longer come with stowage for a spare wheel. This, apparently, is to reduce the environmental impact. This means that stowing a spare wheel would massively impact on luggage capacity.</p> <p>At Pryors we believe that a licenced vehicle should carry at least three Hi Viz items of clothing, allowing the driver and at least two passengers some protection.</p> <p>18 Meters and tariff card</p> <p>We believe, if the council introduces tariff control, that all meters should be set/sealed at the council set tariff. If operators wish to offer a discount on the displayed fare, then that is entirely up to them.</p> <p>By having sealed meters showing different tariffs would lead to public confusion over what the set tariff is.</p> <p>It also raises the question of how an operator could amend his tariff between tests. Would he have to pay for a full test to have his meter adjusted and resealed.</p>	answered	53
	skipped	129

Other comments

Q45. Do you have any additional comments on the proposed new policies in Section B ('other changes') that you would like us to consider?

	Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%
1	no	39
2	No	
3	Passenger safety is foremost	
4	We have been asked to give our comments, but no one listens so it will be pointless	

Q45. Do you have any additional comments on the proposed new policies in Section B ('other changes') that you would like us to consider?

		Response Percent	Response Total
5	Do these requirements also apply to Uber drivers? If not then this is a pointless exercise.		
6	Nothing on Covid yet?		
7	No		
8	.		
9	My feeling is that you are trying to reduce the amount of new entrants and current drivers by extreme policing of the system , Getting a Taxi in Abingdon is difficult at the best of times , if drivers are not incentivised they will not apply		
10	No		
11	No.		
12	No		
13	Glad to see this work is being undertaken. Well done.		
14	None		
15	Don't make operating a taxi too expensive (training and renewed training and insurance) for it to be a paying proposition. A light-handed touch better. Bureaucracy does tend to over-complicate simple operations.		
16	I am pleased to see that a driver now has to hold a current general driving license.		
17	No		
18	No comments		
19	No		
20	The licences should be visible for customer the licences should have a photo of the licence holder		
21	I am very much in favour of all the changes and generally updating your taxi policy to ensure we have good safe drivers and driving.		
22	For added safety, could all taxis operating in the area have a standard colour scheme. As a female, I then know that I am getting in to an authorised taxi. Restrict the amount of licences granted.		
23	These changes look like you sent out an email to a load of people for ideas on what you change and you just cut and paste all those ideas, good and bad into this form. Lots of incomplete policies that haven't been stress tested and frankly a very disappointing document to read. I suggest you reread what you have proposed and then actually try and play out how those policies will affect those they are being imposed upon and what the work flows will look like for you and your staff. Lots of expensive policy changes there and tons of wasted time for those just trying to provide a good service to their customers. It takes ages to get a taxi drivers licence and the pay is crap, you really think these people are sticking around because they are out to rip people off and have nothing but l'll intentions. No they stick around because they love providing the service to their customers and every time you add another check or test your damaging the service not improving it.		

Q45. Do you have any additional comments on the proposed new policies in Section B ('other changes') that you would like us to consider?

		Response Percent	Response Total
24	You don't need any changes. Stop interfering		
25	More spot checks to ensure drivers / operators are compliant with the regulations.		
26	I am concerned about the increase in bureaucracy overall, which will increase costs. Some nice to have items are being wrapped into the bundle.		
27	No		
28	Yes a basic standard of Disability Awareness Training be set and used in practice		
29	I think there is a big issue around pricing and I hope you read my comments. Regarding electric cars by 2030 there needs to be the infrastructure in place to support such a network and this needs to be thought out.		
30	These proposals seem so thorough that they may be cumbersome to operate and regulate, leading to abuse or misuse maybe. Any scope for ""trimming""?		
31	Drivers to be fully aware of care to be taken when overtaking cyclists.		
32	The emissions restrictions should be made tighter sooner, with only Euro 6 or better allowed to renew or obtain a new licence, from April 2022, and with only zero-emissions vehicles able to renew or obtain a new licence, from April 2026.		
33	No, thank you.		
34	BAR ANY DRIVER THAT USES MORE THAN ONE NAME.		
35	See my written response.		
36	Thank you for improving the quality and consistency of the policies.		
37	I feel that doing this review during lockdown could possible be seen as trying to get the policy through the back door, as majority of taxi drivers / operators are not working and therefore not able to discuss these changes among themselves. This could be seen as trying to prevent them to give an appropriate response to the council. Apart from this observation I am in general agreement with the policy update except for the proposed tariff changes.		
38	Admin note: this response has been manually entered into this survey for data analysis purposes, as it was submitted in an email format. •council wants Disability vehicles There are too many changes being made especially changes to vehicles due to pandemic there is no work how can I afford to progress to newer vehicle .There are far too many changes taking place to mention on this email		
39	Admin note: this response has been manually entered into this survey for data analysis purposes, as it was submitted in an email format. 7.4 Vehicles will only be considered for licensing if they are not already licensed by another licensing		

Q45. Do you have any additional comments on the proposed new policies in Section B ('other changes') that you would like us to consider?

	Response Percent	Response Total
<p>authority.</p> <p>Why?</p> <p>There is a well-developed support industry for the taxi/PH trade where operators are provided with a replacement licenced vehicle by their insurers if their own vehicle is off the road due to a road traffic accident or similar. The providers of this service licence the same car in multiple districts to keep taxi drivers on the road and earning. I am sure that there are SODC licensed vehicles 'on standby' that are also licensed in another area.</p> <p>Also, if a licensed operator wanted to move to this district from another, he would have to cancel his/her licence in that district and stop working whilst waiting for the licensing process here.</p> <p>7.19 The council will give careful consideration to incentives to increase the number of disabled access vehicles within the district.</p> <p>It is important to clarify 'disabled access vehicle'. We assume that you intend this to mean wheelchair accessible vehicles (the passenger travels in their wheelchair during the journey). Whilst these vehicles serve a particularly useful purpose for wheelchair users, there is an extremely high risk involved in the activity. We are not aware that any wheelchair manufacturer is prepared to certify that their chairs are fit to travel in. Our own experience is that drivers are placed at high risk to personal injury whilst offering assistance.</p> <p>The council should consider introducing a specific training course to educate drivers in best practice whilst driving such a vehicle, with particular focus on driver/passenger safety and maintaining passenger dignity.</p> <p>It is also important for the council to acknowledge that a large proportion of disabled travellers find wheelchair accessible vehicles more difficult to use than standard saloons or MPVs.</p> <p>7.27 Tariffs Hackney carriage drivers may charge any amount for a journey provided it does not exceed the tariff, including journeys ending outside the district</p> <p>The council has no legal right to dictate what a hackney carriage driver can charge for journeys once outside the district. So long as the customer agrees the fare at the commencement of the journey, and the driver runs his meter to the district boundary (in case the passenger changes the destination) the driver is free to charge any fee he negotiates. See LG(MP)A1976 s66.</p>		
	answered	39
	skipped	143

CCTV in licensed vehicles

Q46. We have not included any requirements for CCTV to be installed in licensed vehicles in our draft new taxi licensing policy and we would like to know what you think about this.

The Department for Transport has concerns about CCTV being made a mandatory requirement because of the potential privacy issues for passengers.

We would therefore need strong reasons to make it a requirement to have CCTV in all licensed vehicles. Can you please let us know below if you believe there are any specific reasons in our districts that CCTV in licensed vehicles would have a positive or a negative effect on the safety of taxi and private hire vehicle users.

								Response Percent	Response Total	
1	I don't have any comments (and agree that use of CCTV should not be a requirement)							47.90%	80	
2	I would like to comment on why I think the use of CCTV should be required							29.34%	49	
3	I have no opinion on this							22.75%	38	
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	1.75	Std. Deviation	0.8	Satisfaction Rate	37.43	answered	167
	Maximum	3	Variance	0.64	Std. Error	0.06			skipped	15

Comments: (67)

1	It safe guards both the passenger and driver
2	I can't see why a dashboard camera could be mounted at the front or rear of a vehicle so as to record driver /passanger activity. These devices are not expensive and the video recording could be kept for a period on months (6?) without incurring significant storage costs. Such recording would be very helpful in cases where disputes arise.
3	I think that cctv would be an extra safety precaution for drivers and passengers
4	I believe CCTV in the vehicle will be if it both the driver and the client.
5	This would be dangerous and should not be introduced
6	For the protection of the driver from false accusations of misconduct and to protect passengers from egregious behaviour
7	aat this time fitting of cctv should be optional to the owner/operator, but if fitted a printed warning must be fitted within the vehicle, in a position clearly visible by all passengers. There should not be any option or control allowing it to be turned off during a journey. Any cctv system must include both audio and video recording
8	I feel CCTV would improve both driver & passenger behaviour and help resolve disputes (such as disability discrimination by a driver or racist abuse by a passenger) - I'm not a fan of big brother CCTV everywhere but for example someone getting off a train late at night getting into a cab on the rank would feel a lot safer if the taxi had CCTV and the system was tamper proof. The downside is extra expense for operators, GDPR compliance, etc.
9	I like the idea of CCTV to protect vulnerable women but am concerned about possible invasion of privacy

Q46. We have not included any requirements for CCTV to be installed in licensed vehicles in our draft new taxi licensing policy and we would like to know what you think about this.

The Department for Transport has concerns about CCTV being made a mandatory requirement because of the potential privacy issues for passengers.

We would therefore need strong reasons to make it a requirement to have CCTV in all licensed vehicles. Can you please let us know below if you believe there are any specific reasons in our districts that CCTV in licensed vehicles would have a positive or a negative effect on the safety of taxi and private hire vehicle users.

		Response Percent	Response Total
10	CCTV is useful to ensure passenger safety, can be used in any disputes and can help the police in investigations.		
11	For the safety of both driver and passenger		
12	I agree , cctv is an invasion of privacy in the vehicle , if you hire a chauffeur car you expect a level of privacy and discretion within the vehicle		
13	Not sure our customers will like to be filmed. Some have already commented on the dash cam filming them. Voluntary CCTV maybe		
14	Surely the CCTV equipment would be there to protect both the driver and the passengers.		
15	I do not wish to be spied on if I am using a taxi or private hire vehicle.		
16	CCTV is good for driver and customer comfort and safety		
17	I think much would depend on who controls the operation of CCTV in cabs. If it can be assured that it is passenger choice (and control) there would seem to be a safety merit. Ensuring this was the arrangement might not be straightforward. I think the decision about CCTV will probably be guided by its design and use rather than cost. Costs are not great - especially when fitted at build. Maybe that is the plice to start.		
18	The taxi is a public place, this would be no more invasion of privacy that street CCTV. Mandatory CCTV could provide protection for both passengers and drivers.		
19	None		
20	A video and audio record is essential for the protection of both drivers and passengers. Simple examples: the passenger that leaves without paying, a dispute resulting in an assault, a false allegation made against the driver.		
21	It's for safety passengers and driver , I believe taxi should have CCTV as most of business and service provider do have them.		
22	Although the presence of CCTV would raise privacy issues for passengers, I feel these would be outweighed by the increased safety that CCTV would afford to both passengers and driver alike.		
23	Agree should not be required due to personal privacy issues of passengers.		
24	cctv protects drivers and passengers. In the event of personal incidents, crime, disputes, traffic accidents video footage can be crucial evidence, and preventative measures.		
	There is no expectation of privacy on public transport, and taxis could be viewed in the same way. If		

Q46. We have not included any requirements for CCTV to be installed in licensed vehicles in our draft new taxi licensing policy and we would like to know what you think about this.

The Department for Transport has concerns about CCTV being made a mandatory requirement because of the potential privacy issues for passengers.

We would therefore need strong reasons to make it a requirement to have CCTV in all licensed vehicles. Can you please let us know below if you believe there are any specific reasons in our districts that CCTV in licensed vehicles would have a positive or a negative effect on the safety of taxi and private hire vehicle users.

		Response Percent	Response Total
	we can accept that we cannot leave our houses without losing our privacy, would a taxi ride really invade our privacy any more? For me, benefits outweigh the risks, though i completely understand the resistance.		
25	Drunken people are drunken people, and unfortunately are disrespectful/cause damage. While the handling of CCTV needs to be carefully scoped and enforced, having it within each taxi should hopefully help settle any disputes while also allowing the taxi drivers to feel safer.		
26	Safety		
27	Should be mandatory when transporting disabled children to school and back. To protect the driver.		
28	I have strong views on the privacy issues of this for the passengers		
29	There should be a fourth tick box answer: 'I would like to comment on why I think the use of CCTV should NOT be required'. It is a breach of personal liberty. Drivers could wear body cameras (that face the windscreen) if they felt it necessary.		
30	I would be in favour of CCTV to protect both drivers and passengers.		
31	For safety of both parties		
32	What about dash-cams that could become CCTV. But also audio recording ? how would this be regulated(?) does it need to be regulated(?)		
33	Not sure but could help protect the driver. i would defer to their view		
34	To protect customers against sexual advances or worse by drivers		
35	Could you have cctv installed but forward facing with sound on only?		
36	Some time we have difficult passengers c c TV may be used as evidence.		
37	It's silent, so cannot record conversations. I can't think of something that is visible that a passenger would not want to be seen in a taxi on a recording that cannot already be seen by the taxi driver or people outside the car. I do think recordings have the potential to make it safer. Maybe it should not be mandatory, but recommended - and taxis that take part are part of a "safer taxi" endorsed scheme?		
38	Protect the public and drivers.		
39	Safety for young passengers travelling alone		

Q46. We have not included any requirements for CCTV to be installed in licensed vehicles in our draft new taxi licensing policy and we would like to know what you think about this.

The Department for Transport has concerns about CCTV being made a mandatory requirement because of the potential privacy issues for passengers.

We would therefore need strong reasons to make it a requirement to have CCTV in all licensed vehicles. Can you please let us know below if you believe there are any specific reasons in our districts that CCTV in licensed vehicles would have a positive or a negative effect on the safety of taxi and private hire vehicle users.

		Response Percent	Response Total
40	Its just another added cost to what is already an expensive process to get a license. I think cctv would make the public very uncomfortable, and brwach their privacy.		
41	CCTV is present on buses, trains, shops, everywhere nowadays. How taxis is any different and why people's privacy should be treated any differently in a cab is a stupid question. If anything most of the policy issues and checks you are asking drivers to do, could be completely solved by having cameras in the cars. You can keep passengers in taxis much safer by sticking a load of cameras up rather than making drivers sit in seminars and trainings and having endless checks and paperwork. So, yes we should have cameras, the council should pay for them and the council should have operatives who monitor the footage to ensure the public's privacy is protected. I'm sure if you really thought about all the money that is wasted on checks, meetings, admin, training and paperwork involved in policing taxi drivers then you could easily afford to just swap out most of that for cameras.		
42	Absolutely essential to have cctv. For the protection of the public but also the driver.		
43	Having indicated as I have I nevertheless have a concern for the safety and privacy of the taxi driver as well as the passengers. I am not in favour of over legislation (cf a previous comment of mine) and, for me, this particular area is always going to be questionable. There is no idea solution so not making CCTV a requirement would, in the end, have my support.		
44	Right where do we start. Privacy. System needs a privacy button for private use. bad driver turns it off when up to no good. If council want it on permanently you buy and maintain the vehicle for driver. The cost. I've heard can be as much as £600 to fit. Cars get wrote of changed this is a cost the industry cannot afford		
45	CCTV would be a good way of ensuring the safety of vulnerable citizens; the old, disabled, women and the young. It also is increasing the safety of the drivers from unruly and poorly behaved passengers.		
46	I think CCTV in taxi cabs would improve the safety of female passengers.		
47	It is one thing to ask for CCTV to be included and another thing for it to be implemented properly. I think the council should have a policy to move towards dashcams as technology gets cheaper. I don't know enough about what is available today and what the public liability insurance industry wants to see happen and I think the council should be more assertive about making progress here, as it does with green energy etc		
48	Benefits of CCTV reassurance for clients		
49	I consider a taxi to be a public place and therefore have no issues with privacy. I have heard far too many stories of rogue taxi drivers that young women feel unsafe with or people being ripped off by horrendous fares when the taxi driver knows that they have had a drink and are not in a state to		

Q46. We have not included any requirements for CCTV to be installed in licensed vehicles in our draft new taxi licensing policy and we would like to know what you think about this.

The Department for Transport has concerns about CCTV being made a mandatory requirement because of the potential privacy issues for passengers.

We would therefore need strong reasons to make it a requirement to have CCTV in all licensed vehicles. Can you please let us know below if you believe there are any specific reasons in our districts that CCTV in licensed vehicles would have a positive or a negative effect on the safety of taxi and private hire vehicle users.

		Response Percent	Response Total
	realise that they have overpaid until the next day. CCTV could certainly drastically reduce these cases.		
50	I think it should be an operators choice, I think we should be able to record internally and externally if we wish to for drivers and passenger saftey. I understand why some people may not want to as it can be expensive to have a comprehensive set of kit		
51	CCTV should not be used to record who is travelling in a taxi. That should be a confidential matter for the user.		
52	Avoidance of doubt in disputes, protection for both driver and customer		
53	Safeguarding of both the driver and the passenger. CCTV used in the taxi in the same way as it is in any other public place. Gives reassurance to loan passenger.		
54	privity issue where is the information held who has access to it, cost of instalation. If the only people who had access to the information was the council/police after reported insident etc. and the installation was ""low"" I would support		
55	It can only help in any dispute regarding inappropriate behaviour by passenger or driver.		
56	There seems no reason why all taxis should be required to have CCTV, but if individual passengers prefer it, , it could be provided in some vehicles as an option, and the passenger's preference stated at the time of booking.		
57	The type of cctv would need to be specified, but if any serious crime occurs in connection with a taxi ride, I am sure the police would be glad to have it. We are filmed everywhere else, so I do not foresee any privacy issues additional to any attendance in a public place.		
58	In consultation with Police this might be usefully be taken forward. If the quality of the images were sufficient to enable the Police to obtain convictions for a range of offences against the taxi companies/drivers, this should reduce attacks, fare dogging, etc. Then with little negotiation the taxi firms may reduce their insurance costs. Boost customer confidence. And help differentiate quality taxi companies from the 'also runs'. All of which means that the taxi companies may wish to consider installing CCTV off their own bat?		
59	A useful deterrent and safety measure		
60	CCTV should be installed but only viewable by authorised persons.		
61	CCTV is now a very cheap think to add. I think it should be used.		
62	Protect drivers and passengers		

Q46. We have not included any requirements for CCTV to be installed in licensed vehicles in our draft new taxi licensing policy and we would like to know what you think about this.

The Department for Transport has concerns about CCTV being made a mandatory requirement because of the potential privacy issues for passengers.

We would therefore need strong reasons to make it a requirement to have CCTV in all licensed vehicles. Can you please let us know below if you believe there are any specific reasons in our districts that CCTV in licensed vehicles would have a positive or a negative effect on the safety of taxi and private hire vehicle users.

		Response Percent	Response Total
63	CCTV recorded from both external "dashcam" front and rear, and inside the cabin, should certainly be required, since in the event of anything going wrong, be it a traffic accident or something else, the footage can be vital to find out what happened! Not to do so in this era would be negligent. The footage should not be accessible to anyone except relevant authorities, however (i.e. not accessible by the operator, nor the council, only by police et al), and when access is made it should be done in a completely audited manner, and only when specifically required to investigate an incident that is already known to have occurred.		
64	CCTV IS USED ON PUBLIC BUSES AND CCTV ON THE OUTSIDE OF CABS WOULD ASSIST THE POLICE IN COLLECTING EVIDENCE.		
65	we would like to see that over the next 5 years CCTV monitoring inside and outside of taxis be made mandatory to battle crime and also protect both the Driver and Passenger. This is a process we have discussed internally and would look to start implementing with new vehicles. We propose that this be mandatory for newly issued plates and staggered for existing renewals. The footage, of course, would be viewable only by the police to assist in a reported crime therefore protecting passenger privacy. It may be the operator has to show that the CCTV is managed by a licensed third party to ensure compliance on this.		
66	It is possible that CCTV could help to protect the driver from assault or robbery. I should like to see figures about the incidence of offences against drivers to determine whether it would be helpful. A taxi is a public carriage and I think our drivers need protection. There's a question whether some passengers might be protected, or offences against them discouraged or prevented, if potential assailants thought they would more easily be traced.		
67	I think there are advantages to having CCTV in a vehicle but this has to be discussed in greater detail as to the level of equipment required and the cost of having it installed.		

Anything else?

Q47. Do you have any additional comments on the proposed new policy that you would like us to consider?

		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	46
1	Taxi-driving is an occupation that is open to people who may have few other qualifications other than being able to safely drive a car. The provision of safe and reliable taxi service is a very useful public utility, Thus I think it is important that rules and regulations governing the issuing of licenses be get as simple and as free of unnecessary ""red tape"" as possible so that otherwise unqualified people can make use of the opportunity for employment that being a Taxi-driver provides.		
2	Encourage taxi drivers to consider, being able to carry a bicycle/ bicycles, to help out a stranded cyclists. Or even to get their bike into a repair shop. This I believe would give confidence to new cyclists who worry about breaking down, knowing there Taxi's that are happy to help cyclists.		
3	All excellent proposals except cctv		
4	I think that the interests of the public would be better served if taxi companies were based in the local area or town with a real and operating office rather that an accommodation address with a mobile number which is what is happening in my local area.		
5	Yes - there are no stated requirements or directives about "Covid safe travel" or cleaning following the previous passenger. This has to be a proper requirement, so that users know they can travel "Covid safely" either because of driver protocols or "cleaning the taxi after each use" protocols- it is surprising this is not included		
6	No		
7	.		
8	After the current pandemic I think money is going to be extremely tight for most drivers and adding additional costs to what is already a poorly paid occupation is ridiculous. Taxi businesses are going to take years to recover so don't add to those costs by charging for courses that achieve nothing short or long term.		
9	No.		
10	No		
11	No		
12	I consider Chiltern Taxis provide an exceptional service.		
13	In order to encourage the use of electric and hybrid vehicles the councils should consider reducing the licensing fees where these types of vehicle are licensed.		
14	New policy should not be costing driver as business was suffered a lot financially. For example, removing tinted window from those cars that already tinted. This will cost or it may damage the car if you were removed.		
15	No, it all looks fine to me. The policies will help safe guard pasengers.		

Q47. Do you have any additional comments on the proposed new policy that you would like us to consider?

		Response Percent	Response Total
16	No		
17	Taxis offer a life line where public transport has been cut! It is important to take this into account in regard to pricing in future.		
18	No comments		
19	No		
20	Very good, sensible proposals.		
21	Are there perhaps too many taxis in Henley who park temporarily in public car parks using up valuable spaces without paying for a ticket? Taxis also run their engines when stationary, this has to stop		
22	Consider how you could make things more efficient and cost effective and work on updating the out of date stuff like the map reading in the knowledge test. It's 2021, hardly anyone used a map 12 years ago when I started this career and they definitely don't today!		
23	I seems in the main to be eminently sensible considering the culture in which we live. But the amount of legislation will, I think, add even more work for those wishing to become taxi drivers. And it will also involve more work for Council staff or representatives. But there is probably nothing we can do. Thanks for the oportunity to comment.		
24	Yes stop the big brother nonsense. Stop the attack on this industry. Bad shit happens. Deal with it. No amount of policy or cameras will stop bad shit happening. All it means is a prosecution. So public safety is impossible to achieve. You already have all these checks and people still get harmed. Meanwhile the majority of honest mindful drivers get stressed and die prematurely from diseases created by too much cortisol in the body created by councils trying to create a utopian world that does not and will not ever exist.		
25	no		
26			
27	I think the lower fees for energy-efficient vehicles should be a key policy. I think South Oxfordshire should incentivise the public to use such vehicles by making it cheaper for such hires and that means setting mileage rates. What do you think?		
28	please just tighten up the taxi licensing laws, and tighten up checks that these rules are being adhered to so that we can go back to feeling safe in taxis again.		
29	No		
30	No		
31	I feel very strongly about the need to educate drivers on the negative impact of vehicles with engines idling when they are stationary. Drivers should understand their responsibility for clean air.		
32	Thame Town Council raises no objections to the proposed changes to the taxi licensing policy and has no comments to make.		

Q47. Do you have any additional comments on the proposed new policy that you would like us to consider?

		Response Percent	Response Total
33	<p>I cannot see where the section on idling is addressed so I will write this here - sorry.</p> <p>Engine idling is very common in South Oxfordshire. As it is illegal and a health hazard to drivers and the public, especially children, every effort should be made to stamp it out as soon as possible. This should include significant and sustained anti-idling education events, sustained enforcement of anti-idling laws (including issuing fines) especially in this case for taxis and PHC.</p> <p>Regarding engine idling, the Council should also strongly consider -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - giving powers to named persons at schools across the district to enforce anti-idling laws and issue fines, following proper training. - increasing the level of fines to at the same as those for parking offences. 		
34	<p>How the public can report inappropriate behaviour of drivers and system regarding complaints made against a driver and the driver's licence renewal in such cases.</p>		
35	<p>The CCTV question is one thing, but perhaps far more importantly for day-to-day operations, always-on GPS trackers, with data sent to the licensing authority and police, and with that data not accessible to the licensee, should be mandatory. Speeding, sometimes dramatically above the speed limit, by private hire vehicles, whether there are fare-paying passengers on-board or not, is clearly extremely commonplace, and could, and should, be eliminated by installing these trackers.</p> <p>Not to improve the safety of all road users by installing such a tracking device in all private hire vehicles would seem negligent to me, given the straightforward nature of the technology, and its ready availability, now. A secondary use to audit fares vs distances etc. might also be useful but is arguably a lot less important.</p> <p>Please take this opportunity to stamp out the bane of speeding private-hire which plagues the roads at present.</p>		
36	<p>No, thank you.</p>		
37	<p>5.1</p> <p>A suggestion instead of updating email address. Bring a system where drivers are able to create an account and see all the services and request everything online and you can update the drivers by creating an alert for any new update or change or anything.</p> <p>Thank You</p>		
38	<p>SHOULD HAVE BEEN DONE LONG AGO</p>		
39	<p>Vale have not increase they tarriff for 7years You are proposing set tarriff but no indication on what rates</p>		
40	<p>Our Full Response:</p> <p>This is Go Green Taxis' official response to your recent proposed licensing policy changes for Hackney Carriage and Private Hire.</p>		

Q47. Do you have any additional comments on the proposed new policy that you would like us to consider?

	Response Percent	Response Total
<p>Go Green Taxis welcomes updates to legislation which aims to keep pace with changing market forces, consumer demand, technology and innovation, accelerating environmental concerns and general improvements in standards and quality delivered across all operators. We welcome collaboration with the licensing officials and have found that although we may not view every situation from the same perspective we do appreciate there is rationale behind decisions which have good intentions.</p> <p>As you may be aware we have a fleet of 95 Hackney vehicles across SODC, VALE and West Berkshire and are the largest fleet in SODC currently with over 11 years experience. As we also operate vehicles within West Berkshire Council, we have the added knowledge of comparing Taxi policies across different boroughs.</p> <p>We also closely followed the TFG (Task and Finish Group on Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Licensing) Report in 2019 and agreed with a lot of their points particularly surrounding the increase of 'minimum standards' across all licensing authorities to ensure public safety. The subsequent Government agreed with the majority of points raised and either suggested that though 'minimum' standards will be met across all Licensing bodies, the Licensing bodies have the choice on what additional standards to set depending on the needs of the area. In some cases the response of the government indicated their plans to increase these minimum standards in future licensing changes.</p> <p>It is our view that South Oxfordshire and the Vale encompass a large area with significant growth and requirements for Taxi Transport particularly given the smaller surrounding villages. Though we see the proposed policy changes as a step in the right direction it does beg the question if we are doing enough to increase standards as a whole in order to prevent companies such as Uber from overtaking the market with very little consistency in standards and to protect the public.</p> <p>With this in mind, our 11 years retained experience both from an Operating and a Drivers point of view, we would like the following suggestions to be taken under consideration, many of which are already enforced in other Licensing areas.</p> <p>Public Safety & Minimum Standards</p> <p>Again, following the government's Task and finish Group report response, amongst other things a key issue highlighted was the safety of vulnerable adults and children. One of the things we have noticed is that the Framework and policies set out by Oxfordshire County Council School & Transport Service, is heavily geared towards protecting the vulnerables passengers and well enforced. In our experience, having reported what we believed to be unregistered vulnerable adults, we find it unsettling that these people should fall outside of these higher standards if they are booking privately and outside of the above mentioned Transport framework.</p> <p>Due to the number of vehicles we operate and the number of contracts we undertake for OCC, we were invited to discuss with them their upcoming system and policy changes at the beginning of the year and so we are able to help in their progression towards higher standards particularly in using available technology to aid this.</p> <p>As such, we would like to see that over the next 5 years CCTV monitoring inside and outside of taxis be made mandatory to battle crime and also protect both the Driver and Passenger. This is a process we have discussed internally and would look to start implementing with new vehicles. We propose that this be mandatory for newly issued plates and staggered for existing renewals. The footage, of course, would be viewable only by the police to assist in a reported crime.</p>		

Q47. Do you have any additional comments on the proposed new policy that you would like us to consider?

	Response Percent	Response Total
<p>The benefit of bringing Taxi operators up to date with the current technology is that this enables the enforcing and monitoring of compliance by Licensing Authorities to be carried out with ease and also be consistent across different operators.</p> <p>We feel that the minimum requirement for this should be that Taxis should have GPS tracking, this enables the licensing authority to audit vehicle locations when investigating complaints such as 'plying for hire' in outside areas.</p> <p>The operating of our accurate and robust booking systems and tracking history has enabled us in the past to quickly and reliably resolve complaints and also to help crime investigations, including in one instance to aid in the capture of a murderer.</p> <p>We are aware that updating technology does come at a cost to the Operator, as we have experienced in the past when improving our systems. However the benefits have also seen us secure more customers as they feel safer and there is more transparency in the way in which we operate. We feel that the increase in consumer confidence outways the costs, which should be reflected in the proposed tariff changes.</p> <p>Currently there is a huge divide between larger Operators such as ourselves and smaller fleets which makes it harder to ensure consistency in the safety and service to the public.</p> <p>For instance, smaller companies take bookings over the phone while driving the vehicle often with passengers. How do the licensing enforcement team intend to handle these kinds of complaints? There are software solutions that can be implemented which force your smartphone to automatically click to voicemail when a vehicle is in motion, which we feel should be mandatory where the Driver is also responsible for taking bookings.</p> <p>Also, with regards to radios, though I hope these are a thing of the past, how is it 'data complaint' to have an operator reading out the next booking including addresses to the Drivers with a passenger on board? Not to mention the hands-free implications.</p> <p>Another standard that we feel the public could benefit from is a mandatory Dress Code for Taxi Drivers to adhere to as already enforced by Guilford council. This aims to ensure professionalism and also to exclude clothing which disguises identity such as hoods/hats which is important for public safety to ensure the badge matches the Driver. We have always endeavored to encourage a standard amongst our Drivers which our Customers have come to recognise and appreciate as a part of our service.</p> <p>Along these lines, we believe that a notice clearly visible from the passenger seats, identifying the current driver of the vehicle is beneficial especially to enable passengers to again check the identity of the Driver and also have the Drivers badge number if, in the unfortunate case, they need to complain. A list of all Vehicles and Drivers licensed under SODC/VALE should be easily accessible to the public as they used to be to ensure the public have the power to check the validity of a vehicle before entering a vehicle from the Rank for example. If all Licensing authorities operated this transparency, and awareness spread to the public, then less criminal activity relating to unlicensed vehicles will occur protecting the market for Drivers but more importantly protecting the public.</p>		

Q47. Do you have any additional comments on the proposed new policy that you would like us to consider?

	Response Percent	Response Total
<p>Taxi Fares</p> <p>As you are aware, we operate from the following areas/towns, meaning that when starting or ending the journey inside of these locations we do not charge what is known as a 'call-out charge'. Didcot, Milton Park, Harwell, E/W Hagbourne, Wallingford, Abingdon, Wantage & Oxford</p> <p>For journeys that start/finish outside of these areas that we often get called to, but that are not worth having a Driver permanently located, such as Goring to Moulsoford we would charge from the nearest operating area ie. Wallingford to Goring to Moulsoford using the Pricing structure.</p> <p>The implications of restricting cross border working particularly for Operators such as us, who operate multi-licensed fleets is that it is unclear how a Call Out can be charged and could leave customers unable to book taxis as none operate in their village.</p> <p>For Example A VOWH driver could pick up a local customer in Wantage, drive them to their destination in Henley on Thames and drop off. On their way back to the VOWH they receive a booking from Wallingford to Didcot</p> <p>How would any proposals cover a call out fee? Would this be calculated from the nearest VOWH area or would the bookings system need to overlook those drivers which would have a disastrous impact on dead miles and therefore carbon footprint and driver earnings. Or in the event one of our customers books in a SODC area such as Sandford Upon Thames which is usually most environmentally serviced from a VOWH area such as Abingdon or Botley how would call out fees be viewed.</p> <p>We calculate the pricing on our system, using the shortest possible route, and quote each price to the Customer so the Drivers, when undertaking pre-booked journeys, do not have to use the meter. This means that our Customers are always aware of the price they should be paying and it also allows the Driver to take alternative quicker routes, (that are longer mileage), due to traffic without the price affecting the passenger.</p> <p>With regards to the new proposed tariff changes, we would like to understand what charges the operator can charge on top of the tariff fare. I.e. Are they allowed to charge a booking fee if agreed with the passenger for journeys booked by phone instead of by App?</p> <p>The tariff set for Vale of White Horse was last updated in 2014, which I think we can agree is not in line with inflation over the last 7 years. We feel that the new tariff should be open for consultation at the same time as the Licensing fees are assessed.</p> <p>Most companies already offer card payments in vehicles however, we believe that this should be mandatory. Not only is it a vital service for passengers who in this day and age come to expect this service but it also limits hiding of earnings which is a massive issue in this industry.</p> <p>On-boarding Process</p> <p>We are pleased to see that taking a practical driving assessment is now part of the onboarding process bringing the standards up to level with West Berkshire.</p>		

Q47. Do you have any additional comments on the proposed new policy that you would like us to consider?

		Response Percent	Response Total
	<p>We are also fully supportive of having a DBS for staff and safe-guarings training however this would only be worth at inception of contract and if any major changes/updates are made. Even then we would suggest that updated resources be made available online instead of taking the minimum of 4 hours time for minor updates. I would even suggest it is more efficient to provide web logins that require quarterly module completions, within a deadline otherwise the applicant would be marked as non compliant.</p> <p>Environmental</p> <p>In order to address environmental issues and also service standards we believe that more should be done to restrict older vehicles from being plates a private hire particularly if they have high mileage and have been used as a taxi for a long period of time.</p> <p>ie. This is the current policy for Guildford Borough Council which we think is sensible.</p> <p>From the date of implementation of this policy, licences will not normally be granted in respect of vehicles that were first registered (or, in the case of imported vehicles, manufactured) more than 5 years prior to the date that the application was made.</p> <p>From the date that the policy is introduced, licences will not normally be renewed in respect of any licensed vehicle that was first registered (or, in the case of imported vehicles, manufactured) more than 10 years prior to the date of renewal (or 12 years in the case of purpose-built wheelchair accessible vehicles). This applies to the renewal of licences only.</p> <p>Considering a climate emergency has been declared we feel that the measures do not go far enough soon enough. The buck on environmental responsibility has been pushed into the next iteration of this policy potentially commencing in 2026. The current policy will represent an opportunity missed and to even lag behind technology by a decade.</p> <p>Another point we feel needs clarification is what the council's proposal for Auditing Operators is? I know that random compliance checks are done on Taxis however I believe we have had maybe 1 Audit in 10 years which in terms of ensuring data protection and understanding the different booking and business models is surely insufficient in order to enforce policies fairly across all operators.</p> <p>In summary we welcome any improvements in passenger and driver safety and we await the release of the tariff consultation however hope that provision is made within the tariff calculation that drivers should be earning at least minimum wage after costs such as purchasing vehicles, professional maintenance and insurance. We would like to ensure that the proposed Tariff is provided along with a clear policy to assess the rates in line with licensing fees and transparency as to how the council proposes to calculate the limits.</p> <p>We look forward to your responses and appreciate the opportunity to discuss these changes prior to their inception.</p>		
41	<p>The licensing team live in an ivory tower and have not engaged with the trade for three years. Their policy is about making life easier for them and 'tying up' drivers/operators in needless red tape.</p>		

Q47. Do you have any additional comments on the proposed new policy that you would like us to consider?

		Response Percent	Response Total
	They are seeking to use a policy document as a method of extending their powers beyond where legislation lets them go and do it in a fashion that is virtually impossible for the trade to challenge.		
42	Glad to see these updated policies, thank you.		
43	<p>Admin note: this response has been manually entered into this survey for data analysis purposes, as it was submitted in an email format.</p> <p>I wish to raise a suggestion that may aid clarification or at least not introduce a loop hole in the new policy. My wife (copied) is a Guide Dog Volunteer and so we take great interest in the use of licenced taxis by the visually impaired who may have a guide dog.</p> <p>I welcome the new section on Disability Awareness and especially the section about Assistance Dogs which I copy below, however I would recommend the wording in the final paragraph to state "assistance dog" rather than "guide dog". In Appendix E, paragraph 17 you correctly state assistance dog.</p> <p>Assistance dogs Assistance dogs can be for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sight loss • Hearing loss • Therapy dogs • Specially trained seizure or stroke awareness dogs <p>Assistance dogs are trained to remain on the floor of a vehicle. Refusal to carry a guide dog (change to assistance dogs) without a medical exemption is an offence under the Equality Act 2010 and is in contravention of the conditions of your licence.</p> <p>A corollary to this section is that I am working with the Guide Dogs to make a map of all those licenced areas which have issued licences to those with a medical exemption. There have been instances where taxis have refused carriage of the assistance dog claiming medical exemption and it is very difficult for the visually impaired person to verify that one indeed exists.</p> <p>Does your licensing policy record that the taxi driver has a medical exemption? I would recommend that all licensing authorities publish the number of medical exempt taxi driver licences have been issued in their area.</p>		
44	<p>Admin note: this response has been manually entered into this survey for data analysis purposes, as it was submitted in an email format:</p> <p>Just to inform you that Henley Town Council support the new taxi licencing policy.</p>		
45	<p>Admin note: this response has been manually entered into this survey for data analysis purposes, as it was submitted in an email format:</p> <p>I've just had a quick look through the proposed Taxi Licensing Policy and wanted to make one comment: Is it possible to have a policy requiring card payment machines in all taxis (private hire and Hackney carriage)? I know from personal experience that most of our private hire vehicles do NOT have card</p>		

Q47. Do you have any additional comments on the proposed new policy that you would like us to consider?

		Response Percent	Response Total
	payment machines and this can be inconvenient, requiring a trip to a bank en route to the destination or telephoning the central office of the taxi company to pay over the phone.		
46	<p>Admin note: this response has been manually entered into this survey for data analysis purposes, as it was submitted in an email format:</p> <p>Our response is wide ranging, covering the process used to create this policy, point out irregularities, outline the likely effects of the proposed changes and the shortcomings of this policy to address these effects.</p> <p>We genuinely hope that the council will engage with the trade to mould this policy into a product that will help the taxi and private operators to provide a service that meets your goals.</p> <p>My name is [redacted] and I respond to this consultation on behalf of Pryors Corporate Travel Limited. The Pryor family entered the Didcot taxi trade in 1955, originally licenced by Wallingford Rural District Council. Our founder [redacted] was a licenced driver for with WRDC and SODC for almost 60 years. Pryors have a nationwide reputation for offering high quality services, including winning the Private Hire Company of the year award at the Pro Driver Magazine annual awards ceremony. Pryors have been involved in the trade at a national level for many years, including an active membership of the National Taxi Association (regularly attending national conferences), National Private Hire Association and the Licenced Private Hire Car Association.</p> <p>Personally, (apart from being virtually born into the trade) I became a licenced taxi driver in 1981 at the age of 18 and a partner/director of Pryors, with [redacted], in 1984. This means that I have now had the responsibility of liaising with the Head of Licencing at SODC for 37 years.</p> <p>In 2018 I accepted complimentary membership of the Institute of Licensing, kindly offered to me by [redacted], the President of the Institute. In 2019 I became the first Taxi/PH operator to be invited to be a speaker at the Institute's annual Taxi Conference.</p> <p>Relationship between the council and the trade</p> <p>Historically the licencing team at South Oxfordshire have always had an 'open door' approach to members of the trade. The Head of Licencing would be keen to visit the offices of local operators and be readily available to discuss any issues that a member of the trade wished to raise. There were also regular 'on the street' presence of the licencing team, arriving on ranks to check badges and engage positively with members of the trade.</p> <p>Previously, in the build up to a policy review the licencing team were keen to hold forums and seminars with the trade (both operators and drivers) to discuss the implementation of any new policy and how it would affect the trade. They were keen to listen to the trades viewpoints on any issues arising and take onboard sensible suggestions from the trade BEFORE drafting a new policy for full public consultation.</p> <p>In our experience many useful additions to policy came forward from ideas presented by experienced trade operators during this process.</p> <p>When [redacted] joined South and Vale as Head of Licencing in [redacted] 2018 Pryors made several attempts to meet with [redacted], to introduce our company and exchange thoughts on the trade in the district. Unfortunately, now nearly three years after joining the council [redacted] still has not accepted an invitation to meet with us in person, and after talking to several other leading operators I am yet to find one [redacted] has met with.</p>		

Q47. Do you have any additional comments on the proposed new policy that you would like us to consider?

	Response Percent	Response Total
<p>Since 2018 there has been no open consultation with the trade, where the people who make their living from the industry can debate matters that they believe important.</p> <p>previous industry background is a large urban, metropolitan borough (Reading). South Oxfordshire is a significantly different market to Reading and our local operators have seen their business evolve over 40 years, focused on meeting and creating local demand. It would have been good to have the opportunity to introduce our local industry and outline challenges faced by the trade to before delivered a new policy document.</p> <p>It is disappointing that the Licencing Team has, in recent years, adopted a combative approach to its engagement with the trade, rather than the cooperative model used for several decades.</p> <p>Joint policy between South and Vale We can understand that the officers managing both authorities would prefer identical policies across both districts to simplify their workload. It is unfortunate that we cannot legally create a 'Joint Authority' for taxis across South and Vale.</p> <p>However, good policy is not simply about making the council employees life easier. Policy is about public safety and the provision of good quality taxi services. It is our view that the licencing team has lost sight of the second element of their policy's aims.</p> <p>The proposal to merge the councils would bring benefit to the taxi trade, simplifying many operational difficulties for operators. For example, are members aware that there are streets on Great Western Park in Didcot where a South Oxon licenced taxi can be legally 'flagged down' by a passenger stood on one side of the road but would be breaking the law if the passenger hails them from the other side of the road.</p> <p>Until the two councils decide to merge, individual licencing authorities will have to remain. With this being the case, the trade in each authority surely deserves a policy relevant to their market and not have to accept a policy written for officers' convenience whilst managing two authorities at once.</p> <p>Separate Hackney/PH driver badges A joint Hackney/PH driver badge was reasonable when there was no tariff control. Most of the trade would licence as a hackney carriage, with Private Hire licencing virtually reserved solely for Executive Service providers, who wished to avoid the requirement for a roof sign on their vehicle.</p> <p>With the introduction of tariff control this will undoubtedly change for operators who work predominantly in our district. 'Flag of Convenience' operators will still need Hackney licences to operate legally in other districts.</p> <p>We believe that the council should reconsider the joint (HC/PH) badge as being the only option in the district. Hackney drivers can expect a more stringent knowledge test in a tariff-controlled district. But it is not reasonable to raise barriers to solely Private Hire drivers.</p> <p>Raising the barrier to Hackney licences would be the most effective method to dealing with 'Flag of Convenience' operators whilst not impacting on local operators endeavouring to recruit local Private Hire drivers.</p>		

Q47. Do you have any additional comments on the proposed new policy that you would like us to consider?

	Response Percent	Response Total
<p>Other aspects of the policy changes</p> <p>1.2 The protection of public health and safety</p> <p>As with many 'council policies' for the trade in this country there is much focus on protecting the public but no acknowledgement of the fact that being a taxi driver is one of the most dangerous and vulnerable jobs in the UK.</p> <p>Taxi drivers are repeatedly subject to physical and verbal assault, particularly racial abuse, theft, and damage to property.</p> <p>Nowhere in this policy does the council recognise this risk or proprot to offer the licenced drivers any support or recourse. The council should be prepared to help protect drivers from abusers.</p> <p>1.3 It is important that the councils'.. licensing powers are used to ensure that licensed vehicles are available where and when required.</p> <p>Where in the policy does the council address supply and demand? Further into the document it aims to control supplier's ability to set their own prices but there is no evidence that the council will seek to help demand. For example, there is no public taxi rank in Didcot, a town soon growing to a population of 50K and the council has not made any endeavour in decades to address this failing.</p> <p>1.4 Hackney carriage and private hire vehicles have a specific role to play in an integrated transport system. They can provide demand responsive services in situations where public transport is either not available (for example in rural areas, or outside 'normal' hours of operation such as in the evenings or on Sundays), and/or for those with mobility difficulties.</p> <p>You clearly state that it is the role of the taxi/private hire industry to fulfil your public transport strategy in all the areas that are economically challenging to offer a viable service. The council should recognise the contribution that the industry makes in 'plugging the hole' and find ways to support those service providers who do offer services in rural locations and disabled access.</p> <p>1.6 Where it is necessary for either council to depart substantially from this policy, clear and compelling reasons must be given for doing so.</p> <p>Is there a right of appeal, without going to court for a judicial review, for operators/license holders to challenge the council's decision to depart 'substantially' from the policy?</p> <p>1.7 make minor administrative amendments to the policy</p> <p>Is the council obliged to inform all licence holders of changes that will affect them? This has not happened previously, and I think the policy should commit to this course of action. Does this also include third party policies that the council states that it will follow under its own policy?</p> <p>3.2 The licence fees are subject to an annual review</p> <p>For many of the licences relevant to the trade the council has an obligation to only recoup their costs.</p> <p>Nowhere in this policy is there anywhere setting out transparency about how the costs of licensing are calculated or specified. There appears to be no apparatus for the licence holders to challenge the fees</p>		

Q47. Do you have any additional comments on the proposed new policy that you would like us to consider?

Response Percent	Response Total
---------------------	-------------------

without resorting to a court of law or the Local Government Ombudsman. The council should prescribe the process for the annual review and engagement with licence holders in the process.

6.1 Enforcement is part of council policy to ensure public safety and maintain standards.

The council's enforcement record is abysmal. There is virtually no 'on the streets' evidence of enforcement being undertaken (even pre Covid).

Enforcement focuses entirely on making sure the existing licence holders are 100% following the policy and shows no aim/intention/action to uncover/investigate unlicensed persons participating in the trade.

The trade has seen growing levels of unlicensed competition, particularly from young drivers offering 'rides' via social media and 'volunteer drivers' privately extending their service offering.

6.2 All enforcement In accordance with our enforcement policy
Is this enforcement policy a public document?

What is the councils record on enforcement? How many illegal, unlicensed operators has it prosecuted in the last five years?

7.1 A hackney carriage or private hire vehicle proprietor is an owner or part owner of a vehicle, or where a vehicle is subject to leasing contract, hiring agreement or hire purchase, a proprietor is the person in possession of the vehicle under the agreement.

This makes no accommodation for limited companies to be the licence holder.
It is now common for vehicles to be owned by a limited company that does not provide taxi services, but rents/leases vehicles to licensed operators/drivers. How will this arrangement be accommodated, or will the council ban operators from adopting such tax efficient policies?

7.33 Private hire vehicles which are used for contract work for at least 75 percent of the time may be exempted from displaying a plate.
We object to this policy on the following grounds.

- Contract is a vague description. Very few customers provide a written contract with suppliers (unlike in the 1970s/80s).
- This is mainly an 'aesthetic' wish on behalf of certain operators rather than being driven by client demand.
- The policy makes it far harder to identify unlicensed vehicles, particularly now other operators are no longer able to freely consult the council register of licences.
- The vast majority of unlicensed operators/vehicles in the trade focus on executive work, making less visible than local service providers.
- It allows a licenced vehicle to do regular taxi work for 25% of the time in a fashion deemed not acceptable to other licenced vehicles.

Q47. Do you have any additional comments on the proposed new policy that you would like us to consider?

	Response Percent	Response Total
<p>Whilst we support exemption from further signage (such as door signs) we believe all licenced vehicles should display a licence plate.</p> <p>8.7 A request form for a medical examination, which must be presented to a GP at the applicant's registered GP surgery</p> <p>We strongly support the requirement for a medical to undertaken at an applicant's registered GP surgery. It would be alarming if the council accepted medical certificates from private doctors with no access to the applicant's medical records.</p> <p>9.20 (your second one) Operator Base Whilst we accept that the operator must have a base in the district where records can be inspected, we feel the requirement that you expect this to be the only location where bookings are accepted is archaic.</p> <p>Covid has shown us all that new ways of working can be satisfactory, particularly home working.</p> <p>Most operators have had their bookers working from home during the last 12 months with no negative impact on clients or council officials.</p> <p>Your ambition to protect the environment should mean that you support remote/homeworking for those that can.</p> <p>Appendix A & B Pryors Corporate Travel are disappointed that the policy does not include age restrictions for licenced vehicles.</p> <p>Whilst we do not want to call for prohibitive barriers for entry to the trade, we feel that it would be balanced and reasonable to introduce policy control on barring older vehicles from being licenced.</p> <p>We would propose that no vehicle can be licenced for the first time seven years or more past its date of first registration. We also suggest that no vehicle should remain licenced 12 years after its date of registration.</p> <p>This policy would allow reasonable access to the trade, but bar older, higher risk vehicles that have greater environmental impact on the district.</p> <p>10(PH11) Licence plates Double sided tape is a remarkably effective and secure method to attach a licence plate. It is not accurate to describe as such tape as 'temporary'.</p> <p>The brackets recommended by the plate supplier frequently obscure the registration plate of the vehicle, and in our opinion are unsuitable and not fit for purpose.</p> <p>21 Trailers Really??? How can you monitor and assure save usage? Where would you get the trailer inspected? Please bar the use of trailers for hackney carriage vehicles.</p>		

Q47. Do you have any additional comments on the proposed new policy that you would like us to consider?

	Response Percent	Response Total
<p>23 Accessible vehicle specification.... ‘when a vehicle has been modified post manufacture’ How do you define ‘post manufacture’? All vehicles are modified to be wheelchair accessible ‘post manufacture’. There are many ‘modifiers’ of vehicles on the market and there are huge variations in the quality of modification and accessories provided. Maybe the council should consider an approved list of modifiers.</p> <p>34 Appendix B ‘Special vehicles’ In this condition you list ‘Executive Vehicle’ as ‘special’. How would you define an ‘executive vehicle’ that does not fall into the standard licensing class? We request that you remove the term ‘Executive Vehicle’ from this clause because it does not seem to be an appropriate inclusion when you already have a wide range of executive vehicles licenced under the standard category.</p> <p>Appendix C Roof signs We are reassured that you have retained the need for hackney carriages to retain a trading name on their vehicle. We strongly believe that this plays an important role in public identification of the operator and thus raises standards. Conclusions This proposed policy has been presented by the licencing team without any engagement with the trade. Its sole purpose is to minimise inconvenience for officers and to introduce control over the trade in a method that gives the operators no right of appeal other than a judicial review. The policy has taken no account of the impact that its major changes will make and how these changes might be anticipated and accommodated in the new policy. The policy gives no consideration to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service quality • Driver safety • Environmental impact • Driver livelihood. <p>We ask that the members of the licencing committee send this draft policy back to its officers and instruct them to carry out full discussions and engagement with the trade to create a positive and constructive policy that works for all parties.</p>		
	answered	46
	skipped	136

And finally...

Q48. How did you hear about this consultation? Tick all that apply.

							Response Percent	Response Total
1	District council website						6.98%	12
2	Email						69.77%	120
3	Facebook						6.40%	11
4	Read it in the newspaper (online or hard-copy)						4.07%	7
5	Twitter						0.58%	1
6	Via town or parish council						6.40%	11
7	Word of mouth						2.91%	5
8	Other (please specify):						6.98%	12
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	2.88	Std. Deviation	1.91	answered	172
	Maximum	8	Variance	3.66	Std. Error	0.14		

Other (please specify): (12)

1	Invitation to comment from Council Licensing Team
2	letter from south oxfordshire and vale of the white horse
3	
4	Taxipoint website
5	On line local newspaper
6	Letter from SODC
7	Email invite from 'Have your say'
8	letter from 'Housing and Environment'
9	I am on your list of individuals who are asked for comment; and was sent a letter
10	Letter
11	Letter
12	From a letter 10.2.21 sent by you to me

END