

**MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
LICENSING COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 28 OCTOBER 2025**

Held at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber Area B, Rushcliffe Arena,
Rugby Road, West Bridgford
and live streamed on Rushcliffe Borough Council's YouTube channel

PRESENT:

Councillors N Regan (Chair), R Butler, K Chewings, T Combellack, G Fletcher,
C Grocock, R Mallender, D Mason, H Om, H Parekh, A Phillips, D Soloman,
C Thomas and J Walker

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

G Carpenter	Assistant Director Public Protection
M Hickey	Principal Officer - Community Safety and Licensing
W Melowey	Licensing and Enforcement Officer
D Roberts	Senior Licensing and Enforcement Officer
H Tambini	Democratic Services Manager

APOLOGIES:

Councillors J Billin, J Chaplain, J Cottee, D Simms, G Wheeler and G Williams

1 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest made.

2 Minutes of the Meeting held on 14 October 2024

The minutes of the meeting held on Monday, 14 October 2024, were approved
as a true record and signed by the Chair.

**3 Rushcliffe Borough Council Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing
Policy 2025-2030**

The Assistant Director Public Protection introduced the report and members of
the Licensing Team. He advised that if the Policy was endorsed this evening, it
would be submitted for final approval to Full Council on 27 November and
implemented the day after.

The Principal Officer – Community Safety and Licensing gave a presentation
covering the proposed major changes, which were detailed in the report. The
presentation covered:

- Policy Overview
- Implementation Timeline
- Current Numbers

- Driver Changes
- Vehicle Licensing Changes
- Hackney Carriage Updates
- Operator Licensing
- Enforcement and Points System
- Appendix Highlights
- Consultation Feedback and Final Amendments from Consultants
- Summary and Next Steps

Councillor R Mallender asked about the removal of the requirement for first aid equipment and the Senior Licensing and Enforcement Officer stated that the Department for Transport (DFT) advised that both first aid kits and fire extinguishers should not be carried, and in case of emergencies, the appropriate emergency service should be contacted.

Councillor Mallender sought clarification regarding CCTV provision, and the Senior Licensing and Enforcement Officer advised that no authority in Nottinghamshire or the DOT specified the need for mandatory CCTV.

Councillor Butler questioned if it was more self-regulatory, to safeguard both operators and drivers, as well as passengers, and that perhaps CCTV was already installed in many vehicles. The Senior Licensing and Enforcement Officer stated that it was up to drivers to assess any safety risks and install CCTV if they wanted to.

Councillor Chewings questioned if CCTV provision was mandatory anywhere in the country and asked who and why this issue had been raised during the consultation. The Assistant Director Public Protection confirmed that during the consultation, a letter had been received from the County Council, requesting a county-wide agreement for mandatory CCTV. For the purposes of endorsing this Policy tonight, mandatory CCTV provision was not being considered, as the Policy had to be renewed before the end of December. It could be reviewed going forward; however, he reminded the Committee that CCTV was not required by the DOT, it would involve significant costs for drivers and operators and place an additional legislative burden on the Council.

Councillor Soloman expressed amazement that mandatory CCTV could not be considered because the letter was submitted after the consultation had started, and she felt that this should not preclude mandatory CCTV forming part of this Policy. The Policy should protect drivers and passengers and she felt that CCTV was a useful tool to ensure that and whilst noting that some drivers had installed it, Councillor Soloman was concerned that other drivers had not done so. She suggested that passengers would feel more comfortable having CCTV, and that girls in particular actively avoided using taxis without it. In relation to cost, Councillor Soloman suggested that if CCTV was to become mandatory, the Council could give a 100% discount on a licence to help drivers.

The Principal Officer – Community Safety and Licensing advised that Bolsover, North-East Derbyshire and Rotherham had mandatory CCTV provision, and he highlighted potential costs to the Committee, if it was applied to Rushcliffe's fleet. He stated that officers felt that this would be a significant burden and that the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) stated that a need had to be

shown, which was not apparent in Rushcliffe.

Councillor Soloman stated that the letter was from the Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) department, asking for proactive action, to avoid what happened in areas like Rotherham. The Principal Officer – Community Safety and Licensing referred to the contracts issued by the County Council and advised that it could amend those contracts and reiterated that drivers could install CCTV voluntarily if they wished.

Councillor Soloman reiterated that she was concerned about the drivers not wishing to install CCTV and that the County Council was asking all councils in the County to mandate it, to provide blanket protection and provide the highest standards possible. The Principal Officer – Community Safety and Licensing advised that when mandatory provision had been introduced by other authorities, they had seen a huge reduction in vehicle numbers, and some authorities had reversed the decision.

Councillor Parekh questioned if there was any evidence to suggest that CCTV actually reduced crime or improved safety, or if less intrusive methods could achieve the same goal. She was concerned that people might not want to be constantly watched and whilst agreeing that the Council needed to be proactive, evidence was required that those measures would work. She questioned if continuous recording would violate human rights and felt that there might be better, more cost effective options.

Councillor Grocock sought clarification regarding the Council's response to the letter and asked what other authorities in the County were doing, as many taxis from other authorities operated in Rushcliffe. The Senior Licensing and Enforcement Officer advised that only 22 out of 249 local authorities in the UK had mandated CCTV, and locally, Charnwood Borough Council, Melton Borough Council, and most importantly City of Wolverhampton Council, which made up 26% of all Private Hire vehicles in the country did not mandate CCTV. He reiterated that the ICO stated that provision had to be proportionate and required in an area, and that Rushcliffe had no evidence from the Police at this time to identify any issues that would justify making CCTV mandatory.

Councillor Chewings questioned what actions were taken following the receipt of the letter in June and asked if the Policy could have been amended and the consultation started again, as that would still have given time for it to come before Committee tonight. He also asked if going forward, the Policy could be amended before it expired again in five years. The Senior Licensing and Enforcement Officer explained that it was now too late to amend the proposed Policy; however, it could be reviewed anytime, with a further consultation taking place. The Principal Officer – Community Safety and Licensing advised that the Chief Executive responded to the letter on 30 June 2025, confirming that for reasons already outlined by officers, the Council did not support mandatory CCTV. A copy of the email would be circulated to the Committee. The Assistant Director Public Protection confirmed that the Policy was already out for consultation when the letter was received, and in those circumstances the Policy would not be redrafted and sent out for consultation again. He reiterated that if the Committee was minded to request CCTV, that could be looked at separately next year. He also reminded the Committee that authorities that had

mandatory CCTV had lost many drivers, and a key incentive of this Policy was to promote and make it easier to become a driver.

Councillor Thomas referred to the changing climate on this issue and felt that the letter to other councils might affect their thinking, and five years was too long to wait. She put forward a recommendation that the Committee should resolve to review the Policy, following a further public consultation, in respect of CCTV provision in 12 months' time, when more information would be available from other authorities. The recommendation was seconded by Councillor Soloman.

The Chair agreed that CCTV did keep people safe; however, he was concerned that making CCTV mandatory would reduce Hackney Carriage numbers in the Borough, rather than increasing them. He noted that many taxis licensed by other authorities operating in the Borough did not have CCTV, and he hoped that by adopting the Policy it would encourage more drivers to be licensed in Rushcliffe. The Chair requested that details of the 22 authorities, which had mandated CCTV, together with information on numbers and costs be circulated to the Committee.

Councillor Parekh questioned if a review would be necessary if the evidence gathered showed that CCTV was not required. Councillor Chewings stated that the proposed recommendation was clear that a review should be undertaken, and it was for elected members rather than officers to make a decision. Councillor Combellack agreed with Councillor Parekh that if evidence showed that CCTV was not required, having a review in 12 months would be wasting the Council's time. Councillor Soloman reiterated that there was a changing climate and this review would be forward thinking rather than looking back at historical data. Councillor J Walker was concerned that by insisting on mandatory CCTV, those eight cars could be licensed elsewhere, and then Rushcliffe would have no control.

The Senior Licensing and Enforcement Officer confirmed that as of today the Council had seven Hackney Carriage vehicles and 317 Private Hire. Numbers of Private Hire were increasing, particularly Uber and it was hoped that amending the Policy would encourage more Hackney Carriage drivers and operators to be licensed in Rushcliffe.

The Assistant Director Public Protection suggested the following wording for the proposed recommendation that "the revised Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy be endorsed for approval by Full Council, subject to a review being undertaken in respect of CCTV in 12 months' time." This proposal was voted on and agreed by the Committee.

Councillor Soloman referred to the City of Wolverhampton Council and asked if a letter could be written requesting it to consider mandating CCTV as part of its own licensing regime. It was suggested that this should be raised at Full Council.

In answer to a question from Councillor Walker regarding disability and safeguarding training, the Senior Licensing and Enforcement Officer confirmed that on approval of the Policy this training would be combined for drivers.

Councillor Parekh referred to Paragraph 6.14 of the Policy and sought clarification on what alternative evidence would be required to allow an asylum seeker to hold a license and under what circumstances. The Senior Licensing and Enforcement Officer advised that drivers would be required, where possible to provide a Certificate of Good Behaviour from their originating country, or evidence of their good character.

Councillor Chewings asked if a Disability Impact Assessment had been undertaken in relation to the proposed Hackney Carriage vehicle change. He also questioned if there was any evidence to substantiate the proposal to change the Council's points retention period from 12 to 36 months and asked if neighbouring authorities had a similar process, as he felt that it was quite arbitrary and evidence was required. The Assistant Director Public Protection confirmed that an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) had been undertaken. The Senior Licensing and Enforcement Officer reminded Committee that there were only seven Hackney Carriages licensed in the Borough; however, there were around 120 wheelchair accessible vehicles registered. In relation to the points retention, it was hoped that by increasing the time to 36 months, it would encourage better driving.

Councillor Chewings reiterated that evidence was required to justify any increase from 12 to 36 months. He questioned details in the EIA and stated that the loss of standard Hackney Carriages would have a negative impact, which should be quantified in the EIA. The Senior Licensing and Enforcement Officer reiterated that there were numerous Private Hire vehicles that were wheelchair accessible and could be booked. The Principal Officer – Community Safety and Licensing reminded Committee that the points system allowed officers to keep a check on drivers, and if necessary give Councillors the opportunity to question any drivers close to maximum points, to decide if they remained fit to drive. It was for those reasons that officers felt that it was appropriate to extend the retention period. Councillor Chewings requested information on the number of drivers who were reaching the maximum points and officers agreed to email those details to the Committee, together with information on which councils operated a 12 months' points retention.

Councillor Combella questioned if proposed changes were being put forward due to Local Government Reorganisation (LGR), as she felt that would be presumptuous. The Assistant Director Public Protection advised that many of the proposed changes were being put forward to try and harmonise with other councils and work more closely. Councillor Combella stated that she was pleased to hear that as it was important that people felt safe using taxis licensed by different authorities.

Councillor Grocock agreed with this approach, and whilst noting that some suggested regulatory relaxations would be required to achieve harmonisation, a more draconian route, such as mandatory CCTV would drive away business. He questioned what the Government was looking at regarding harmonisation, coordination and national legislation and the Assistant Director Public Protection confirmed that Rushcliffe was bound by Government guidance, working together as a County-wide group. There was a suggestion to move taxi licensing to the East Midlands Combined Authority (EMCCA); however,

currently Rushcliffe would continue to operate under Government guidance. The Senior Licensing and Enforcement Officer advised that a current Government consultation was looking at future regulation, and whilst councils across the country operated differently but under the same legislation, it was hoped that the Government would start providing more regulation.

The Chair concluded the meeting by thanking Licensing Officers for their hard work in producing the report, which he felt had led to a constructive debate.

It was RESOLVED that the revised Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy detailed at Appendix 1 to the report be endorsed for approval by Full Council, subject to a review being undertaken in respect of CCTV in 12 months' time.

The meeting closed at 8.26 pm.

CHAIR