Consultation on the review of the Rushcliffe Council Hackney Carriage & Private Hire Policy 2025 to 2030
Consultation Comments Response

Consultee comment	Response
I support the changes to an extent. The increase of car use to 15 years. The increase of a yearly MOT to 7 years only goes so far. Only licensing cars from new up to 5 years old is a barrier to entry not previously in force. Your regulatory changes do not go far enough in respect of the driver and still leave you less competitive than Nottingham city council. I was originally with Nottingham before joining Rushcliffe as you licensed up to 12 years. (I refuse to join Wolverhampton but welcome the fact that they have provided greater competition and lowered some unnecessary regulation) I would like to stay with Rushcliffe but you would have to match the yearly MOT up to 10 years old that Nottingham City Council have introduced. They also like you, license up to 15 years but 6 monthly MOT's are enforced after 10 years. I also believe they are cheaper. If my reading of your terms are correct, you require an MOT at an approved garage initially and that this negates the need for the follow up test, but the license fee and badge fees remain unchanged and I'm not clear if a fee would be paid (standard £45) to Ludlow hill or Mr Brown in addition So likely I'll still be joining Nottingham as things stand	• See **comment 1** below • Fees are assessed annually and are set on the basis of full cost recovery over a three year rolling period in accordance with relevant legislation.
In general I support the changes, however I believe further consultations with operators would be an advantage to both the council and more importantly the declining number of operators in the country. The council seriously need to look into the costs for a new application, fast approaching 600 pounds now with all the add	• Operators have been consulted as part of this process. • Re costs See above

Ons the government and council have in there wisdom increased. You mentioned in the outside the decreasing number of Hackney vehicles in the Borough, let's ask ourselves why, it's obviously because it is far cheaper to licence these vehicles in let's say Wolverhampton. Now having run a business for over 30 years I have seen massive changes in the industry and if these fees are increasing above inflation every year company's like ours will fold without any doubt. 5 years ago we had over 50 drivers with new recruitment never an issue. Now we have 20 with not a single new driver being employed for over 3 years. I would love to talk at the next licencing committee and make them aware of the challenges we are facing due to ever increasing costs and no recruitment. The very first change the council need to change is the ridiculous KT.. an outdated test that holds no place in the 21st century. In its wisdom the government guide lines have recommended English tests. So a man driving a taxi for over 30 years is expected to pay 50 pounds to keep his licence.. Surely if you are enforcing KT these should be adequate to acknowledge the applicant can read and talk English. Many thanks for the opportunity to voice my opinions and let's hope changes are indeed in the immediate future.	• The Knowledge test is though important to ensure local knowledge and supports the English language requirement • Any consultee can attend the committee the date will be published. • The English test fee is only paid in very limited circumstances and a third party is used to avoid unbiased discrimination and to place the cost on the individual rather than all applicants
I think it's brilliant that there will no longer be a limit on KT. As sometimes people just fail them marginally. Excellent idea to make all SEND vehicles with no age restrictions from 1st December 2025. However will there be an exception for vehicles that are due to expire in sept/oct/nov?	• Positive comments noted • The policy will not come into effect until approved in Nov 2025.
My only suggestion would be to allow drivers to work with Multiple operators as currently the licencing in Rushcliffe differs to that of Nottingham City Council which allows for a driver to be registered with multiple operators. This would help new drivers and operators to enable them to source income streams from multiple sources.	• Noted. Officers are open to this. It is likely a working solution is to apply for one operator and subsequently apply for a licence copy to deposit at a second or third operator for a nominal fee. **See comment 2**
This service has received a request from Nottinghamshire county council requesting cctv in all PHV/Taxis or encouragement to adopt.	• See below **comment 3** on cctv in vehicles

The letter was NOT in response to this policy consultation but received during the consultation period. Letter	

Comment 1

We consulted on this

Any NEW LICENSED application (as opposed to a renewal) vehicle will only be able to be licensed with the Council if its date of first registration as stated on the DVLA V5 document, is **not older** than five (5) years of age at the date of application.

We propose to amend to (8) years of age, so the paragraph should be changed to

Any NEW LICENSED application (as opposed to a renewal) vehicle will only be able to be licensed with the Council if its date of first registration as stated on the DVLA V5 document, is **not older** than eight (**8**) years of age at the date of application.

Reason:

This 8 years figure reflects that of neighbouring authorities that have a limit and comments received are accepted.

Comment 2

Comment received concerns allowing a driver to have multiple operators.

On page 42 it is recommended to insert the following paragraph

“Drivers wishing to work for more than one operator, should apply online to this service subsequent to receiving their initial driver’s licence. This service will normally issue an additional driver’s authorisation/licence for deposit at the additional operator’s office. There will be a charge for this request on the online form payable at the time of application. You may only request an operator that is currently licenced with Rushcliffe Borough Council.”

It is expected that this fee will be nominal e.g. £18.70, the same as the cost of a replacement licence.

Reason:

Historically RBC have not permitted more than one operator, however the regulators code states this restriction should not be applied. Also comment received supports multi operators.

Comment 3

CCTV: Comment on officer recommendations for cctv in vehicles.

Pros	Cons
Driver • it will assist in cases where drivers are abused or assaulted (can be managed by voluntary cctv) • assist with disputes between driver and passenger • assist with any allegations of policy or criminal investigations.	Driver • cost implications to both operator/driver and owner • legislative control over data would be an additional burden for taxi operators/drivers or owners • technical constraints and specification and the quality of the system needs to be determined.(£600-£900 plus possible ongoing) e.g. Bolsover system with 4eyez Taxi cctv is £621 installed. • Ensuring system is turned on and operating. System design can be such not able to turn off. • period of use can lead to recording private data when in private use unless able to turn off • Arrangements for the processing of cctv subject access requests and DPA requests will add a further burden on operators/drivers/owners •
Passenger • increased perception of being in a safe place. • Assist and deter with any allegations of policy or criminal investigations. • assist with disputes between driver and passenger	Passenger • cost implication to end user e.g. county council contracted transport e.g. SEN or public • it will record personal and private interactions between passengers. • where a passenger is not happy with being recorded how the driver deals with this.
	RBC • The Casey report does not require or recommend CCTV it suggests the following: **Recommendation 11: The Department for Transport should take immediate action to put a stop to 'out of area taxis' and bring in**

	more rigorous statutory standards for local authority licensing and regulation of taxi drivers. RBC believe this is around standards of drivers and the following statutory guidance. • LGA have produced the following document on this subject 5.42 LGA Guidance developing an approach to mandatory CCTV in taxis and PHVs_WEB in which the following is stated “Surveillance Camera Commissioner (SCC) and the Information Commissioners Office (ICO) may all raise concerns about the impact of mandatory CCTV systems on privacy,”. CCTV needs to be justified. • Officers have assessed the complaints data received into RBC. The number of complaints received are more directed at driver behaviour or vehicle standards than they are connecting a driver to a serious offence or safeguarding issue such as assault, sexual assault, sexual harassment, or substance misuse. Rushcliffe officers have not identified a need for cctv as a solution to a concern. • Mandated implementation, this will likely lead to a reduction in renewal and new driver applications. Eg Bolsover lost 40% of drivers when implemented • It is likely a DPIA will be required for compulsory CCTV, it is unlikely that this will meet entirely the ICO guidance and as such be liable for challenge lead to failing to comply with the ICO rules. • Decide on the use of audio if introduced. The ICO states it is “generally considered by the ICO to be more invasive of privacy than cameras and will therefore require much greater justification.” • There will be a need for consultation and engagement prior and a date set for when applications will be refused if they do not have CCTV of the right standard installed.

	Advanced notice and lead in time needed to be determined. • Increased costs to officer time for attaining and viewing cctv. • Difficulties in ensuring the cctv is being used when it should be. • Enforcement options when not being used. Eg suspension or points, will result in increased officer involvement • Possible data controller responsibilities, although if implemented as non mandated this remains with the operator/owner/driver e.g. as per Wolverhampton. • Need to develop a specification and supplier list. • It is non mandatory in the statutory guidance and hence RBC would need to justify the installation in every vehicle. Currently the ICO guidance says this is not proportionate. • Open to legal challenge by interested parties • A view would be needed from the councils cctv lead and legal services on the legality of including mandatory • Arrangements for the processing of cctv subject access requests and DPA requests will add a further burden on council

Officer comments on cctv:

At this time under current guidance, there is insufficient evidence to indicate that a mandatory cctv system in every licenced vehicle is ‘needed’ to address safety concerns. Cctv can only be installed where a need is identified. ICO guidance.

Also mandated cctv will need to be subject to consultation with various bodies and stake holders. This was not initially proposed in this consultation and as such would need to be reconsulted.

It is officers' opinion is that applications for Driver, Vehicles and operators will reduce significantly if mandated if particularly there is no consistent approach across Nottinghamshire.

It is the intention of this policy revision to be safe and efficient in accordance with the regulators code, Regulators' Code. The implementation of a fleet wide cctv is contrary to this approach and it is believed encouraging voluntary cctv adoption is the best approach.

Important note in response to NCC comment:

The request by the County Council to have cctv in vehicles that transport SEND can be dealt with by the County Council by amending any contractual arrangements they have in place with transport suppliers.

The NAFN register of drivers that have been refused, revoked or suspended is a national register, it is compulsory to be checked on application and now notifies any interested LA about a change in the driver's status. This prevents circumvention/avoidance of a driver following action by any Local authority. It is this type of measure that is key to identifying poor drivers or those that become not 'fit and proper'. Rushcliffe are clear that once a driver is not 'fit and proper' appropriate action will be taken and we have officer delegation to ensure it is prompt.

Voluntary cctv is already encouraged by RBC. Until such time that it is mandated by statutory guidance.

The "weak and ineffective taxi licensing arrangements that left the public at risk" which were in place in Rotherham cannot be assumed to be in place here at Rushcliffe. We have delegated decision making practices and fully follow statutory guidance and act promptly to safeguarding issues. The application process requires safeguarding training and regular safeguarding updates. The aim is to ensure that drivers are and remain fit and proper at all times and if not a driver will be suspended or revoked. We also work closely with partner agencies on enforcement and data sharing etc.