Full Consultation Results Comments

Question 1

Taxi Policy Consultation

Are you? (Please tick all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A member of the public</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney Carriage owner</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney Carriage driver</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Hire Vehicle owner</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Hire Vehicle driver</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle testing centre/inspector</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Hire Operator(s)</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number answered question: 164
Number skipped question: 1

Number | Response Date            | Other (please specify)                                                                 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 3:42 PM</td>
<td>An officer of the council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 12:20 PM</td>
<td>Supply and fit taxi equipment, Taxi meters, Roof signs etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mar 1, 2012 11:06 AM</td>
<td>Spouse of Hackney Driver/Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dec 19, 2011 3:36 PM</td>
<td>Rent six cars to drivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dec 12, 2011 1:03 PM</td>
<td>Former Civil Enforcement Office ( NBC M15 ) &amp; NCC &amp; NCP ( NP026 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dec 5, 2011 11:07 AM</td>
<td>officer of the Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 2.

Taxi Policy Consultation

Do you think that the age of a vehicle is related to its roadworthiness?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number answered question: 164
Number skipped question: 1
Yes

But so are many other things. If roadworthiness is what matters, then it should be assessed directly rather than using another criterion which may be statistically related. If an inspection (the Council’s or the MoT) shows that the vehicle is roadworthy, why rule it out on age grounds? Most modern vehicles are good enough for at least 200,000 miles therefore whether the vehicle is hackney (black) taxi or private hire if maintained properly and roadworthy the age should not matter. Most cars today are better than black cabs and more comfortable. Sorry running out of space....

All vehicles are tested so have to be roadworthy to be a Private Hire vehicle

My car is 10 years old and passes MOT like a flash and drives like new car.

regular maintenance and servicing keeps any car roadworthy whatever its age, otherwise you wouldn't see any cars of old age on the road at all such as classic, vintage or 10 years old!

This depends on the type of vehicle. A saloon car used as a taxi or private hire will only last for a number of years before corrosion sets in. A purpose built hackney has a separate chassis and will last for many years if well maintained.

In general, an older vehicle, or high mileage vehicle will require more maintenance. However maintenance on newer cars tends to be more expensive. Its not the age but the condition of the vehicle that is more important. Some of the new taxis with risky brakes and other faults and drivers drive with excess alcohol should be looked at.

People are not always able to afford the most modern cars to drive and if a car is old but is still running well it should be worthy on road.

Because these vehicles are thoroughly checked twice a year for mechanical fitness and for cosmetic condition

I think it depends more on the condition of the car rather than age.

As long as it passes MOT test it should be ok. Not necessarily. Items such as tyres, brake pads, light bulbs can need to be replaced anytime.

A car/vehicle can be maintained well with full service history. Taxis are checked every 6 months. Surely that means that they are roadworthy. Its also down to the individual driver to maintain a certain standard during the day to day running and the council should be able to inspect/view the cleanliness of the vehicle both inside and out in town.

Of course not

vehicles on the whole are made much better today than they were say 30-40 years ago.

Improved manufacturing methods mean that the "rot boxes" that many cars became in the past - even before their first MoT test at three years old - are rarer than hen’s teeth. It is not unusual to see cars older than ten years which, outwardly, show no significant signs of their
age, other than the inevitable and constant shifts in vehicle design. It is far more important to know that a vehicle is roadworthy and this should be addressed by the standard checks which take place. In this regard, private hire vehicles are no different to private vehicles - and the public can travel in either!

The roadworthiness is related to:

a) the honesty and integrity of the vehicle's owner, driver and or service agent.

b) the usage of the vehicle i.e. town/local work, distance work, chauffeuring or wedding hire.

c) the type of vehicle and its manufacturer.

One could have

Parts on a vehicle are subject to metal fatigue brought on by age, mileage, etc

If a vehicle is roadworthy then the age should not matter. If the vehicle is well maintained and ticks all the boxes with regard to the Council's requirements, then I think the age of the vehicle is irrelevant. Hackney carriages and private hire vehicles already have to pass vigorous safety/roadworthy tests twice a year. I would suggest that if the vehicle fails by 6 or more potential defaults then and only then the vehicle should be refused a new licence.

If its roadworthy then it should be on the road

not really as long as its looked after and serviced regularly its not a problem

If vehicle is sound after MOT then it should be ok for roadworthiness

Not looking after any vehicle do become this is a ble to cost lots of money to repair.

Judge each vehicle on its own merits

If the MOT has been passed and the vehicle has eligible road tax then it is roadworthy

A well maintained vehicle can last many years yes but good condition looked after cars are just as safe as a new car and this very much should be taken into account

Bexcause we get MOT twice a year

Any vehicle will deteriorate with age. The roadworthiness of any vehicle at any age is dependant upon the quality of the maintenance it receives. An exceptionally well maintained vehicle can be in a better condition than a poorly maintained vehicle half it's age.

If a vehicle has passed the test then it is fit to work. Most of the faults found at roadside checks relate to blown lightbulbs and tyres. These can happen with a taxi that is 6 months old.

Provided the older vehicle is maintained and serviced and in perfect condition will be similar to a new vehicle.

MATERIALS USED IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF A MOTOR VEHICLE ARE SUBJECT TO STRESS .

SEE REPORTS FROM MOTOR INDUSTRY RESEARCH ASSOCIATION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 19, 2012</td>
<td>4:01 PM</td>
<td>A well-kept 15 year old vehicle can be in a better condition than a poorly maintained 5 year old..!! Reading reports of vehicle defects found during spot roadside checks on both hackney carriages and private hire vehicles most of the defects appear to be attributed to poor maintenance standards and failure to do basic regular checks. Defective lights, reflectors, tyres appear a lot in these checks. All vehicles no matter how old they are must have frequent checks on the basic vital maintenance items such as oil, coolant, brake fluid and windscreen washer fluid levels and tyre condition and pressures. It is also important for the manufacturers servicing schedules to be followed. It is important that operators pay attention to maintenance that affects exhaust emissions. If a vehicle is well maintained and passes the current MOT and council &quot;Plate Test&quot; there is no reason why it should not be allowed to be used as a Private Hire Vehicle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 16, 2012</td>
<td>10:43 PM</td>
<td>It is dependant on the make of the car for an example if is a mercedes it is known by specialists that this car can drive easy until 500,000 miles and still look in good condition and safe for passengers. The London Taxis are built for doing this job as it has to MOT twice a year and also it always stop check shdoult be any limit as long as well maintained and go through MOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 16, 2012</td>
<td>8:45 PM</td>
<td>If a vehicle is well maintained and passes the current MOT and council &quot;Plate Test&quot; there is no reason why it should not be allowed to be used as a Private Hire Vehicle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 13, 2012</td>
<td>10:11 AM</td>
<td>It is dependant on the make of the car for an example if is a mercedes it is known by specialists that this car can drive easy until 500,000 miles and still look in good condition and safe for passengers. The London Taxis are built for doing this job as it has to MOT twice a year and also it always stop check shouldnt be any limit as long as well maintained and go through MOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 13, 2012</td>
<td>9:15 AM</td>
<td>The London Taxis are built for doing this job as it has to MOT twice a year and also it always stop check shouldnt be any limit as long as well maintained and go through MOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 11, 2012</td>
<td>4:11 PM</td>
<td>I think older vehicles require more maintence. Irrespective of the annual MOT there are many defects that arise the older a vehicle gets. I've been in Northampton cabs with ripped seats, door knobs and trim missing, and they still look at you expecting a tip!!!! I booked a taxi-cab from Weswitbridge motors to collect me from my home at Gayton to an appointment at Northampton General Hospital, when it arrived I saw that it was a Saloon Car, the driver was scruffily dressed, wearing boots with the laces undone, the passenger seat well contained empty cigarette packets and take-away containers and the vehicle was in a dirty condition. I objected to the driver who simply shrugged, I didn't have time to obtain an alternative taxi so had to use it to keep to my appointment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 11, 2012</td>
<td>4:02 PM</td>
<td>private Hire vehicles are already MOT at a Higher standard than a normal car twice a year and mosat of our fleet are serviced regularly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 11, 2012</td>
<td>3:05 PM</td>
<td>An older vehicle has more C02&gt; While we are considering the age we have look carefully like what will be first reg of the vehicle. Recommended at least 4 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 11, 2012</td>
<td>2:49 PM</td>
<td>Because regular maintenance is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 11, 2012</td>
<td>2:36 PM</td>
<td>Because most important maintenance of car and presentation of car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 11, 2012</td>
<td>2:26 PM</td>
<td>As long as it is well maintained. My own car not taxi 12 yrs old is immaculate air con everything. You can't tell difference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 10, 2012</td>
<td>10:58 AM</td>
<td>If a vehicle is properly maintained and worn body and interior parts replaced when required it will always remain roadworthy until the main structure starts to deteriorate. This condition would normally be picked up by the council tester, and if nessacary the license could then be revoked.,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I think the roadworthiness is down to the person who owns or drives the vehicle. Its maintenance of the vehicle.

Silly question. If the vehicle is not roadworthy it will not pass the test. One only has to look around at quite a lot of modern vehicles that leave a lot to be desired. Although there are those who will lovingly care for their vehicle and keep it well managed and in good condition - a good rule of thumb would be that age and roadworthiness is positively correlated. Some private Hire vehicles cover 100,000 miles per year, even a brand new vehicle can be dangerously unroadworthy in a matter of weeks. The crucial thing is proper maintenance.

The vehicle is tested 2 times a year. Its up to Jacksons to see fit. A lot of taxi's in Northampton are more than 5 years old this is a hazzard, some of them are not roadworthy and have lots of black smoke coming out of the exhaust the breaks are terrible the cars screech and some taxi's seem to have problems with the steering...

A vehicle could do 30,000 plus in first year and could be on bald tyres. Surely the inspection twice a year is a sufficient indication of roadworthiness and not age. Maintenance carried out on an older car on a regular basis could be the same condition as a newer car without regular maintenance. With plating twice a year and spot checks it should never be unroadworthy. No responsible drivers would risk injury to self and passengers driving a vehicle that was not roadworthy.

As long as vehicle is properly maintained and repaired correctly.

Depends on the how the car has been maintained. I spent 12 years as a mechanic and this statement is untrue. Mileage of a vehicle is a better measuring stick. Good maintenance and regular inspection is the key not necessarily the age of the vehicle. I suppose some drivers dont have the level of care and competence to keep on top of maintenance, but why should the reasonably competent majority be mafe to suffer. The cost of regular car replacement will ultimately mean higher farres. Higher costs= higherfarres=loss of affordable taxis=loss of work=less people in business=less revenue for drivers, operators and council.

Fitness is more important than age, quite a lot of newer cars are unsafe and unroadworthy in Northampton. Don't know how they get through the MOTs. The standard of repairs to older vehicles is very often not to the standard of older ones.

Vehicles well maintained will have no effect with ageing. Others not properly maintained will age quicker. The roadworthiness of a vehicle depends on how it has been driven and looked after by its owner/drivers. Age does not come into it.

If there were no MOT concept then my answer was going to be yes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timestamp</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec 12, 2011</td>
<td>The majority of companies that operate modern vehicles, But there are several around the town that are very much older. May I suggest that as part of the licence procedures &amp; annual MOT tests, these vehicles MUST have a fully documented history for Safety Inspections &amp; Servicing, as do ALL Passenger carrying vehicles, similar to what the NCC operate. Statistically old cars have more repairs carried out to pass an MOT or are more likely to be 'behind' economic repair at the time of an MOT. So following this logically, the old cars must have been driven for some period prior to the MOT in an unroadworthy or below MOT standard condition, because they could not have just developed to wear immediately prior to the MOT test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 9, 2011</td>
<td>Tests should determine this. A person can have a three year old car and never look after it and drive over 100K a year, whilst another could have an 8 - 10 year old car, service it 6 monthly and only drive less than 12K a year. I believe that each vehicle should have an annual stringent inspection which would cover all the requirements of road-worthiness, appearance, emissions, cleanliness, &amp; provided it passed this the licence should be granted regardless of the age of the vehicle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 8, 2011</td>
<td>Hackney Carriages are very expensive to purchase &amp; so there should not be an added burden on their owners to replace them at a certain age regardless of their condition. Taxis are by nature very high mileage vehicles. Therefore the quality of maintenance is more important than the age of the vehicle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 7, 2011</td>
<td>The older cars become the more unreliable they are, they become more expensive to run etc. There is no direct correlation. If you want to measure road worthiness, then inspect the vehicle for road worthiness. If the vehicle is serviced regularly and has an MOT, I would assume it to be roadworthy. I would be more interested in assuring it is serviced properly than in its age. Otherwise the current legislation regarding MOT's is wrong. Vehicle mileage and constant use - as some cabs are used virtually 24 hours a day - must also contribute to excessive 'wear &amp; tear'. Provided a vehicle is serviced and maintained regularly and in accordance with manufacturer schedules then age is irrelevant in the motoring world today. A 5 year old vehicle owned by a local family can be in a worse condition than a 15 year old vehicle operated by a professional operator which is regularly serviced and inspected by the local authorities. But mitigated by maintenance regime - otherwise their would be a legal limit on the age of all road vehicles. But so are many other things. If roadworthiness is what matters, then it should be assessed directly rather than using another criterion which may be statistically related. If an inspection (the Council's or the MoT) shows that the vehicle is roadworthy, why rule it out on age grounds?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 3

Do you think that the age of a vehicle relates to its safety?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

**answered question** 163  
**skipped question** 2

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Response Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 3:42 PM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 3:30 PM</td>
<td>But again, only indirectly. Modern cars have more safety features, but these could be defined directly (e.g., the car must have a front passenger airbag). If 'safety' here means 'roadworthy', see previous answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 12:41 PM</td>
<td>See overleaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 12:20 PM</td>
<td>Goog regular maintenance is the key factor. A new vehicle that is badly maintained can be very unsafe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 11:51 AM</td>
<td>Not if it is properly maintained. However to be realistic, not all owners maintain their vehicles properly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 11:27 AM</td>
<td>The condition is more important than the age. An old vehicle that is well maintained is more safe than a newer vehicle that is not properly serviced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 11:21 AM</td>
<td>If a car is reliable and has passed a MOT then it is fine on road no matter what its age is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 11:03 AM</td>
<td>There are hundreds of cars, vans, buses on road which are older than 10 years and there is nothing wrong with them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mar 1, 2012 11:33 AM</td>
<td>Not necessarily. If you look after your vehicle it is safer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mar 1, 2012 11:26 AM</td>
<td>All this is checked at MOT. Partially, but some older cars may still be more safe and crashworthy than some newer cars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mar 1, 2012 11:06 AM</td>
<td>Not a fair yes/no question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Feb 29, 2012 12:28 PM</td>
<td>As long as the vehicle is maintained as ours are it is fine. The maintenance and upkeen should enable the vehicle to remain safe. It is also the driver's responsibility to drive safely and replace/repair damaged parts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Feb 29, 2012 12:19 PM</td>
<td>More likely..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

New vehicles does have warranty period which can replace/repair easily. If it's been looked after and taken care of there's no reason why it shouldn't be as safe as it was new.
A car which has clocked up a high mileage in its first year in the hands of an irresponsible owner who has never checked the tyres, brakes, lights or fluid levels could be extremely unsafe. This scenario may be unlikely, but it is not unfeasible. At the other end of the scale, modern day cars can clock up huge mileages which, provided they are regularly maintained, are no barrier to those vehicles passing the annual MoT and any additional testing private hire vehicles may face. I travelled in a Mercedes E300D private hire vehicle two years ago. It had over 320,000 miles on the clock and looked and felt like a car with just one tenth of that mileage.

Comment 2. also applies.

As previously stated, the current state of repair of roads, speed humps etc all have an effect on safety.

Vehicle manufacturers continually add new or enhanced safety features, which will add to the overall safety of a vehicle provided these features are not used by the operator as an excuse for careless or dangerous operation of the vehicle.

Not if it is correctly maintained, and see my comments for the previous question.

Within reason (e.g. since 2000) a vehicle with modern safety (airbags, ABS etc) maintained and serviced and in perfect condition will be similar to a new vehicle.

you could have new one and become unsafe

MODERN VEHICLES ARE MUCH SAFER

Age has NOTHING whatsoever to do with safety on a properly maintained vehicle.

My short answer to this is no, my general comments on this are broadly in line with those in Q2. Although features that improve vehicle safety could have been introduced to all newer vehicles it is probably unlikely that over a span of 8 years the oldest vehicles would be substantially behind in terms of overall safety.

But not necessary a risk to passengers, newer vehicles will have higher safety specs as improvements are made by manufacturers.

As long as MOT is followed by NBC every 6 months the vehicle will be safe.

Not always, especially this LT taxi strong built motor, design to last long.

I had a drive shaft literally snap on a 10 year old vehicle. Luckily I was only pulling away from a junction. If that was on the A45 at 60+ mph I would not be here now. The mechanic said it was metal fatigue and would not have shown up at a service or MOT. Imagine that being a 7-10 year old taxi....
I believe that mechanical parts wear-out irrespective of body condition and appearance.

I was a traffic Manager for many years, I am now 76 years old and been a driver since I was 16.

Vehicle is being checked very often as private hire vehicle. Its being checked every now and then.

As before. 10k full service essential

It not maintenance of cabs even new cabs can go wrong anytime.

Safety is dependant on maintenance and general care of the vehicle and also its driver.

Simply because of the 6 monthly test, if a vehicle is deemed to be unsafe it will not pass.

Have seen many multiple driver fairly new vehicle in a poorer state than older cars and hackneys in the last twenty five years.

Assuming this refers to road safety. Mileage would seem a better measure.

If it did there would be no point in having a vehicle test.

It's all about service.

As STATED ABOVE. Also if the breaks screech every time you use them then surely they are not able to stop in an emergency..

Surely the WAY the vehicle is driven is more important.

As long as vehicle is properly maintained and repaired correctly.

A new car is likely to be more safe but only up to a point of about 70,000 miles. Then safety partly relies on good inspection, maintenance, driver awareness.

Not at all.

The more modern the vehicle the higher the Euro N Cap rating is so ensuring better safety features as standard e.g. ABS traction/stability control, more airbags etc.

Again this is down to how it is looked after and maintained.

MOT once again proves that vehicle is enough safe for itself.

The majority of recently operating vehicle, that were stopped in a Police operation were found to have defects, some quite serious, thus potentially putting the customers at risk of serious injury or death.

Modern vehicles are designed to reduce injury to anything they collide with, and to reduce injury to the passengers and driver.

Modern design improves vehicle safety

Similar as above. If someone looks after their car regularly and properly, then the car is more likely to be safer than someone who drives alot, erratically, and never services it properly.

Providing the vehicle is serviced & kept in good condition I do not think the age of the vehicle relates to its safety. yes but only in the broadest sense, in that a 40 year old vehicle would much less safe intrinsically, than a newly produced model.

The most important factor in road safety is the skill and care of the driver. Regular observations and training of drivers would improve passenger
The cars have safety checks to assess their road worthiness and thus their safety. This is much more appropriate than assuming a direct correlation between age and safety.

In the background information, it is asserted that many other councils have implemented vehicle age limitations; is there any evidence of an improvement in safety? None seems to be referenced.

Again I assume that current safety rules, or any new safety regulations, have to be adhered to regardless of the age of the vehicle.

I repeat: Otherwise the current legislation regarding MOT's is wrong. Vehicle mileage and constant use - as some cabs are used virtually 24 hours a day - must also contribute to excessive 'wear & tear'.

As above comment. Vehicles are inspected every 6 months so no major safety issues should occur and prohibition can be used where necessary.

But mitigated by maintenance regime - otherwise their would be a legal limit on the age of all road vehicles.

But again, only indirectly. Modern cars have more safety features, but these could be defined directly (eg the car must have a front passenger airbag). If 'safety' here means 'roadworthy', see previous answer.

Question 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 163
skipped question 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Response Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 3:42 PM</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 2:57 PM</td>
<td>I'm not convinced that age limits as such are necessary We do the same work taking members of the public around town so the same rules should apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 2:51 PM</td>
<td>No more than 10 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 2:45 PM</td>
<td>Not at all as long as passes the strict MOT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 2:41 PM</td>
<td>Against age limits but both should be treated equally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 2:38 PM</td>
<td>Against age limits but both should be treated equally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 12:41 PM</td>
<td>Private Hire are just normal cars. A purpose built hackney is made to do many 100,000's miles if regularly serviced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many of the Hackney vehicles are modified versions of the same vehicle used as private hire. Mechanically identical. Age limits should be similar. LTI are built for safety, longer lasting than private cars.

As above Hackneys are purpose built, long lasting and huge investment money wise compared to private Hire vehicles - AND IT IS STUPID TO APPLY THE SAME AGE LIMIT FOR THEM.

No age limit

All taxis built on a chassis can be rebuilt. Taxis built on a subframe can receive irreversible damage.

Because Black Cab cant be compared with saloon cars have traditional TX type taxi cabs been subject to NCAP test etc. Traditional Taxi Cab may be less safe and crashworthy than equivalent age passenger car. Therefore the logical outcome of this review is to include traditional taxi cabs.

private Hire vehicles are different to Hackney vehicles. Private Hire should have an age limit as they are smaller and have a great deal of wear and tear. Hackneys are a symbol of tradition and are an older vehicle such as a fairway model can be maintained. Obviously if it fails MOT it should not be used.

Hackney Carriage (London Cabs) are built to last.

Allow first time private hire vehicles up to five years old, possibly with a maximum mileage and subject to a thorough check of the vehicle's service and maintenance history.

Under normal circumstances one would recommend a 10 year age limit for PHV's and 15years for HC's. However, there are a considerable number of HC's that are relatively speaking 'new' to the industry and their build quality and reliability is suspect and not yet proven.

For private hire should be 5 years from first time Hackney carriages specially built for the trade. Private cars are not. There is currently an 11 year old sporty type astra with alloy wheels and metallic silver in colour. Not a good advert.

Age limits should be imposed as a guideline only. Vehicles should be judged on their own performance and maintenance record. If an individual vehicle is deemed to be unsafe/unroadworthy by an individual qualified expert on its bi-annual inspection, then the vehicle will be deemed to have failed the test and a licence refusal should be issued or a warning given to the owner/driver that he must bring the vehicle to the required standard or replace it.

If its age limits adopt then its should be for both.

With the recession its very difficult to buy a new car. Business is very slow at the moment. Where will we get the funds.

Only if PH vehicle is maybe 10 years old

Because Hackney Carriage are made for public use. Private Hire vehicles are family saloon vehicle there should be age and time difference

Note: the age restriction that applies in Northampton for Hackney Carriage vehicles are only there because the HCA asked for them

Because Hackney vehicles are purpose built

Hackney carriage are more robust and purpuse built taxi

Any applied age limits should be common to both Hackney and Private Hire vehicles.

If you were to look underneath a black cab you would see it is built in a totally different way to a modern car or van. It is built on a very strong seperate chassis, like a truck, not a pressed steel shell like a car.
Hackneys are purpose designed for the job and as such should be expected to give longer service. They are also greater capital investment. Drivers do not have the fund to buy new cabs without going into debt and as long as they pass all requirements and roadworthy

HACKNEY CARRIAGES ARE CONSTRUCTED FOR THEIR USE AND SHOULD ( SUBJECT TO PROPER MAINTENANCE ) HAVE A LIFE OF 20 YEARS FROM 1st. REGISTRATION.

PRIVATE HIRE ( UNLESS PROPER HACKNEY CARRIAGE ) MAX. 10 YEARS.

For what reason.

What benefits are there...?

It's a complete waste of time and money (ours.!!)

Subject all vehicles passing the Licensing Authority inspections and operators showing evidence of regular servicing.

It is only right that both types of vehicles are treated equally.

I personally think it is good to have a new vehicle to drive also to give the best we can to our passengers. However by adopting the age limit we will punish many good drivers which is not fair

Definitely in private hire should be a limit and size of engine for comfort.

See above. It's a no brainer.

I accept that Hackney cabs have to be built to a higher standard for hire work and that an additional two years would not be unreasonable to their working life.

Age limits can be adopted but have to consider the 1st registration of the year. At least four years.

Would be unfair to Hackney drivers

Most important the customer service is cabs properly maintenance. the driver or owner and no better the car what will happen?

Only not disable friendly

Supposedly a purpose built LT1 vehicle is built to last longer than a mass produced private hire vehicle perhaps not so on the converted van fleet of hackneys now permitted to operate.

Why not? Your assumption that Hackneys are more sturdily built immediately disqualifies all the Hackneys other than TX's and metros. the Peugeots, Mercedes, V.W's and Fiats all being conversions from standard vehicles.

5 years if possible or up to 8 at a push, but will stop any old driver driving a damaged unroadworthy car!

Private Hire as they are not purpose built

Totally different type of vehicles

Equality should apply

If an age limit on one then the same should apply to the other. There should be a level playing field. Hackneys private hire both pay same fees to council so they should have same terms and conditions. If parity and equality on age then there should be parity and equality to all areas therefore private hire should be able to use taxi lanes and be able to pick up off street.

If they do should be lenient
All rules should be the same for taxi and private hire with the exception of being able to be able to ply for hire in a public place.

If age limits are introduced then there should be a level playing field.

The are approximately 300 plus Private Hire Vehicles, all bidding for work that is reducing due the economical climate. The Hackney vehicles should be capped at say 60 vehicles. The reduction in Private Hire would thus allow the Hackney drivers to become more viable.

As well as the clear safety issues relating to older cars, there are issues of poorer emissions, and considering that we are considering taxis, they are very likely to do more mileage than an average car, and as such will cause more pollution.

Another aspect of old private hire cars, is the image it portrays of our town. Some of our embarrassingly old private hire cars cannot provide a vibrant image of our town and could affect potential investment.

Hackney Carriages are built to last longer and take more of a hit. The reason they cost more is attributable to this fact. Hackneys and Private Hires are two different leagues.

However, the newly plated Hackneys which are not the usual balck cabs could be subject to the same age limits (if applicable)

See 2 above

Cars should be a max of 5 years old.

There is no reason given why having common age restrictions is, in itself, a good thing. If it is, then relaxing the age restrictions on Hackneys would have equal merit.

If an age limit is adopted I do think it should be common to all taxis.

As a regular 'cab' user who uses both Hackney and Private Hire I have experienced some appalling vehicles and some equally appalling driving - however, vehicles with poor brakes and poor suspension seem to me to be far too common in Northampton.

There should be no limits, just appropriate and checked maintenance/condition regime

I'm not convinced that age limits as such are necessary.

Question 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 162
skipped question 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Response Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 3:42 PM</td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 12:41 PM</td>
<td>Impossible to answer, as I don't think it should I run an old taxi. The body is glass fibre. It has a separate chassis. I think it runs better as it gets older because nothing is original. Running parts have all been replaced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 12:20 PM</td>
<td>Should just be an upper age limit for both Hackney and Privat Hire. Having a lower to upper age limit would just promote higher mileage vehicles. The value of higher mileage vehicles would be inflated (already plated). Max of 10 years only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 11:51 AM</td>
<td>Especially not on Hackney carriages. These vehicles are built to last longer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 11:21 AM</td>
<td>Not now - earnings are 60-70% less so wait until country is out of worse business conditions. THERE IS NO WORK OUT THERE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mar 1, 2012 11:33 AM</td>
<td>Maybe for Private Hire but not for Black Cabs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mar 1, 2012 11:26 AM</td>
<td>Not convinced age limits are necessary for reasons explained elsewhere. I think Private Hire should have an age limit as they are a normal car but a hackney is a purpose built vehicle. This will affect peoples livelihood and in the current climate people cannot afford new cars or get finance to help them. Many vehicles will need to be scrapped. Will they get compensation from the council? Hackneys are more expensive than private hire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mar 1, 2012 11:06 AM</td>
<td>As the vehicles are serviced and MOT’d regularly age is almost irrelevant. Age limit should be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mar 1, 2012 9:48 AM</td>
<td>4/5 years from registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Feb 29, 2012 12:28 PM</td>
<td>6 years on road. I drive a 9 seaterr mini-bus. I won't be able to buy one under 3 years old for less than £20,000. If then I have to buy another one when its eight years old it won't be affordable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Feb 29, 2012 12:19 PM</td>
<td>Allow private hire vehicles up to ten years old, possibly subject to a maximum mileage, with the right to revoke a vehicle’s plate in individual cases where there are concerns that the vehicle has fallen outside the specification due to wear, accident damage, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Feb 29, 2012 12:23 AM</td>
<td>Hackney carriages should have a longer life than private cars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Feb 28, 2012 3:35 PM</td>
<td>Hackney Carriages and Private Hire vehicles should be equally regulated. i.e. no more than 3 years old on the date of first registration with Northampton Borough Council. yes - First time will be no more than 3 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Feb 20, 2012 8:38 PM</td>
<td>PHV license for further 5 years ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Feb 20, 2012 3:53 PM</td>
<td>Hackney license for further 12 years ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Feb 20, 2012 3:40 PM</td>
<td>I think they are too high. I think 5 years will do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Feb 20, 2012 10:52 AM</td>
<td>Both vehicle are made from different use there must be years gap between both vehicle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The age for the upper limit should be set at 10 years. The age of the vehicle when first used as a private hire should not be taken into consideration.

I think Hackeny should be 12 years and private Hire 10 years if they pass MOT

It should be 10 years

Hackney carriage are bought on finance and it takes 5 to 7 yrs to pay off. It would be unfair and unjust for us as a hackney carriage driver.

The real issue is roadworthiness and safety and perhaps these should be used as boundaries for acceptable vehicles. Ageing vehicles would be increasingly less likely to meet required standards.

As a black cab can work in London for 10 years and then can carry on working subject to 3 monthly plating checks it seems ridiculous to think that the same vehicle is not fit to work in Northampton after 8 years.

SEE ABOVE

If introduced, by definition you are saying that an 8yr. old vehicle is perfectly OK to use, but 8yrs and 1 day it is not, and should be scrapped.

What complete and utter nonsense!

Probably about right for vehicles that do a fairly high mileage.

The limits being suggested are more stricter than what is being suggested nationally, and no other council in Northamptonshire has these limits.

More workable limits would be under 5 years at first plate and allowed to be plated till 10 years old this is in line with the National average. Note a normal vehicle will do on average 60,000 miles in five years this is approximately 25% more than a Private Hire Vehicle with one full time driver will complete in a year.

This will be very bad move many driver will be out of job. May cause more burden in local economy.

I would suggest 8years for Private hire and 10years for Hackney cabs with a uniform colour for each type of vehicle.

Questions seem loaded

My view is is should be 4 years.

5 years old would be fairer because to life and death never be ???. same way new cabs and old cabs any time will be stopped. Only depends who is best luck.

Due to the imposed mandatory plating/MOT testing the majority of taxi/private hire vehicles are far safer and roadworthy than many privately owned vehicles that are less than half the age of taxis even taking into consideration mileage.

I think the age for the first test on private hire cars should be 2 years

Its a too easy or unthinkable decision.

If a vehicle is structurally safe and aesthetically acceptable, then there is no reason for criteria to change.
private should be 8 years
hackney should be 12 years

For reasons above

No more than 5 years old from 1st registration. A further 5 years to renew, altogether 10 years instead of 8yrs.

These seem reasonable.

Any age limit is arbitrary - the only possible justification is 'image', which can never replace 'quality'.

8 years should be 8 years. i.e. new or first plate anytime in 8 years. Not must be less than three years as this inflates the value of second hand taxis

3 years is a bit disengenious to operators and place a financial burden on them which cannot be met in times of austerity. 5 years would be more realistic and achievable. Adopting to encourage a 3 year policy will actually result in more pollution when taking into consideration the manufacturing of cars.

Depends on make and model. there are a lot of pristine older mercedes for example

It is not. This would mean putting many private hire owners and drivers out of business.

Maybe mileage would be more appropriate. some drivers are not busy enough for the proposed limit to be affordable. If I buy a car at three years, keeping it for 5, if I’m a part-time low mileage user then an age limit is rather unfair.

Perhaps 12 years or more

Its about time age limits came in for mboth provate hire and hackney and I feel 10 year rule is right and fair

10 years Private Hire

12 years hackney carriage

10 years is probably more realistic

I don't agree that there sould be a lower age limit, especially in the current financial climate.

I think an upper age limit should be introduced but at 10 years and not 8.

My proposal would be that a car of any age up to 10 years old could be introduced as new at any time

if borough council agrees to lend loan which could be from 10 to 14 k for the prescribed age limit car then i dont think its a bad idea

In my opinion the vehicles should be limited to a maximum of 5 years of age for Private Hire. They ALL should be either painted the same colour, so that the public know that it's not just a car driver trying to get some extra money by using his own car, without the need to register, Insure or have a FULLY Enhanced CRB Certificate.

The alternate is to have a wide band running the length on the vehicle on both sides saying PRIVATE HIRE. This would save the need to have the vehicle sprayed to one colour. But make a mandate that with in the next 5 years ALL Private Hire cars must be ONE COLOUR.
7 years of age on all private hire, and no age on Hackey carriage.

Too severe

There should definitely be an upper age limit of 10 years maximum, but the lower age limit should be higher than 3 years.

Also, there should be other rigorous tests to check if a vehicle is roadworthy or not, not just age.
No evidence has been given to show how safety is improved by having younger vehicles, or, therefore at what age vehicles become 'unsafe'.
In the absence of any evidence, the proposed age can therefore at best be an arbitrary guess.

There is no evidence for this choice

The current method of testing the cars every 6 months should be sufficient to ensure that cars are in good condition mechanically and aesthetically.

Impossible to answer, as I don't think it should!

Question 6.

Do you think Northampton Borough Council Licensing Authority should have exemptions from the age limit for vehicles that are in exceptional condition and have low mileage?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment

answered question 164
skipped question 1

Number  Response Date          Comment
1       Mar 2, 2012 3:42 PM No
2       Mar 2, 2012 2:45 PM   The vehicles have to be 'immaculate' already. You can't get any better than that - immaculate means faultless. All cars must be safety checks
3       Mar 2, 2012 2:41 PM   If a car is not roadworthy, remove it, but age does not apply all the time.
4       Mar 2, 2012 2:38 PM   If a car is not roadworthy, remove it, but age does not apply all the time. I think this depends on the garage that tests the vehicle and what is meant by low mileage. Would have to exception for specialist vehicles. Proper limousines for example. Wedding cars for another. Vehicles that would not be used for regular taxi work.
5       Mar 2, 2012 12:41 PM   As Taxis have special MOT test. I think if a taxi passes its test 100% the taxi should not be looked at its age. Tell the testing centre to be a bit more strict.
6       Mar 2, 2012 12:20 PM   If a car is in good condition and has low mileage then yes why not. Only if you have to go along these lines.
7       Mar 2, 2012 11:51 AM   In fact, scrap this idea all together of applying age limits.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2, 2012</td>
<td>11:03 AM</td>
<td>But I only agree if I know the exceptional condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1, 2012</td>
<td>12:05 PM</td>
<td>Although since LTI taxis can be stripped back to its chassis and rebuilt with all new parts then surely a taxi does not grow old, only its parts do which can be replaced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1, 2012</td>
<td>11:33 AM</td>
<td>Conditions are checked in MOT and black cabs are built to do high mileage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1, 2012</td>
<td>11:06 AM</td>
<td>However a high mileage vehicle is ??????? as Hackneys are designed for this Kind of work. It is believed and is inevitable that taxis will have a high mileage. Stringent MOT procedures will decide which vehicles are roadworthy not the numbers on the speedometer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 29, 2012</td>
<td>12:19 PM</td>
<td>If taxis are being plated every six months they should be in exceptional condition anyway. I don't know how you can have a taxi on low mileage. I just do a n school run and clock up about 15,000 miles per year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 29, 2012</td>
<td>12:09 PM</td>
<td>If you bring in this option you could end up being intercepted by the individual making the decision. If it is clearly defined then it would be ok.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 29, 2012</td>
<td>12:23 AM</td>
<td>For similar reasons to those expressed in the comments to question 2, although a common sense adaptation of the proposed changes outlined in the responses to questions 4 and 5 should reduce the number of exceptions encountered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 28, 2012</td>
<td>7:50 PM</td>
<td>Chauffeuring work using limousines that originally are more expensive for new/nearly new/ low mileage would become prohibitive to purchase if a 3 year age limit were to be imposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 28, 2012</td>
<td>3:35 PM</td>
<td>Older limousines subject to your exemption parameters. All vehicles, regardless of age or mileage, if well maintained, should have equal status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 20, 2012</td>
<td>10:52 AM</td>
<td>Because of how used or single shift work vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 20, 2012</td>
<td>10:11 AM</td>
<td>Age limit is irrelevant. Judge each vehicle on its own merits. Surely this would make a mockery of the rules and regulations regarding age limits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 20, 2012</td>
<td>9:53 AM</td>
<td>Yes, provided they satisfy the regulations for roadworthiness and safety current at the time of assessment / application for continued use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 11, 2012</td>
<td>9:49 PM</td>
<td>If a vehicle passes the test it is fit to work. A vehicle that is in exceptional condition, serviced &amp; maintained in that condition is equal to a new vehicle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 10, 2012</td>
<td>8:11 PM</td>
<td>There is an environmental impact in manufacturing new vehicles. Therefore, taking perfectly serviceable vehicles off the road may well be detrimental to the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 29, 2012</td>
<td>8:22 PM</td>
<td>As long as the vehicle is clean, tidy and passes current MoT criteria, age is immaterial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 19, 2012</td>
<td>4:01 PM</td>
<td>Subject to the operator being encouraged to do their best to maintain the engine and engine systems to a very high standard so as to keep exhaust emissions as low as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 16, 2012</td>
<td>10:43 PM</td>
<td>This would be open to abuse, low milage does not mean the vehicle has been well maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 16, 2012</td>
<td>8:45 PM</td>
<td>As I said in question 2 it depends on models of cars which can be exceptional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 13, 2012</td>
<td>10:11 AM</td>
<td>Should set limit on mileage and age of all car in private hire. It is a ordinary built for everyday use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 13, 2012</td>
<td>9:15 AM</td>
<td>Yes, it could be possible to do that but difficult to decide where to draw the line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 11, 2012</td>
<td>4:02 PM</td>
<td>If age limit is adopted New cabs will breakdown and customer will get problem. Then mileage not give anything to customer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Taxis won’t have a low mileage if they are busy, but most are not busy as there are many cars chasing work because council giving too many badges.

Contradictions. Because of the nature of the job they do, you cannot have an aged vehicle with low mileage. It is rare to have vehicles of 10 yrs plus to have the original components (engine, gearbox, etc) Only in special circumstances i.e. 10 yr old Hackney in v good condition gets written off in an accident (rare!) then able to replace with a similar age one if low mileage.

Seen vehicles with high mileage that are in good condition

Assuming there were a way to accurately assess the condition. The condition of the vehicle is everything. Either its good enoughj or it isn’t. Mileage is irrelevant.

to be under a official agreement

As above but mileage should relate to make and model. Some diesels will take heavy mileage without undue problems

There should be no exemptions at all as I feel this creates loopholes.

No just stick to one thing otherwise it all starts again.

It should be a level playing field for everyone.

To make one rule for one person / company is a DOUBLE STANDARD

Yes, because this will allow for the ‘Novel or Quirky’ party/event, and help generate business and development; But the Council MUST have the right to refuse with the only right of appeal i exceptional circumstances.

Condition is important - The driver however is key!!!

You shouldn't adopt these regulations at all without some more evidence; however, mileage and vehicle condition are probably better (and more generally accepted) predictors of road worthiness than age alone.

Mileage is an irrelevant number in motoring nowadays. vehicles that are well maintained, serviced and looked after can clock in excess of 300,000 miles. Some current PH in the town operate vehicles less than 3 years old that are not looked after and look worse than the older ones

There should be no age limits

The vehicles have to be ‘immaculate’ already. You can’t get any better than that - immaculate means faultless.

**Question 7**

Do you think that Council testing for Hackney and Private Hire Vehicles should be increased from twice to three times per year if the Council Licensing Authority did not introduce an age limit?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Response Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 3:42 PM</td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The decision should be based on evidence. If the existing tests are showing that a significant percentage are not up to standard, then yes, increase the frequency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 3:30 PM</td>
<td>Does Northampton Borough Council know or think that money grows on trees? Please Northampton Borough Council twice a year is good enough and more to the point expensive enough. THINK!!! Times are hard enough. Is this council from another planet? Please help us not hinder. Thanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 2:57 PM</td>
<td>Bring in another test for older vehicles. Drop MOT part of licensing for vehicles that are not required to have MOT for 3 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 2:51 PM</td>
<td>If they are I think the fees should be halved. Newer vehicles are easy to keep to the spec required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 2:45 PM</td>
<td>It should be once a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 2:41 PM</td>
<td>Twice is enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 2:38 PM</td>
<td>Twice is enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 12:41 PM</td>
<td>I think two times per year is plenty. The cost of each time is a lot and why should we pay for 2 MOT's when 1 lasts for 12 months..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 12:20 PM</td>
<td>For older vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Plate for first, 3 years from new.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Plates for vehicles up to 8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Plates thereafter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 11:51 AM</td>
<td>In some of the towns and cities are still having test once a year. Twice a year is ok.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 11:27 AM</td>
<td>It will be more costly and stressful for the driver and the earning isn't enough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 11:21 AM</td>
<td>Yes can do this after 5 years when public will have money to spend for hiring taxis/private hire vehicles. NOT IN THESE DAYS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 11:03 AM</td>
<td>Bot the price should be the same as we pay for a year one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mar 1, 2012 12:05 PM</td>
<td>Once a year is ample.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mar 1, 2012 11:33 AM</td>
<td>Because Northampton is only small town but some cities are only once a year even now we dont do the mileage as those in cities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mar 1, 2012 11:26 AM</td>
<td>But it is probably more use than the age limit being considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mar 1, 2012 11:06 AM</td>
<td>6 months is a very short time. Other towns have one year e.g. Bedford. hackney owners pay a large amount of money to test vehicles and have new plates created and this affects many families and their incomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1, 2012</td>
<td>9:48 AM</td>
<td>The present testing is more than adequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1, 2012</td>
<td>9:43 AM</td>
<td>The Government is considering extending the time between MOT's to 2 years (as in Germany) so why do you want to increase the number of tests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 29, 2012</td>
<td>12:28 PM</td>
<td>Half yearly testing is more appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 29, 2012</td>
<td>12:19 PM</td>
<td>If twice yearly platings have been ok all these years, why change it now. Its only more expense for the car owners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 29, 2012</td>
<td>12:09 PM</td>
<td>Unless you do not being in an age limit then my answer would be yes. You have to be sure the cab is always roadworthy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 29, 2012</td>
<td>12:23 AM</td>
<td>An incentive for operators to ensure their vehicles are in sound mechanical condition and a fair compromise if the other proposed concessions suggested above were to be adopted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 28, 2012</td>
<td>7:50 PM</td>
<td>Refer to London's requirements from 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 28, 2012</td>
<td>3:35 PM</td>
<td>Most definitely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 20, 2012</td>
<td>8:38 PM</td>
<td>Twice a year is more than adequate to ensure the high maintenance and safety of the vehicle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 20, 2012</td>
<td>3:40 PM</td>
<td>I think twice a year is good coz it cost a lot of money, to do it more than twice a year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 20, 2012</td>
<td>3:20 PM</td>
<td>Should be once time per year if twice per year then council licensing authority open more testing centre. MOT testing centres not friendly with drivers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 20, 2012</td>
<td>10:52 AM</td>
<td>But more frequent spot check and stop flagging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 20, 2012</td>
<td>9:53 AM</td>
<td>I have said no because few could afford the increased cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 20, 2012</td>
<td>9:33 AM</td>
<td>It should of been one year in the first place, 2 times a year is more than enough for both types of vehicle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 10, 2012</td>
<td>8:11 PM</td>
<td>This would just add more expense to the cost of operating a vehicle that the trade cannot afford. Operators who maintain their vehicles do so anyway, and it is up to the enforcement authorities to ensure that those who do not are removed from the trade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 19, 2012</td>
<td>4:01 PM</td>
<td>The regulations are fine as they are.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 16, 2012</td>
<td>8:45 PM</td>
<td>Don't try to fix what isn't broken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 13, 2012</td>
<td>10:11 AM</td>
<td>But it could be increased to three times for older vehicles, other licensing authorities have introduced this system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 13, 2012</td>
<td>9:15 AM</td>
<td>This proposal to increase from twice to three times per year definitely will be rip off and nothing in connection with health and safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 13, 2012</td>
<td>4:11 PM</td>
<td>For those taxis that are three or more older.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 11, 2012</td>
<td>3:05 PM</td>
<td>It should do this REGARDLESS of the limits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 11, 2012</td>
<td>2:36 PM</td>
<td>You already have 2 per year plus in present economic climate you are more likely to destroy the trade and put people out of work. Very intelligent that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 11, 2012</td>
<td>2:26 PM</td>
<td>Should be twice to three times per year depending on age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 11, 2012</td>
<td>6:46 AM</td>
<td>Present time all kind of driver not make any money but cost are going up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 10, 2012</td>
<td>11:04 AM</td>
<td>Current format is more than enough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 10, 2012</td>
<td>10:53 AM</td>
<td>I think that a car that is of older age with more mileage should be looked at different. This is nby the MOT and council have a limit of 3 times a year! Should not apply to all vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 10, 2012</td>
<td>11:04 AM</td>
<td>This is already a costly procedure which is stretching the trade to its limits. Other than the annual statutory requirements a lot of money is spent on cosmetic whims that most customers do not even notice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I think the current Twice a year test is more than sufficient. In the areas where age limits have been introduced Daventry, Wellingborough they only test cars ONCE A YEAR.

Because it depends how the maintenance of vehicle is

That would equate to a period of every 4 months. The drivers would suspect a change would be effected purely on a financial advantage to the council

Just do more spot checks visiting the multiple operatives premises as well as the spot checks procedure carried out at present.

Its more hassle for us drivers to take the test. It is best to introduce an age limit. Stick with twice a year.

Considering the amount of mileage these vehicles do this seems reasonable.

Only if you will pay for it.

For cars over 6 years.

It is expensive enough for two testing a year. You try and make a living as a taxi driver and see what a (b----) difficult it is.

Its expensive enough as it is without adding an additional charge for what amounts to two months difference

The industry cannot afford additional costs at this moment in time, unless the fee is waived.

Seems a good compromise

Two times a year is already too much considering the costs involved (i.e. plating, MOT etc

I say no because its not affordable. It would be okay if the council paid for the test or extra tests. Maintenance costs would rise. Fares would rise. Taxi economy, council revenue would take a hit. If an ordinary member of the public were asked this they'd say yes, but would they say yes if it meant a fares increase?

It sounds like another money making scam for the council

But the Three times I will like to be free of charge, because will get our expenses stay the same.

Only if overall cost is the same in one year

Twice a year is enough

Police car and ambulances only twice a year. How can taxi be expected to be given harder life than these?

But more authority for Borough examiners to refuse to test unsuitable vehicles

Testing for purpose built taxis should be returned to a yearly test as mileage is less than private hire. P.H. should be tested twice with an option of third test.

There are a lot of issues in the industry that need addressing before you start taking more money from the drivers.

twice a year is still a lot, will we gonna be fixing our cars 12 months a year

This should be mandatory for testing to be carried out every 3 months & a safety check carried out twice a year as well as regular servicing.

Three times a year as this will improve standards.

Keep existing system

Absolutely. If there is no age limit, as these vehicles serve the public on a very regular basis, they should be tested even more frequently.
I think this would be a better alternative to the proposed age limit.

Twice a year is more than enough provided the period in-between the tests is monitored and that enforcement is carried out and that any complaints made are followed up immediately. Any driver can call into the licensing officer and report an issue with a fellow drivers car but whether that is investigated is another matter! More regular spot checks, office visits etc. are a thing of the past it seems. It doesn't take long for any person to walk or drive around the Town to spot issues with many PH and Hackney vehicles but as this is rarely carried out, then the Council think the easiest option is not to monitor but to change policies that ensure their enforcement duties will become less by introducing this age limit.

The decision should be based on evidence. If the existing tests are showing that a significant percentage are not up to standard, then yes, increase the frequency.

Question 8

Do you think the minimum engine capacity of Private Hire Vehicles should be increased from 1400cc to 1600cc?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No

I can't see the argument for this. On economy and emissions grounds this would be a retrograde step. A modern 1.4 is perfectly capable of travelling at motorway speeds fully loaded. Taxis and minicabs don't need to be sportscars!

Why?

I would think that depends on how the vehicle performs. I would think economy is more important than speed.

No manufacturer of vehicles makes an underpowered vehicle. London is currently testing hydrogen taxis. These have a fuel cell system, they are 0cc. Engines in vehicles are far more powerful than in the past.

Not only engine cc but the size of the body as well. Some of the private hire too small. A big built person struggle to get in and out.

With engines power increase - all the positive specifications of vehicles increase - so this maybe a good idea for comfort of drivers/passengers.

I'm not an expert, although perhaps a fully loaded car may struggle on a 1400cc engine, or some and not others.
Specific output from engines have improved. Many 1400cc engines would be more powerful than 1600cc engines. A car needs to have some power. A family size car is considered to be around 1600cc so it makes sense to do this and a larger size for comfort.

Depends on power not engine size

Smooth running and quick speed up. As I said before, including that that the engines are made so much better now, than they used to be. Smaller engines can quite easily manage higher mileages now. Bigger engines will use more fuel and cost more in road tax.

Modern engines are more powerful than those of even a few years ago. A current one litre car has roughly the same horsepower as a 1.6 or 1.8 of ten years ago.

Even for LPG/electric vehicles. Apart from emissions there is more importantly the safety aspect when considering the acceleration capabilities when potentially loaded with 5 persons on board.

If the vehicle is carrying more than 5 people, the combined weight of those people could compromise the performance and safety of the passenger if the engine capacity is too low.

This would exclude most Toyota Prius models which in my opinion the council should be encouraging the use of.

I think a car with bigger engine is much smoother ride and comfort. A paying customer should expect that.

Should be.

I have no experience of the private hire trade.

Lower displacement engines are becoming more common with high power outputs and greater efficiency. Newer vehicles may mean this limit is too high.

Not sure on the logic behind this as some new 1400cc engines have stop/start and low emissions and are able to transport passengers locally and on longer trips.

For what purpose?

Who gains from this? Probably yes as the proposal is for a 2 year phase in period to give owners of the smaller engine capacity vehicles reasonable time to purchase vehicles with larger engines.

Engines are more efficient nowadays, what about hybrids?

This is definitely right. The engine capacity is a key role. Higher engine capacity better quality more safe.

1400cc with 4 in the vehicle is going to put extra strain on the engine

1400cc is far too low for 4 passengers plus driver on a longish run.

Do not take into account technology and hybrid and electric cars

Personally I've never driven less than 1.9 cc
As long as it is roadworthy by the checks I don't see any problems.

I think that the current engine limits are OK, how many of the current Private Hire Fleet are under 1600cc

In this day and age the cost of running and maintaining a vehicle has to be a massive factor before buying a vehicle

I cannot see what benefit this would bring, but have no information on which to form an informed opinion.

The BHP and torque are what counts, not the cc.

Should be on Horse power as this would not help hybrid owners like me.

because of emissions... and keep the cost down for tax and insurance for the drivers.

Many hybrids are less than 1600cc. Also emissions incurred with 1600cc

There isn't really enough difference -200cc. Also shouldn't we be going more green i.e. less fuel burnt, lower emissions etc. car manufacturers should be producing smaller engines. Don't give excuse for larger ones.

I thought part of introducing an age limit was to reduce emissions.

Cannot understand the reasoning with modern vehicles

With todays modern engine 1400cc is okay

Depends on whether the vehicle can perform what it is meant for not about the engine capacity

Not sure, will it mean more emissions?

Small cars can't carry four blokes/persnons

I see this has no impact as a taxi/private hire vehicles

Definitely. I think 1600cc is too low.

Maybe even higher, 1900cc

don't have problem with that

WHAT WOULD THIS HELP ???

In this day & age & the need to cut C.O.2 emissions, we all need to be aware of MPG. So a more efficient vehicle may be over the 1600 cc & may be a 2.0 ltr TDi

I think emissions should be considered and not engine size.

more safety for passengers

It should all be based on horsepower.

As today a 1600 may produce certain emissions but a newer car may be introduced where a 1300 gives the same output and service as a 1600 and the whole policy will have to be rewritten

No will increase carbon emissions

200cc ! - Get real, this will make no difference in a modern engine.

I don't really follow the argument for this. 1400cc engines generally do not equate to vehicles that provide adequate size and comfort nor do they actually make a positive contribution to less 'greenhouse gas' but in many instances they make a negative contribution by virtue of having to work harder and at greater engine revolutions emitting even more pollutants.

Engine capacity does not denote power of engine
I can’t see the argument for this. On economy and emissions grounds this would be a retrograde step. A modern 1.4 is perfectly capable of travelling at motorway speeds fully loaded. Taxis and minicabs don’t need to be sportscars!

**Question 9**

Do you think that Hackney Carriages and Private Hire Vehicles that are adapted to carry wheelchairs should be exempt from age/engine capacity restrictions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 164  
skipped question 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Response Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 3:42 PM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If it improves access opportunities. I’d expect these to be the bigger vehicles with larger engines anyway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 2:45 PM</td>
<td>Not at all. Age must be adopted for the wheelchairs as they carry the disability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 2:41 PM</td>
<td>Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 2:38 PM</td>
<td>Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 12:41 PM</td>
<td>All hackneys are able to carry wheelchairs. Not sure about Private Hire vehicles. Small minibuses are stronger than saloon cars and last longer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 12:20 PM</td>
<td>No vehicle is exempt from age related problems. Do people in wheelchairs not count as much as anybody else?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 11:21 AM</td>
<td>Because of the amount of money invested in these vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mar 1, 2012 11:26 AM</td>
<td>Probably not. This could be seen as implying that wheelchair users can accept different standards to everyone else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mar 1, 2012 11:06 AM</td>
<td>As your aim is to improve disabled use this will enable more cars to remain. The TX models have ramps and therefore should be considered for this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mar 1, 2012 9:43 AM</td>
<td>It costs a lot to convert a vehicle so it will put proces up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Feb 29, 2012 12:28 PM</td>
<td>All motor vehicles have the similar vehicle emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Feb 29, 2012 12:19 PM</td>
<td>Depending servicing, mmaintenance and age Owners will struggle to keep replacing them and there would ne a shortage of these type of vehicles to cater for the disabled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Feb 29, 2012 12:09 PM</td>
<td>The whole point is safety. This would imply that they could avoid changing cabs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Feb 20, 2012 8:38 PM</td>
<td>Common sense should prevail here. Provided the vehicle is well maintained and is equipped to accommodate wheelchairs (i.e.restraining straps fitted/engaged adequately) then engine age and capacity restrictions are irrelevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Feb 20, 2012 3:40 PM</td>
<td>I think it should be a uniform for everyone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Feb 20, 2012 9:53 AM</td>
<td>There must be rules to include everyone not just a few</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I’m not too sure about engine capacity but they should not be exempt from age restrictions. The newer the car better for wheelchair users. Newer cars have better access.

Since all hackney vehicles are able to carry wheelchairs I would support this.

Particularly for converted vehicles already in the fleet.

Age and/or capacity is totally irrelevant.

Owners of these vehicles should probably be encouraged to comply with the age/engine capacity restrictions although consideration would need to be made for the higher cost of replacement vehicles.

Again this could be open to abuse.

Definately not. Disabled people deserves the same safety regime as able bodied people.

But only as far as section six applies

As stated before vehicle condition is paramount

You could argue that one backwards and forwards. Good one for future discussion on committee. I would rely on officers decision.

They still clock up similar mileages and ir anything should carry more stringent conditions

Because these vehicles were built for the disable ones

At the end of the day they are 'Hire' vehicles regardless of wheelchair capability and should conform just like everyone else.

Unless there is a need for some mechanical lift system or other machinery that would assist people in getting in or out of the vehicle. Otherwise I do not see that a larger engine would be needed to offset for any additional weight.

Lets have a level playing field just like our european masters say we should have.

These vehicles only pay £1500 for the lift and it can be moved to their next vehicle easily.

i'm not sure again depends on the vehicle condition and an official to confirm and the vehicle to be checked on a regular occasion

Of course. The cost of converting these vehicles from standard is very high and would make replacement for a new vehicle unsustainable. They tend to travel fewer miles too.

Rules should apply to all relevant sectors within the industry

they do same job as any other taxi

Should perhaps be givena a larger limit as great expense is incurred in the adaptation of vehicles

Wheelchair doesnt make any difference if cc over 1600cc

there should be no exemptions

Why?

Purpose built taxis yes, saloon or MPV no

There should be a level playing field.

I currently drive for NCC as a Qualified Midas Bus Driver, fully Enhanced CRB checked & work with the Disabled on a daily basis.

We have a large amount of Private Hire & Hackney vehicle that are both for abled & disabled persons, so they are obtaining the same amount of work, so must stick to the same rules.

Balanced views... It costs more to adapt the car, but then why show disabled people have to settle for older cars.... No real thought, but we must have enough cars to cater for all.

HOw many are involved???:if only a small % a we could loss some of them with the new rules then NO
However, they should still be subject to the same rigorous testing for safety. They should be even safer than the normal vehicle see 8 above

Of course these vehicles should have the same regulations, are you suggesting wheelchair users should have a reduced level of safety (and not have their extra 200cc of comfort)?

I think all vehicles should be under the same age limit. I am sure wheelchair users are just as interested in their safety as non-wheelchair users.

But only under very strict limits and also only if a thrice a year inspection is adopted.

They are normally more abused than any other vehicle due to the nature of business.

If it improves access opportunities. I'd expect these to be the bigger vehicles with larger engines anyway.

Question 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the minimum engine capacity of Private Hire Vehicles is increased from 1400cc to 1600cc, should Northampton Borough Council Licensing Authority have exemptions (e.g. for hybrids, which are generally 1500cc)?

If you know why you are increasing from 1400cc to 1600cc then you should not be asking this.

Exemptions for any vehicle that can demonstrate that it doesn't do whatever it is that you don't like about 1400s

No manufacturer of motor vehicles makes a vehicle that is underpowered

Dont listen to company owners. Listen to public. Public safety and comfort is more important than size and age of a vehicle.

Either increase it or leave it as it is to keep the trade business as simple as possible. Too much regulations just makes things complicated

If you are going to have exemptions then you need to be able to show that there is a genuine need.

Same as Q8

As for Q8 engine capacity is not necessarily relevant.

As long as the hybrids are of family size that carries 4 passengers. The smaller hybrids will not be useful.

Although it is hoped this is one consultation where the council will actually listen to and adopt the public's responses, so an exemption for hybrids would not prove necessary.

See comment 8 above.
Provided hybrids meet all Council's hackney/private hire requirements, then there is no reason for exemptions.

The minimum size does not need to be raised in the first place.

Hybrids should be encouraged

I cannot see any justification for increasing the minimum engine capacity. It is a generally accepted fact that larger capacity engines have higher emission levels. Enforcing larger capacity engines will increase emission levels. Use of hybrid engine technology should be encouraged.

Hybrid technology is still developing and should not be limited by traditional capacity measurements.

Hybrid or alternative fuel vehicles should be exempted from all engine capacity considerations to encourage uptake.

For environmental reasons, these vehicles should be allowed provided they meet the rest of the Council's specifications.

Keep it simple. 1600cc minimum. If manufacturers see a gap in the market, I'm sure they will develop 1600+ hybrid versions.

What a stupid question. You had no need to put question 8 in. Answered already

You're digging yourself into a hole.

Hybrids should have their own guidelines.

Depends on brake horse power

If the council says 1600cc, this should be the minimum requirement then that should be a formative condition when the vehicle is chosen/purchased

I approve of any move to encourage hybrids or electric vehicles.

Hybrids have 1.5 and 1.4 petrol with electric motor = 130 brake horse power, the same as a 1.9 diesel in power output.

Just think you are opening a new can of worms. What about totally electric vehicles? You should be encouraging alternative methods. Why not let it find its own level? Who in their right mind would run an 850cc or a 6 litre vehicle for general purpose work

This is supposedly a drive to reduce emissions so obviously yes. If the council genuinely wished to reduce emissions then restricted users/no left/right turning (example Marefair and Castle Station) would be open. These restrictions cause congestion in other areas and cause unnecessarily longer journeys hence more expense for customer.

They are environmentally friendly cars. Good for environment.

Please no exemptions at all, which means no loopholes and everybody would be clear of one ruling only. Be brave and take this chance to make one rule for all. No exemptions means no confusion.

Output same as 2,200 diesel so must be good

Why make life difficult. Keep to one rule.

CANT SEE WHY ENGINE CAPACITY SHOULD BE INCREASED

The council makes the rules & regulations, so Private Hire persons or companies to comply with these rules & regulation.

Emmissions should be the main consideration.

we must support any green policies
Again, they should consider horsepower rather than engine size. Yes the hybrids are environmentally friendly. While the whole proposal is pretty ill thought out, inadvertently banning hybrids would be crazy. Environmentally friendly cars are to be encouraged. And encourage investigation into the use of electric vehicles. Exemptions for any vehicle that can demonstrate that it doesn't do whatever it is that you don't like about 1400s.

Question 11

At present all vehicles, irrespective of age, have to have an MOT certificate and a council test to receive a plate and are then re-tested by the Council again after 6 months. Should all brand new vehicles be exempt from a council re-test until 12 months from first DVLA registration?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment

1 Mar 2, 2012 3:42 PM
Don't know

2 Mar 2, 2012 2:57 PM
Depends on the evidence - is this a problem? Don't try to solve problems that don't exist.

3 Mar 2, 2012 12:41 PM
For the 3 years no MOT but council test only.

4 Mar 2, 2012 11:27 AM
I think it is good for a new vehicle to be tested. As I have experienced new vehicles having loose parts on steering.

5 Mar 2, 2012 11:21 AM
yes because they will be brand new and it will be less stressful for the driver.

6 Mar 1, 2012 12:05 PM
Because sometimes brand new vehicles can have things doing required for private Hire purposes e.g. having meter, fire extinguisher etc fixed.

7 Mar 1, 2012 11:26 AM
See Q7

8 Mar 1, 2012 11:06 AM
Light bulbs could fail at anytime. Tyres could be U/S due to damage or wear. So some type of inspection is required but a responsible driver should do that anyway.

9 Mar 1, 2012 9:43 AM
when a new car is bought it is exempt from MOT for 3 years so a year sounds reasonable as it is a brand new vehicle. However council should do an inspection after 5 months and if requires it then an MOT.

10 Feb 29, 2012 12:28 PM
Why waste other peoples money.

11 Feb 28, 2012 7:50 PM
As its under manufacturers warranty

12 Feb 21, 2012 1:20 PM
It is not unknown for both new HC's and PHV's to fail the first Council plating test. The safety of the public is paramount.

13 Feb 20, 2012 8:38 PM
And once a year for the first three years

14 Feb 20, 2012 3:40 PM
If a vehicle is brand new, then there is no need for 2 tests to be carried out in its first year. A normal private vehicle is exempt from an MOT test for 3 years.

15 Mar 1, 2012 7:05 AM
I think they should be exempted for up to 3 years
A new vehicle can develop faults just as much as any other aged vehicle.

It's surprising the number of new vehicles which fail their first MOT.

A badly maintained vehicle can deteriorate to a very bad state from new in 12 months.

No. Due to the wear and tear of these vehicles they should be tested sooner than other cars.

Having to take a brand new vehicle, straight from the showroom, to have an MoT test, is quite frankly, ABSURD.!!

New vehicles can have faults, be they minor or major they should still be inspected.

We all see brand new cars less than a year old with bulbs out and poorly aligned headlights. The MOT and council tests will ensure they are fit to carry the public.

I've known situations in the past where new cars failed their test.

Whether the first inspection is necessary is debatable. Certainly not the second.

I think up to a vehicle of that is X.Y reg and below depending on the mileage should be down to the MOT testing and council to check condition of car!

In 12 months, a fleet "new car" could have mileage of 80000/100000.

Always be tested if the vehicle is in public use

London Taxis has vehicles (Hackneys) new and up to 6 years is 1 test per year and two after.

When you buy a new vehicle you would hope it was roadworthy for the first year.

Only if this could be used as an incentive to encourage more drivers to use new or near-new vehicles.

A new vehicle could be a wreck after 12 months

Then once a year for the first three years to make people buy new cars.

the reason i say no is because regardless of the vehicle they all do roughly the same mileage and all need checking as it is the public who are in danger if anything happens

Due to the excess mileage they could possibly do

Usually new cars are exempted for three years before they can have their first MOT and the council should consider this as well.

But a taxi could cover up to 60,000 miles p/a if running day and night. Again perhaps mileage is a more appropriate measure.

Again if a car is new it doesn't mean its safe

Having just spent £28,000 on a new vehicle I think 12 months is fair. I would also be agood idea to force private hire vehicles to have their plates fixed to the exterior rear of vehicles as do Hackney vehicles. Please enforce this.

Because a new vehicle can do a lot of miles within 6 months, therefore tyres and brakes mainly need checking

fault on car can incur after one day new or old. So leaving garage why can brand new car not have problem.

In 6 months some vehicles are capable of doing 30 - 35000 miles in that time

Also, purpose built taxis should only be tested annually.
in that case brand new vehicles should be exempted for three years

An MOT does not prove that the vehicle is in a roadworthy condition, it is a test that only tests certain things for compliance.

This will encourage people to buy new... And the standard of newer cars is generally better.

A vehicle can be damaged within minutes of leaving a show room. They should all be tested equally. However I understand this will not be incentive then to buy new cars

Depends on mileage driven. Perhaps that should always be the determinant for testing

Even brand new vehicles have been known to have factory faults so all vehicles need testing.

Acts as incentive to get new vehicle

Depends on the evidence - is this a problem? Don't try to solve problems that don't exist.

Question 12

Can you suggest any other ways in which Northampton Borough Council Licensing Authority could help improve public safety, reliability and comfort for passengers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Response Date</th>
<th>Response Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 3:42 PM</td>
<td>No, other than listen to what customers and the drivers themselves say about what could be improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 3:30 PM</td>
<td>I have so much to say this space is not enough. I will write another letter of suggestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 2:57 PM</td>
<td>By regular checking of vehicles that are plated and do not announce that you are doing it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 2:45 PM</td>
<td>I think the safety checks be increased and random checks in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 2:41 PM</td>
<td>Give Private Hire somewhere in the Town they can park without being hounded by wardens all the time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 2:38 PM</td>
<td>Give Private Hire somewhere in the Town they can park without being hounded by wardens all the time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 12:41 PM</td>
<td>No. The comfort depends on how the vehicle is kept clean and safe driving and seatbelts working properly is important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 11:51 AM</td>
<td>Please keep an eye on drunk drivers. They are playing with innocent public life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 11:35 AM</td>
<td>To introduce saloon cars as hackney carriages because they are more reliable, safe and comfortable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 11:21 AM</td>
<td>Need to ask questions separately for Hackney and Private Hire vehicles. Then better suggestions can be made. CONSIDER THIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 11:03 AM</td>
<td>Extra comfort and safety comes with an extra charge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mar 1, 2012 12:05 PM</td>
<td>More frequent on the spot checks from licensing officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mar 1, 2012 11:33 AM</td>
<td>Make town centre emission free zone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Insist on exemplary standards of driving and presentation of the vehicle.

Have more council patrols at ranks to see the cleanliness of vehicles - drivers should keep the inside and out clean for customers. Set up a course for drivers - Dealing with Customers, hospitality?

CCTV camera in vehicles

Dress code for drivers.

To putting more safety features in the cabs such as air bags and to increase road stability etc.

To introduce saloon cars in hackney because they are more comfortable, more stable on the road. Got air bags in front and rear got lot more.

All is being done

To improve LTI quality. You can get a brilliant make of vehicle for that much money with more stable on road and more safe. Ok you should introduce saloon cars as hackneys.

More training, seminar etc

Have all your drivers passed a UK driving test and how stringent is the checking of those passed to ensure they have taken the test and not someone on their behalf.

It could require all drivers holding a private hire licence to take advanced driver training and to take their Institute of Advanced Motorists (IAM) or Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents (RoSPA) test within two years of first issue of their licence.

Closer control of PH operators especially those with large fleets or multiple operator licences. They are prepared to continually charge weekly radio rents knowing that there is insufficient work for the drivers who then have to resort to flagging to make a living. If there are a number of drivers fined for flagging the operator should also be fined. If, after a pre-defined number of fines their licence should be permanently revoked as an unsafe operator.

More ad-hoc inspections of unsafe vehicles with higher penalties for drivers.

Implement ad-hoc inspections for clean vehicles, the drivers receiving a three warning system before token fines being implemented.

More 'sting' operations especially at night/ early morning and at peak times i.e. Friday/Saturday & bank holidays. This has to be a large scale operation and almost instantaneous as for many years the HC's and a vast number of PH'v's disappear as soon as the Licencing/police/immigration/ social services make their first move in town. Mobile phones and radios spread warning very quickly. Clamp down on the drivers who continue to smoke in their vehicles. There are still a considerable number who do.

Implement a random breath test for drivers in the mornings. There are quite a number who drink excessively some nights.

Drivers should be tested (As London cabbies) and have a tachograph

More checks on condition and driving standards

Maybe more checks

I have no idea

Training should be compulsory to teach drivers how to load and unload wheelchairs and deal with disabled passengers.

Just to continue to have ransom checks if they are roadworthy, like what VOSA and the police do, at least once per month.
Many Hackneys are too old to be on the road. Also they are not disabled accessible. Hackneys should not be on the road after 5 years.

Tighten who can drive. Too many thugs and drug dealers driving cabs in the Town. Ban anyone who has been to prison.

More spot checks as frequent as possible

Yes, no smoking means no smoking. The council have given up checking drivers. Should have lived in N'ton 5 years before they get their badge.

More spot checks, more stringent 1st badge.

Stop Hackney carriages flagging in a queue anywhere. Also private Hire should not be allowed to flag

By having an upper age limit for Private Hire Vehicles of 5 years, except for specific purposes, where a 'classic' car may be requested for a wedding, etc.

I'm not aware of any consideration being given to the assessment of drivers, for example frequent eye sight checks, recognised advanced driver training qualification (and ongoing re-assessment).

Ensure that drivers and operators who do not measure up to the required standards are removed from the trade as they give everyone a bad name. Allow hackney carriages to use ALL bus lanes.

weed out bad operators.

Taxis to have vehicle number displayed on the side of the vehicle to aid identification

Each taxi should have a mini camera installed to record the whole journey in a taxi, this protects the driver and customer.

Drivers should be able to speak good English and know where to go which many don't

COLOUR CODE THE VEHICLES AS IN OTHER TOWNS/CITIES/COUNTRIES.

HIRE VEHICLES SHOULD BE INSTANTLY RECOGNISABLE FOR WHAT THEY ARE, HACKNEY CARRIAGE (SAY BLACK) PRIVATE HIRE (SAY YELLOW)

COLOUR CODING ADDS STATUS TO THE TOWN AND ENSURES SAFETY AND SECURITY FOR PASSENGERS.

A company stands or falls by it's service. Quite simply, if a driver turns up in a scruffy looking vehicle, full of rust holes, and stinking of cigarette smoke, the passenger will not use that company again. It is in the company's best interests to have only clean and tidy cars.

Working with owners/operators of Hackney Carriage and Private Hire vehicles to promote a high standard of vehicle maintenance and presentation. It's very disappointing to report of vehicles found in spot checks to have faults such as defective lights and tyres.

Yes increased spot checks and proper policing of the trade, this includes flagging by legal and illegal drivers at peak times not just on the occasional night when the licensing officers feel like it.

NBC should spend more money on road maintenance.
I think you are doing the best

After 12 hours a driver should have 3 hours rest

Current standard of mot/stop check is good enough for passengers satisfaction.

Ensure they can speak English. There is a massive proportion of foreign drivers and some just cant communicate.....

Have a drees standard, some drivers are absolute tramps and do-not give confidence to passengers.

By dealing with flagging more regularly. Concessions are being given to Hackney Cabs i.e. drapery taxi rank and treating private hire as second class citizens because of flaggers.

Quality of service isn’t only based on new reg of the car:

- Knowledge and commnication skills
- Good training and operation of drivers

Spot checks and enforcement top stop flagging would get rid of rogue drivers

Introduce NVQ qualification as standard requirement for all drivers, this would make drivers aware of their safety responsibilities towards the paying public. Put an end to the constant “flagging” that occurs in Gold St and the Horsemarket as vehicles are causing disruption to other sensible road users, who have no interest in breaking the law, by their inconsiderate parking.

Where it does not affect everyone who have vehicles that are over 2001 reg onwards. If need be those cars need to be tested 3 times a year.

Stop giving out so many badges so that drivers can earn money to maintain their cars

By ensuring all drivers have an adequate level of oral and written english language and a competent skill in driving!

There should be more stringent tests on driving standards

More spot checks either days or nights

Stop Hackney and Private Hire vehicles parking in town centre flagging. Get Borough Officers off the office chairs into town and enforce regs. Stop drivers smoking and using mobiles while working

Minimise the illegal flagging by Private Hire at night more.

NBC Licensing could improve by carrying out more stings on flagging rather than the odd clamp down. Unclean cars should also be taken off the road until they are fit to carry passengers. Private Hire drivers are also affected by flagging so that should be considered rather than ignored.
More spot checks and surprise testing with tougher penalties. It is unacceptable that so many vehicles fail these spot checks. Clearly indicative of a problem with the testing system.

Perhaps an approved list of testers for their non-MOT? Or maybe this could be brought in-house to the police or council?

Remove illuminated roof signs which encourage flagging and entice drunken pedestrians to step out into the road in an attempt to flag you down.

As above then after 6 years, 3 plates per year this better to have. New cars make people Think New.

Ensure all drivers speak good english, have studied the highway code, can understand it and abide by it. Check drivers ability regularly.

the council should do more spot checks and catch those flaggers and unlicensed taxis

making sure that the drive has I.D. shown in his car and the interior is in good condition as well as the exterior... English speaking drivers would be preferred not just by me but friends, family and colleagues...

a seatbelt sign advising passengers to always wear seat belts and drivers to reinforce that... maybe a booster seat available as when travelling with children these are required by law and parents cannot carry them around with them when shopping in town with children.

Possibly spot checks however costs are high in policing this.

No....I think that twice yearly test is sufficient, at the end of the day if there were to be a legal case it would be the operator not the council that would be charged so maybe issue all operators with their maintenance expectations.

Concentrate on the quality of driver.

More spot checks

I think the purpose of the MOT every 6 months is to ensure the vehicles are safe. The inspection done at the MOT are more than enough.

Limit the total amount of private hire vehicles and hackneys so that drivers earn a decent living. Then they have no excuse about affordability of new cars and maintenance.

Enhanced CRB, Proper communication, health issue for all drivers

If any change is need to done, I think the old cars like 10 years old need to be tested sooner than 6 months because one of three years old is not need to be the same test for old and young cars.

More spot checks for Hackney/Private Hire vehicles. patrols on Wellingborough Road to reduce amount of flagging on Fri/Sat nights and more public awareness of difference between hackney and Private Hire.

Bring in 10 year rule and 1600cc with no exemptions which would allow a fairly modern fleet of vehicles with latest safety technology which I feel would without a doubt be good for the fare paying public

Some of the smaller vehicles like Fabia's, roomsters etc have very limited leg room and doors not opening wide enough to allow easy access in-out of the vehicle.

Some sort of minimum leg room in the rear seat area. Some vehicles are too short inside. No leg room.

More stringent policing of vehicles
There should be much stricter enforcement of the current rules, especially in relation to flagging.

IMPROVE THE SAFETY OF PRIVATE HIRE DRIVERS FROM GETTING STABBED, FROM RUNNERS AND FOR GETTING ROBBED, PUBLIC SAFETY IS ENOUGH ALREADY

Stop unlicenced cars being used for private hire. This would be more to the council's credit to improve safety than worrying about the cc of an engine. Follow up reports of unlicenced cars and companies and punish individuals before the unsuspecting public travel in these vehicles.

1. Vehicle branded up as PRIVATE HIRE - band on each side of vehicle.
2. Fully Enhanced CRB for ALL drivers (Children & Adults).
3. A uniform & driver's wearing there photo badges, rather than the usual practice of pinning them to the air vents.
4. Limiting the MAXIMUM number of hours that a driver may be behind the wheel, as I have often found driver asleep in the car, obviously they have been on an early shift, worked 'oncall' in the quite times & are still on duty in the late afternoon & into the evening. European working times are 48 hrs Max in any one week, Truck drivers had limits, cars too can KILL - but they are not regulated.

We have good standards and driver checks. The council should consider more enforcement checks.

2 /3 yearly review and survey to general public
Spot checks

Make all vehicles in Northampton Hackneys and give all drivers hackney licensing. This way there will be no fights, every driver will be out for themselves and every driver and vehicle will be on an equal footing and therefore will have to abide by the same rules.

Spot checks, which I know are carried out, are a good way to weed out poor vehicles. These should have their license suspended for 6 months as a deterrent.

Mystery travellers should also be used to report cleanliness of cab & driver, helpfulness, & observing the Highway Code eg not driving over mini-roundabouts, going through amber lights

i have seen a hackney taxi cab driver put his cab on a jack leave it there in the road for days on a jack then fix it himself was he qualified he did the brakes then he carries passengers hes a cab driver not a mechanic i think public safety would be better if just a caddy did not do his repairs we wont be using black cabs anymore and ive spread the word with the cabs reg number surely you do not allow this

- Clean cars
- Good communication skills
- Less taxis, there are too many in this town.
- New cars

Accidents tend to be caused by drivers rather than defects in the vehicles that they drive. If you need to focus on public safety focus on the drivers not the cars.

Only by enforcing breaches. Do not impose further restrictions No
Make reporting bad experiences more transparent and invite customers to complete a short questionnaire [returnable post paid to NBCLA] which each driver is required to hand to x number of passengers per month.

More spot checks, follow up instantly on any complaints and reports and make it easier for the general public to complain about any vehicle they feel is unroadworthy. Also any driver or operators found with dangerous or unroadworthy vehicles should have fines imposed on them.

Stop unnecessary rules such as having an age limit

No, other than listen to what customers and the drivers themselves say about what could be improved.

**Question 13**

Can you suggest any other ways in which Northampton Borough Council Licensing Authority could help reduce emissions/pollutants from Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Vehicles?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Response Date</th>
<th>Response Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 3:42 PM</td>
<td>believe these are tested along with roadworthiness - certainly for MoTs they are. rather than impose general rules about age and mileage, why not limit this directly? (ie any taxi or minicab must demonstrate emissions less than x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 3:30 PM</td>
<td>Please go out on the road and have a good look on so called Hackney carriages the condition and smoke you do not need more suggestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 2:57 PM</td>
<td>Only to make sure readings are correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 2:48 PM</td>
<td>New cars/vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 2:45 PM</td>
<td>Strict test for emissions test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 2:41 PM</td>
<td>yes, stop moving them on in the town! Bounds office has double yellow lines. Remove them and allow 3/4 cars to park and wait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 2:38 PM</td>
<td>Remove traffic lights Sty Peters Roundabout, allow taxis up to gold street from rail station. Turn right out of train station instead of heading to a gridlocked St Peters roundabout and getting stressed from passssengers who think we are ripping them off! Increase traffic flow not restrict it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 12:41 PM</td>
<td>yes, stop moving them on in the town! Bounds office has double yellow lines. Remove them and allow 3/4 cars to park and wait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 12:20 PM</td>
<td>there is many company's that can fit catalytic converters to reduce emissions. I spoke to some coach that go into London city.They have had to have catalytic converters fitted to reduce emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 11:21 AM</td>
<td>Sort out the stupid traffic system where a vehicle has to elongate the journey to get to a destination. (St Peters Way/rail Station fiasco).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mar 1, 2012 12:05 PM</td>
<td>Not only private hire and hackney carriages are on road - there are plenty older cars on road without any problem to pollution so why are we after these cars that are twice MOT tested a year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mar 1, 2012 11:58 AM</td>
<td>Open all bus lanes to us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1, 2012 9:33 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage NCC to eliminate unnecessary traffic signs and the associated delay with vehicles idling. It has been proved that taking whole life cycle into account having older cars has less environmental impact than replacing with new cars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1, 2012 11:06 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Put a number limit of Private Hire and hackney drivers and close the plates for new drivers. Run with the current cars unless buying a hybrid. Other towns have closed their plates - Bedford, Luton, Oxford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1, 2012 11:33 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td>To introduce saloon cars in Hackney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1, 2012 11:26 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t you think this is a dual fare? like on new vehicles like TX4 you are charging higher road tax due to higher emissions when other older vehicles are on low tax. In other words you are trying to put higher emission cars on roads and taking low emission ones off the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 29, 2012 12:09 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>This should be dealt with under the periodic (four monthly) checks. Although statute does not permit the limiting of PHV fleets there would be a perfectly legal method of reduction by adopting suggestions above. This would eventually reduce the number of vehicles polluting the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 28, 2012 3:35 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Continually monitor vehicle improvements and when the time is right go electric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 20, 2012 8:42 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage Hybrids. Turn traffic signals off at roundabouts apart from peak times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 20, 2012 9:33 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Turn off engines when no jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 20, 2012 9:29 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td>By leaving the minimum engine size at 1400cc, or even reducing this to 1200cc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 16, 2012 5:21 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage the use of cleaner alternative fuels and hybrid engine technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 10, 2012 8:11 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Allow hackney carriages to use ALL bus lanes for shorter and less polluting journeys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 29, 2012 8:22 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Promote EVs, hybrids and low emission engines by linking the fees to the CO2 emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 23, 2012 12:16 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Specify emission controls on vehicles for private hire and provide financial incentives for those using hybrids, i.e. lower licence charges and testing fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 19, 2012 4:01 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leave the choice of vehicle to the drivers, and leave the emissions to the legislation for passing the MoT test.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don't interfere..
Working with owners/operators of Hackney Carriages and Private Hire vehicles to promote a high standard of maintenance of the systems that could result in increased emissions/pollutants.

Perhaps also work with other departments to review road routes permitted for taxis can get easily to destinations such as the bus and rail station.

This is difficult Hackney Carriage and Private Hire vehicles like all forms of public transport will generally do high mileage and generally be around town centres and schools, but as long as the council adopts polices which are manageable without excessive costs this could be an ongoing reduction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/Time</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec 15, 2011 10:10 AM</td>
<td>Traffic lights that change from red to green when traffic approaches, especially at night time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 14, 2011 12:39 PM</td>
<td>More spot checks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 14, 2011 12:12 PM</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 14, 2011 11:57 AM</td>
<td>Allow more access and remove restrictions on no left/right turnings. Example from Wood Hill through to the Guildhall. Allow access for Hackney/private hire at all times from railway station into Marefair. Allow left turn at the bottom of Marefair and left turn from Marefair at Sol Central. Allow turn from Horsemarket into Gold Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 14, 2011 10:49 AM</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 14, 2011 10:12 AM</td>
<td>ECO friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 14, 2011 10:07 AM</td>
<td>Encourage stop/start technology vehicles. This would reduce vehicle engine idling time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 14, 2011 9:53 AM</td>
<td>Keep to stringent emissions as published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 14, 2011 9:44 AM</td>
<td>No, cars are tested every six months. This is enough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 13, 2011 5:12 PM</td>
<td>STOP ALL ENGINES RUNNING ON THE ROADS OF BRITAIN, THATS THE ONLY WAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 13, 2011 4:20 PM</td>
<td>No as this should be part of the regular testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 12, 2011 1:03 PM</td>
<td>Limit the number of vehicles allowed in the town centre are - difficult to police - but as these are Private Hire - they should not be parking in the area, as customers need to book in an office. There is already a limit to the number of hackney's allowed in the Town Centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 9, 2011 9:06 PM</td>
<td>Regular spot checks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 9, 2011 4:24 PM</td>
<td>5 to 10 year plan to move all vehicles to Hybrids Electric set out time scale so everybody knows and can budget for the change over. The new VOLT from GM could be the TAXI for northampton of the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 8, 2011 2:04 PM</td>
<td>Emission are tested for, are they not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 7, 2011 10:21 AM</td>
<td>Ensure all vehicles are tested regularly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 7, 2011 9:24 AM</td>
<td>Instruct drivers to turn off engines while waiting for a fare or when stuck in traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 6, 2011 7:42 PM</td>
<td>Consider using LPG powered vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 6, 2011 11:38 AM</td>
<td>Have less taxis, too many plying for limited trade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 6, 2011 9:40 AM</td>
<td>I assume emission testing is part of the council's vehicle test (as it is in the MOT). If air pollution is an issue - again there is no evidence of this - then reflect this is the vehicle inspection and impose lower limits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 5, 2011 10:19 PM</td>
<td>Rely on existing legislation for this. Do not add to the burden. The Council should improve its green policies in relation to transport, park and ride and better cycle routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 5, 2011 5:13 PM</td>
<td>Incentives to use such vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 5, 2011 4:59 PM</td>
<td>Invest in electric and investigate technology already used in other parts of the world where there is less of a 'luddite' attitude.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 5, 2011 2:56 PM</td>
<td>Limit the number of vehicles allowed to be licensed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 5, 2011 2:00 PM</td>
<td>Should not have rules over and above national pollution rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 5, 2011 11:07 AM</td>
<td>I believe these are tested along with roadworthiness - certainly for MoTs they are. rather than impose general rules about age and mileage, why not limit this directly? (ie any taxi or minicab must demonstrate emissions less than x)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If these proposals were introduced, do you think that any individuals or groups would be more positively or negatively affected than others?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positively</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negatively</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please specify, stating who, and suggesting what actions would need to be taken to minimise any potential adverse impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Response Date</th>
<th>Please specify, stating who, and suggesting what actions would need to be taken to minimise any potential adverse impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 3:42 PM</td>
<td>Owners of taxis and minicabs might find their costs increase, through having to replace perfectly serviceable vehicles. Considering discrimination, there could be an indirect issue since drivers (and owners?) are disproportionately male and from certain minority communities. I think a lot of us would be affected. To buy a new taxi costs £30 - £35,000 and for those renting a taxi that would go up too. At present its about £350pw. With brand new taxis that would increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 12:41 PM</td>
<td>Hackney and Private Hire vehicle owners would be put to considerable expense when updating their vehicles. When a vehicle reaches the maximum they would have to purchase a vehicle about six years newer, not the 2 or 3 years as before. More asians own older vehicle than the others. Introduce these proposals and unemployment make go higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 12:20 PM</td>
<td>Hackney drivers will be affected. Things are difficult for families at the moment. What do we do with the cars that are over 8 years? They still have a good value? Compensation for loss of earnings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 11:35 AM</td>
<td>It will effect negatively on individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 11:27 AM</td>
<td>Mostly drivers depending on what company they work for and how much they earn. Hackneys will be negatively affected/mistreated than Private Hire vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 11:21 AM</td>
<td>This consultation is unfair and badly planned/written/asked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 11:03 AM</td>
<td>I am a PH vehicle driver. If these proposals were introduced then I might be paid more for my weekly rental. Not only us but all europe is in big time recession. Those who will have to buy new black cabs will not be able to afford it or make a living out of it. hackney drivers will be affected. Things are difficult for families at the moment. What do we do with the cars that are over 8 years? They still have a good value?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mar 1, 2012 11:33 AM</td>
<td>If vehicles can be sold will they be scrapped which will be use of more energy and resources people in the trade may need to stop working and apply for benefits so more cost to the council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mar 1, 2012 11:06 AM</td>
<td>You will put a lot of us unemployed or in trouble with high rents. Most of the people in this trade have bad credit history and may not be able to get finance again. You are trying to push them to pay more money in the name of rent or claim benefit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ir the proposals are introduced fares will have to be raised to cover the expenditure incurred. e.g. hire charges by the drivers.

Many in this trade have bad credit history and can't get finance so with that proposal you will force them to leave that trade or get a hire car and pay more money for rent. Or claim benefits from job centre.

Black cabs worse hit by idea

Individual will suffer negatively

Maybe driver owner be affected more

they would all be treated equally around car ownership and standards.

Your question didn't really allow for my answer/comment.
The current proposals are too stringent and, in a time when it is quite feasible that someone made redundant may choose to apply to become an owner and may be starting out on a carefully-planned budget, the council should honour its policy statements elsewhere to encourage local enterprise.
The alternative proposals I have outlined above are fairer than those proposed by the council.

Those that currently run responsible businesses will look at the financial viability and probably source business elsewhere thereby leaving Northampton with the ever growing band of suspect drivers who take chances and fleece passengers who are either drunk or more often whom have overslept and had to take a HC or PHV from Northampton Station to an out of town destination.

The public initially at the expense of the drivers.

In current economic climate HC drivers with a tariff rate that has remained unchanged whilst fuel, servicing and plating costs have risen.

PH drivers who struggle to make sufficient to service vehicle costs and income.

However, it should be implemented over a period to facilitate a better transportation system for Northampton.

I don't know the breakdown of drivers/operators

Older Hackney drivers who paid around £30 000.00 for their vehicle and then hope to work part time after they finish their payment

Obviously, every owner/driver of a hackney/private hire vehicle will suffer financially as a result of the new legislation, but as long as the new stringent measures are equally and fairly applied to both hackney and private hires alike, then health and safety will prevail.

Only few people would be able to meet the criteria (drivers).

many drivers will be out with no jobs

It will affect clients for they will be forced to wait longer pick up times.

Driver owner would be more careful to look after the vehicle well

People who have a low income will not be able to afford a new car. People will become unemployed

As a private hire driver I would not be able to purchase a less than three year old car and I know that discussing this with my colleagues this would apply to many.

Operators will clearly be affected, however the plans do provide for a transition period for vehicles that are already licenced. This period may benefit operators by being extended.
These proposals would seem to target the most vulnerable operators who are forced to run older vehicles even if they do so correctly. In the current economic climate this seems unfair.

Private owners. It does not matter how old is your vehicle. if it's maintenance properly it will last. as you put on your background inforn hackey's are build to last longer. Do you have any proof that a normal vehicles are not build to last.

Regular users - considerations will have to be given to the costs of the measures which ultimately will have to be reflected in fares. Might increase fares, which are sometimes already over inflated, as some vehicles will need to be changed due to age. Hybrids cost alot more to purchase so if no incentive to purchase than may get resistance.

keep things as they are ADDITIONAL SAFETY AND SECURITY FOR PASSENGERS . MORE RECOGNITION AND STATUS FOR OPERATORS.

CUT OUT COWBOYS ! Small 'one vehicle' operators would be affected. This trade is hard enough as it is.!

As already identified by the Licensing Authority Asian owners might be negatively affected more than others on age/capacity restrictions so perhaps vehicle age restrictions should overall be considered as less important than a high standard of vehicle maintenance and presentation. A reasonabel phase in time would help to minimise a negative impact on any particular group.

People that rely on a door to door service could be priced out as the proposal will have a cost implication which would have to be passed on eventually to the customer / passenger.

It isn't necessary, if this go ahead majority of driver will be affected due to present state of economy. The public would feel safer in younger vehicles.

The taxi drivers and/or cab firms costs may increase which may be passed on the the public.

Dodgy taxi firms may go out of business. Good riddance! Most, if not all, Taxi drivers will complain and perhaps a reduction of the following years council charge would help sweeten the pill' .

Most, if not all, passengers would be delighted.

There could also perhaps be a small increase in hire charges allowed, maybe 1 or 2 % it would put a premium on on already plated vehicles./ It would put hardship on drivers whose car failed new tests and on operators losing rents making business less stable. Less cars more problems getting people home weeekends in an expanding Northampton (safe)

private Hire Driver having own vehicle. In this economic declining situation its not possible to replace the car, one who using car 10/12 years old. My point of view to give at least 2 years time to bring these packages into effect.

No (as in none of the above)

All will affected but majority very bad affected.

Owner driver private hire vehicles with only one driver will abviously do a lot less mileage than company cars that are being used 24 hrs per day and therefore be unfairly penalised on several counts.

Any person who has purchased a new vehicle with the intention of running it for a period of 10 to 15 years, possibly as their last vehicle before retirement and running it as a single driver, would be adversely affected by the proposed conditions.
eg I have in the past kept a taxi for 10 years driving myself and employing another driver. The total mileage for this vehicle was 550,000 miles when I exchanged it, still in good condition.

My present vehicle is five years old and only driven part time by myself, has covered 130,000 miles.

So by the time it is 15 years old will only have covered at the most 290,000 miles, well bellow the half a million miles the manufactures claim it will last. The council will need to support the small businesses where their actions could put too much pressure on small companies especially in light of the current economic climate.

Yes indeed

Above speak for themselves and are also against the law

Of course it would affect all sole traders who own older vehicles and try to maintain them to a good standard. I cannot answer for operators who own several vehicles i.e. A1 cars etc.

Most of the people who rent their cars out, who make money out of renting their old vehicles, they will be affected the most.

Many private hire owner/drivers would find it difficult to afford to comply. What with fuel and insurance costs rising as the are, the last thing they need is even more unnecessary expense. The council should be trying to help the private hire community, not bury it under an ever growing mountain of costs and beaurocracy.

After you received good ideas put these on another survey.

You will have taxi drivers struggling to meet ends and this will cause more flaging and other activities

The public and licensing authority and maybe some law abiding taxi drivers will be positive about the change but there will definitely be negative comments from the drivers who can not afford the new cars... then maybe they shouldn't be doing the job as they could be putting the public at risk and may not have the insurance to cover a lawsuit if any accident happens and they are not fully covered....

I think that all private hire and hackney owners would incur more cost to the detriment of the general public who would ultimately have to pick up the tab. surely if the vehicles had to be virtually new for first registration then you run the risk of these vehicles being newer but cheaper quality. You'll have a chinese manufacturer supplying cheap vehicles to satisfy the UK taxi market, being unreliable and made from poor quality materials with a life of a few years.

I recently bought a new chinese cheap motorbike. Fell apart in 6 months!

If three years is top go ahead as opposed to 5 years this could hinder growth within the industry and harm prospective employers.

This will reduce the size of the towns taxi fleet. The public will find transport harder to get and drivers will end up unemployed/priced out.

These proposals are just meant to put many taxi/private hire drivers or owners out of business and in this economic climate it will be impossible to buy a new car. Not forgetting nothing much is coming from this business anymore.

Will be more cost to drivers hence more cost to public. Leave things as they are or extend the proposed age limit.

Taxi business suffering big time. By introducing above proposals trade is worse for a lot of them. Not everybody can afford new cars/vans

For me, I am individuals I think will be better, because the groups person will be more negatively because the business (buisness?) may be can be stop and the car to buy will be more expensive.

It would be financially very difficult to buy a new private hire

(Group's) being changing 40 cars in two years would be very costly
It might give drivers more pride in the vehicle they are using.

Hackney trade as some vehicles are older, but safer and better maintained. I think there could be a big impact with regards to drivers/owners not being able to afford to put on a car that is 3 years or younger. This could result in them not being able to work, and therefore private and home lives as well will suffer. You could put people out of work.

WILL BE BIG DISEASTER FOR ALL HACKNEY AND PRIVATE HIRE DRIVERS

Drivers with older cars who look after there vehicles better than some drivers with more modern vehicles could go out of business.

Private Hire Drivers - Think that they own the road anyway, so any changes will come as a real shock.

It would improve safety of the drivers, the passengers, other road users, and members of the public.

It would help raise the profile of the town.

It would improve emmissions.

anything that costs extra money will be resisted, the council have a responsibility to its towns folk to provide a good image of npth to all concerned and not be pressurized by some peoples self intrest

There are both postive and negative effects.

Positive : Better, more fuel efficent modern cars.

Negative : More annual expense for taxi owners, which will have to be passed on to the fare payer.

Customers will feel safer and feel they are getting their moneys worth. Hopefully less accidents / incidents.

Some drivers may however have to invest more, but this will be an option for them and they will not be forced into anything. Similarly the operators may feel aggrieved as they may initially lose out, but safety for public is greater than financial benefit for businesses.

Good companies & individuals would benefit if those who flout their license are weeded out. The public would have a greater confidence in their service.

Drivers would be subject to unnecessary restrictions. Legislation already exists and should not be added to. Accidents should be investigated and acted upon.

Is there any evidence that accidents have occurred in older cars?

I think that owner drivers and smaller taxi companies would be more negatively affected than others. They would have to spend more money on a 3 year old car and then only have a further 5 years to earn enough money to replace the car with another 3 year old car. I don't think this would be economically viable

I am concerned for taxi drivers whose cars are over the age limit. Two years grace doesn't sound very much, I think 3 would be fairer.

All drivers, companies and operators will incur major expenses and will put many drivers out of business. Let's put time and effort into working together and not with the council always finding ways to penalise the PH and Hackney industries that create a huge revenue for the Council.

drivers/owners - more expense

users i.e. anyone who does not own their own vehicle - higher fares (or pressure to increase or reduction in vehicles if not profitable)
Owners of taxis and minicabs might find their costs increase, through having to replace perfectly serviceable vehicles. Considering discrimination, there could be an indirect issue since drivers (and owners?) are disproportionately male and from certain minority communities.

Question15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Response Date</th>
<th>Response Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 3:42 PM</td>
<td>Base it on evidence - what are the real problems that can be demonstrated, and how can they be tackled DIRECTLY as far as possible. Eg, if emissions is a worry, measure emissions not something else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 2:57 PM</td>
<td>Private Hire vehicles should have same rights as Hackneys i.e. using roads that hackneys use. We all do the same job!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 2:41 PM</td>
<td>Think the money spent on this would be better spent on something worthwhile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 2:38 PM</td>
<td>Think the money spent on this would be better spent on something worthwhile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 12:41 PM</td>
<td>I operate a taxi. Its a metrocab. The body don’t go rusty its glass fibre. Seperate chassis.Brakes, steering, brake pipes,carpets, seats, tyres, gearbox, almost everything has been replaced and it gets serviced regular. I don’t want to buty a new taxi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 12:20 PM</td>
<td>These age limits have been thrown out on three previous occasions. The government is proposing new legislation for 2013. This may all have to be thrown in the bin by this. What a waste of time and effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 11:51 AM</td>
<td>Give more power to police to stop and check vehicle on the spot and alcohol test. That is safer for public. I know few drivers drink heavily and drives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 11:35 AM</td>
<td>Bad time to introduce such a bad policy. Can you people individually started spending money in this recession? You will get answer from yourself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mar 2, 2012 11:21 AM</td>
<td>At September meeting 90% affected drivers and people wanted not to go ahead on this subject - but CHAIRMAN MEETING pushed his opinion to waste money on consultation in recession time for age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mar 1, 2012 12:05 PM</td>
<td>More on the spot checks would mean the cleaner vehicles for the public and if the bus lanes were available to taxis that could result in cheaper fares.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mar 1, 2012 11:33 AM</td>
<td>Those who do not know the difference between black cabs and saloon cars and the trade and are not bothered about the downfall of the trade cos of recessions should not be making these decisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Safety and image of Private Hire cars is far more influenced by the drivers. Private Hire drivers should set the highest of standards of driving and presentation. In my opinion they often do not. What evidence does NBC have that accident and injury is a problem in relation to the age of a Private Hire vehicle? Without evidence the proposals seem misguided.

The Hackney is a British symbol and should be maintained. Can help with tourism.

As the work involves driving it is difficult to have a very low mileage car unless bought in 2011

Will affect peoples lives - loss of earnings - especially with the credit crunch.

You are trying to follow other councils but for you knowledge we are less earners from them. And you have done nothing to improve our earnings.

In the time of recession when government not council got enough money the government is trying to give relief to the ordinary man whereas you are trying to screw us into the ground. You should compare our earnings to London cabbies.

Because of the above I see no point in introducing the age limit. Who would benefit???

I just want to get from A to B at a price fair to all.

In this time of recession where people already struggling even government and even you as a council got no money for your needs. Government is trying to give frelief to ordinary man. You people are trying to put us in more trouble. You should also compare our earnings to London cabbies.

Forget this idea

Cancel this consultation

Useless consultation

Age limit can be introduced but it should be a good grace period. I.E. 5 years old first plate then five years plating.

Simply that the council does not have the best of reputations at present for taking any notice of what the public says, so it will be refreshing to see if any of what I have proposed actually makes it into policy. I emphasise that I am a member of the public with no connection to or which the Hackney or Private Hire trades. The views expressed in this consultation response are my own.

1) Take a good hard look at the types of person who hold HK and private hire badges. Often their manner, dress code and personal hygiene will provide a good insight as to the safety and cleanliness of their vehicles.

2) Look at the owners / operators of PH businesses and if, as many do, they flought the law with regard to advertising, "turning a blind eye" to flagging or growing a fleet of vehicles where there is insufficient trade then they are also unlikely to keep their vehicles in a clean and safe manner.

I yhink if this is taken forward it should be taken at least 7 years back
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb 28, 2012 3:35 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicle colours should be standardised. i.e. Hackneys Black with a gold band and Private Hire yellow with a red band. This gives status to the town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 28, 2012 3:23 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some drivers cannot afford to buy new cars. Yes, if these measures are to be imposed to hackney carriage vehicles as a &quot;public transport operators&quot; then surely these restrictions should be applied (age limit/emissions/pollutants/regulatory or otherwise) equally to buses and trains?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 20, 2012 8:38 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>PH - 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 20, 2012 3:53 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hackney - 12 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 20, 2012 3:42 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHV and Hackney should have the same law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 20, 2012 3:40 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>I hope you will consider the factors we have raised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 20, 2012 3:29 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>get rid of old cabs and cars not just the new plating over 5 years dont plate there are too many vehicles 15 - 20 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 20, 2012 3:20 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>My comments is to open a new testing MOT centre in Northampton need competition and cheaper testing centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 20, 2012 3:16 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>still believe PH cars should be allowed up to 10 years old if passed 6 months PH MOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 20, 2012 10:11 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Age of vehicle is by and large irrelevant. An older well maintained vehicle is more safe than a neglected and abused newer vehicle. Although I know the council carry out driving and languate tests I still come across drivers that cannot convers in the most basic english</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 20, 2012 9:53 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes I do. You want our views but the reality is that the proposals brought forward you are going to do them anyway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 20, 2012 9:42 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td>The proposal to increase the minimum engine capacity doesn't make any sense and will increase relative emission levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 10, 2012 8:11 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>If a vehicle is in a fit state to work then its age does not matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 20, 2012 11:56 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td>WHAT TESTS ARE IN PLACE FOR DRIVERS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 20, 2012 9:49 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Current regulations are quite sufficient to weed out the rogue vehicles and companies, and doesn't need any more interference from the authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 16, 2012 8:45 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>To waste resources on this is a disgrace. What statistical evidence is there to show that customers are happier riding in a newer vehicle, rather than a clean and tidy vehicle of whatever age..? This consultation relates to Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Vehicles, but many more vehicles are used in the similar transport roles within the borough and these are not included or restricted, if age was the answer to the safety problem then why are coach and bus companies allowed to use much older vehicles to transport school children to and from school. New cars can have bald tyres just as easily as an old car, this is down to poor maintenance not age of vehicle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 13, 2012 9:23 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td>I think this is wasting of public money to deal with this issue which is not important. That money can be used in other way to policing public safety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a member of the public the seemingly life long feud between the black cab and the private hire drivers at the train station need to be resolved. These proposals would mean all vehicles are equal and therefore private hire taxis should be able to pick up at the station just as black cabs do. The public are currently ripped off by black cab there.

Some Councils do now have all of their Hire cars in Uniform Livery, and very smart they are too.

I think the use of the press is to biased. The councillor who went to the papers with 'chicken' comments should not be allowed to chair the committee and also changing rules to suit his situation i.e. only four of you can talk. This is a democratic country.

To give more time to eliminate/replace the existing vehicle. To avoid financial difficulties to the individual.

I may be available for any further consultation if necessary

In this current economic climate we should all be trying to save money and this would be an extra expense.

Instead of looking at the age of vehicles the council should start concentrating on the quality of drivers and the standard of driving i.e. not knowing the town?inability to speak english/rudeness etc

Employ a full time enforcement officer/s to work all hours 24/7 to enforce all regs for all taxis/cabs to be fair to both not all regs biased for black cabs. Treat all as equal. Stop Hackneys queing other than on ranks

having been a hackney carriage driver for over twenty years and driving old and new cabs and saloon vehicles can the council come up with any examples of compromising public safety or comfort in the said vehicles that have passed a plating test. I think not.

We private hire drivers get abused the most by customers, than hackney drivers.

There should only be one badge for both hackney and private hire

There are too many taxi drivers in Northampton. Do not allow any more

NBC need to be more aggressive when it comes to flagging. PH drivers need to be targeted more and I say that as a PH driver myself. Once in a blue moon stings are not good enough it needs to be constant. The same Vehicles are removed

Yes - I would suggest that the image of the town offered in respect of Hackney and Private Hire vehicles would be improved dramatically by concentrating on an equal degree on the quality of the drivers as on the vehicles. I am willing to bet that if you analyse your complaints that very few will be about vehicles with many more about drivers. i.e. Cleanliness, dress, manners, knowledge of rout, overcharging, ability to communicate, general attitude.

Think Horse Power?

Not engine size thus: The new hybrid electric cars Hydrogen Fuel cells coming through will not be excluded by old laws.

Put a limit on the number of taxi drivers in Northampton so you could make a reasonable living
I do have a comment that relates to taxi.... although it is also a question....

Who sets the prices for the taxi fairs? is this regulated? and why are taxi drivers/firms allowed to charge so much and some taxis don't even have a meter in their car so they can charge what they like!!!

I say change the system and introduce new cars and make it more official without bringing the taxi prices up for the customers. I am buying a new Hackney TX4 when I have paid the 5 years HP I will only have 3 years left to bring me up to 8 years. I then would not be able to drive the taxi and so would lose out. there will be no point in buying a new taxi.

I would have thought that if a vehicle is able to pass a strict MOT test twice a year then what's the problem? Ambulances and county council minibuses are just examined one a year.

Safety should come first, but not at the expense of putting people out of their daily earnings. Introducing age limit is just a way of reducing taxi/private hire number and it has got nothing to do with safety. The safety measures already in place are enough.

On emissions - Its stated that newer vehicles have less emissions. This is true but colossal emissions are produced in the manufacture of new vehicles so the idea is a false economy. The onus should be on manufacturers to produce more efficient vehicles that last longer (the technology and skill is there. Vehicles produced to fail have more corporate profit.

Be practical, use common sense and apply across the board.

In the above questions you asked about cars/public/how to make more money from drivers but nothing about the drivers for e.g. How we can make their lives easier (Please add next time)

I think the NBCLA must check the cars sometimes to see if there are clean and nice smell and good condition, because the taxi company they don't care about public comfort. Some cars need to be excluded (No Space) for passenger and luggage ex VW Golf, Peugeot 308, Hatchback Vauxhall Astra Hatchback.

I think as a tester that a single test station should be reinstated as I see different test standards are giving drivers an excuse to argue points of refusal of their vehicles.

I think that having two testing stations removed some of the authority the council have over the vehicle standards having one played off the other so reducing the overall high standard.

Private Hire initial 3 year is good, also lifetime of working saloon should be capped at 12 years. No age cap for Hackneys.

STOP GIVING UNDUE ADVANTAGES TO HACKNEY DRIVERS PLEASE

IT ALL SEEMS VERY UNECESSARY
Please can you call all drivers both Hackney & Private Hire, with the Police & NCC Inspectors - so that the drivers will be made aware of their responsibilities for their passengers.

I am horrified to see children not correctly strapped in cars, rear seat passengers not wearing seat belts, Drivers on mobile phones.

IT IS THE DRIVER'S RESPONSIBILITY

Termination or suspension of the PH or Hackney licence WILL effect your income.

Thank you for taking this issue forward.

Please seek opinions of customers from train station and bus station as sometimes they feel forced to use a Hackney and not allowed to call a private hire vehicle. This will impact the thoughts of whether an age limit should be introduced in Npton as they are not given the chance to test the competition.

Private Hire companies should not be allowed to permanently advertise by parking vans with hoardings on grass verges, in on-street parking areas etc County Cars have one by Weston Favell centre on the grass verge for months & another on Wellinborough Rd opposite Beech Ave.

I am surprised that in these times of cutbacks and tight budgets the council should be spending time and my money considering any unnecessary additional bureaucracy.

A local PH taxi company collecting night club and pub goers and shoppers will have a more abused and often not so cared about vehicle compared to a licensed Chauffeur driven limousine/executive travel vehicle. The slightly older executive vehicles are better maintained than some newer local PH vehicles.

If there was a real safety issue national government would and should legislate to restrict age of vehicles on roads.

Base it on evidence - what are the real problems that can be demonstrated, and how can they be tackled DIRECTLY as far as possible. Eg, if emissions is a worry, measure emissions not something else.
BLACK CABS

A Comprehensive Review of the Proposal to Introduce Age Limits for Black Cabs & Private Hire Vehicles in Northampton
INTRODUCTION

As a working rule you only know the arguments put forward by the Licensing Officers who are your only conduit for information in and about the Taxi and Private Hire Trade. This document exists to try and redress that imbalance. If you have not had many of the Consultation Questionnaires returned it is NOT because drivers are apathetic but rather they think that the ‘discussion’ is a phoney whitewash and the decision has already been made. Also, if the public have not responded it is because they don’t care anyway. There is a great deal of cynicism regarding the Licensing Officers who are generally held in contempt by the trade as a whole. The lack of trust in them is so great that people genuinely believe that their Consultation papers would be ‘binned’ if they came back with an unfavourable response.

The reason that this is being sent to all the members of the Licensing Committee by email first is to ensure that 11 envelopes addressed to all the Councillors who sit on that Committee do not ‘just go missing’. This reflects the level of distrust and sense of betrayal by the Licensing Officers.

The following is intended to be a comprehensive review of the proposal to introduce age limits for Hackney Carriages (Black Cabs) in the Borough of Northampton, examining its viability and consequences.

For the purpose of clarity I will assume that the reader understands nothing about the Taxi trade in Northampton and will not presume a knowledge that is common to all drivers and Private Hire (PH) Company owners, but will take a step by step approach.

It is strange that during the years of affluence in this country the Borough Council had no views at all on age restrictions for either Black Cabs or PH, and now that we are in the years of austerity, cut backs being made across the country to public services, with rising unemployment, pay freezes (and pay cuts) in the private sector, rising inflation and with things so bad that Mervyn King (Governor of the Bank of England) has repeatedly warned in the national press that the, - ‘... British public must prepare themselves for the biggest drop in living standards for 80 years’.

and with everyone experiencing financial hardship, you wish to ‘upgrade’ the vehicles used in the trade! When the turnover is down 30% over the last 2yrs in the Hackney Trade???
This is laughable and will have the effect of throwing hard working people, many of whom are in the relatively unemployable age bracket of 40-60yrs old, into unemployment who will then claim benefits.

The **perception** that, -

a) The public will benefit from such an ‘upgrade’, and  
b) That there will be improved road safety

is a completely specious argument **without any public benefit merit**, or a basis of statistical data proving that many (or *any*) road traffic accidents have been attributed to mechanical failure: especially of the Black Cabs.

The current state of affairs regarding the Taxi and Private Hire trade can squarely be laid at the door of the **Licensing Department** and successive previous councils who have adopted strategies without any regard for their consequences, **who abrogated their legal duty of care to the Hackney Carriage trade, and who acted in breach of their statutory duty under the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976, over a period of many years.**

This latter point will be dealt with at length because it has had such a profound effect on the entire Taxi environment which has resulted in regulation when such interference was not necessary, and lack of regulation when it was required. Some of the aforementioned ‘regulation’ (and lack of it) also breached competition law under the terms of the **Competition Act 1998 & The Enterprise Act 2003.**

As an addendum to this review you will find:

- Copy correspondence sent to Mr Bayliss and which was also copied to Inspector Rayfield  
- A statement issued by London Midland Plc about the abolition of the unlawful ‘closed shop’ arrangement at Northampton Railway Station, which was **facilitated and sustained** by Northampton Borough Council through the negligence and/or complicity of its Licensing Officers, which was deemed unlawful by the said Railway Company. In order to minimise their legal liabilities, London Midland applied this ruling to their entire network where there existed similar restrictive trade practice ‘access cartels’.
- A breakdown of the economic reality of owning a Black Cab on finance as experienced by John Hills, the Secretary of the **Northampton Hackney Carriage Drivers’ Association.**
- The last two (2) MOT certificates of mine which indicate the low mileage that we are now doing as a result of the economic downturn: *(you will no doubt remember that at the meeting that was open to the public back in September, that Steve Ward declared that each of his vehicles averaged around 100,000 miles per year! I do around 30,000 in my Black Cab).*
**1) THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN HACKNEY CARRIAGES AND PRIVATE HIRE VEHICLES**

**Hackney Carriages** (hereinafter referred to as ‘Black Cabs’) are purpose built vehicles, predominantly of the iconic ‘London Taxi’ design, but also include the ‘E7’ model as well as ‘minibus conversions’.

- A Black Cabs (London Style) are built by the [London Taxi Company](#), (‘LTI’) and are of the model designated ‘TX’. The older Blacks Cabs are the Fairway and TX1 models. These have 2.7ltr engines which are capable of doing well in excess of [1 MILLION MILES](#).
- They operate exclusively from ranks where the public queue for a cab.
- They can lawfully accept ‘flag’ fares from the highway, i.e. where a member of the public indicates that they would like the Taxi to stop and pick them up.
- They may also accept work that has been pre-booked.
- They are wheelchair accessible.
- Depending on their design (i.e. London Cab style, E7, or minibus conversion) they carry between 5 and 8 people at the same tariff rate. Black Cabs carry either 5 or 6 people, E7 taxis carry 7, and minibus conversions carry either 7 or 8.
- Black Cab fares are set by the Council.
- Black Cabs are differentiated from PH vehicles by the colour of the rear council number plate. Previously this was white, but has now changed to brown and white.
- **CRUCIALLY** a Black Cab must be under 3yrs old at first plating, and any older Black Cab must have been previously plated in the Borough, and cannot be introduced from outside the Borough.
- The 3yr age limit at first plating does **not** apply to the E7 or minibus conversion style Hackney Carriage, which must be new at first plating.
- A new Black Cab will cost around £35,000, and at 3yrs old will usually cost £16,000 - £18,000.
- **EXEMPTION** from the 3yr rule in if the Black Cab is in ‘exceptional condition and has low mileage’.
- A new E7 or minibus conversion style Hackney Carriage will cost around £26,000 (E7) & £27,000 to £32,000 for the minibus style Hackney Carriage.
Private Hire Vehicles (hereinafter referred to as ‘PHV’s) are ordinary family saloons or hatchback cars over 1400cc but which may also be varying designs of minibus.

- PHV’s must be booked in advance
- PHV’s work for an ‘Operator’ (i.e. Bounds or A1 etc.)
- They are not permitted to ‘flag’
- If a PHV takes a passenger who has NOT be pre-booked then his insurance for that journey is null and void and amounts to the criminal offence of driving without insurance
- They receive their work via radio link, or, more usually, by PDA data screen
- PHV’s are not permitted to form ranks outside their offices, and ostensibly, prospective passengers are not permitted to form queues for their services outside their booking offices
- They are not permitted to stop for a ‘flag fare’ and then allow that person to telephone their operator control office to book them. The proper course is for the booking to be taken and a separate vehicle to be despatched by their Operator
- They pay a rent’ to their Operator, ostensibly for the radio or ‘PDA’ device which communicates their pick-up destinations.
- A small minority of PHV’s (i.e. vans) are wheelchair accessible but obviously, most family saloon style PHV’s are not wheelchair accessible
- The rent they pay to the Operator depends on how much work they receive. i.e. a busy Operator may charge £160 per week whereas a smaller Operator with less work might only charge £80
- PHV’s are differentiated from Black Cabs by their yellow rear Council number plate, and by the presence of an illuminated roof sign
- The Council does not directly control the tariff of the PHV’s
- **CRUCIALY a PHV does not have to be new at first plating**
- **A PHV may be of any age at first plating and the cost varies between £200 from the Car Auctions to a £35,000 Mercedes or any costly, new, minibus.**

2) **DISPARITY BETWEEN PRIVATE HIRE VEHICLES AND BLACK CABS**
As can be seen from the above there are significant differences:

- A Black Cab **must** be under 3yrs old at first plating and **no** older vehicle may be introduced from outside the Borough, **UNLESS it is in ‘exceptional condition and with low mileage’**
- A PHV can be **any age** at first plating, and **any family saloon car or minibus of any age** is permissible
- Any appropriate PHV can be introduced from outside the Borough
- A Black Cab will cost anywhere from £27,000 (for the E7 type) to £35,000 for the iconic London Style Black Cab
- A PHV can cost as little as £200 from a Car Auction (as long as it meets the usual MOT criteria).
- The older **Fairway** style of Black Cab together with the older **TX1** style are virtually indestructible and **can provably do over a million miles**
- The overwhelming majority of PHV **non-purpose built family saloons** will be ready for the proverbial ‘knackers’ Yard’ by **300,000 miles**
- **A Black Cab driver must sit a 2 hour written test**
- **A PHV driver must present himself for a 10 minute oral test**

As you can see it is much more arduous to qualify as a Black Cab owner and considerably more **financially onerous** to own a Black Cab than a PHV.

3) **THE EFFECT OF THE 3 YR RULE ON THE HACKNEY CARRIAGE TRADE**

- Because it is impossible to introduce a Black Cab older than 3yrs into the Borough from outside, this has led to an **artificial value for older Cabs plated within the Borough**
- **Example:** I had to pay **£10,000** for a Black Cab that was 8yrs old, and with a **general market value** (outside the Borough) of only **£3,000**
- In the event of a non-fault accident that writes the Black Cab off, the insurers will **only pay the value of its market price, which is £3,000**, and not the **£10,000** it cost. **This has already happened to drivers in the past.**
- **So much for the Council’s Legal Duty of Care in evading the consequences of their own rules!**
- As in the present instance, proposing 8yr or 10yr age limits on highly expensive vehicles (i.e. Black Cabs), **it is easy for a bureaucrat working in the Licensing Department, working on his SECOND index linked pension, and who has NEVER, himself, been involved in any career activity that is measured by productivity and with a pay structure that is performance related, to impose financial burdens on others who are already working at the raw edge of free market economics**
• A Black Cab driver therefore, in the circumstances outlined above has been forced into a £7,000 uninsured risk (and loss) through the thoughtless (mindless) application of a short sighted rule
• The 3yr rule has also ensured that it is sufficiently more financially onerous to purchase a NEW Black Cab, or even an older one plated in the Borough, than buying a PHV for £500 from the Car Auctions. This is why the numbers of Black Cabs are artificially too low in Northampton compared to the PHV’s

This is not only unconscionable but most likely also a breach of Competition Law. It is a state of affairs that is contrary to any public benefit.

NOW, let us examine the Breach of Statutory Duty by previous Councils, which has had such a profound effect on shaping the ENTIRE Taxi and PHV trade in Northampton:

4) NORTHAMPTON BOROUGH COUNCIL’S BREACH OF STATUTORY DUTY AND HENCE LEGAL DUTY OF CARE TO THE HACKNEY CARRIAGE TRADE

• The Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976, imposes a mandatory duty on the Borough Council as the Licence Issuing Authority, to police and stop the practice of ‘flagging’ by PHV’s.
• Over a period of years the Licencing Officers seemingly made desultory attempts to prevent this widespread practice, and was in permanent breach of this provision. Until recently, with the establishment of what has been designated a ‘temporary Night Hackney Carriage rank’ in the Drapery, there was a permanent rank of PHV’s touting for trade the full length of the Drapery on a Friday and Saturday night, most notably stealing jobs belonging to the Hackney trade from MacDonald’s restaurant. The establishment of the rank has now curtailed this activity many years too late. This was only made possible after I wrote a highly pertinent letter to Mr Bayliss that was also copied to Inspector Rayfield (copy enclosed in the ‘addendum’ section of this report, and which uncomfortably drew their attention to the recent and evolving area of law regarding the offence of corporate manslaughter.
• The combined effect of the consequences of the ‘3yr rule’ being applied only to the Black Cabs, together with no power to restrict the number of PHV’s under the Act, and the breach of statutory duty in failing to prohibit the prevalence of ‘flagging’ effectively demolished the checks and balances structured into the Act. This resulted in the unsustainable growth of some Private Hire Companies, (notably A1 Taxis), which could not provide sufficient legitimate bookwork for their drivers, and which was essentially just a
licenced flagging operation’, with a fleet of around 60PHV’s and with bookwork for probably only 6! Since the introduction of the aforementioned temporary night Hackney Carriage rank in the Drapery, which has effectively prevented the customary mass flagging activities of the PHV’s, free market economics have partially redressed the balance by making continuation of A1 Taxis unviable, and it was sold to Bounds PH Company just a few days ago and is now essentially defunct

- This is likely to the scenario of several other PHV’s who have similarly been the product of the Borough Council’s breach of statutory duty

5) Previous Councils Supported and Condoned a Long Standing Restrictive Trade Practice at Northampton Railway Station by Breakaway Group of Black Cab Drivers

- Over a period of about 20yrs a ‘closed shop’ existed at Northampton Railway Station, the most lucrative Hackney Carriage rank in the County.
- This group of drivers formed an unincorporated association, which under the terms of the Partnership Act 1890 made every member jointly and severally liable. This rank was closed to approximately half the Hackney Carriage Trade
- The Licencing Department knew of this state of affairs but refused to act, fatuously stating that it was private property and they had no jurisdiction (or right of censure) over a group of drivers who independently contracted with a third party within the Borough!
- Such an arrangement was clearly contrary to competition laws, which the Council knew or ought to have known
- I brought this matter to the attention of London Midland Plc, who after consulting their legal department, agreed and declared the contract that they had with this ‘unincorporated association, null and void
- I drafted a case against Alan Payne (Black Cab driver) who, as Chairman was being sued, by John Hills, in a representative capacity on the basis of joint and several liability, in the Chancery Division of the High Court. The case was dismissed over a misunderstanding about the scheduled trial date. The matter is not dead and an application has been made to renew the proceedings
- The Council, through its Licencing Officers is ultimately liable to the Hackney Carriage Drivers who were unable to earn a living by plying for hire at the most lucrative rank in the town
- Another ‘closed shop’ similarly exists at Weston Favell! The Hackney Carriage Drivers’ handbook clearly identifies 3 Taxi ranks from which ALL Hackney Carriages can ply for hire. Over many years, the reality was that only ONE rank could be worked by ALL members
- Even the Hackney Carriage test poses questions relating to the departure from each of the 3 ‘notional’ ranks
This is just further evidence of the unprofessional and cavalier manner in which the Licencing Department has dealt with the Hackney Carriage Trade

I would suggest that you consult the Borough Solicitor over your legal position in this matter

6) THE CONSEQUENCES OF ALLOWING SUCH A RESTRICTIVE PRACTICE TO EXIST OVER A 20YR PERIOD

Because there were a restricted number of Taxis working at the Railway Station it ensured a very good livelihood for those who benefited. The result was that they earned sufficient money so as not to have to work nights or weekends

This lead to a shortage of Black Cabs working in the town centre at nights and weekends, and the opportunity was seized by emergent PVH companies whose cars went out ‘flagging’

Given the shortage of Black Cabs, and the large number of people who needed to be cleared from the town on busy weekend nights, both the Council and the Police turned a blind eye to the practice of ‘flagging’– i.e. driving without insurance

The recognition of this illegal closed shop operating within, and dividing, the Hackney Trade was the direct cause of so many of the problems in the trade

When you put all these factors together:

a) The 3yr limit on Hackney Carriages entering the trade without a similar restriction imposed on PHV’s:

b) The prohibitive cost of getting into the Hackney Trade as opposed to PHV:

c) The closed shop at the Station making it difficult for new Hackney carriages to enter the trade and earn a living:

d) The Council’s failure to prohibit PHV’s flagging:

makes it galling that a subsequent Council, which is ignorant of the short sighted legal ignorance and administrative incompetence of its predecessors and its Licencing Officers should now seek to add to the burdens that have been imposed on hard working enterprising people who have enough about them to get off their backsides and risk a significant investment, should NOW seek to impose age restrictions on perfectly road worthy vehicles!

7) METHODOLOGY OF THE CONSULTATION QUESTIONNAIRE
The questions which relate to age as a safety factor are invalid for TWO reasons: 1) they presuppose the answer and 2) they seek the opinion of the person, which is irrelevant. The ‘opinion’ is irrelevant because unless it is based on solid statistical data that conclusively identifies mechanical failure due to age as a factor in a given number of accidents, it is more prejudicial than probative.

As such it is outside of the knowledge of the average layman member of the public, who would then merely express a ‘preference’. Establishing a ‘consensus of ignorance’ through biased questions serves no objective purpose.

If the Council ran a Consultation Questionnaire on Public Spending, would it be a ‘skewed’ question to ask if the Public would prefer to accept cuts to Public Services but pay the same Council Tax, or just leave things as they are? The preference or ‘opinion’ of the layman is irrelevant because the argument is underpinned by economic reality.

The questions relating to identical age limits for both PHV’s and Black Cabs fail for the same reason. They provide no differentiation between either the cost or performance of purpose built vehicles versus family saloons, and as such are ‘unfair’.

The superficiality of the questions has no bearing on the substantive arguments raised in this Report, which exist independently of any consensus of technically uninformed opinion.

8) SUMMARY

A unified age limit on both PHV’s is nonsensical as it does not take account of the disparity in cost, or robustness of the vehicles.

The imposition of any age limit is largely irrelevant as long as the vehicle meets all existing legal criteria.

Unlike family saloons and either E7 or minibus conversions OR minibus’s used as PHV’s the TX series of Cabs are purpose built, can be stripped down to the chassis and ALL panels replaced.

Ironically, it is the older Fairways and TX1’s which have by far the most robust engines which have proved themselves capable of doing well in excess of 1 million miles.

The Council has made the assumption that because ‘half’ the Boroughs in the country have introduced age restrictions,

a) this is a good thing, and

b) that it is preferential as opposed to ‘equivocal’
Whilst stating that ‘half’ the boroughs in the country have introduced age limits there has been no evident enquiry, or statement regarding whether those boroughs, like Daventry, for instance, have purpose built Hackney Carriages or whether they simply have Ford Mondeos (as does Daventry) which are plated as Hackney Carriages, ALSO ignoring the fact Black Cab plate capping also exists in many boroughs that have introduced age restrictions (Leicester for instance)

Plate capping has been introduced in some of those places adopting age restrictions as a means of protecting the much higher investment needed to provide purpose built, wheelchair accessible vehicles.

It would be more useful to upgrade the PHV fleet with the adoption of a similar 3yr restriction on vehicles at first plating, which would prevent the inclusion of cheap and dated looking vehicles from Car Auction rooms. This would also be compliant with Competition Law.

The Financial Environment further militates against introducing upper age limits as the situation is undoubtedly going to get worse in view of the fact that £1 TRILLION DEBT has not yet been reduced by ONE PENNY, ensuring that deep and prolonged cuts are inevitable, and that this is not the time to be creating more unemployment and hardship when our administrators should be doing all they can to alleviate that hardship.

It is absolutely NOT in the Public Interest to impose additional costs on people making such considerable investment (and taking such RISK), which would inevitably have to be passed on to the consumer.

Furthermore: the age limit proposals as they stand would impose a kind of economic apartheid against those with poor credit histories which would effectively deny them the right to work on the grounds of not being creditworthy.

IRONICALLY, it is the owners of the older Taxis which have superior engines, and who have already paid for their vehicles, who are best positioned to survive the inevitable economic hardship facing us all.

Those with the newer Hackney Carriages with mortgagesized monthly repayments are likely to go to the wall.

If any of the members of the Licensing Committee actually believe that Black Cab drivers are earning vast amounts of money then PLEASE come to Northampton Railway Station at 5.00pn, any week day, and witness how few of the disembarking hordes of passengers catch Taxis.
I personally work between 70 to 90 hours per week (as do most of us) and there is no room for further costs to be imposed on us.

**IN CONCLUSION**

I would be most grateful if you would not make a final decision without open discussion from the elected representatives of the Hackney Carriage Drivers’ Association, namely myself, Paul Bruere (Chairman), and Jonathan Hills (Secretary).

You will find Mr Hills’ economic breakdown of the costs of owning a new Black Cab on repayment, in the addendum to this Report, very illuminating.

**Paul Bruere LLb**
Consultation

Review of the Technical Specifications for Hackney Carriages and Private Hire Vehicles to introduce an age policy and increase of engine capacity for Private Hire Vehicles from 1400cc to 1600cc.

Introduction
On 27 September 2011 the Northampton Borough Council Licensing Committee agreed to consult on the feasibility of introducing age limits for Hackney Carriages and Private Hire Vehicles, to increase the engine capacity of Private Hire Vehicles from 1400cc to 1600cc and associated exemptions.

The committee requested that all interested parties, be they in the trade, associated with the trade or members of the public, have the opportunity to have a say.

This is your opportunity to have your say. Here is a link to some background information that you will need to read to complete the questionnaire To complete the questionnaire please click here [insert link].

For a paper copy, more information or help in completing the questionnaire please contact the community safety team on 01604 838986 or email licensing@northampton.gov.uk

The consultation starts on 01 December and runs until 12.00pm 29th February.

What happens after the consultation?

The findings of the consultation will be reported back to the Licensing Committee in May 2012 for a decision to be made on whether to introduce amendments to the Technical Specifications for Hackney Carriages and Private Hire Vehicles.
Background information for Hackney Carriage and Private Hire vehicle consultation.

Nationally around half of local authorities have an age limit for their Hackney Carriages and Private Hire Vehicles in a bid to improve public safety. In Northamptonshire, Daventry, Wellingborough and Kettering have introduced such a policy.

Current age limits in relation to Hackney and Private Hire Vehicles and Technical Specifications for Private Hire Vehicles

In October 1997, Northampton Borough Council introduced a lower age limit for Hackney Carriages. It requires that these vehicles must be less than three years old when licensed for the first time. There is no upper age limit placed on these vehicles thereafter, as they are purpose-built vehicles that are generally more robust than the average family saloon.

There is currently no upper or lower age limit in relation to Private Hire Vehicles. Private Hire Vehicles are usually vehicles representative of the private car fleet e.g. medium/large saloons, people carriers for up to eight passengers and some limousine type vehicles for specialist hire.

The current Technical Specifications for Private Hire Vehicles are:

1. That the vehicle is in an immaculate condition both mechanically and cosmetically. There is no age limit on this type of license, but vehicles are expected to remain in a first class condition.

2. That the vehicle is right hand drive. We will not accept any "conversions" from left to right hand drive under any circumstances. The vehicle must not have less than four road wheels. They will still need to pass the Council test.

3. That the vehicle (if a car) has a minimum of 4 doors giving adequate access and egress from the vehicle. The design of the car can be saloon, hatchback, estate, or MPV.

4. That the vehicle has a back seat width (when measured in a continuous line from edge to edge) of at least 1220mm (48 inches).

5. That the vehicle provides easy access from a door to any passenger seat.

6. That the vehicle is constructed or adapted to carry a minimum of 4 passengers in comfort.

7. That the vehicle (if a minibus or "people mover") has sufficient doors of sufficient size to allow passengers to get in and out quickly and safely.

8. It is a requirement of the Council that seat belts be provided for all persons, irrespective of age, and according to the licensed capacity of the vehicle.

9. The license number shall be displayed on the outside of the vehicle on the official plates provided.
10. Our policy being a vehicle, 4-door saloon or estate of not less than 1400 cc, and includes specific measurements relating to the interior and exterior of the vehicle, and other nominated specialist vehicles.

(Due to the size of the technical specifications for Hackney carriages document we are making them available here, or a copy can be obtained by telephoning the number above).

The licensing authority may not restrict the number of such vehicles.

Currently there are 569 Private Hire Vehicles in Northampton, 140 (24%) of which are over eight years old, and 69 (12.2%) of which are over 10 years old. Of 132 Hackney carriages, there are 30 (23%) which are over 10 years old. We would expect there to be a higher percentage of Hackney carriages over 10 years old as they are purpose built vehicles designed for higher mileages.

When considering adopting an age limit policy, the determining factors that influence local authorities are:

- The interests of public safety
- Reducing pollution/emissions
- Establishing commonality across the trade/improving the overall standard of the fleet
- Ensuring comfort and reliability to fare paying passengers.
- The promotion of quality of life and accessibility

Public safety:

Ensuring licensed vehicles are as safe, reliable and comfortable as possible is the responsibility of local authorities.

There have been significant improvements in safety features by manufacturers that would imply newer vehicles are safer.

During this consultation Northampton Borough Council will also be seeking evidence from local inspectors to help inform the Licensing Committee’s decision.

Emmissions:

The European Union has developed a number of emissions control measures that all new vehicles must comply with. European emission standards define the acceptable limits for exhaust emissions of new vehicles sold in EU member states. The emission standards are defined in a series of European Union directives staging the progressive introduction of increasingly stringent standards.

For further information see:

http://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/transport/index_en.htm

Introducing upper and lower age limits could help meet the European emissions regulations by reducing significantly emissions from vehicle exhausts. The European Commission on Climate
Action claim that a 10-year-old vehicle will emit approximately 20 times the emissions of a new vehicle.

**Commonality across the trade/improving overall standard of the fleet:**

If Northampton introduces an age limit, the question of whether the limit should apply to both Hackney Carriages and Private Hire Vehicles should be considered. A limit that is common to both would mean that all owners have to comply with the same conditions and standards.

At present a Hackney Carriage must be less than three years old when licensed for the first time in order to trade. There is no such condition for Private Hire Vehicles, which means that any vehicle that complies with the Technical Specifications of the Vehicle Policy and passes an MOT test can operate as a Private Hire Vehicle.

**Accessibility**

Taxis and Private Hire vehicles play an important function in the life of people with disabilities. The Department of Transport report they are used 67% more by people with disabilities. It is essential we consider the needs of people with disabilities and the potential links to the age of vehicles and the benefits to disabled people in relation to their accessibility and quality of life.

**Current engine capacity policy**

Currently the Northampton Technical Specifications for Private Hire Vehicles requires a Private Hire Vehicle to have an engine capacity of no less than 1400cc. When mini-cabs (Private Hire Vehicles) first began trading they were, as the name implied, small cars that made short journeys. Today a great deal more is expected of them, and airport runs are part of everyday life. The safety and comfort of passengers and drivers is paramount, however, as well as engine capacity, consideration should be given to Brake Horse Power and ‘cleaner’ engines and not just engine size as these vehicles are often less than 1600cc. However, any vehicle must still comply with the other Technical Specifications for Private Hire Vehicles listed above.

**Proposal**

1. A Private Hire Vehicle licensed for the first time will be no more than three years old from the date of first registration. This will bring Private Hire Vehicles in Line with the current lower age limit for Hackney Carriages.

Providing the standard is maintained in line with the Technical Specifications for Private Hire Vehicles, Hackney Carriages or Private Hire Vehicle can be licensed for a further five years.

Hackney Carriages or Private Hire Vehicle will not be able to renew that licence once it is more than eight years old from the date of first registration.

2. The engine capacity of Private Hire Vehicles be increased from 1400cc to 1600cc.

**Exemptions**

- Prestige Vehicles – we cannot give a definitive list of models that constitute a prestige vehicle, however examples would be Bentley, Rolls Royce and vehicles currently
licensed as chauffeur driven vehicles. Each vehicle would be considered on its own merits. A prestige vehicle would not be used for everyday private hire usage, but only available for hire to undertake specific events or contracts where the use of the vehicle is necessary for the running of the vehicle owners business. A prestige vehicle would also have to meet the Exceptional Condition criteria.

- **Exceptional Condition**

Vehicles of exceptional condition will still be considered for a licence but, should a vehicle fail its first test when over eight years old, it cannot then be considered as being in 'exceptional' condition. To determine exceptional condition the following guidelines will be applied

1. The vehicle must pass the Council vehicle inspection,

2. The bodywork should be in near perfect condition with no signs of panel age deterioration, dents, scratches, stone chips or rust or any other abrasions that may detract from the overall appearance of the vehicle.

3. The general paint condition should not show signs of fading, discolouration or mismatching that may detract from the overall appearance of the vehicle.

4. The interior trim, panels, seating and carpets etc should be in excellent condition clean, free of damage and discoloration.

5. The vehicle service record can be used as supporting evidence of exceptional condition in that a vehicle of exceptional condition would normally be expected to demonstrate regular servicing and maintenance in accordance with the manufacturer's service specification.

6. The vehicle to be in excellent mechanical condition and in all respects safe and roadworthy with no signs of corrosion to the mechanical parts, chassis, underside or body work.

7. The boot or luggage compartment to be in good condition, clean and undamaged

8. Low mileage – Hackneys and Private Hire vehicles generally incur higher mileages than domestic vehicles. In considering low mileage in this context we would view a private hire vehicle or hackney carriage to not have exceed 15,000 miles for a petrol engine and 20,000 miles for a diesel engine per year since the date of its first registration.

If an age limit is introduced it is recognised that this may affect vehicle owners who currently license vehicles that would not qualify under the proposal. In order to minimise any impact, the introduction of an age limit would only relate to new license applications, with all existing licensed vehicle owners being allowed to license their vehicles for a further two years. So for example a vehicle which is currently 12 years old could be licensed for a further two years as long as it passes the MOT test.

- Hybrid vehicles and those with clean alternative fuels
- Vehicles adapted to facilitate wheelchairs and disabled persons in general
• Disabled drivers who have had substantial adaptations made to their vehicle

**Equality Impact Assessment**

An Equalities Impact Assessment has been undertaken to consider the potential impacts, positive and negative to groups of people that may be affected by the introductions of these proposals. The Assessment will be reviewed and amended through the consultation as information is gathered and will also inform the decision of the Licensing Committee in May.
NBC Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Vehicle Consultation

This is a consultation on the age limits and engine capacity for hackney and private hire vehicles. On 27 September 2011 the Northampton Borough Council Licensing Committee agreed to consult on the feasibility of introducing an age limit for Hackney Carriages and Private Hire Vehicles, increase the engine capacity of Private Hire Vehicles from 1400cc to 1600cc and associated exemptions.

The committee requested that all interested parties, be they in the trade, associated with the trade or members of the public, have the opportunity to have a say.

This is your opportunity to have your say.

We advise you to read the background information which can be found at www.northampton.gov.uk/taxiconsultation or upon request. For more information or help in completing the questionnaire please contact the community safety team on 01604 838986 or email licensing@northampton.gov.uk.

Postal questionnaires can be returned to:

NBC Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Vehicle Consultation
Community Safety Team
Northampton Borough Council
1st Floor, 14 Fish Street
Northampton
NN1 2AA

or hand-delivered to the licensing desk based at the One Stop Shop.

The consultation starts on 5 December and runs until 12 noon on 29 February 2012.

The findings of the consultation will be reported back to the Licensing Committee in May 2012 for a decision to be made on whether to introduce amendments to the Technical Specifications for Hackney Carriages and private Hire Vehicles.

All personal information will be held and used and stored in line with the Data Protection Act 1998. We will use the data you provide solely for the purpose of reviewing Council policy associated with this consultation.
1. Are you? (Please tick all that apply)

[  ] A member of the public
[  ] Hackney Carriage owner
[  ] Hackney Carriage driver
[  ] Private Hire Vehicle owner
[  ] Private Hire Vehicle driver
[  ] Vehicle testing centre/inspector
[  ] Private Hire Operator
[  ] Other (please specify) ____________

2. Do you think that the age of a vehicle is related to its roadworthiness?

Yes/No/Don't know

Comments......................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................

3. Do you think that the age of a vehicle relates to its safety?

Yes/No/Don't know

Comments......................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................

4. Should Northampton Borough Council Licensing Authority adopt age limits that are common to both Hackney and Private Hire Vehicles?

Yes/No/Don't know

Comments......................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................

5. If Northampton Borough Council Licensing Authority was to introduce age limits, do you think the proposed age limits are correct?

Yes/No/Don't know

Comments......................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
6. Do you think Northampton Borough Council Licensing Authority should have exemptions from the age limit for vehicles that are in exceptional condition and have low mileage?

Yes/No/Don't know

Comments

7. Do you think that Council testing for Hackney and Private Hire Vehicles should be increased from twice to three times per year if the Council Licensing Authority did not introduce an age limit?

Yes/No/Don't know

Comments

8. Do you think the minimum engine capacity of Private Hire Vehicles should be increased from 1400cc to 1600cc?

Yes/No/Don't know

Comments

9. Do you think that Hackney Carriages and Private Hire Vehicles that are adapted to carry wheelchairs should be exempt from age/engine capacity restrictions?

Yes/No/Don't know

Comments

10. If the minimum engine capacity of Private Hire Vehicles is increased from 1400cc to 1600cc, should Northampton Borough Council Licensing Authority have exemptions (e.g. for Hybrids, which are generally 1500cc)?

Yes/No/Don’t know
11. At present all vehicles, irrespective of age, have to have an MOT certificate and a Council test to receive a plate and are then re-tested by the Council again after 6 months. Should all brand new vehicles be exempt from a Council re-test until 12 months from first DVLA registration?

Yes/No/Don’t know

Comments

12. Can you suggest any other ways in which Northampton Borough Council Licensing Authority could help improve public safety, reliability and comfort for passengers?

Yes/No/Don’t know

Comments

13. Can you suggest any other ways in which Northampton Borough Council Licensing Authority could help reduce emissions/pollutants from Hackney and Private Hire Vehicles?

Yes/No/Don’t know

Comments

14. If these proposals were introduced, do you think that any individuals or groups would be more positively or negatively affected than others?

Yes/No/Don’t know

Please specify stating who and suggesting what actions would need to be taken to minimise potentially adverse impacts
15. Do you have any other comments to make in relation to this consultation?

Comments

16. What is your ethnicity?

- White English
- White Welsh
- White Scottish
- White Northern Irish
- White Irish
- Gypsy or Traveller
- Other white background
- White & Black Caribbean
- White and Black African
- White & Asian
- Other mixed/multiple background
- Indian
- Pakistani
- Bangladeshi
- Chinese
- Other Asian background
- Black or Black British Caribbean
- Black or Black British African
- Other Black background

Other (please specify)

17. Please state your gender

- Male
- Female
- Prefer not to say

18. Do you consider yourself to have a disability?

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to say

Thank you for taking part. If you are interested in taking part in further consultation activity you may like to join our Residents’ Panel. Please visit www.northampton.gov.uk/residentspanel for more details.
When reviewing, planning or providing services Northampton Borough Council needs to assess the impacts on people. Both residents and staff, of how it works - or is planning to – work (in relation to things like disability). It has to take steps to remove/minimise any harm it identifies. It has to help people to participate in its services and public life. “Equality Impact Assessments” (EIAs) prompt people to think things through, considering people’s different needs in relation to the law on equalities. The first stage of the process is known as ‘screening’ and is used to come to a decision about whether and why further analysis is – or is not – required. EIAs are published in line with transparency requirements.

A helpful guide to equalities law is available at: [www.northampton.gov.uk/equality](http://www.northampton.gov.uk/equality). A few notes about the laws that need to be considered are included at the end of this document. Helpful questions are provided as prompts throughout the form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Name of policy/activity/project/practice</th>
<th>This is a change to the: Technical Specifications for Hackney and Private Hire Vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Screening undertaken (please complete as appropriate)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director or Head of Service</td>
<td>Steve Elsey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Officer for developing the policy/activity/practice</td>
<td>Bill Edwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other people involved in the screening (this may be people who work for NBC or a related service or people outside NBC)</td>
<td>Steve Elsey, Debbie Ferguson, Licensing, Legal Team, Silvina Katz, Communications Team, Vehicle Operator Standards Agency, Lindsey Ambrose - Equalities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Brief description of policy/activity/project/practice: including its main purpose, aims, objectives and projected outcomes, and how these fit in with the wider aims of the organisation.

Please note that Hackney Carriages are more commonly known as Black Cabs and Private Hire vehicles are the general vehicles used as mini cabs identified by the yellow bubble on the roof.

To inform the review of the Vehicle Technical Specifications undertaken by the Licensing committee to determine whether an age limit be introduced to both Private Hire and Hackney Carriages. We will be consulting with stakeholders to identify issues and gather evidence in order to compile the final report.

Currently, a lower limit age restriction does apply to Hackney carriages but there is none in relation to Private Hire vehicles. Therefore the proposal is to bring Private Hire vehicles in line with the lower limit that cover Hackney carriages and to introduce an upper limit common to both The proposal is that, any Private Hire Vehicle licensed for the first time will be no more than 3 years old from the date of first registration and, providing the standard is maintained, the vehicle will be licensed for a further 5 years.

A Private Hire vehicle will not be able to renew that licence once it is more than 8 years old from the date of first registration. If agreed, the new proposals will only apply immediately to new licenses. Existing vehicles that are older than 8 years can continue to be licensed for another two years as long as they pass the MOT test.

It is also proposed that the current allowable engine size for a Private Hire vehicle increases from 1400cc to 1600cc. This would result in all Licensed Vehicle being a minimum of 1600cc. We are considering exceptions to the engine capacity for hybrid vehicles, those that have wheelchair access; and adaptations for disabled people; vehicles that have been adapted for disabled drivers and vehicles in exceptional condition

4 Relevance to Equality and Diversity Duties

In undertaking this work we are considering our duties in relation to improving the quality of life of people of all groups in Northampton and promoting equality and accessibility.. The 2009 Northamptonshire Strategic Needs assessment shows that Northants has a higher than average rate of people who have a physical disability. There are 29,750 people in the County claiming Disability Living Allowance. Research suggests that Nationally,1 in 5 adults and 1 in 20 children have a disability. Taxis and Private Hire vehicles therefore play an important function in the life of people with disabilities with the Department of Transport reporting that they are used 67% more by that group. It is essential we consider the needs of people with disabilities and the potential links to the age of vehicles and the benefits to disabled people.

By having a common age policy covering hackney carriages and private hire vehicles all drivers will be bound by the same conditions in relation to age, whereas at present hackney owners cannot license a vehicle which is older than 3 years at first plating. There is no such restriction facing Private Hire owners.

This will provide commonality across the trade and will ensure that any new design requirements introduced to vehicles that contribute to accessibility and public safety will be definitely be incorporated into the Northampton fleet. Under the present policy this would not be the case.

Key issues that surround the implementation of a vehicle age limit policy are those of the promotion of improved quality of life, accessibility, public safety, and emissions/carbon management. We will be consulting as to whether evidence exists to substantiate these views locally to assist in the decision whether to introduce the proposals.

The policy will impact upon private hire vehicle owners whose vehicles do not fit within the limits of the new proposals. It will require those vehicle owners to purchase newer vehicles if they want to
continue to trade. At this stage records held within the Licensing department show that approximately 50% of Hackneys are owned by drivers of an ethnic minority, but of the 132 Hackneys currently licensed 30 (22%) would fall outside of the proposal in relation to age. There are currently 566 Private Hire vehicles that are currently licensed, of which 69 (12%) would not meet the age limit proposal. We have also identified that 62% (61) of the owners/drivers of Private Hire and Hackney carriages that fall outside of the proposal are of an Asian background. This shows that the proposal currently has a disproportionate effect on that group. However, further work will need to be undertaken to identify any specific group. It is also possible that one individual owns a number of vehicles. We will be undertaking further work to find this out.

Only six Private Hire vehicles have an engine capacity of less than 1600 cc, and those are the Hybrid vehicles which have an engine capacity of 1500cc. We will be consulting as to whether these green hybrid cars should be exempt from the engine capacity limit. The bulk of the private hire fleet is made up of operators who own a number of vehicles. In order to minimise the effect of the change of policy we intend to introduce the changes over a two year period. This will minimise the impact and number of vehicles and owners that will be affected.

Vehicle age limit policies are currently in place by approximately 47% of local authorities. Some authorities have been unsuccessful in implementing policies due to either unwillingness by the trade and public in the area, or by mistakes made by the authority during the consultation process.

**Review of EIA – 23rd March 2012.**

The consultation has now finished and results compiled for a final report to go to Licensing Committee on the 8th May 2012.

Question 14 of the consultation asked if any specific group would be either negatively or positively impacted upon by the introduction of the proposed age limit or change to existing policy. The significant majority felt that Drivers/Owners/Operators would be significantly impacted upon as it would create financial hardship as there would be a requirement to purchase newer vehicles on a regular basis. It would result in many going out of business causing hardship on themselves and their families. This would be compounded by the current financial climate. It would also have an indirect effect on the paying public as increased costs to the trade would be passed on to customers.

If you have indicated there is a negative impact on any group, is that impact:

**Legal?**

Yes If an age limit is adopted, Mitigation would have to be considered and implemented where required.

No

Please explain: We are consulting with all interested parties including those owners who may be affected by the proposals.

There is no intention for the proposal to have a negative impact on any particular group. The proposal is aimed at providing a safer, greener and more accessible fleet of Private Hire and Hackney Vehicles in Northampton.

**5 Evidence Base for Screening**

Link for Newport failure to implement age limit –
Vehicle Owner Ethnicity - NBC Licensing Records.

Multi agency checks – Multi agency checks with VOSA have not been undertaken this year due to VOSA work commitments. VOSA will be engaging in the formal consultation as will our local MOT inspectors Jackson and NCS. Records of our own vehicle checks carried out by Licensing enforcement officers show a higher number of older vehicles having defects. Through the consultation we will collate more information from our inspectors to assist the decision.
6 **Requirements of the equality duties:**

(remember there’s a note to remind you what they are at the end of this form and more detailed information at [www.northampton.gov.uk/equality](http://www.northampton.gov.uk/equality))

Will there be/has there been consultation with all interested parties?

**No but it is intended**

Initial consultation has taken place internally to ensure we are proceeding with this process in the correct way. There has also been some press interest and vehicle owners are aware of the proposal following the Licensing Committee meeting on the 27th September.

We are planning to go out to full consultation at the end of November. It will run for 12 weeks.

**Are proposed actions necessary and proportionate to the desired outcomes?**

**Yes**

We believe that we should go out to consultation in relation to this issue. We are aware of the potential impact and are therefore not predetermining any decision. We feel that the introduction of these proposals are reasonable to assess our desired outcomes of improved public safety, a cleaner environment and more accessible methods of transport.

**Where appropriate, will there be scope for prompt, independent reviews and appeals against decisions arising from the proposed policy/practice/activity?**

**Yes**

Any decision taken by the Licensing Committee can be appealed through the Magistrates Court and by Judicial review.

**Does the proposed policy/practice/activity have the ability to be tailored to fit different individual circumstances?**

**Yes To a point**

We are including proposals in relation to exemptions for vehicles classed as being in exceptional condition, for vehicles that are wheelchair accessible, adapted for disabled persons or for a disabled driver. We are also proposing a two year period which will not require existing vehicles older than 8 years old to comply for two years.

Where appropriate, can the policy/practice/activity exceed the minimum legal equality and human rights requirements, rather than merely complying with them?

**From the evidence you have and strategic thinking**, what are the **key risks** (the harm or ‘adverse impacts’) and **opportunities** (benefits and opportunities to promote equality) this policy/practice/activity might present?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Risks (Negative)</th>
<th>Opportunities (Positive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td>We have identified that owners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
from an Asian background may be disproportionately affected by these proposals. We will be gathering further evidence through the consultation to identify the extent of any impact and potential measures to address. **Updated 23/3/12** – It was identified during the consultation that there could be a disproportionate negative impact on drivers/owners from minority backgrounds as they tend to drive older vehicles. and who become drivers will have some protection from having to drive the vehicles of fleet owners which are older and potentially less safe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>The introduction of the proposals may result in a reduction of wheelchair accessible vehicles. We will be gathering further information during the consultation. <strong>Update – 23/3/12</strong> The consultation resulted in some concerns that if exemptions from age limits were allowed for wheelchair carrying taxi’s then disabled could be seen as having to utilise older vehicles than able persons.</td>
<td>Any requirements to new vehicles in relation to disability will be passed on to that group. Fewer emissions will have a positive impact on those with breathing or repertory disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender or Gender Identity/Gender Assignment</td>
<td>No risks have been identified at this stage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy and Maternity (including breastfeeding)</td>
<td>No risks have been identified at this stage</td>
<td>Consultation may find that this group will feel safer in newer vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>No risks have been identified at this stage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (including children, youth, midlife and older people)</td>
<td>A reduction in the number of purpose built hackney carriages could have a negative impact on elderly people and small children due to their low chassis and grab rails for ease of entry exit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion, Faith and Belief</td>
<td>No risks have been identified at this stage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>No risks to Human rights have been identified at this stage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7 Proportionality
There is a definite risk that some owners will be affected and those groups shown could also be affected.
The consultation will attempt to ensure that all groups have an opportunity to input into this process.
There will be online and paper consultation questionnaires, residents panels and associations will be contacted. All drivers and owners will be contacted and provided with the information they need. Language line will be offered to those who require it.
We will also be utilising the various forums organised by Northampton Borough Council.
Updated 23/3/12
As stated above, consultation results indicate there could be a negative disproportionate impact upon BME drivers/owners as many tend to drive older vehicles and are not in a position to purchase newer cars or are not creditworthy. This could lead to unemployment and hardship for them and their families.

8 Decision
Should an age limit be adopted by the Licensing Committee, Mitigation will need to be considered and implemented to minimise any potential negative impact.

Date of Decision: …/…/20…

EITHER: We judge that a full impact assessment is not necessary since:

OR: We judge that a full impact assessment is necessary since:
Equality Duties to be taken into account in this screening include:

**Prohibited Conduct under The Equality Act 2010 including:**
Direct discrimination (including by association and perception e.g. carers); Indirect discrimination; Pregnancy and maternity discrimination; Harassment; third party harassment; discrimination arising from disability.

**Public Sector Duties (Section 149) of the Equality Act 2010 for NBC and services provided on its behalf: (due to be effective from 4 April 2011)**
NBC and services providing public functions must in providing services have due regard to the need to:
- eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation;
- advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between different groups. ‘Positive action’ permits proportionate action to overcome disadvantage, meet needs and tackle under-representation.

**Rights apply to people in terms of their “Protected Characteristics”:**
Age; Gender; Gender Assignment; Sexual Orientation; Disability; Race; Religion and Belief; Pregnancy; Maternity. But Marriage and Civil Partnership do not apply to the public sector duties.

**Duty to “advance equality of opportunity”:**
The need, when reviewing, planning or providing services/policies/practices to assess the impacts of services on people in relation to their ‘protected characteristics’, take steps to remove/minimise any negative impacts identified and help everyone to participate in our services and public life. **Equality Impact Assessments** remain best practice to be used. Sometimes people have particular needs e.g. due to gender, race, faith or disability that need to be addressed, not ignored. NBC must have due regard to the duty to make reasonable adjustments for people with disabilities. NBC must encourage people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or any other activity in which their participation is too low.

**Duty to ‘foster good relations between people’**
This means having due regard to the need to tackle prejudice (e.g. where people are picked on or stereotyped by customers or colleagues because of their ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation, etc) and promote understanding.

**Lawful Exceptions to general rules:** can happen where action is proportionate to achieve a legitimate aim and not otherwise prohibited by anything under the Equality Act 2010. There are some special situations (see Ch 12 and 13 of the Equality Act 2010 Statutory Code of Practice – Services, Public Functions and Associations).

**National Adult Autism Strategy (Autism Act 2009; statutory guidelines) including:**
to improve how services identify and meet needs of adults with autism and their families.

**Human Rights include:**
Rights under the European Convention include not to be subjected to degrading treatment; right to a fair trial (civil and criminal issues); right to privacy (subject to certain exceptions e.g. national security/public safety, or certain other specific situations); freedom of conscience (including religion and belief and rights to manifest these limited only by law and as necessary for public safety, public order, protection of rights of others and other specified situations); freedom of expression (subject to certain exceptions); freedom of peaceful assembly and to join trade unions (subject to certain exceptions); right not to be subject to unlawful discrimination (e.g. sex, race, colour, language, religion, political opinion, national or social origin); right to peaceful enjoyment of own possessions (subject to certain exceptions e.g. to secure payment of taxes or other contributions or penalties); right to an education; right to hold free elections by secret ballot. The European Convention is given effect in UK law by the Human Rights Act 1998.