


**CONSULTATION RE: HACKNEY CARRIAGE SERVICE****CONSULTATION RESPONSES****Consultation question 1**

**What are your views on: (i) the removal of the limit on the number of hackney carriages in the Congleton zone; (ii) an unmet demand survey in relation to the quantity of hackney carriages in any of the zones; (iii) maintaining the status quo; (iv) an increase in licence fees to fund any unmet demand survey?**

<b>RESPONDENT</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>
Representations of the East Cheshire Taxi Association at meeting with officers (11.02.11)	Suggested that the limit in Congleton should be retained and a limit imposed on the Macclesfield and Crewe zones. Suggested that rather than an increase in licence fees to fund an unmet demand survey there be a one-off payment.
Mottram St Andrew Parish Council	(i) We have no view, as we have no knowledge; (ii) we are in favour of an unmet demand survey; (iii) not sensible; (iv) yes.
x 2 hackney carriage drivers (zone 2)	Issuing hackney carriage plates should STOP. Too many hackney carriage plates in Zone 2 (Crewe & Nantwich), not enough jobs to cover even the expenses, with related to this Private Hire Vehicles working in Nantwich specially in Welsh Row as a hackney carriages as there is NOT ENOUGH CONTROL AND INSPECTION by the Council at the weekend nights.
Wilmslow driver (zone 3)	I think there should be a capping system in Macclesfield/Wilmslow borough as there are too many putting in for plates, when someone surrenders their plate then the next person on a waiting list should be nominated to put a car on as a taxi.
Driver (zone 2)	(i) Although I am not a driver in zone 1, my experience from our zone suggests that removal of the limit would have a detrimental effect on the livelihoods of current hackney drivers who would have to increase their working hours to make a living. (ii) This would be beneficial to our zone, as it would confirm what we already know and that is that zone 2 is saturated beyond any doubt to the point that it is increasingly difficult to earn a living. Although the number of taxis would be the same at least the problem would be recognised officially and that would be a major step forward. (iii) Maintaining the status quo would be the worst possible outcome because it would allow the situation to get worse which I feel would be like us all

	burying our head in the sand and hoping it will all go away. (iv) We are only just benefiting from lower licence fees which are slightly easing the situation. Given the financial burden we have anyway it would be inappropriate, also if the local drivers and taxi association had been listened to earlier and spoken to this situation may have been avoided.
Driver (zone 3)	The number of hackney carriages to be restricted. No survey necessary. We already know that there are too many hackney carriages. It would be a waste of time and money. Zoning to be removed. No increase in fees.
x 42 hackney carriage drivers (zone 1)	<p>(i) I think that removing the limit on the number of hackney carriages would have potentially disastrous consequences for the following reasons – in recent years the size of the Congleton taxi rank has been halved and, as such, we do not have sufficient rank space for the amount of taxis as it is. In addition to this, the presence of the buses mean that there is much juggling around of vehicles already, therefore even more taxis would only add to this problem and make the taxi rank a potentially hazardous place for both drivers and the customers wishing to use the public transport.</p> <p>(ii) There was a survey carried out only a few years ago which concluded that there was no unmet demands for taxis, but even so several extra wheelchair friendly plates were issued, meaning that there is surely more than enough taxis available in the Congleton area already.</p> <p>(iii) I strongly believe that we should maintain the status quo.</p> <p>(iv) I think it would be very unfair of the council to increase the licence fees to fund any unmet survey demands, as given the fact that the supply of taxis currently already meets the demand satisfactorily as aforementioned in answer to (ii), it therefore seems only fair to me that it is the council that should be responsible for paying any extra money towards this, as they are the people that wish to change the taxi boundaries, not the taxi drivers themselves.</p>
Driver (zone 3)	<p>(i) I can't really speak for the situation in Congleton as I am not allowed to work there.</p> <p>(ii) Unmet demand surveys are an expensive needles protocol. A town hall employee / official could do a similar survey at a fraction of the cost.</p> <p>(iii) No, I can't speak for Congleton and C&amp;N but we already have too many hackneys in Macclesfield, and</p>

	<p>not enough work to go round. I would like to see the Council impose a moratorium on the issuing of new plates with immediate effect. The only exception to this would be for a quota of wheelchair friendly vehicles. Therefore I would propose that any new first grant licenses would be for wheelchair friendly vehicles only. This would in effect, kill two birds with one stone.</p> <p>(iv) No. Unmet demand surveys are expensive and needless. If you want one YOU pay for it. The trade neither wants one or can afford one.</p>
<p>Driver (zone 1)</p>	<p>In addition to this Congleton Taxi Drivers are concerned that if Hackney Carriage Licences are de-regulated in the Borough of Congleton then excessive numbers of taxis may appear in Congleton that we have little or no room for. To highlight the current situation I have attached a photograph below taken this week showing that at any one time taxis are finding it hard to fit into the nine spaces on the rank allocated by the Council. The picture shows 14 taxis jostling for space.</p> 
<p>Driver (zone 2)</p>	<p>My view, on removing the limit of hackney carriages in Congleton you will create the same mess as you have in all the other boroughs, we have ranking for 3 cars on the town and 3 to feed the town. The only</p>

	<p>other 24 hour rank in Crewe is that station feeder rank in Crewe (this is no use unless you buy a station permit to work Crewe station rendering it no use as a public rank).</p> <p>Of the 6 spaces we have there are around 200 hackney vehicles fighting for spaces. The traffic wardens are on our backs day and night but we have nowhere to go to ply our trade yet the council continue to issue plates as a cash cow for them without consideration to how the new or existing hackney owners will earn a living with nowhere to operate from. There is a desperate need to an unmet demand survey to be carried out and now.</p>
Twemlow, Somerford and Cranage Parish Council	The Council are disappointed that it has got as far as this to carry out a survey. They feel it is a pointless and expensive survey. They think that there should be no limit and regulation would never work. The thought of an unmet survey is concerning to say the least. To conclude Council feel that there should be natural supply and demand allowed to develop in each area with a standard guideline pricing for all zones.
Chorley Parish Council	Retain control on the limit on the number but continue to review demand on a regular basis.
Driver/Proprietor (zone 3)	<p>I believe that all zones should have a number restriction on the amount of Hackney carriages and feel Congleton has the correct format on this matter as it keeps the balance between Private Hire and Hackney.</p> <p>(ii) A higher licensing fee to cover costs of anything to do with Taxis and Private Hire should also include covering the costs of Policing i.e. it would be good to see back designated Taxi officers on the street sorting out illegal practices their sole job to enforce Taxi rules and regulations, test drivers, carry out demand surveys. A higher fee would also see people take more care in their efforts to keep the rules and treat as I do Taxi driving is a profession not a means to add income to benefits and by bringing in a higher cost to cover surveys policing the owners outlay is higher and the loss to them greater if they break the rules.</p>
Proprietor/Driver (zone 3)	(i) I cannot answer the question, as I am not plates to work in that zone so have no local knowledge. (ii) If that is the only way we can stop any more taxis getting plated then so be it. (iii) Definitely not! There has been for many years, far too many taxis for the amount of work available. Because of this drivers are working for longer hours (50 – 70 hours per week is not uncommon) for less money, in fact, most of the time for less than the government's minimum wage. (iv) If that is the "ONLY WAY" to get the unmet demand survey done, to prove to the Council that there is far too many taxis. What a pity we weren't asked

	5 or even 10 years ago.
x79 drivers	<p>Congleton limit should be kept.  Increase limit all the way across East Cheshire.  No extra to licence fees to do unmet demand survey. You should have the money already from licence fees.</p>
Proprietor/driver	<p>In my view, not only should the limitation of licences apply to Congleton, but to Macclesfield and right across the boundaries of Cheshire East. The stacking reality proves beyond doubt that with the economy not fully recovered, business is slow. Having too many taxis on the road when there is not enough work to go round is inciting animosity among the drivers because new drivers are going to be frowned on by drivers who have been at the rank much longer and feel they rule the roost. I am speaking from experience that although I have been at the rank for exactly [.. ] months to the day, I have never stepped out of my car to make friends with a lot of the drivers. Not because I never bothered to, or that I am selfish, no, it's all because when I appeared at the two taxi ranks, Tesco and the station, a lot of the drivers did not show me their approval and so I have kept myself to myself and that is the way I want it to stay.</p> <p>There are only two busy ranks where drivers can queue up: Tesco and Macclesfield train station. The later has only got 5 parking spaces and Tesco has 3 which most of the times are occupied. At times the queue at Macclesfield Train Station go all the way into the main road, causing mayhem to other road users, There may be other ranks elsewhere but they are not as busy as the station or Tesco. That's why these two ranks are always full at all times.</p> <p>The other reason why in my view I propose a limit on the number of licences is the one I have alluded to at the beginning, and that is the economy being so slow which has a knock on effect on most businesses and this is also affecting the taxi industry. Worse still, fuel and VAT have gone up, slowing the business even further. It would be better to compare the economic growth in the area before more licences are issued, or else we could end up with a situation where drivers start fighting for work.</p>
Proprietor/Driver (zone 3)	<p>(i) No Comment  (ii) I believe there should be an unmet demand survey in Crewe paying particular attention to the following points:  (a) The majority of people in Crewe are able bodied therefore why insist that any new plates can</p>

	<p>only be granted to vehicles with wheel chair access. There is a need for some wheel chair accessible vehicles but very few of the people who have been granted plates on this basis will actually undertake wheelchair work. If there is a market for wheel chair work somebody will fill that void. Business men do not want to be transported in vans why discriminate against them for the sake of a minority of the population</p> <p>(b) Once the decision has been made on the percentage of vehicles required in the zone to cope with the disabled maintain the status quo by making the transfer of plates between individuals a thing of the past. Instead every plate should be returned to the council with a refund of the last pass off fee (pro rata) and the council should then issue that plate to the next applicant who has applied for that particular type ( ie restricted or unrestricted)</p> <p>(c) If the Council then feel there is an increased demand for a particular type of vehicle it would be easy for them to control.</p> <p>(iv) I feel the cost of the 'unmet demand survey' should be met jointly by the Council (who have caused the problems by the over issuing of plates) and by the Hackney Drivers (who desperately need the problem resolving) through a one off payment and not an increase in the license fee as this would then be ongoing.</p>
<p>Proprietor/Driver</p>	<p>1 (i) Removal of limit on the number of Hackney Carriages in the Congleton Zone.</p> <p>In order to maintain a sustainable quality service regulation must apply. If deregulation at entry is removed then the authority will need to have a leap change in its performance at regulating quality. World wide studies have shown that deregulation at entry has failed to achieve the benefits to the travelling public claimed by its' supporters. One of the main reasons for this is the increased cost to the authority of administering and PROACTIVELY ensuring the quality of service for a large number of vehicles and drivers. Failure to provide sufficient Rank space for the increased numbers have caused major traffic problems, and in some cases increased revenue for the authority from the issue of parking tickets to cabbies!</p> <p>1 (ii) An unmet demand survey in relation to the quantity of Hackney Carriages.</p>

This is totally unnecessary. If someone from the authority would "walk the Floor" as part of the regulatory quality aspect of regulation, it is plainly obvious that in other zones, Crewe and Macclesfield, ranks are overflowing. Similar things can be seen in bordering areas e.g. Stoke & Newcastle. This is the stock answer taken from the Dft guidelines which as Confucius says Guidelines are used by wise persons but obeyed by ..... The more forward looking authorities have found other means of assessing demand. As with all the surveys so far carried out by experts/consultants at great cost, the results are inevitably flawed because the survey relates only to Hackney carriages and takes no account of the service levels LEGITIMATELY provided by the PHV sector.

1(iii) Maintaining the status quo.

Not sure what this refers to. If it refers to maintaining the numbers of Hackneys licensed at today's figure for ALL 3 zones then YES YES YES. If it refers to maintaining numbers regulation of Congleton Zone then YES. Any "harmonisation" to give a consistent view from CEC's point of view should be to regulate numbers in Crewe and Macclesfield. The sight of streets full of cabs unable to rank is not desirable from any one's point of view.

1(iv) An increase in licence fees to fund any unmet demand survey.

ABSOLUTELY NO NO NO. This again is the stock easy answer from the DfT guidelines, which by the way are outdated and have been superseded by many other independent reports. How can it be justified to increase licence fees in perpetuity for a one off exercise! Furthermore we were informed at the inception of CEC that the enormous leap in licence fees at that time was based on the previous authorities costs. As CEC was formed on the basis of reducing costs then it was stated that as LGR progressed then the licence fees could be looked at again with a view to LOWER fees, based on the efficiencies gained through reorganisation. We have seen much reduction of staff from the Licensing Sections, on whose costs the fees were calculated, and are beginning to experience a reduction in service! Have fees come down? NO. Any increase in fees for this survey could not be justifiably applied to PHV licences. A final point on licence fees, legally the authority can only recover reasonable costs associated with their responsibilities.

One point not addressed is the issue of Zones. It would be advantageous to have CEC standard conditions

	and may be CEC standard Tariffs but existing zones should be maintained. This to protect the urban nature of the Congleton Zone from the inevitable Turf wars involving large operators from the other two zones.
Sandbach Town Council	Members feel the status quo need be maintained without increase in licence fee to fund unmet demand survey.
Sutton Parish Council	<p>I submit below the response of Sutton Parish Council to the Consultation on Hackney Carriage Service within Cheshire East.</p> <p>Q1 - What are the Council's views on</p> <p>a) the removal of the limit on the number of hackney carriages in the Congleton zone.  <b>A - Unable to comment on Congleton zone except to say that any increase in the number hackney carriages, whatever zone, which may impact upon the Macclesfield zone would not be welcome.</b></p> <p>b) an unmet demand survey in relation to the quantity of hackney carriages in any of the zones  <b>.A - Do not possess sufficient knowledge of demand to make any constructive comment.</b></p> <p>c) maintaining the status quo  <b>A - All zones should be subject to same criteria</b></p> <p>d) an increase in licence fees to fund any unmet demand survey.  <b>A - No.</b></p>
Driver (zone 2)	<p>I have worked as a taxi driver in Crewe &amp; Nantwich since 1982, in that time the amount of taxis in the borough has increased by about 700% in the same time as the population has increased by 10%. The result of this is I can no longer take the minimum wage before overheads are taken away which means I have to work excessive hours in order to have a living wage, which cannot be fair and also cannot be in the public interests to get into a taxi with a driver who has already worked 12 -14 hours that day. It is imperative that you hold surveys as quickly as possible in order to bring Crewe &amp; Nantwich and Macclesfield into line with Congleton. I realise that a survey would have to be done in Congleton also.</p> <p>I would not object to an increase in fees to fund a survey, however I feel I must point out the fact that</p>

	<p>around 1990 we had a survey in Crewe &amp; Nantwich funded by an increase in our fees of £20.00 for 3 years however the £20.00 was never removed and so in Crewe &amp; Nantwich we are already funding it.</p> <p>I feel the zoning should remain in place in the short term however the knowledge test should be changed in the way of having an extensive knowledge of the driver's chosen zone and a reasonable knowledge of the other two. I also think they should be fluent in English.</p>
--	--

**Consultation question 2:**

**What are your views on how the differing tariffs should be brought into line?**

**Consultation question 3:**

**Whether or not the tariffs can or should be standardised across Cheshire East, what are your views on the current tables of fares?**

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
Representatives of Association	Suggested that the tariffs should be harmonised to the Crewe rates inflated by 5% and 2.5% (to take account of the increased VAT rate). Stated that wished the legal position about charging less than the meter fare to be made clear.
	<p>A meeting was held in Macclesfield on the 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2011 to discuss the setting of a standard Hackney Tariff across East Cheshire.</p> <p>It is agreed by all that a standard Tariff would be the prelude to de-zoning and pave the way for rationalising of all other conditions, byelaws and regulations.</p> <p>The meeting was attended by representatives from Wilmslow, Knutsford Macclesfield and East Cheshire Taxi &amp; Private Hire Association.</p> <p>The following proposal, with options, agreed after lengthy discussions, is presented via the Councils Officers to the Licensing committee for their consideration.</p> <p>The proposal reflects current costs to running a Taxi, which are escalating, customer expectation of a fare(</p>

a very lengthy discussion), the different ways which the old Borough's calculated the Fare and the Councils duty to its electorate to agree a fair and equitable rate for all Hackney Drivers, Proprietors and their customers so ensuring the continuing high standard of service.

Tariff 1 7am to 9pm	
Flag 200yds	2.35
Consecutive 195yds	0.21
Consecutive Mile	1.90
Tariff 2 9pm to 12 midnight	+ 12%
Option 1	
Tariff 3 12 midnight to 7am	+ 33.3%
Option 2	
Tariff 3 12midnight to 7am	+ 50%
Tariff 4 Sunday & Bank Holidays	+ 33.3%
Tariff 5	
7pm Christmas Eve to 12 midnight Boxing Day	
7pm New Years Eve to 12 midnight New Years Day	+ 100%
Waiting Time per hour	18.00
Soilage	75.00

Mottram St Andrew Parish Council	(2) They should be standardised, average and simplify, 1 <sup>st</sup> mile charge and a fixed rate for subsequent 196 yards. (3) Yes – should be similar subject to 1 <sup>st</sup> mile charges.																		
Knutsford Town Council	The Town Council sees no reason for differing charges throughout the borough and would support common charges. The Town Council would welcome the publication of charges in the most effective way possible.																		
Wilmslow driver (zone 3)	I think the day rate should be increased by 20p and the night rate should stay the same as people do complain about the rates that's why Lynx get a lot of the work around the Wilmslow area, as they are cheaper.																		
<p data-bbox="311 624 510 651">Driver (zone 2)</p> <p data-bbox="212 890 609 917">(PROPOSAL B in Appendix 4)</p>	<p data-bbox="660 624 2042 820">With regard to the tariffs in the different zones, the logical solution for this would be recalculate all the tariffs with regard to how they run. i.e. all zones could just run the three tariffs. Although I would assess the judging by the documents shown, if fares were standardised the biggest reduction in income would be in zone 2 as our first mile is £3.80 compared to £2.60 in zone 1. This may not seem a large amount but over a night and week it will add up to a significant sum. For me this would require a lot of consultation and compromise. I myself would be happy with a combination of the tariffs in zones 1 – 2 something like this:</p> <p data-bbox="660 858 891 885"><u>Tariff 1 (Day rate)</u></p> <table data-bbox="660 890 1043 991"> <tr> <td>First 1,500 yards</td> <td>£3.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Each 195 yards after</td> <td>£0.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Waiting time</td> <td>£0.30</td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="660 1029 907 1056"><u>Tariff 2 (Night rate)</u></p> <table data-bbox="660 1061 1043 1161"> <tr> <td>First 1,300 yards</td> <td>£3.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Each 176 yards after</td> <td>£0.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Waiting time</td> <td>£0.30</td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="660 1200 1025 1227"><u>Tariff 3 (Bank Holiday Rate)</u></p> <table data-bbox="660 1232 1043 1332"> <tr> <td>First 1,100 yards</td> <td>£4.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Each 146 yards</td> <td>£0.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Waiting time</td> <td>£0.30</td> </tr> </table>	First 1,500 yards	£3.20	Each 195 yards after	£0.20	Waiting time	£0.30	First 1,300 yards	£3.20	Each 176 yards after	£0.20	Waiting time	£0.30	First 1,100 yards	£4.20	Each 146 yards	£0.20	Waiting time	£0.30
First 1,500 yards	£3.20																		
Each 195 yards after	£0.20																		
Waiting time	£0.30																		
First 1,300 yards	£3.20																		
Each 176 yards after	£0.20																		
Waiting time	£0.30																		
First 1,100 yards	£4.20																		
Each 146 yards	£0.20																		
Waiting time	£0.30																		



	<p>Initial or minimum fare                    £2.60                    £3.00  (first 1,466.69 yards)</p> <p>Each subsequent 97.77 yards            10p                    13p</p> <p>Waiting time                                    £13.19 /hour            £20 /hour</p> <p>Up to every 27.3 seconds                10p                    15p</p> <p>Soilage charge                                £45.00                £50.00</p> <p>Extra charges to be done away with</p>
Driver (zone 3)	One tariff calculated using the Brighton & Hove formula, with yearly inflation increases. Yes, the tariffs should be standardised across Cheshire East.
Company operating hackney carriages (zone 3)	<p>I refer to your invitation for observations on various issues contained in the consultation document in relation to hackney carriage services. Whilst there are comments which pertain to individual questions I would like to offer my thoughts on the business of providing taxi services in the borough as a newish company looking at the expansion of it's fleet.</p> <p>I assume it is the Borough's aim to provide the borough's residents and businesses with hackney carriages that meet all rules and regulations laid down by Cheshire East and that the vehicles (after they have had their annual test) are well maintained , safe, serviceable and well presented? To achieve such a situation requires an adequate level of income to ensure proper servicing budgets are realistic. So the matter of a credible fare structure is vital to ensure that there is adequate income.</p> <p>It seems to me, regarding the standardisation of fares, that it is obvious that the fares have to go to the highest level that is currently in place. That region is quite clearly not going to accept a decrease in tariff when costs, like fuel, have increased by 20-30% and insurance premiums are following a similar trend. If you are going to standardise fares then an overall increase in the tariff should be done at the same time and it is vitally necessary. We are all suffering increased costs but fuel is our lifeblood and just like the haulage industry which is really struggling, it is our main cost, so please standardise but increase at the same time.</p>

	<p>I also feel that minibus owners like ourselves should be allowed to charge more when we are carrying in excess of 4 passengers. The current surcharge is derisory and must hark back to Hansom cab days and needs to be increased in line with private hire operators.</p> <p>You only have to take a trip around the ranks in Macclesfield to see how the current economic climate is impacting on both vehicles and operators alike.</p>
<p>x 42 hackney carriage drivers (zone 1)</p> <p>PROPOSAL D in Appendix 4</p>	<p>The differentiation between the tariffs are too insurmountable to be harmonised in a manner that would be fair to all groups of taxi drivers in the existing separate boroughs. In the short term it would be impossible to implicate these new prices without causing damage to the trade, and in the current difficult economic conditions it would be very unfair to the public, as they are already suffering in the uncertain financial climate as it is.</p> <p>No, I do not believe that the tariffs should be standardised across Cheshire East. The different tariffs exist because each one has been formed so that it is appropriate to each area, hence the current Congleton tariff means that we only get £2.60 for 1,760 yards, whereas Crewe receive nearly just as much (£2.30) for only 200 yards!</p> <p>We in Congleton have already asked for a small fare increase on account of the current fuel and insurance prices that have risen way above the rate of inflation, meaning that many of use struggle to meet our running costs. However, to ask for more than this and increase the fares too much would be equally damaging to the taxi trade in Congleton, in not more so, as the people of Congleton will not be able to pay such high prices and as a result withdraw their business from the industry altogether by using other means of transport. For whilst it is important for us as taxi drivers to be able to earn enough to survive, it is also not fair to ask customers to pay way above what they can afford just because of the fare imposed on other areas.</p> <p>Proposed variation:  An increase of 20 pence for the 1<sup>st</sup> mile flag fall, from £2.60 to £2.80  The second and further miles an increase of 10 pence, from £1.80 to £1.90</p>

	Also, as a long standing Congleton driver, I personally don't feel that it is right or proper for myself or any other Congleton drivers to comment on the states of fares in other areas of Cheshire East. I respect the decisions regarding fares that taxi drivers in other neighbouring areas have made, and hope that they would feel the same with regards to ours.
Driver (zone 3)	<p>If you are to keep the three separate zones and we cant work in each others zone then there is no point amalgamating the three different tariffs.</p> <p>As above. Not until you abolish the 3 zone system. Current fares are overdue for an increase. I was last allowed to put my prices up on April 1st 2009, I can't think of another business that is treated in this way, certainly not Shell or Esso who have increased their prices by a third in the same time. Also don't forget the insurance companies in this equation. Whatever increase you do decide on, it will hardly effect the taxi drivers income, as we have been subsidising ourselves for the last eighteen months. This is without taking into account the cost of living, inflation, VAT rise, mechanical suppliers costs and the current economic climate, coupled with the fact that less people are using taxis. Do I need to go on ?</p>
Driver (zone 2)	Our last increase was in 2008, we agreed with the trade under discussion to hold back our 2009 proposal for increase in a bid to allow the other zones to be brought into line. Unfortunately the council failed to act and we put in for an increase in 2010 which we have received no correspondence from the council about. Now with a VAT increase and fuel going through the roof we need the increase and urgently.
Chorley Parish Council	Tariffs should be the same rate across Cheshire East. Should be made simpler and described in the same way across all Hackney Carriages.
Proprietor/Driver (zone 3)	Fare standardisation is a must as if we are Cheshire East we should be one zone not three as it is hard to lower a price than to raise a price a rate as it seems Macclesfield is the higher it should be aligned across the board.
Proprietor/Driver (zone 3)	If these are tariffs are to merge, then there must be proper meetings between drivers and taxi companies from all the three zones as well as council members to discuss the merging of the tariffs.

	Between Macclesfield and Congleton zones I would have thought that they could be merged together, fairly easily and without too many problems. However, the C & N tariffs are so much more, that if their rates were to be adopted by the other zones, then it would decimate their taxi-rank businesses. I feel that the only way forward to be to increase the tariffs in Macclesfield and Congleton zones in steps over a number of years.
x79 drivers	Tariffs should be standardised across the whole of Cheshire. So we can be flagged down in Cheshire East anywhere.
Proprietor/driver	I personally would like to see all the fares in Cheshire East to be standardised for uniformity. I don't think having yellow, blue, red triangles in the licence plate makes a difference. Example is: You drop off a fare in Congleton at 01.45 am and someone is flagging you down because they want to go home and you can't pick them up because the tariffs in Congleton and Macclesfield and Crewe are different. People see a taxi sign they don't see what colour triangle is in the plate to distinguish which area you are coming from. So standardising the fares will make it easier for us to serve the public so that if I drop off in Crewe and I see people needing a taxi I can drop in and help shift the people home safe and sound after all it's one Cheshire East Council. This also applies to the bye-laws. By merging them into one standard law will make the area more organised and we as drivers will be working together to achieve one common goal.
Private Hire Driver	A short note to you, I have been a Private Hire Driver for 12 years. What bothers me the amount of taxis or private hire cars running is what do they charge for a journey , how much goes in the books or back pocket no one is checked only the VAT boys. One more, what insurance do they carry. It makes people wonder you can go from Holmes Chapel to Man Air return for £50.00 with a Middlewich taxi company.
Proprietor/Driver (zone 3)	(a) First of all Crewe appears the only zone which includes Vat within the tariff. This needs amendment immediately. Only vat registered proprietors should be permitted to charge Vat as they are the only ones paying Vat to the treasury. If the Vat is taken out of the tariff then this immediately reduces to the general public (and allows the Vat reg proprietor to decide if he wishes to charge it to that customer) and prevents problems when the Vat rate fluctuates. Eg: When the Vat increased from 17.5% to 20% I applied for the tariff to be adjusted, this was rejected and I suggest that this is bordering on being illegal. The treasury has increased the amount I have to pay in Vat yet I am unable to increase the amount I charge ????

	(b) The tariff for the 3 zones requires standardising but as for the best way of reaching a satisfactory conclusion I have no suggestions at present.
Sandbach Town Council	Differing tariffs should be brought in line with Crewe and Nantwich who currently offer the fairest of tariffs.
Sutton Parish Council	Q2 - What are your views on how the differing tariffs should be brought into line. <b>A - Average tariff across all zones</b>  Q3 - a) Whether or not the tariffs can or should be standardised across Cheshire East. <b>A - Yes</b>  b) What are your views on the current tables of fares <b>A - Too diverse</b>
Driver (zone 2)	I also think the Council should automatically award an increase in fares annually, and only consult if we object on any grounds.

**Consultation question 4:**

**Which of the conditions do you think should be retained? Which do you think should be abolished or changed?**

**Please provide reasons for your responses to this question.**

<b>RESPONDENT</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>
Representatives of the Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• adopt vehicle specification for hackney carriages from existing Cheshire East Borough Council Private Hire Vehicle conditions – with the addition of a requirement that all new hackney carriages must be wheelchair accessible (MI specification);</li> <li>• all existing saloon cars could remain as hackney carriages (i.e. there would be ‘grandfather rights’ in relation to the wheelchair accessibility requirement);</li> <li>• any new application for a vehicle licence must relate to a vehicle under eight years of age, and no vehicle may remain licensed once it is over twelve years old, together with removal of six monthly testing</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>wish to be able to have towbars fitted to the vehicle and to use them;</li> </ul>
Mottram St Andrew Parish Council	These are technical issues. The responsible officers (jointly) from the three zones should be empowered to review and agree a revised set of conditions. Obviously these were drawn up independently to cover matters that were experienced locally and it is therefore better that those with the technical and experienced knowledge be allowed to draft the regulations.
Knutsford Town Council	The Town Council sees no reason for differing vehicle specifications throughout the borough and would support the standardisation of specification in providing suitable disabled access
x 2 hackney carriage drivers (zone 2)	<p>There should be an age restriction on hackney and private hire vehicles as they are a lot of old cars are still being used as a tax which they don't give and safety and comfort the customers.</p> <p>Private hire vehicles should carry the sign "It's illegal if it's not pre-booked" on the vehicle door.</p>
Driver (zone 3)	We want Crewe's 'Terms and Conditions' to be adopted.
Driver (zone 3)	If you are proposing an end to the zoning system then new T&Cs need to be adopted. This would best be done with proper consultation and NEGOTIATION with Taxi Trade Associations and Representatives. I would urge the Council to take this opportunity to update the T&Cs to modern standards for the 21st Century and not to use the outdated terminology of Appendix "G" Section "15" Paragraph "a", "By the bus station" would do.
Driver (zone 2)	For over 2 years I was in talks with other associations and the council to try and sort the all under one borough mess out but during this time little or nothing has been done by the council, we have put in proposals for conditions, petitions for a cap on the issue of new hackney plates, plans and requests for extra ranking in writing to planning and licensing, been to the local press, involved local MPs and yet the council have done nothing. All these proposals on conditions from all zone associations must be on record somewhere or have we wasted 2 years of our time?
Driver (zone 3)	<p>I would like to propose the following for the consultation exercise :</p> <p>i) No vehicles over EIGHT YEARS OLD to be allowed to be plated.</p>

	<p>ii) No vehicles over FOUR YEARS OLD at the first application to be plated to be allowed.</p> <p>iii) Only drivers that actually live in the BOROUGH to be licensed.</p> <p>My argument being the above will eliminate the Old Bangers and drivers that Do Not Know the area thus improving the image of the Industry.</p>
Chorley Parish Council	<p>We have insufficient knowledge of the conditions to determine which should be retained/abolished. I would suggest that where conditions are considered to be 'best practice' within the three zones then that should be adopted and the remaining two abolished.</p>
Proprietor/Driver (zone 3)	<p>Terms and Conditions is a difficult one as I have always found Macclesfield old council T &amp; C fine I see no reason to change it although a more in depth approach on the testing of the terms is needed and to make it a higher penalty for touting and plying fore hire when not on the rank i.e. sitting outside a public place as this practice is killing the private hire trade and by making drivers knowledge tested there is no reason for them not to know the rules. A NVQ should be brought in to test all drivers/operators to obtain higher standards something that could be brought in to be a part of a drivers conditions and requirements again tested by Taxi officers and should be charged for at a cost. Current license holders would be given time to take this and maybe a grandfather type grant (with a test) to cover older long term drivers. A dress code should be introduced and strict penalty for smoking in a Taxi including the car having a full valet if caught smoking or car smells of smoke.</p> <p>Over a set period to phase out the use of standard vehicles as hackneys and to introduce purpose built vehicles as these are easy to identify to be flagged down or stand on the taxi rank. A hackney carriage could only pick up private hire if the booking was given by an operator with a private hire operators licence and although the hackney works a taxi rank and not working off a base it should be affiliated to a private hire operator and thus stop a lot of illegal touting. I believe strongly that all private and public hire vehicles on their first grant should be no more than two years old with less than fifty thousand on the clock and not be plated after seven years old unless purpose built with disabled access.</p> <p>Light in a taxi as stated a 70% light should be monitored in a taxi as the law is 70% for front windscreens</p>

	and as I have had to pay a £1000 have windows that on a Ford that are standard tint to clear glass this area should be taken into account that standard tint at 50% light is a pass but no privacy glass. At 50% you can see people in the vehicle easily and see right though the vehicle at distance.
Proprietor/Driver (zone 3)	If the three zones, T & C are to be merged then as my answer to question 2, there should be proper meetings between all the parties, i.e. drivers, companies and council members. Differences such as towbars, seating arrangements in people carriers/mini-buses, removal of six month taxi-test, maximum age limits for taxis, introduction of eco-friendly electric cars and standardisation of all taxi specifications i.e. size etc.
x79 drivers	Most stay the same but talk about them with the taxi drivers. Allow towbars but test the trailer and the driver. Allow factory fitted tinted windows. Do not remove seats below manufacturer specification.
Sandbach Town Council	Members believe conditions used by the former Congleton Borough Council served the public well and should be the basis of any future list of terms and conditions.
Sutton Parish Council	Q4 - a) Which of the conditions do you think should be retained? <b>A - Most if not all but reconstituted and applicable to all.</b>  b) Which do you think should be abolished? <b>A - Unable to comment</b>

**Consultation question 5:**

**How suitable do you think the current provision of ranks is, and what, if any, changes do you think are necessary? Please provide reasons for any changes you feel are needed.**

<b>RESPONDENT</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>
Mottram St Andrew Parish Council	A demand survey should be carried out to review this issue.
Knutsford Town Council	The number of spaces given over to hackney carriages at Canute Place (North) should be increased from

	3 to 4 and that the spaces given over at Canute Place (South) should be converted into disabled parking bays.
x 2 hackney carriage drivers (zone 2)	There are not enough spaces in taxi ranks, especially in Nantwich during the weekends. Swine market is so busy at the weekend nights and this road should be only taxis and emergency vehicles during the only weekend nights.
Driver (zone 2)	With regard to this Crewe has a severe lack of rank space compared to the number of taxis, for example town rank has three spaces and the bus station three spaces. This is ridiculous when you consider 10-20 cars are trying to rank up and end up parking illegally as there is nowhere for them to go. Fair enough when it's time for school runs or Friday/Saturday between 12pm – 5pm you will sometimes find spaces. Again this all boils down to the excess hackney carriage plates in zone 2. As for Nantwich, there isn't a rank here during the daytime at all so locals have no opportunity to hire us.
Driver (zone 3)	We need more rank spaces as there are not enough, as the number of hackney plates has increased dramatically.
x 42 hackney carriage drivers (zone 1)	It is a clear fact to anyone who has seen the Congleton taxi rank area at peak times that there are simply not enough taxi rank spaces to house the amount of taxis already active in the borough. We have continually asked for more ranks in the area and minutes from meetings that we have had over the last fifteen years with the Congleton Borough Council will clearly show this. But, as I have already said, instead of being granted more rank spaces, the amount of spaces was halved as a result of the Congleton bus station improvements a few years ago, so increased the amount of taxis would only serve to exacerbate this continuing problem. Also I am sure that the people of Holmes Chapel and Alsager would strongly welcome the existence of any taxi rank, as presently they do not have one at all.
Driver (zone 3)	RANK SPACES, PROPOSED CHANGES. "It is proposed under section 63 to consult on these changes" The above statement was told to me over 12 months ago and it was one of the Council promises that it would achieve in year 1. We are still waiting !  RANK SPACES, CURRENT. Macclesfield. Train Station 6 Spaces.

	<p>As this is the main rank in Macclesfield it is used by most of the independent Hackney drivers in town, it is also used as a waiting area by Hackney plated office cars when their radios go quiet. Subsequently there can be up to 25 cars using this rank and it can take over an hour to get from the back of the queue to the front. The average price of a job is about £6.00. The cost of fuel, blah blah blah, and you still think we need an unmet demand survey!</p>
Driver (zone 2)	<p>How suitable do I think the provision of ranks is.</p> <p>6 free rank spaces between 200 hackneys, 3 hour queues and parking tickets for trying to ply for hire, petitions to you request for help yet no response they are a joke.</p>
Cheshire Constabulary	<p>The Congleton Neighbourhood Policing Team have commented on the current Taxi Consultation that, insofar as Sandbach is concerned, there is insufficient rank provision with just one space on The Commons. It is felt that there should be at least one other rank in High Street, Sandbach as that is the area where most of the night time economy is centred. Experience in other areas has shown that people having to walk to an out of the way taxi rank have been vulnerable to assault whilst in quieter areas.</p>
Chorley Parish Council	<p>Satisfied with current provision of ranks.</p>
Proprietor/Driver (zone 3)	<p>The obvious answer is because of the ever growing number of taxis there isn't, and hasn't been enough taxi rank spaces for years and years and years, and we've been told that we would be getting more for years, and years, and years and after more consultations we will stay be waiting for years and years and years!!! During the day Macclesfield has two working ranks only, at the Old Tesco (Exchange Close) and at the train station. Because of the sheer volume of taxis in Macclesfield, it is not uncommon to see between 15 – 25 taxis waiting at either rank, built for 3 and 6 respectively. The only limiting factor being the space to find, to park anymore. At the Old Tesco rank you get smaller fares (£2.60 - £5.00) but more often, with a waiting time between 5 – 45 minutes, between each job. At the train station you get larger fares (£2.60 - £20.00) but with waiting times of 1 – 2 hours. Anything less than 1 hour is normally an exception. I would like to see a stop to anymore taxis being plated, and if anything even a reduction of the number of taxis on the road to give the existing drivers the ability to earn more than the minimum wage (which more than often</p>

	is not the case at present) and maybe even to work less than then 50-70 hours per week that a lot of the drivers are doing at present, so that they can earn a reasonable wage. Also maybe to find spaces to put new taxi ranks, where people would actually use i.e. at the hospital, Sainsburys and the big Tesco.
x79 drivers	Outside Wildings camera shop should as it is now 6.00 am to 21.00 pm.
Proprietor/Driver (zone 3)	Ranking spaces need to be increased and I suggest maybe 4 or 5 on each supermarket car park and perhaps 4 or 5 at Leighton Hospital.
Sandbach Town Council	Current provision of rank is acceptable and needs no amendment.
Sutton Parish Council	Q5 - How suitable do you think the current provision of ranks is, and what, if any, changes do you think are necessary? <b>A - Ranks only to be used by licensed carriages within specific zones to avoid over supply. (e.g. Macclesfield zone)</b>

**Consultation question 6:**

**Do you wish to express any further views in relation to any other aspects of the licensed trade? If so, please provide reasoning for any other changes which you think should be made.**

<b>RESPONDENT</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>
Mottram St Andrew Parish Council	No further views.
x 2 hackney carriage drivers (zone 2)	There is not enough inspection and controls on private hire vehicles and its drivers, which is some private hire vehicles working as a hackney carriage which is illegal, in such cases insurance doesn't cover anything. The customers doesn't know about this and our council should take the control as soon as possible. This is very important for the public safety.

Wilmslow driver (zone 3)	I also think that the licensing officers should be out and about checking vehicles that they are road worthy and thd drivers are not drinking and smoking whilst driving their vehicle.
Driver (zone 2)	The biggest problem in zone 2 is the fact we have too many plates and this ensures that there is only limited work to go round. For example, I can site on a rank for 1.5- 2 hours before I get to be front car and this isn't a one off it is a regular occurrence. Because of this we have to work more hours in a week which could lead to drivers working 12-16 hours a day to make a living which is potentially dangerous. Therefore capping the number of taxis is the only way to allow us to make a living and ensuring our livelihoods continue and hopefully improve. If not, businesses are going to go under which will increase employment and social problems in the area.
Driver (zone 3)	I sincerely hope that the responses, from members of the trade and the association are listed to, as it doesn't seem that we have been listened to over the last 2 years. All the things mentioned in your consultation document, have been discussed with us over the last 2 years and we have already given our opinions, but to no avail.
x 42 hackney carriage drivers (zone 1)	<p>The only additional point that I would like to make is regarding the issue of the Congleton taxi rank phone, the cost of which Congleton taxi drivers pay for fairly between themselves. I fear that with following proposals to merge the different areas, other taxi drivers from outside the borough taking jobs from this phone would not only be highly unfair to those paying for it, but could also potentially cause many arguments and disputes amongst drivers.</p> <p>Finally, I would like to take this opportunity to remind the Cheshire East Borough Council that the current relationship between the Congleton public and its taxi drivers is a very good one, and it therefore prompts the question "Why is change needed at all when the current set up already works so well?"</p>
Driver (zone 3)	If you are to abolish the 3 zone system and new T&Cs are to be written, then can you take this opportunity to write them in Plain English, this would help everyone concerned and help clear up any anomalies that may exist. It would also be an ideal opportunity for the Council to reflect how modern and forward thinking they are.
Driver (zone 2)	One question for you as you now have my opinions, I have for the last 2 plus years given up a lot of my time and effort free of charge to work with the council first with Tony Potts, then Peter Hartwell and now

	<p>Julie Openshaw as well as your enforcement officers, [...] we have sat round tables, I have involved local MPs and the press to highlight our plight, we have sent in petitions for a cap on plates, applied for a rise in meter rates, been into and written letters to planning and licensing committees over extra ranking stood up and spoken in front of the licensing committee put letters to the licensing committee and my question to you is what have you done for us over these issues in the last 2 years?</p>
<p>Chorley Parish Council</p>	<p>No thank you.</p>
<p>Proprietor/Driver (zone 3)</p>	<p>I would like to see Cheshire East set out their stall at the offset by making taxis a business and thus a profession the reasons that taxis should be restricted to demand is that I have for one have worked hard for years to build my business and run it I have never been put in front of any committee for any offence. A taxi plate should be the tool of your trade something of value and not as it has become dished out to anyone that passes a test that I have seen on cars that are in my opinion not fit for the carriage of the public, i.e. V and W reg cars.</p> <p>I would like to see it made that to obtain your taxi plate you need to outlay a reasonable amount of money on the plate the vehicle as insurance is also a cost by having to put up or loan a considerable amount to start your business it is in your own interest to abide by the rules and look after your investment by good maintenance and vehicle care it would raise the profile of the taxi trade and quality of people in it as it stands a V reg car worth a few hundred they just run it into the ground I see them with lights out and engines smoking at the six month test they have made their money and get another that meets the test and so on till one injures someone I know my trade and its going on and as you look at the rules now is the time to change them.</p> <p>Executive plates – it is no my area but I feel that these vehicles run with no real plates on and do the same as a private hire take cash (and they do) a taxi is a taxi with a plate as is a private hire with a plate there should be no grey areas these so called executive cares are working as private hire with no plate if a company can have a contract with a person to run an exec car on a seven day rotation they need a employed driver or hire a taxi there are plenty of private hire Mercedes about.</p> <p>Mini-bus – should be private hire only unless they have wheelchair access.</p> <p>Enforcement – A higher fee and fines for offences should cover the cost of one full and a part time taxi</p>

	<p>enforcement officer over the last few years this area has fallen well short of its requirements to protect the public and also to protect the industry itself. I have heard of many cases of overcharging and seen illegal practices by drivers and I have challenged them there answer is simple no one will do a thing as there is no one on the streets full time to sort it out.</p>
Proprietor/Driver (zone 3)	<p>All new hackney carriage drivers to work with a taxi company for a minimum period of 12 months, where they can learn the trade and local knowledge, essential for working off taxi ranks. After that they must take a BTEC/NVQ test and pass before going to work the ranks, without the backup guidance and safety net that a radio company would give.</p> <p>A further point would be to see the licensing enforcement officers on the ranks and in the towns, doing spot-checks on taxis and putting an end of, out of area, private hires coming in to our areas and poaching work. This would cease if mystery shoppers and sting operations were to be used. Another point is that as a hackney carriage driver in the Macc zone, where do I have to wear a seat belt bylaw, at the boundary of the Macc zone or at the end of the Cheshire East boundary.</p>
x79 drivers	<p>Allow Eco-friendly cares Have more test centres. Have all new drivers BTEC, NVQ trained as Cheshire West have had since April 2009.</p>
Proprietor/Driver (zone 3)	<p>I feel strongly that some of the practises regarding the Hackney License Trade need to be severely dealt with by the Council, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) The refusal to undertake wheel chair work even though the plate was issued on that basis.</li> <li>(b) The refusal by some drivers to accept passengers who are only going on a short journey.</li> <li>(c) The foul and abusive language used in full hearing of women and children by drivers waiting for fares especially at Crewe Station.</li> <li>(d) The disgusting habit of some drivers urinating on the grass verge at the station feeder</li> <li>(e) The disgusting habit by some driver's discarding their litter, left over lunch etc on the grass verge at the station feeder.</li> </ul>
Sutton Parish Council	<p>Q5 - Do you wish to express any further views in relation to any other aspects of the licensed trade? <b>A - Enforcement of Conditions. e.g. non-smoking of drivers</b></p>

Driver (zone 2)	The council when issuing a licence should automatically inform the DSS and Inland Revenue that the new licence holder was now in work also any person holding in excess of two licences should inform the Customs & Excise for VAT reasons as I believe there are some companies in the Borough should be registered and aren't.
-----------------	--

This page is intentionally left blank