

CHESHIRE EAST COUNCIL

LICENSING COMMITTEE

Date of meeting: 20 July 2009
Report of: Tony Potts, Community Safety Manager
Title: Fees and Charges

1.0 Report Summary

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to provide the Licensing Committee with the responses to the consultation exercise on fees and charges and to seek a decision as to the fees to be charged by the Council in relation to the licensing of hackney carriage and private hire vehicles, drivers and operators.

2.0 Recommendations

- 2.1 The Licensing Committee is requested to:
- 2.1.1 Consider the consultation responses received from the licensed trade in relation to fees; and
- 2.1.2 To determine the fees to be charged by Cheshire East Council in relation to the licensing of hackney carriage vehicles and drivers within each of the three zones and private hire vehicles, drivers and operators with effect from the First of August.

3.0 Reasons for Recommendations

- 3.1 The Licensing Committee is requested to take into consideration the representations and to take these into account when determining its decision. The committee is requested to decide the amount of the fees to be charged by Cheshire East so that this may be resolved and in place by the 1st August 2009.

4.0 Wards Affected

- 4.1 All

5.0 Local Ward Members

- 5.1 Not applicable

6.0 Policy Implications including - Climate change, Health

None

7.0 Financial Implications for Transition Costs (Authorised by the Borough Treasurer)

- 7.1 Should the committee decide not to implement the proposed fees and charges then this will have an impact upon the 2009/10 budgets

8.0 Financial Implications 2009/10 and beyond (Authorised by the Borough Treasurer)

- 8.1 As above

9.0 Legal Implications (Authorised by the Borough Solicitor)

- 9.1 Section 53 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 ('the 1976 Act') provides the local authority with the power to charge "such a fee as they consider reasonable with a view to recovering the costs of issue and administration" for the grant of hackney carriage/private hire drivers licences.
- 9.2 Section 70 of the Act provides the authority with a similar power to make a reasonable charge for the grant of vehicle and operators licences. It also prescribes that fees in relation private hire and hackney carriage vehicle licences and private hire operator's licences must be subject to a statutory publication requirement with provision for representations to be made within twenty-eight days of publication of the notice. Where objections are received the Council must consider these representations when coming to its determination as to the level of fees
- 9.3 A district council may charge such fees for the grant of vehicle and operators' licences as may be resolved by them from time to time and as may be sufficient in the aggregate to cover in whole or in part-
- (a) the reasonable cost of carrying out by or on behalf of the district council of inspections of hackney carriages and private hire vehicles for the purpose of determining whether any such licence should be granted or renewed;
 - (b) the reasonable cost of providing hackney carriage stands; and
 - (c) any reasonable administrative or other costs in connection with the foregoing and with the control and supervision of hackney carriages and private hire vehicles

10.0 Risk Management

If the Committee are unable to determine the fees, the current situation of unequal fees (charged by the three previous district councils) will remain.

It is suggested that leaving the charges as they are would be inequitable

11.0 Background and Options

- 11.1 As Members will recall, at its meeting on 22nd May 2009, the Licensing Committee resolved to approve proposed fees in relation to taxi licensing so that these fees may be subject to statutory consultation. The fees that were proposed in the report are set out at **Appendix A**.
- 11.2 In accordance with the requirements of section 70 of the 1976 Act, notice of the proposed fees were published in newspapers throughout the administrative area of Cheshire East during the week commencing 1st June 2009. In addition details were also put onto the council's website. The date by which representations were required to be submitted was 3rd July 2009.
- 11.3 The Council has received a total of 7 representations as part of the consultation exercise. For further information a copy of all the letters received are attached **Appendix B, C, D, E, F, G & H. (Appendix H also includes a response)** to which a verbal presentation will be given at the meeting. Also attached at **(Appendix J)** is a representation that has been responded to and is included for information.
- 11.4 The proposed fees have been calculated from consolidated costs previously incurred by each of the three-district council's and adjusted for identified cost savings. The committee must also take into account when determining the level of fee to be set, that the cost of providing the service ensures that the costs are reasonable, and relate to cost recovery.
- 11.5 A summary of the proposed harmonised fees **Appendix K** has been calculated using the cost per hour of available officer time using the calculated rate per hour.

For further information:

Portfolio Holder: Councillor Brian Silvester

Officer: Tony Potts

Tel No: 01270 529869

Email: tony.potts@congleton.gov.uk

Background Documents:

None

Appendix A

Details of the proposed fees are set out below:-

Hackney Carriage Vehicle (Annual)	£290
Private Hire Vehicle (Annual)	£290
6 month test (hackney carriage) (vehicles over 7 years old)	£75
6 month test (private hire vehicle) (vehicles over 7 years old)	£75
Joint Hackney Carriage/Private Hire fee) Drivers Licence – New application (3 years)	£210 (including CRB
Joint Hackney Carriage/Private Hire fee) Drivers Licence – Renewal (3 years)	£150 (including CRB
Private Hire Operators Licence (5 years)	£335

APPENDIX B

Cornes, Jane

From:
Sent: 20 June 2009 21:58
To: Licensing Mail Box
Subject: Complaint against Taxi and PH licence fee hikes

Dear Sirs,

To date there has not been one statement by the CE Council, either via the Licensing Dept or Finance Dept, as to the total revenue raised from the various fees received that are associated with Taxi/PH revenues.

As you no doubt are aware, the applicable legislation provides only for either part or full recovery of the costs with which to supply the licensing service, there is no provision for a Council to make any surplus above the actual operating costs, to do so would leave the Council open to a charge of profiteering in an illegal manner.

The original intent of the law governing Taxi/PH licensing was that it should be a public service to ensure the safety of the travelling public, not a cash cow to subsidise other areas of Council expenditure.

All of the current licence holders therefore, formally request the relevant financial information as to whether the Councils Licensing costs are equal to or greater than, the income generated in the past and current years, most hold the opinion that the current fees are already creating a surplus and that the suggested hike in fees (some 43%) is not only unfair at this time of recession, it is a blatant misuse of the powers placed upon those who are supposedly working only for the public good.

You may also be aware of the front page article in the Macclesfield Express dated June 10th 2009 ("Council Hides Parking Profit") which may give you some idea of how the public feel about the current way the "transparency of Government" depts are operated, you simply cannot pluck a figure out of the blue for fees without having the figures to back up your claim, to do so would leave you open to litigation at a later date and would not be in the interests of the public purse for if a case came to court that found the Council was acting in an illegal manner it may well cost taxpayers a great deal of money in compensation.

You must approach licensing fees in a correct, fair, and legal way. you must provide a genuine reason for increases and be in a position to back up your decision with figures that can be verified, not to do so could see you end up with another front page story which could (in this case) go national and effect every Council in the country.

Protect yourselves ! I formally wish to register my complaint against licensing fee increases until you can provide a sound verifiable basis for them to be increased.

Yours faithfully

22/06/2009

Robson, Vilma

From: Robson, Vilma on behalf of Licensing Mail Box
Sent: 23 June 2009 12:25
To:
Subject: RE: Proposed Licence fee increases

Dear
I write to acknowledge receipt of your objections and suggestions in relation to the proposed fees and charges. I confirm that I will forward these to Mr Tony Potts who is dealing with this matter.
Regards Vilma Robson

Vilma Robson
Licensing Officer
Cheshire East Council
vilma.robson@cheshireeast.gov.uk

-----Original Message-----
From: uk [mailto:kenkar54@tiscali.co.uk]
Sent: 23 June 2009 09:40
To: Licensing Mail Box
Subject: Proposed Licence fee increases

I wish to object to Cheshire East Councils proposal to increase fees for Private Hire Vehicles etc. The proposed increases are way above the rate of inflation and cannot be justified, particularly in this current financial climate. This proposal, coupled with the extra burden of the cost of the new conditions will seriously jeopardize the future of many operators. We all know the cost of fuel nowadays notwithstanding the increased cost of tyres etc., etc.
Should the Council need to save costs then may I suggest they look no further than themselves and do some in house pruning.

Value your online security: Get 50% off Norton Security 2009 -
<http://www.tiscali.co.uk/securepc>

APPENDIX D

Robson, Vilma

From:
Sent: 22 June 2009 14:11
To: Licensing Mail Box
Subject: Plates

To whom it may concern I'm a driver in the east Cheshire bough and I'm not happy with the plate increase from £210 to £290 this is by far a large increase and is not fair for the current climate, this is unfair to increase the plates as the work has dropped of and the plates in macclesfield are increasing all the time I feel this needs looking into further before it can be decided to be increased thanks for your cooperation

[FREE Animations for your email - by IncrediMail!](#)

[Click Here!](#)

22/06/2009

APPENDIX E

Cornes, Jane

From: Jane Cornes
Sent: 01 July 2009 10:30
To: Licensing Mail Box
Subject: Taxi Fees

To whom it may concern I'm a driver in the east Cheshire bough and I'm not happy with the plate increase from £210 to £290 this is by far a large increase and is not fair for the current climate, this is unfair to increase the plates as the work has dropped of and the plates in macclesfield are increasing all the time I feel this needs looking into further before it can be decided to be increased thanks for your cooperation

Upgrade to Internet Explorer 8 Optimised for MSN. [Download Now](#)

02/07/2009

Cornes, Jane

From:
Sent: 07 June 2009 21:48
To: Licensing Mail Box
Subject: License fees

I would like to object to the proposed license fees as published in the Macclesfield Express newspaper dated 3/6/09.

The hackney carriage vehicle test is still too high at £290-00. The 6 monthly test for vehicles over 7 years old IS acceptable at £75-00.

Why should I be forced to pay for a joint Hackney/Private hire badge when I have no intention of owning a private hire vehicle?.

Are these proposed fees simply plucked out of midair or are they calculated on the basis of hours required to process a license.

How were these figures arrived at?.

As it stands, we are at saturation point where I work in Macclesfield , and I am having to work excessive hours to keep in business.

Further increase in cost is totally unacceptable, as we are still in a recession.

It would appear that you have no consideration for the trade and only seek to reap revenue from it.

Deregulation plus a recession is not a good environment to propose an increase in fees.

25years experience of the trade.

Get £25 off a case of wine with Tiscali's Naked Wines offer - www.tiscali.co.uk/wine

APPENDIX G.



Dear Sir or Madam

In response to the proposed increase in Private hire and Hackney carriage Licenses I object for two main reasons.

Firstly the present financial climate means there is a large reduction in people using taxis and the general increase in the cost of fuel and repairs.

Secondly there are too many licenses being issued and that is reducing the share of business available to make a reasonable income.

Is the M O T certificate included in the increase in fees or are we expected to pay out again for something which has been unnecessary in the past?

Yours faithfully

A large, dark, illegible signature or stamp, possibly a red wax seal or a very dark ink mark, located below the "Yours faithfully" text.

1st. July, 2009.

Mr. T. Potts,
Licensing Department,
Cheshire East Council
Council Offices
Westfield's,
Middlewich Road,
Sandbach,
Cheshire,
CW11 1HZ

Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976
Fees and associated charges for the Licensing of Vehicles, Operators and Drivers.

Dear Sirs,

Cheshire East Council – Licensing Fees for taxis etc.

Further to the Statutory Notice placed by the Council in The Macclesfield Times we wish to submit our Objection to the implementation of the fees as advertised.

We are particularly concerned that the failure of the Council to address the difficulties which ought to have been apparent to it when considering the transition to a new authority has resulted in a situation where partial variation of conditions of licence and the continuing operation of what are essentially three licensing services is engendering considerable feelings of inequality of treatment amongst the trade across the three former authority areas.

Four months in to the new Council's life we find that the degree of disparity of treatment of existing licence holders is producing increasing doubt that the Council has a proper appreciation of our sense of dissatisfaction with the failure of the Council to devote sufficient management input at an early stage into resolving these complex issues.

If the Council will be unable for reasons of lack of available management resource to meet with us and resolve our substantial concerns within the next two months, then we believe the Council should revert to charging the lowest fee levied for any particular licence across the three former councils for the remainder of this financial year.

In the meantime we ask the Licensing Committee to defer consideration of our and any other Objections submitted, to allow for consultation to produce a thorough and acceptable resolution of the anomalies inherent in the current proposals.

At the meeting of the Licensing Committee held on 22nd May, 2009, it was resolved that fees for licensing of drivers, vehicles and operators be approved as set out in the Report

for the meeting at Appendix A and that those fees would be advertised further to allow for Objection to be made in accordance with the provisions of the Act.

We set out below a number of the major concerns we have and hope that these will demonstrate the need for the detailed consultation/negotiation we have requested.

The council had produced a revised budget for the Licensing of taxis etc following the adjournment of the meeting of the Committee on 30th March, 2009 when concerns raised by the trade and elected members were sufficiently serious to make a determination of the fees then proposed unsafe on the basis of the information available to the committee at that time.

The council subsequently supplied a considerable amount of financial and other data to support the recommendations made to the Committee for approval on 22nd May, 2009.

The budget showed an apparent deficit (under recovery of alleged operating costs) of between £84582 (based on actual numbers of licences issued in 2008/09) and £133,536 (based on the budgeted volumes of the three former authorities).

The council's position is that on the basis of the fees now approved the trade as a whole will be enjoying a considerable subsidy, by reference to the estimated cost of providing the service over the coming twelve months (being the actual outturn costs of the former authorities for 2008/09 with a few minor adjustments).

That is all predicated on the assumption that the three previous authorities were applying reasonable apportionments of costs to their respective Taxi licensing Cost centres.

Examination of the costs attributed by them to taxi licensing activity indicates widely disparate approaches.

To date, the new authority has not established an integrated costs and overheads recharging system.

✓ Has the Cheshire East Council approved a consolidated budget for 2009/10 and was this approved as a single budget or are there four separate budgets operating as 'satellite' operations which will only be consolidated for the purposes of producing the Statutory Accounts?

The operation of the Cheshire East licensing functions to the present time is based on three separate offices working to the working practices and administrative systems of the former authorities.

As such, the setting of the fees by reference to notional time allowances for particular licence processes is unsafe as there is no commonality of actual practice.

By way of example we cite the method by which licence renewals and vehicle testing is carried out in Macclesfield. The licensee does not deal with licensing staff but submits applications to staff in the Customer Services Centre who check papers and documents against a 'checklist' for completeness and accept payment. Licences are issued by the Licensing Department, in the case of vehicles, after completion of the Compliance Test by the Council's appointed contractor. The time involvement of the Licensing department staff and other Council staff is therefore considerably less than that stated in Appendix J of the report to the Committee for 22nd May, 2009.

It is our considered view that the Council should reject the concept of 'time based' fees for the following reasons:-

- 1) As stated in our submission to the Committee on 22nd May, 2009 we do not accept a summation of total 'staff hours' to be expended in licensing of taxis and drivers, based upon notional time estimates to process each type of licence, as a valid basis of budgeting – example above.

The Council is required to provide an 'on demand' service in normal office hours, which will be in place regardless of demand on any day or time of the year. The council must also respond to public enquiries, complaints, carry out enforcement and process action to the committee or courts in appropriate circumstances.

If the time allocations set out in Appendix J (Report 22nd May, 2009) are accepted, the only funding for on-going administration of these additional matters would appear to be the trivial sum of £34 per annum drawn from the Five –Year Operator licence.

- 2) In correspondence, the council has stated that the 'savings' in the staff employed on taxi licensing for the future (as shown on the Costs and Income Spreadsheet presented to the meeting on 22nd May) have been achieved by reducing from 4.72 down to 4.12 FTE posts as against the staff input to this activity in the former authorities. Are these actual proportions of given posts, or derived figures based upon the notional hours calculated/stated for the grant and renewal of licences?

Whichever seems not to matter, as the notional hourly rate derived from the costs appears to move inversely to the reduction in the FTE staff figure given on the budget calculation spreadsheet? The future forecast operating departmental costs are simply the consolidated outturn for last year in the three former councils. Thus, as the staffing FTE figure has been reduced this results in less total staff hours per working year to be applied as the denominator in the calculation of the hourly charge out rate. This has now increased from £50 as given in the Report to the committee at paragraph 7.9 to £60.53 at the 6th paragraph of section 8.1 of the report to the meeting on 22nd May.

The net result is to maintain the level of Fee income by increasing the hourly charging rate as the 'alleged' staff time input 'falls'.

On the basis of the above observations we do not see any point in engaging in a detailed argument about the specifics of costs included in the account until such time as we have had the opportunity provided under the Audit Commission Act 1998 – Public Inspection of Accounts Regulations, to examine the details of the specific charging policies and costs included in the Licensing accounts of the former authorities, which should be available for inspection within the next few weeks.

The differences of practice between the three 'licensing sections' including the testing regimes for Private Hire Vehicles and Hackney Carriages, for which the 'old' conditions remain in force, is producing considerable inequality of treatment and costs for owners and drivers in different places. The council must address these issues urgently to remove the current lack of faith in the trade that the merging of the authorities will produce any efficiencies or improvement in the area of licensing activity; which impinges on their businesses to an extent far greater than in almost any other area of activity subject to Council supervision and control.

We hope that the council will give due consideration to our Objection and suggested timetable to resolve the current concerns, which are felt widely across the whole of the new authority and allow us the opportunity to present additional comments to appropriate senior Officers of the Council at an appropriate time.

Yours sincerely,

chairman

For and on behalf of Cheshire East Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Association.

Please reply to

Cheshire East Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Association
C/O

APPENDIX J

E Mail to Mr Rennie from

dated 22nd June 2009

Mr. Rennie,

I understand from Mr Potts that a requested meeting with Trade representatives will unfortunately not be possible. Consequently and in order for me to prepare appropriate and accurate representations to the proposed fee structures, a timely response to the following is requested;

Central Services Recharges.

a) How was the apportionment of the total consolidated cost base arrived at for the TAXI/ PHI licensing functions?

b) How were the FTE figures calculated?

c) Under the Supplies and Services section are items IT Software + Communications & Computing. Are these duplicated within the ACT Services Recharge?

d) Law & Admin; Community Safety; Environmental health; Customer Services, DEBTORS; and a very large item called OTHERS. What service is provided to the Taxi / Licensing function to justify these recharges?

e) Can we be assured that a department whose costs are being recharged e.g.. IT services do NOT include any recharged costs made to them by a.n.other service dept e.g. Law & Admin?

Many Thanks

Terry ME.

E.Mail Response to From Andrew Rennie Dated 3rd July 2009.

Taxi Licensing Fees

Central Service Recharges

a) How was the apportionment of the total consolidated cost base arrived at for the Taxi/PHI licensing functions?

The total consolidated cost base for Central Service Recharges has been arrived at by the using the historical data for each of the three districts.

As I mentioned at the meeting on 22nd May 2009 and in my email to Alan Fiddler dated 14th May 2009 (who represented the Taxi Drivers at the same meeting) the overhead allocations made to Taxi Licensing are considered to be a reasonable estimate at the present time.

Each District has it's own basis of allocations and to help you understand how these have been arrived at I attach a spreadsheet showing the basis of allocation.

The FTE figures (reduced for 2009/10 by 0.6 FTE) represent staff numbers who are directly charged to the Licensing Section. An estimate of their proportion of time spent on Taxi Licensing compared to other Licensing has been made. The addition of these proportions makes up the FTEs shown on the costing sheets.

Contained within Supplies & Services are Software Licence Costs & Updates which are directly related to the Taxi Licensing function. The ICT Recharges are computing recharges made from the ICT function. I confirm there is no duplication of costs being charged to Taxis.

The recharges from the various sections you have mentioned are included on the attached spreadsheet. I have split the others section out below the body of the spreadsheet and have provided an explanation of the basis of the allocation of the recharge.

I cannot assure you that a department whose costs are being recharged have not already had costs recharged to it. The recharge calculation has to start at one cost centre and finish at another cost centre. The IT Section would recharge costs to almost every cost centre including Law & Admin and each of those cost centres would in turn recharge their total costs to other cost centres (inclusive of recharges).

APPENDIX 1

Sheehy East Borough Council

2011 Licensing Demand Allocation Details 2009/10

Central Service Requirement	Condition	Estimated	Costs & Variations	Total
	Based on Allocation	Based on Allocation	Based on Allocation	
ICT Services	Based on Number of PCs used & direct software used	6,150	No of PCs = Proxies plus any direct software related costs	26,697
Law & Admin	Officer Time of Legal Section	19,780	Officer time paid	50,490
Community Safety	Officer Time of Community Safety Manager	7,200	Officer Time dealing with tax vehicle licence issues	7,390
Enforcement Health				40,000
Customer Services				26,063
Utilities				16,501
Central Point Unit Head of Service Transport Management	Officer Time of Transport Manager	2,650		6,792
				9,575
				2,050
Others	Finance/Other/Police/Collectors	1,251		
				30,316
Total		37,064		218,610

See above for explanation

Consideration of Other services
not detailed in above. The majority
of these costs have been allocated
based on staff numbers employed &
% of officer time spent.

HR
Press Publicity Communications
Business Visitation
Accounts Payable/Receivable
Design & Graphics Unit
Invoice Planning Unit
Corporate Accountability Bus Trans
Performance & Central Projects
Human & Safety

HR
Press Publicity Communications
Business Visitation
Accounts Payable/Receivable
Design & Graphics Unit
Invoice Planning Unit
Corporate Accountability Bus Trans
Performance & Central Projects
Human & Safety

HR & Payroll - Staff time based on assignment to &
directorate then apportioned over services in directorate
based on FTEs in each section.

Communications - FTEs per directorate/service

Planning Hologram/Alarm - % alloc of time spent on front despatching payments leaving etc

Office rooming - based on sq ft of office space for licensing function

AP - No of invoices processed

Insurance - Corporate insurance based on staffing

Design & Graphics -

APPENDIX 1

Greenwich East Borough Council

Total Licensing Overhead Allocation Details 2009/10

Central Services Resource

Condition

Misclassified

Class & Mainhead

Total

Basis of Allocation

Basis of Allocation

Basis of Allocation

ICT Services

Based on Number of PCs used & direct software used

0.150

No of PCs + Office time spent on systems work

16.997

No of PCs + Persons plus any direct software related costs

5.240

26.997

Law & Admin

Office Time at Legal Section

19.780

Office Time of Legal Section

24.796

Office time and decision of legal operations

6.004

59.490

Community Safety

Office Time of Community Safety Manager

7.332

Office Time dealing with Tax vehicle licence issues

40.806

Office Time dealing with Tax vehicle licence issues

40.806

7.230

Environmental Health

Office Time of Community Safety Manager

7.332

Office Time dealing with Tax vehicle licence issues

40.806

Office Time dealing with Tax vehicle licence issues

40.806

7.230

Customer Services

Office Time of Community Safety Manager

7.332

Office Time dealing with Tax vehicle licence issues

40.806

Office Time dealing with Tax vehicle licence issues

40.806

7.230

Debtors

Office Time of Community Safety Manager

7.332

Office Time dealing with Tax vehicle licence issues

40.806

Office Time dealing with Tax vehicle licence issues

40.806

7.230

Central Print Unit

Office Time of Community Safety Manager

7.332

Office Time dealing with Tax vehicle licence issues

40.806

Office Time dealing with Tax vehicle licence issues

40.806

7.230

Head of Service/Transport Management

Office Time of Community Safety Manager

7.332

Office Time dealing with Tax vehicle licence issues

40.806

Office Time dealing with Tax vehicle licence issues

40.806

7.230

Others

Office Time of Community Safety Manager

7.332

Office Time dealing with Tax vehicle licence issues

40.806

Office Time dealing with Tax vehicle licence issues

40.806

7.230

Total

Office Time of Community Safety Manager

7.332

Office Time dealing with Tax vehicle licence issues

40.806

Office Time dealing with Tax vehicle licence issues

40.806

7.230

Comprehension of Other resources are detailed in below. The majority of these costs have been allocated based on staff numbers employed & % of office time spent.

17.028

See below ***

12.037

30.315

See above for explanation

HR & Payroll - Staff time based on assignment to a directorate, then apportioned over services in directorate based on FTEs in each section.

12.037

Planning & Development - % slice of time spent on most distracting payments banking etc.

Office accounts - based on sq ft of office space for licensing function

AP - No of invoices processed

Insurance - Corporate insurance based on staffing

Design & graphics -

Appendix K

Breakdown of costs by licence type

Hackney carriage/private hire vehicle licence (annual licence)

Item	Number of hours	Cost ¹
Initial processing of application	2h:45m	170
Vehicle test ² including administration	1h:30m	90
Issue of licence/plates	0:30m	30
TOTAL		290

Hackney carriage/private hire drivers licence (three year licence new application)

Item	Number of hours	Cost
Initial processing of application	2h	120
Knowledge test	1h	60
Issue of licence/plates	0:30m	30
TOTAL		210

Hackney carriage/private hire drivers licence (three year licence renewal application)

Item	Number of hours	Cost
Initial processing of application	2h	120
Issue of licence/plates	0.30m	30
TOTAL		150

¹ Based on an hourly rate of £60 per hour

² Based on an average over the three existing districts

Operators' licence (five year licence)

Item	Number of hours	Cost
Initial processing of application	3h	180
Issue of licence	0.30	30
Element for 'control and supervision' (Over 5 year period £34 per year)		125
	TOTAL	335