

Responder	Generally in support/not supported	Response
HC Driver	Not	<p>I have looked at your idea for electric WAV's and I think you have lost all grasp of logic and sensibility!</p> <p>You will put I would guess 90% or more of the trade on universal credit or lose the loss of one couples income, causing financial hard ship and or poverty especially now with domestic bills rapidly escalating and the cost of living. But in the name of carbon targets etc. you don't care that you will be ruining decent people's lives do you? But we know how bombastic this council is one could quote the boots corner fiasco, even Gloucestershire highways didn't buy into it!! But I digress I will raise my points as to why I think this is an untenable idea from a council who in my opinion is unfit for purpose.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the cost... no cab driver can afford £30k to £40k or over for an electric taxi. Whether second hand or not! Especially if you're going to keep the Draconian age threshold.</li> <li>2. no infrastructure for charging especially on taxi ranks let alone only a couple around the town, and if drivers live in a flat 3 stories up... Well unless they're going to run a 60ft extension lead out of the window!?! Or they have no off road parking or nearby (can't have a lead obstructing the foot way and verges)!!</li> <li>3. the limited range of battery, no good to drivers or companies trying to run airport/seaport transfers. Most mass produced so called affordable cars range vary. Some only appx 150 miles max.</li> <li>4. also if the rumours are correct you will also force this onto private hire. So it will be only a short time before the public suffer, because across the taxi and PH trade there will be next to no taxis left to service the public!!</li> <li>5. so from point 4 people won't be able to book taxis or hire taxis from the ranks, affecting people across the board going to school or the doctors or hospital appointment etc. etc.</li> <li>6. public order and more important safety of the public at weekend nights.</li> </ol> <p>But yes you know best despite the chaos you'll cause and the fact this idea will do next to nothing in affecting the air quality, may I remind you that you also have a duty of care and consideration of the drivers!</p>
HC Driver	Supported	<p>Thank you for taking into account feedback from your licence holders</p> <p>The following is my personal viewpoints</p>

		<p>1) happy for a 2030 deadline with regards to current vehicle guidelines Personally I'd hope to be in a full electrical vehicle way before this date. As soon as it is affordable and the infrastructure to support owning one is improved.</p> <p>2) there is no practical or ethical benefit in the enforcement of an electric WAV before or after 2030 The market for WAV vehicles does NOT justify a wholesale fleet policy</p> <p>My suggestion would be for things to continue along the same guidelines as current I.e Current saloon type vehicles must be electric by 2030 and the choice of electric vehicle resides with the plate licence holder Any electric WAV vehicle can be licenced as a Hackney vehicle from 2030 as it is now.</p> <p>These are the 2 most fundamental points that I am concerned about.</p>
HC Driver	Not supported	<p>I am writing regarding the draft consultation.</p> <p>As you are aware, the Euro 3 and Euro 4 vehicle owners already pay more on road tax and pay the ULEZ charge and more on fuel due to price increase in fuel. Forcing those vehicle owners to buy a Euro 6 Wav is unacceptable.</p> <p>The car prices skyrocketed and it is not cheap and easy to find a second hand car, let alone the SILVER ones. Now, there is even more pressure to find a Wav that is SILVER and Euro 6. The council has not done a proper survey in order to decide whether the town needs 100% Wheelchair fleets, and now forcing those with EURO 3 and EURO 4 vehicle owners to buy a Euro 6 Wav on its own will cause significant hardship when the prices of a second hand car skyrocketed. The decision makers should check the second hand car prices in order to decide whether it is actually the high time to do anything with the current policy. I do not think the council would be happy to cause those who already struggle to become unemployed. Some of us hardly ever make enough to provide enough income and bring food to the table. The council should understand that the cost of living has increased, and by making those vehicle owners buy another vehicle at the moment will cause significant hardship and debt that needs to be repaid.</p> <p>I believe the council should delay any policy changes until the economy recovers. At least give the drivers the option of buying any vehicle that can suit their budget.</p>

HC Driver	Support	<p>It's a good step from council to make carbon free by 2030 but the decision to change all hackney licenced vehicle as wheel chair access EV is practically impossible.</p> <p>EV itself is unaffordable. So wheelchair access EV may cost more than 40000 pound. If the council's intention is genuine to protect the environment (which is more priority than WAV since there are more than WAV on fleet), it is better to make high end EV as a criteria to give new hackney licence.</p> <p>So my suggestion is:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) give new hackney permit for only EV</li> <li>2) allow renewal of the WAV only if it meet Euro 6 standards. So that we can make sure there is enough WAV on fleet</li> <li>3) by these changes all the good intention of council can fulfil.</li> </ol> <p>It is driver friendly, environmental friendly and disabled friendly.</p>
HC Driver	Not supported	<p>As the council have changed their minds so many times about this policy, and in my opinion have lied to the Taxi trade! Firstly I was told when I asked the question why you have changed the policy, I was told several times by individual councillors, and categorically that the policy was not changed! Lies ,</p> <p>You then told us it would be unfair illogical, and even that it would punish us drivers that have complied with your policy! But still you changed it, even though it cost me thousands of pounds, to comply with your policy!!</p> <p>You then told those that didn't comply to your policy, that they could only change their vehicles to another saloon car in exceptional circumstances, i.e. if there car was damaged beyond repair, and then only Like for Like.</p> <p>This again has been made a joke of.</p> <p>By allowing drivers to get rid of perfectly good cars, and buy completely different cars, One driver being allowed to change his non electric car for a brand new electric vehicle!</p> <p>On a second occasion a driver has been allowed to change a perfectly good hybrid car , for a brand new car completely different from the car he had !</p>

		<p>Now it seems that the car he sold to another taxi driver has been re licensed can how can we be expected to trust policy makers that change policies at the drop of a hat ☹???</p> <p>All the statements I have made can be verified by emails received by the council over the years.</p> <p>I have been denied the same choices as these other drivers, and that's not right!</p> <p>After reading your consultation reasoning I see it only refers to your clean air policy!</p> <p>Making me realise that I was right when I said at a meeting with councillors that the WAV policy change was purely because of the realisation by the council that they had made a blunder, in telling taxi drivers they could license zero 5 emissions vehicles, The consultation process is therefore floored, I don't believe that the council listens to any debate made by the taxi drivers, and I believe that they have already made their decision over what they are going to do!</p> <p>This is just a box ticking exercise by the council, and as they have done with previous policy can change it at will.</p> <p>For the record my view is all taxi drivers should be treated equally, not letting some drivers use saloon cars, but others cannot.</p> <p>Showing them that by not complying to your policy, they have been rewarded, But those drivers who did comply to your policy have been left financially out of pocket, and in debt!</p>
HC Driver	None	<p>My Peugeot E7 (Silver) Hackney Carriage vehicle is licensed since July 2015 and is a purpose built Wheelchair Accessible Vehicle.</p> <p>It is a Euro 5 emission standard according to the V5 Logbook. I have read the 'Licence Vehicle Emission and Wheelchair Accessibility Policy' (Draft for Consultation) and I understand how various measures will be implemented as the authority's ambition is to transition it's licensed Hackney Carriage fleet to a fully Carbon Neutral fleet by 2030.</p>
HC Driver	Not supported	<p>Cheltenham Borough Council are in danger of scoring a horrendous own goal if they continue to pursue a fully wheelchair accessible net carbon zero policy for all Hackney vehicles by 2030.</p>

It is absolutely essential that the council looks again at the all WAV policy as these vehicles clearly discriminate against people who are less able bodied such as the elderly or those with "minor" disabilities.

As you will know, I have been a private-hire operator for almost ten years now and my business model was to enable wheelchair bound passengers to be able to access cab services with no limitations. This model was extremely successful for the first seven and a half years. However, during that time we had noticed an increasing number of clients who were requesting not to have WAV cars sent as they found them more difficult to get into and out of. We are able to add a note to client's telephone numbers not to send a WAV or a car with sliding doors. A simple fix for us, but when you have a taxi rank filled with nothing but WAVs the customer has no choice. Well they do, they can walk away and call a private-hire company to send a saloon car.

The problem with these vehicles is the sills are considerably higher than a standard saloon car. They are all converted vans that have bench seats in the back that provide significantly less leg room. The side rear seat belts are often set in a position that makes it almost impossible for passengers to reach and the sliding doors have a lock position when fully open that makes them almost impossible to close, even for most able bodied people. As a result, on almost every journey, the driver will need to get out of the car to assist with seatbelts and close the doors.

It is complete and utter madness to pursue a policy that so blatantly discriminates against so many, and for what purpose? The average number of wheelchair journeys completed by the entire fleet of Hackney vehicles is somewhere between 5 and 10 a week, and most of these are because they can't access an appropriate vehicle from any of the private-hire companies.

A lack of private-hire vehicles.. why would that be? Before the pandemic we had started to see a decline in the number of drivers willing to do wheelchair pick-ups. The main reason for this is the fear of liability issues. Since starting Dial-a-Cab there have been three legal cases brought against my drivers for alleged negligence in performing their "duties". All the incidents involved the loading or unloading of wheelchairs. It is not the driver's responsibility to load the wheelchair into the car or remove it at the end of the journey. His duty is to attend the pick-up, prepare his ramp, apply the front harnesses and then when the passenger is in the

car, apply the rear harnesses. He is not responsible for pushing the wheelchair into the car or removing it at the end of the journey. This should be done by a family member, friend or carer who should oversee the safe harnessing of the wheelchair.

I fear that in the near future we will reach a point where we will no longer be able to provide any wheelchair cars. The less vehicles we have the more damaging the effect on the earnings of the remaining WAV drivers.

We currently have 7 WAV vehicles on Dial-a-Cab. One belongs to me and I have very little opportunity to get out on the road, but do what I can. One is a dedicated night driver who so far this year has been required to do zero wheelchair jobs. One is a part time driver in an E7 that hasn't been able to carry wheelchairs for 8 years due to a bowed floor, but as accessibility isn't part of the fitness test the driver has been able to renew his licence every year. One is a private-hire vehicle, the only one in Cheltenham. This is driven by guy who has exceeded retirement age but continues to work and is a vital asset to this company. One is licensed by Tewkesbury Borough Council but is a side loader which means it is useless for about 50% of our wheelchair work as the side access height is too low and the other two are C.B.C. Hackney vehicles that do as much as they can. Both of these drivers have significant family commitments and are restricted to working around 6-8 hours a day.

The WAV drivers I have are realising that they are not getting their fair share of quality work as they are constantly being held in reserve for upcoming WAV bookings. Taxi drivers talk to each other and word soon spreads across the entire trade that it is a bad idea to own a WAV. My own son drove a WAV from 2016 to 2021 but changed to a luxury saloon car last summer. He says there hasn't been a moment when he regretted that decision. He's driving a car he can be proud of and, most importantly his income has increased by around 25%.

So, we move on to Martin Horwood. A lovely guy with a really good heart. He is genuinely trying to seek a solution to the problem but will not find one until he recognises that he and the licensing officers need to be more connected to the trade. In the 10 years of running Dial-a-Cab I have never seen a licensing officer at my office. This was standard practice in years gone by that gave C.B.C. a real insight into the day to day issues of running a private-hire office.

My phone operators are constantly fending off abuse, accusations and general unpleasantness from customers trying to book WAV vehicles but being told that due to fleet restrictions we can no longer accept advance bookings. As a result of being held up on lengthy phone calls other calls are being missed, so drivers are missing out on work... and why? Because it is generally considered that Dial-a-Cab is the place to call if you need a WAV. So you may ask "What are the other companies doing?". The answer, "Sorry we don't have any WAVs, you need to ring Dial-a-Cab"

I have been forced to remove all references to wheelchair accessible vehicles from our website to try to reduce the amount of pressure my staff are under but I am in danger of losing good people because they are sick of the abuse and accusations directed at them on a daily basis.

I digress.. back to Martin Horwood. His solution to the problem seems to be developing a ride hailing app so people in wheelchairs can book Hackney vehicles that are parked on the taxi rank. Given the lengthy delay getting a response from legal about whether this is a viable and legal proposition I am not confident that it will ever see the light of day. If it does you then need to force all Hackney drivers to subscribe which cannot and will not happen and, even if they do they are not likely to actually accept any bookings as they can't be forced to log-on to the system. They have chosen to be Hackney drivers because they want to be completely free agents to do as they please, when they please with no subscription costs.

I am also certain that if C.B.C. does want to become a private-hire operator the combined operators that pay their annual fees will launch a legal challenge as it is clearly not right that the council should compete in the marketplace.

In the most recent online meeting I made a suggestion to Cllr. Horwood that was met with a smirk and "that sounds expensive". That suggestion was for the council to offer a limited number of grants each year to drivers who wished to licence a private-hire WAV. As I said earlier in the piece, there is effectively only one private-hire WAV licenced by CBC and there lies the problem.

If a grant scheme was made available, lets say for £5,000 for up to 10 vehicles a year I am certain that, given the right publicity there would be a take-up. Within 4 years you would probably have an additional 30 WAV private hire vehicles on the road.

This could be carried out in partnership with the operators so you could receive a monthly report on how many WAV jobs are being completed by each driver.

Expensive? Nowhere near as expensive as forcing 200 plus Hackney drivers to buy ridiculous £70k faux electric WAV vehicles that spend more than half their life running off a petrol generator. Zero emissions, I think not. Just a total embarrassment to CBC. How expensive will it be to have to move the Promenade taxi rank to a location where wheelchairs can access these electric WAVS safely from the pavement? How expensive will it be to provide the correct infrastructure to allow these vehicles access to fast charging points whilst they are waiting on the rank? How expensive will it be when a passenger tries to sue a driver for injury caused getting in and out of one of these WAVs and the driver argues in court that he was forced to drive one by CBC and then hung out to dry when the inevitable happens?

On the subject of access to fast charging points, the council had the opportunity to install these on the site of the Royal Well taxi rank. An upgraded hut would have given drivers access to rest and refreshment facilities whilst they waited for their vehicles to charge. Instead, under cover of covid restrictions the council saw fit to rid the town of that facility in an attempt to make a little extra cash from a parking meter. A clear swipe at the trade for it's previous protests and incredibly short sighted. No taxi rank now means that everyone coming off National Express coaches etc have to drag their cases all the way round to the Promenade... more age discrimination and suffering.

Undoubtedly there will come a time when all taxis will be electric, but they need to be real electric cars that aren't going to leave the fleet decimated whilst drivers are searching for fast charging points so they can carry on working. In the meantime, until the infrastructure is in place a mixed fleet of hybrid cars would have a significant effect on reducing carbon emissions in the town centre.

Martin Horwood has consistently sought advice from a disability forum. I have regular conversations with almost all the wheelchair users in Cheltenham and none of them are represented on this forum. When I talk to them about the council's plans for the trade and Martin's proposals they all say that he clearly has no idea about the trade and the needs of wheelchair users. I personally wouldn't go that far. It is clear that he is trying to fix something that is broken but without understanding how it



		<p>works in the first place you can't possibly fix it. So I would invite Martin, or any licensing officer to come and spend some real time at the sharp end of the trade, in my office and on some ride-alongs, getting to meet the real people affected by the shortage of WAVs. He may also wish to brush up on his local knowledge as he claims that the Star College have their headquarters in Overton Road, but Overton House was taken over by the Barnwood Trust some years ago.</p>
HC Driver	Not supported	<p>Thank you for having published the Draft licensed vehicle emission and wheelchair accessibility policy for consultation. I have the following observations...</p> <p><b>Vehicle Emissions</b></p> <p>The current policy allows a Euro 5 Private Hire Vehicle that was first registered in 2013 to remain licensed for 14 years until 2027. This time-scale would have been used by the owner of the car when assessing it's viability as a private hire vehicle. The new policy would not allow such a vehicle to remain licensed beyond 2025, which is 2 years earlier than the current policy.</p> <p>This 2 year loss is material to the owner of such a vehicle for the following reasons:-</p> <p>It removes 2 years of life that would have been used by the owner of the car when assessing it's viability as a private hire vehicle.</p> <p>Its use over the last 2 years for private hire work has been severely restricted due to Covid.</p> <p>So by reducing the period it can be licensed for by 2 years this doubles the period of loss of business the owner will suffer, when adding in the effects of Covid.</p> <p>The aims of the council re vehicle emissions are commendable; however, they should also take into account the severe hardships vehicle owners have suffered recently due to the pandemic. By allowing current vehicles to continue in use according to the current policy would achieve such an aim because the rational expectations of the vehicle owner would be met.</p> <p>Moreover, private hire vehicles, unlike hackney carriages, are required by clients to travel long distances, whilst carrying large amounts of luggage. As the years pass, the range of carbon neutral vehicle that can match the ability of petrol cars to achieve</p>

these requirements will grow. So by allowing the current policy to continue, this will give owners plenty of time to plan ahead to purchase a council approved replacement vehicle that is fully carbon neutral and not just Euro 6 compliant. This in turn will accelerate the Council's ambition of a carbon neutral council by 2030.

In conclusion, by allowing the current policy to prevail, the council will facilitate the following benefits...

Vehicle owner's original calculations re the economic viability of the car will be met

The harsh effects of Covid will be alleviated by not curtailing the life span of the current vehicle

Vehicle owners will have a realistic amount of time to plan well ahead and go straight for a carbon neutral vehicle that will be much more capable as manufacturers develop their products over the next few years.

### **Vehicle Age Limits**

The Consultation Paper includes the following:-

Paragraph 2.5 states: *Subject to table 3 and 2.6, licensed private hire vehicles will be licensed for a maximum period of 8 years provided the licensed vehicle continues to comply with the authority's fitness standards for licensed vehicles.*

Paragraph: 2.6 states: *The authority does not impose a maximum age limit for licensed carbon neutral vehicles provided the licensed vehicle continues to comply with the authority's fitness standards for licensed vehicles.*

Paragraph 2.7 states: *1 January 2024, all new private hire vehicles must be either: a petrol vehicle manufactured to at least Euro 6 Emission Standards or a hybrid vehicle or a fully carbon neutral vehicle.*

### **Comments**

Please confirm that Paragraph 2.5 reads as follows: the age limit of existing vehicles is not restricted to 8 years but rather dictated by the content of Table 3.

Please confirm that the combination of Paragraphs 2.5 & 2.7 has the following implications: If a Euro 6 compliant vehicle is licensed after 1<sup>st</sup> January 2024 and it is just under 5 years old then it cannot be licensed for more than 3 years. Might it not be better to apply the following approach: that any non-carbon-neutral vehicle cannot be licensed beyond 31<sup>st</sup> January 2029, so that the Council's ambition of a carbon neutrality by 2030 is achieved.

I trust my observations are of value to the Council.

HC Driver	Not supported	<p>I would agree in principle for Hackney vehicles to be environmentally more acceptable.</p> <p>During this precarious financial time you do need to take into account the costs involved. A large hike in fares will be needed.</p> <p>Cheltenham has never needed a fully wheelchair accessible fleet. Check the number of registered disabled people in the borough, then look at the proportion that use a wheelchair.</p> <p>Even your own licensing team say that most of the wheelchair accessible Hackney's are not fit for purpose.</p> <p>Passengers not using a wheelchair find them very unpleasant to travel in.</p>
HC Driver	Not supported	<p>Please find in this email my response to the proposed licensed vehicle emission and wheelchair accessibility policy.</p> <p>Firstly, I would like to say that the policy makes NO mention of maximum renewal dates for current licensed carbon neutral non-WAV vehicles. I did email to this effect on March 13th but have had NO response ??</p> <p>This may be a golden opportunity to revisit the WAV policy in its entirety. We all know that the original policy was not correctly adopted in that the Cabinet Member at the time ignored the findings of the Public Consultation carried out. This was further exacerbated by the Member stating he was forced to go 100% WAV because of Government legislation, namely the 2010 Equalities Act (for which there is still a radio recording of this statement). This was subsequently shown to be incorrect. The only sections of this Act relating to the Taxi industry were 161-165. 161-164 were/are/ and probably will be prospective sections of the Act that were never enacted in Law. These were the sections the Member was using to justify the policy.</p> <p>Government guidelines also recommended that Local Authorities carried out a Public Consultation (there was NO PC on 100% WAV) on this matter and carried out an un-met demand survey to see if there was a need for this policy. Neither of these were done.</p> <p>To the present:</p> <p>There is a current national Public Consultation for 'Taxi and Private Hire vehicle best practice guidance' to Local Authorities:</p> <p>Taxi and private hire vehicle best practice guidance - GOV.UK (<a href="http://www.gov.uk">www.gov.uk</a>)</p>

This still recommends that Local Authorities adopt a mixed fleet to cater for ALL abilities/disabilities. This runs side by side with the recommendation from DPTAC (Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee) who also recommend a mixed fleet to cater for all abilities/disabilities. They also state that it is acceptable for a wheelchair user to wait for up to twice as long as a non-wheelchair passenger for a vehicle:

DPTAC position on taxis and PHVs - GOV.UK ([www.gov.uk](http://www.gov.uk))

Cheltenham Borough Council Constitution states that all policy decisions should be 'evidence led'. The policy currently put forward does not take into account there is NO provision or plan for charging infrastructure on any of the ranks in the town or that the ONLY vehicle which is suitable for the proposed policy (Mercedes-Benz EV WAV) has a starting retail price of £75,000. This is an immediate bar to, I would suggest, the vast majority of the HC trade in Cheltenham. I know I would not be able to finance such a vehicle.

You may also be interested to know that there is also a Public Consultation going on in the West Suffolk district. They are proposing REMOVING the WAV policy they have had in place due to it not meeting the demands of users of ALL abilities/disabilities:

It's time to have you say on package of taxi proposals ([westsuffolk.gov.uk](http://westsuffolk.gov.uk))

I do also believe that the person invited to act as a representative for a major disabled group in the town, namely Anne Lightfoot from Insight Gloucestershire, voiced her concerns about access to WAV's in a recent meeting (Andy Pyrka & Nick Fisher witnessed this) and stated she felt a mixed fleet was more suitable.

Whilst the policy, on paper, would appear to be a laudable suggestion by CBC to remove discrimination for wheelchair users, if you carry on with this, you will actually create a situation where YOU will discriminate against people who cannot access these vehicles. These people:

...

Are passengers that I, personally, have carried within the last few months from the Promenade rank after trying and being unable to access WAV vehicles. Unfortunately for the trade, these people tend not to complain to CBC about this situation, they just 'soldier on', so you do not get a balanced view about access issues.

		If you introduce this policy and only ONE person cannot access a Hackney Carriage, once all WAV, then you will have introduced a policy which discriminates and leads to the very situation you say you wish to eliminate.
HC Driver	Not supported	The change to carbon neutral is very expensive and difficult so I (as a taxi driver) would like the cars to stay as they are for now.
HC Driver	None	<p>The licensed vehicle emission consultation does not provide enough information to enable a decision and opens many questions that should be answered before providing a detailed response and decision by the council. These mainly focus around costs and range anxiety.</p> <p>If you could add the answers to these following questions as part of the draft consultation a more considered response could be provided, namely:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The electric WAV vehicles that we were shown by levc have 2 models that are considered electric (Range Extended and Battery Electric). The range extended has a backup of petrol, therefore would a petrol backup vehicle be excluded?</li> <li>2. LEVC says vehicles are good for 377 miles between top ups, though only 64-80 of those miles would be using batteries alone. Is this still considered carbon neutral for licensing purposes?</li> <li>3. These vehicles are very expensive and my home does not have a charge point. Will there be grants available from the council for purchasing the vehicles and infrastructure especially as the legal target is 2050?</li> <li>4. Current ranges from these WAV vehicles are exemplified at 80 miles which is not very practical on a busy weekend or race week. I am conscious of range anxiety that has not yet been solved for WAV, although non-wavs are reaching 225 miles (tesla 600 miles if I have £100K to spare). Therefore will you be providing rapid 30 min charge points at ALL the hackney ranks for average 10-20 vehicles or are you expecting us to go home for 8 hours?</li> <li>5. If you do provide rapid charge points, will the compatible charge points be a mix for most manufacturers (bear in mind that the manufacturers are implementing different and not universal power points) or will we have to buy LEVC vehicles which has a CCS and CHAdeMO charging socket ?</li> <li>6. Are we calculating carbon neutrality which includes the cost of new manufacturing batteries and cars for a forced 2030 timescale in our consultation compared to the legally required 2050 timescale?</li> <li>7. Lithium batteries are devastating to the environment and recycling is currently at 5%-25%, not exactly environmentally friendly when you look at the end-to-end process. Can this be considered as part of the consultation?</li> </ol>

		<p>8. Does our small council have the financial support to push a 2030 target or are we just setting an ambitious project but not providing me with the financial support to achieve it with detrimental effect. Especially when I have just been wiped out by a pandemic and now a massive increase in cost of living including an increase in council tax. Surely there are larger and more supported verticals that could take the pain ready for us to implement by 2050 when technologies will be more energy secure and infrastructure/vehicles will be cheaper.</p>
HC Driver	Not supported	<p>Hi surly it makes sense to have a mix of wav and cars that are obviously fully Eclectic. Not every passenger wants to get into a wav. So I would suggest the drivers with a WAV need to get an electric WAV . Then the drivers with a car get an electric car. So by 2030 you have a mix but all electric.</p>
HC Driver	Not supported	<p>Think all electric wheel chair vehicles are not a good idea as a lot of elderly people can't get in them so that would be discriminating against them. A mixed fleet of all electric vehicles would be a better option.</p> <p>Classic example we've had elderly customers come to a ordinary car as they couldn't get into a wheelchair accessible vehicle</p>
CBC Climate Emergency Programme Officer	Supported	<p>Great to see the direction of travel (no pun intended) with this policy.</p> <p>However, we need to go through the document and replace every instance of 'carbon neutral' vehicle with 'zero emissions' vehicle. Will you also be considering ultra-low emissions vehicles?</p> <p>Net Zero and carbon neutral were once used interchangeably but now there are clearer definitions between the two. Essentially, carbon neutral means you can continue to release emissions as long as you offset them later, but to make sure we aren't releasing and emissions from the outset, we need to be pushing for zero emissions vehicles. See below for the definitions outlined in our Climate Emergency Action Plan:</p> <p>Carbon neutral means that any carbon dioxide (CO2) released into the atmosphere from an organisation's activities is balanced by an equivalent amount being removed. Typically, this would be achieved by determining the organisation's carbon footprint and deciding how best to counteract these emissions via renewable energy generation or carbon offsetting, and sometimes carbon emissions reductions. An organisation can demonstrate carbon neutrality, whilst still increasing its own carbon emissions.</p> <p>Net-Zero emissions means not adding any greenhouse gases to the atmosphere through an organisation's activities. Becoming net-zero starts with a plan to rapidly reduce GHG emissions to zero by a specified date. However, most organisations find that some emissions can't be reduced to zero. These are expected to be small and are usually then offset</p>

		<p>by initiatives aimed at removing an equivalent amount of GHG from the atmosphere. The UK became the world's first major economy to set a target of being net zero by 2050. Cheltenham has set a more ambitious target of being net zero by 2030.</p> <p>Happy to have a chat about this on the phone if easier.</p>
--	--	--