

Total number of responses received: 21

Breakdown of category

- Hackney carriage/private hire licence holder (HC/PH): 11
- Councillor: 5 (inc Licensing Committee)
- Other statutory body: 1 (GCC)
- Public: 3
- Head of Service (HoS): 1

Analysis of responses

Proposal	Support for proposal	Not supporting proposal	No response/ comment	Comments/officer assessment
Q1: Do you agree, or disagree, with the authority's proposal to display information on how to make a complaint in licensed vehicles?	HC/PH: 8 Cllr: 4 GCC Public: 3	HC/PH: 3 Cllr: 1	HoS	HC/PH: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. I believe only the plate number is sufficient for the safety of drivers.2. Displaying the information on how to make a complaint is very positive, but equally how to submit a compliment or comment is equally important too. Cllr: Complaints should be made with proper evidence it is vital to proof. Public: Always good to provide this info for members of the public. <i>Officer assessment:</i> <i>Update to information on how to make a complaint, compliment or concern – pg 7</i>
Q2: Clarification around types of DBS checks that CBC can accept and 6 month checks that will be carried out on update service				NB This is a requirement under the Department for Transport (DfT) Statutory Standards and Home Office Guidance regarding DBS checks so no views will be sought. <i>Officer assessment:</i> <i>Adopt</i>

Proposal	Support for proposal	Not supporting proposal	No response/ comment	Comments/officer assessment
Q3. Do you agree, or disagree, with the authority's proposal regarding medical assessment frequency?	HC/PH: 10 Cllr: 4 GCC Public: 3	HC/PH: 1 Cllr: 1	HoS	<p>HC/PH:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I think drivers should have to do a taxi driving assessment every 5-10yrs as well. 2. Licence holder should declare any changes immediately to the licence authority. <p>GCC: Aligning with the DVLA guidelines makes sense.</p> <p>Cllr: Would help to assessment easy if reduced the list of questionnaire in medical assessment form.</p> <p><i>Officer assessment:</i> <i>We cannot amend the D4 medical examination used by the DVLA as this is prescribed by them and is industry best practice.</i></p> <p><i>Adopt.</i></p>
Q4. Do you agree, or disagree, with the authority's proposal regarding WAVs and emissions?	HC/PH: 6 Cllr: 1 GCC Public: 2	HC/PH: 6 Cllr: 4 Public: 1		<p>HC/PH:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All current licenced vehicles should be Licenced until they age out. 2. The fleet will naturally evolve over time. There is no need for a " line in the sand" date. 3. Confirmation that from 2030 only zero emissions vehicles will be licensed as hackney carriages and confirmation that this is the authority's aspiration for the PHV fleet; 4. Will the council make allowances for retiring drivers? Older drivers will find this difficult as finance options to purchase Zero emission vehicles will have limitations. <p>What infostructure will the council make available in support of drivers changing to such vehicles?</p>

Proposal	Support for proposal	Not supporting proposal	No response/ comment	Comments/officer assessment
				<p>Will the council change the policy in good time if net zero is abolished or relaxed if a new government is appointed? Basically to avoid another Policy fiasco such as the WAV implementation.</p> <p>Will the council also consider the affordability of such vehicles ?</p> <p>Currently we are experiencing the erosion of work available or lost ie;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Uber 2. Hospitality sector (especially night time economy) is on the decline 3. Electric Scooters 4. 24hr Stagecoach buses 5. National express may pick up and drop off solely for the Golden Valley Transport Hub 6. Student population no longer use Hackneys - Uni Transport provided 7. Invasion of non local taxis during festivals 8. Mileage limitations on zero emission vehicles (as it stands at the moment) Drivers may find themselves having to avoid long distance work such as Airport runs due to mileage anxiety. Having to pause work to charge such vehicles - especially during festival times. <p>10 years ago there was none of the above to consider but now we are faced with unguaranteed income - where before a driver could meet his targets fairly easily due to demand - now its like playing roulette - you just hope you fall lucky.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. agree with emissions and disagree with WAVs policy. as there are enough available. Mostly people prefer to travel in non WAVs. we have seen this objection from customers. 6. Cheltenham does not have enough charging points for full electric taxis.

Proposal	Support for proposal	Not supporting proposal	No response/ comment	Comments/officer assessment
				<p>7. A market research should be conducted in regard to WAVs demand on taxi ranks.</p> <p>8. Page 21 of the Draft Policy of the Conditions for Private Hire and Taxis operating in the Borough of Cheltenham, February 2025 states... “The authority aspires to only licence new private hire vehicles, [replacement applications and renewal applications] from 1st January 2030 where they emit no harmful emissions from the tailpipe.” This date is less than 5 years away and there doesn’t appear to be anywhere in this Draft Policy for a full consultation process to be undertaken of this momentous aspiration. It is therefore vital that the authority implements such a process and uses this time to carefully consider all of the implications of this proposal long-before it is adopted. This process must include full consultation with the trade and other appropriate organisations, such as the motor industry. It should also be revisited on a regular (annual) basis so as to be amended according to the latest developments. Set out below (next page) are some examples of the matters that such a process must consider now if the authority’s aspiration is to become a reality. They are only a selection of the issues, there being many more that a consultation will identify. If they aren’t and the policy is adopted then Cheltenham Borough Council is likely to be bereft of a comprehensive fleet of PHV’s that its residents need. 7 (1) The requirement for a PHV to be capable of travelling several hundred miles in a day without stopping for long periods, which an electric vehicle would need to do to recharge. a. A realistic example of this would be a journey from Cheltenham to central London, for a pick-up (which given the terrain allows no time for stopping), followed by a journey involving several short stops (where charging facilities aren’t available, due to the nature of the stops) & then returning to Cheltenham. b. As well as the sheer distances involved, this journey is highly likely to</p>

Proposal	Support for proposal	Not supporting proposal	No response/ comment	Comments/officer assessment
				<p>involve a significant amount of time sat in heavy traffic in London, which would quickly drain the battery of an electric vehicle. c. This will in turn cause anxiety for the driver and thereby the passenger, who will (via the hotel) explicitly require a vehicle to be booked only if it is capable of performing the journey without incident d. Additional pressure on the PHV's range will occur as passenger numbers in the vehicle rise, along with the associated volume of luggage; both of which will drain the battery of an electric vehicle at an ever increasing rate. e. When the colder months are upon us, the electric vehicle's battery will be further depleted by the weather due to the lower temperatures and the need for it to run ancillary devices, such as heating and window de-misting systems. f. So only when electric vehicles are capable of achieving these requirements can the authority cease to license PHV's that aren't zero emission. (2) There are also macro-economic factors occurring that will affect the ability of a PHV Driver to obtain a zero-emission vehicle by 1st January 2030. These include the following... a. The market for zero-emission/electric vehicles has slowed recently, thereby i. Reducing the ready availability of such vehicles. ii. Potentially restricting the investment manufacturers are prepared to put into such vehicles iii. Which in turn will limit the capability of a PHV Driver to find a vehicle that can perform the sorts of journeys described in Point (1), above. b. The price of electric vehicles tends to be appreciably more than non-electric vehicles, thereby making them less economically viable for a PHV driver, who is attempting to run a business. c. The infrastructure upgrade to the UK's electricity network by 2030 that is required to support electric vehicles is by no means guaranteed, it currently being way behind. (3) With the renewal of PHV Licences from 1st January 2030 requiring them to be zero emission vehicles, anyone applying to licence a new PHV between now and that date will have an ever diminishing</p>

Proposal	Support for proposal	Not supporting proposal	No response/ comment	Comments/officer assessment
				<p>lifespan for the PHV, during which time it can be used to generate an income... a. A PHV licensed from 1st January 2025, will have a 5 year life. One from 1st January 2026 a 4 year life and so on. b. This makes the licensing of a non-zero emission PHV less and less economically viable, to the point that it won't make economic sense to do so long before 1st January 2030. c. Given that the macro-economic factors at play (as set out in Point (2) above), are liable to restrict the availability of zero-emission cars suitable for PHV use for several years, this "renewals policy" is liable to cause the number of PHV's being licensed to fall significantly over the next few years. d. So when all of these matters are taken together, it becomes clear that a Consultation by the authority must be wide-ranging so that the interaction of the various parts of The Draft Policy do not dis-advantage PHV drivers and thereby the inhabitants of Cheltenham. e. One solution could be to allow a phased approach for non-zero emission vehicles licensed from 1st January 2025, allowing them to continue beyond 1st January 2030 for a set number of years.</p> <p>Cllr:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fluctuations in vehicle sales makes a mandatory silver colour restrictive - I recommend relaxing this to include all basic colours. Licenced vehicles should also be a mixture of WAV and non-WAV for similar reasons. Finally, given the cost of living and various financial challenges facing society, having a vehicle less than 8 years of age and zero emissions could prove challenging and costly. 2. zero emissions vehicle should be licensed from 2035 and should be mixed fleet of WAVS and Non WAVS, more WAV vehicles should be licensed to PHVs. The non WAVS should be replaced for Non WAVS end of its lifetime or cause of not roadworthy or uneconomical repairs to cost.

Proposal	Support for proposal	Not supporting proposal	No response/comment	Comments/officer assessment
				<p>GCC: We agree to an extent, but the cost to drivers will be considerable/operators will be considerable and this may reduce the number of vehicles licensed, and the charging infrastructure must be in place before any changes are implemented.</p> <p>Public: Financial burden.</p> <p>HoS:</p> <p>Part Two – Vehicles, Hackney Carriage Vehicles</p> <p>On the numerous references to “must emit zero emissions”, please consider whether this will also disqualify, perhaps inadvertently, Hydrogen powered vehicles. These vehicles technically do “emit emissions” but do not emit any greenhouse gases they emit water vapour.</p> <p>Private Hire - Renewal vehicle application</p> <p>Whilst this draft policy sets a maximum licensing age for PH WAVS (16 years), it is not clear whether the policy also proposes a similar maximum licensing age for saloon PHVs.</p> <p><i>Officer assessment:</i> <i>Agree with concerns, however CBC has declared a 2030 aspiration date to be carbon neutral by. LGR will pave the way on County approach. Amend to aspire and commit to keeping under review?</i> <i>Update to include HoS comments.</i> <i>No need to amend upper age limit for PHV's as this will be catered for with carbon neutral aspirations.</i></p> <p><i>Officer assessment (in conjunction with Cabinet member):</i></p>

Proposal	Support for proposal	Not supporting proposal	No response/ comment	Comments/officer assessment
				<i>To not adopt this change for the time being and conduct a separate 4 week consultation on revised wording.</i>
Q.5 Do you agree, or disagree, with the authority's proposal regarding WAVs remaining as WAVs?	HC/PH: 10 Cllr: 3 GCC Public: 3	HC/PH: 1 Cllr: 2	HoS	<p>HC/PH: A driver should be able to de-wav a vehicle if..he no longer can push a wheelchair due to a medical condition or chooses to no longer use the vehicle as a wav (so long as driver has a limited toplight to add to the vehicle).</p> <p>Cllr: Then it would allow to have mix fleet.</p> <p>GCC: We support this.</p> <p><i>Officer assessment:</i></p> <p><i>There is a medical exemption process for any licence holder who is unable to push wheelchairs.</i></p> <p><i>Adopt.</i></p>
Q.6 Do you agree, or disagree, with the authority's clarification on temporary vehicle replacements?	HC/PH: 9 Cllr: 3 GCC Public: 3	HC/PH: 2 Cllr: 2	HoS	<p>HC/PH: sometimes its difficult to get one's.</p> <p>Cllr:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Similar to above, financial and market challenges could risk drivers being out of work longer than necessary. 2. Temporary replacement is a vital to keeping drivers in work in case of car damage, accident or breakdown. <p><i>Officer assessment:</i></p> <p><i>Insurance companies can provide as part of policy.</i></p>

Proposal	Support for proposal	Not supporting proposal	No response/ comment	Comments/officer assessment
				<i>Adopt.</i>
Q.7 Do you agree, or disagree, with the authority's proposal on the frequency of taximeter tests?	HC/PH: 10 Cllr: 3 GCC Public: 3	HC/PH: 1 Cllr: 2	HoS	Cllr: I think it is sufficient doing once a year and it is an appropriate requirement. <i>Officer assessment:</i> <i>Adopt.</i>
Q.8 Do you agree, or disagree, with the authority's proposal that vehicle tests can be no more than 1 month old?	HC/PH: 9 Cllr: 2 GCC Public: 2	HC/PH: 2 Cllr: 3 Public: 1	HoS	HC/PH: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 month is unworkable... Due to the limited number of testing stations and drivers need flexibility around school holidays..(most drivers have a school run and use the school holidays to test vehicles, if a driver has to test during school time, then school kids can't get to/from.school). Drivers and testing stations may not have an available time slot. Confusion between 1 month on pg 22 and 4 weeks on pg 23 Cllr: Vehicle test should be later or not more than 3 years old on a new vehicle. <i>Officer assessment:</i> <i>Due to the amount of mileage/wear and tear that can take place within 1 month, it is in the public safety interest to have a recent test.</i> <i>Have amended the confusion between 4 weeks and 1 month.</i> <i>Adopt.</i>

Proposal	Support for proposal	Not supporting proposal	No response/comment	Comments/officer assessment
Q.9 Do you agree, or disagree, with the authority's proposed roof sign dimensions?	HC/PH: 9 Cllr: 4 GCC Public: 2	HC/PH: 2 Cllr: 1 Public: 1	HoS	<p>HC/PH:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. And enforce it. 2. I think you will find that some drivers have chosen their own size rather than what has been approved. 3. It should be as small as possible. sometime really scared that roof sign will comes off. <p><i>Officer assessment:</i></p> <p><i>Adopt.</i></p>
Q.10 Do you agree, or disagree, with the authority's proposal that meters must be calendar controlled?	HC/PH: 9 Cllr: 4 GCC Public: 3	HC/PH: 2 Cllr: 1	HoS	<p>HC/PH:</p> <p>As the taxi meter update is to be extended and the dates for future race meetings and other high footfall events is only published 1 year in advance, drivers need to keep the ability to set/adjust fares accordingly.</p> <p>It is the WAV drivers association intention to lobby for higher fares for all high footfall events, the same as other local authorities, look cotswold, Gloucester and Stroud do..</p> <p>When local councils are merged in 2026.</p> <p><i>Officer assessment:</i></p> <p><i>This measure will make overcharging less possible.</i></p> <p><i>Adopt.</i></p>
Q.11 Do you agree, or disagree, with the authority's proposal that private hire operators must undertake safeguarding training?	HC/PH: 11 Cllr: 4 GCC Public: 3	Cllr: 1		<p>GCC:</p> <p>Safeguarding is paramount and we fully support this proposal.</p> <p>HoS:</p> <p>"When a renewal application is made evidence must be shown to demonstrate that at least one named individual in a management position or acting as a director for the company has undertaken</p>

Proposal	Support for proposal	Not supporting proposal	No response/ comment	Comments/officer assessment
				<p>safeguarding training approved by the authority and completed refresher training on a cycle of not less than 5 years.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should the draft policy clarify as per the above. • Should we impose a requirement that a new person in a management position or acting as a director for the company should be trained if the trained person leaves the company? <p><i>Officer assessment:</i> <i>Agreed with Cllr Atherstone to amend as per LK's comments</i></p>
Q.12 Clarification of the situations where first aid kits and fire extinguishers should be used.				<p>No views are sought as this is clarification.</p>
Q.13 Do you agree, or disagree, with the authority's proposal that card machines in licensed vehicles will be mandatory?	HC/PH: 8 Cllr: 4 GCC Public: 2	HC/PH: 3 Cllr: 1 Public: 1		<p>HC/PH:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In some area signals are not great. everyone should have but not mandatory. 2. Signals can't be controlled and conflict can be caused. 3. A cashless society is becoming the norm and it can make a Licensed Driver's accounting much more efficient. However, the requirement should include a clause preventing the driver from adding a fee for use of the machine. <p>GCC: This is very positive and customers will appreciate the flexibility of being able to pay with cash or card.</p> <p>Cllr: ALL PHV and HCV must be used card machine reader.</p> <p>Public:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Customers and drivers choice how they want to get paid. 2. Most preferred way of paying now.

Proposal	Support for proposal	Not supporting proposal	No response/ comment	Comments/officer assessment
				<p>HoS: <i>"The card machine or device must be in working order at all times, and the licensed vehicle cannot be used to carry passengers if this is not the case."</i></p> <p>Have we considered instances where a card machine or device may be affected by supplier or other external issues that means that do not work where this is outside the drivers control? Technical faults, outages etc. happen all the time and if a supplier is affected by this, it may be unfair to take several licensed drivers and cars off the road if the technical issues are beyond their control. I wonder if we need to include some fallback on a case by case basis to allow them to temporarily revert to cash.</p> <p><i>Officer assessment:</i></p> <p><i>Understandable that signals may be an issue, especially in remote areas.</i> <i>See Liverpool's policy. card-payment-guidance.docx</i> <i>Discussed with Councillor Atherstone and have updated wording and included some additional guidance for drivers (page 50/51)</i></p>
Q.14 Do you agree, or disagree, with the authority's amendments to the medical exemption process?	HC/PH: 10 Cllr: 4 GCC Public: 3	HC/PH: 1 Cllr: 1	HoS	<p><i>Officer assessment:</i></p> <p><i>Adopt</i></p>
Q.15 Do you agree, or disagree, with the authority's proposal to remove topographical questions from the private hire knowledge test?	HC/PH: 6 Cllr: 2 GCC Public: 2	HC/PH: 5 Cllr: 3 Public: 1	HoS	<p>HC/PH:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The knowledge test, should involve all aspects of Cheltenham knowledge..Including history, culture and geography... After all taxi drivers are also tour guides. 2. All drivers should have a minimum standard of local knowledge; regardless of accessibility to a satnav.

Proposal	Support for proposal	Not supporting proposal	No response/comment	Comments/officer assessment
				<p>GCC: Agree to remove the topographical questions, but its imperative the driver is still able to demonstrate they know the area.</p> <p>Public: If you are a local PHV driver then these should still be required or carry this out when undertaking the driver test. If PHV driver is long distance airport or chauffeur then this test is irrelevant.</p> <p><i>Officer assessment:</i></p> <p><i>The DfT recommend that PH drivers do not undertake this test as all journeys are prebooked.</i></p> <p><i>Adopt.</i></p>
Q.16 Do you agree, or disagree, with the authority's proposal that PHO's should notify the LA when a driver/vehicle stops working for them?	HC/PH: 9 Cllr: 4 GCC Public: 2	HC/PH: 2 Cllr: 1 Public: 1	HoS	<p>GCC: This is essential in our opinion, its important to know where approved crew have moved to.</p> <p>Public: Good to track drivers</p> <p><i>Officer assessment:</i></p> <p><i>Adopt.</i></p>
Q.17 Do you agree, or disagree, with the updated CCTV wording and requirement to notify the licensing authority if a system is fitted?	HC/PH: 5 Cllr: 3 GCC Public: 2	HC/PH: 6 Cllr: 2 Public: 1		<p>HC/PH: Privacy data protection maybe at stake here</p> <p>GCC: CCTV is essential in our opinion, and we fully support this proposal and hope all licensed Cheltenham drivers will install CCTV. CCTV is a mandatory requirement on all GCC contracted home to school transport.</p>

Proposal	Support for proposal	Not supporting proposal	No response/ comment	Comments/officer assessment
				<p>Public: Good to have database</p> <p>HoS: Worth noting that Cabinet approved more work on a CCTV policy on the basis that vast majority of respondents agreed that <i>“CCTV in licensed vehicles will benefit the safety of passengers using licensed vehicles. Similarly, the majority of respondents agreed that CCTV would benefit the safety of the licensed drivers, reduce the fear of crime and the benefits to public safety outweigh the cost and any adverse effect on privacy.”</i></p> <p>We may need to reflect this on the draft policy – if this is still Cabinet’s position. Need to discuss with Vix. Important to clarify to satisfy the stat guidance’s requirements.</p> <p><i>Officer assessment:</i> <i>Adopt.</i> <i>Commitment to work identified at Cabinet as pointed out by HoS.</i></p>
Q.18 Do you agree, or disagree, with the authority’s amendments to the enforcement and complaints policy?	HC/PH: 8 Cllr: 3 GCC Public: 3	HC/PH: 3 Cllr: 2	HoS	<p><i>Officer assessment:</i></p> <p><i>Adopt.</i></p>
Q.19 Do you agree, or disagree, with the authority’s update to lost property being returned or taken to a police station?	HC/PH: 9 Cllr: 4 GCC Public: 3	HC/PH: 2 Cllr: 1	HoS	<p>HC/PH: Drivers should only have to return property to a passengers location if passenger will pay the fare....</p> <p><i>Officer assessment:</i> <i>Adopt.</i></p>
Q.20 Do you agree, or disagree, with the authority’s proposal that operator returns are changed from quarterly to monthly?	HC/PH: 8 Cllr: 4 GCC Public: 1	HC/PH: 4 Cllr: 1 Public: 2	HoS	<p>Public: Operators have enough to do especially if you are a one person operation.</p> <p><i>Officer assessment: Adopt.</i></p>

Proposal	Support for proposal	Not supporting proposal	No response/ comment	Comments/officer assessment
Q.21 Do you agree, or disagree, with the authority's amendments to the strike policy?	HC/PH: 8 Cllr: 2 GCC Public: 3	HC/PH: 3 Cllr: 3	HoS	<i>Officer assessment:</i> <i>Adopt.</i>
Q.22 Do you agree, or disagree, with the authority's proposal that insurance write offs should not be licensed?	HC/PH: 5 Cllr: 3 GCC Public: 2	HC/PH: 6 Cllr: 2 Public: 1	HoS	<p>HC/PH:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Only vehicles that are deemed unsafe to repair should be excluded. 2. I think that the category of the write should be taken into account. Unfortunately, Insurance providers are too quick to write a vehicle off for minor damage. Vehicles are written off (In some cases) due to not being able to find a garage who can repair within a reasonable time scale. <p><i>Officer assessment:</i></p> <p><i>As you can be unsure as to what extent the vehicle has been damaged, it is imperative for public safety to adopt this measure.</i></p> <p><i>Adopt.</i></p>
Q.23 Do you agree, or disagree, with the authority's proposal that individuals will have to wait 6 months until they are permitted to re-sit the knowledge test if they have already failed the test 3 times?	HC/PH: 9 Cllr: 3 GCC Public: 1	HC/PH: 2 Cllr: 2 Public: 2	HoS	<p>HC/PH:</p> <p>Everyone makes mistakes 1st time.. I think I failed mine by 1 mark.. 6 .months is a long time to wait.. Maybe 3 months</p> <p>Public:</p> <p>The written test is not great and should be a physical test whilst undergoing the driver test. Drivers can circumnavigate this test by going to Tewkesbury and then working in Cheltenham. If you get into any taxi they input the destination into Sat Nav.</p> <p><i>Officer assessment: Adopt.</i></p>

Head of Service further comments: Officer assessment – have updated

Appendix A - Table of Delegations

The table is not technically correct because some of these actions initially or also sits with Head of Public Protection as per constitution – see page 69-70 (<https://democracy.cheltenham.gov.uk/documents/g1960/Public%20reports%20pack%2003rd-Dec-2024%20CONSTITUTION.pdf?T=10&Info=1>). Need to note the delegations and conditions on the table I would recommend. For example, the delegation to suspend does not sit with Licensing Officers. Equally, powers to suspend drivers sits with the head of service in addition to...