



Committee: LICENSING REGULATORY COMMITTEE

Date: THURSDAY, 3 AUGUST 2017

Venue: LANCASTER TOWN HALL

Time: 1.00 P.M.

A G E N D A

1. **Apologies for Absence**

2. **Minutes**

Minutes of the meeting held on 13 July 2017 (previously circulated).

3. **Items of Urgent Business Authorised by the Chairman**

4. **Declarations of Interest**

To receive declarations by Members of interests in respect of items on this Agenda.

Members are reminded that, in accordance with the Localism Act 2011, they are required to declare any disclosable pecuniary interests which have not already been declared in the Council's Register of Interests. (It is a criminal offence not to declare a disclosable pecuniary interest either in the Register or at the meeting.)

Whilst not a legal requirement, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9 and in the interests of clarity and transparency, Members should declare any disclosable pecuniary interests which they have already declared in the Register, at this point in the meeting.

In accordance with Part B, Section 2 of the Code of Conduct, Members are required to declare the existence and nature of any other interests as defined in paragraphs 8(1) or 9(2) of the Code of Conduct.

Matter for Decision

5. **Proposed Variation of Hackney Carriage Fares - Notification of Objections Received**
(Pages 1 - 10)

Report of Food, Safety and Licensing Manager

ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

(i) **Membership**

Councillors Colin Hartley (Chairman), Terrie Metcalfe (Vice-Chairman), Alan Biddulph, Susie Charles, Mel Guilding, Tim Hamilton-Cox, Joan Jackson, Janice Hanson and

Robert Redfern

(ii) Substitute Membership

Councillors Sheila Denwood, Rebecca Novell, Sylvia Rogerson, Oscar Thynne and John Wild

(iii) Queries regarding this Agenda

Please contact Jane Glenton, Democratic Services - telephone (01524) 582068, or email jglenton@lancaster.gov.uk.

(iv) Changes to Membership, substitutions or apologies

Please contact Democratic Support - telephone (01524) 582170, or email democraticsupport@lancaster.gov.uk.

SUSAN PARSONAGE,
CHIEF EXECUTIVE,
TOWN HALL,
DALTON SQUARE,
LANCASTER, LA1 1PJ

Published on Friday, 21 July 2017.

LICENSING REGULATORY COMMITTEE

**Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 –
Proposed Variation of Hackney Carriage Fares -
Notification of Objections Received
3rd August 2017**

Report of the Food, Safety and Licensing Manager

PURPOSE OF REPORT

<p>The report is to enable Members to consider objections received in response to the advertising of proposed fare increases through the application of RPI to current Tariff charges for hackney carriages licensed by Lancaster City Council.</p>

<p>This report is public.</p>

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **The Committee is requested to consider the objections received in response to the public advertisement of proposed Tariff increases to hackney carriage fares licensed by Lancaster City Council.**
2. **To determine whether to vary the increase agreed by this Committee on the 1st June 2017, and if so, to determine in what manner, or to implement the increase as previously agreed and set a new implementation date.**

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 The Licensing Authority is required to consider the tariffs for fare charges in respect of hackney carriages on an annual basis and to determine whether a fare adjustment is necessary. There is no nationally agreed formulae for assessing and applying an adjustment.
- 1.2 Members will recall that a proposal was presented to this Committee on the 1st June 2017 that in accordance with procedure, an annual increase based on RPI, as of March 2017, be applied to the Tariff for 2017/18 subject to the necessary public notice period.
- 1.3 It was agreed to apply RPI at 3.1% to the Tariff and to authorise the Chief Officer (Governance) to advertise the table of fares.

2.0 Lancaster Hackney Carriage Tariffs

- 2.1 A copy of the revised Tariff card increases, as advertised in accordance with the Committee decision on the 1st June 2017, is attached as Appendix 1 to this report.

- 2.2 The advert was placed in the Lancaster Guardian on the 15th June 2017. The deadline for making any such objections to the proposed Tariff increase was to be made by noon on the 7th July 2017.
- 2.3 Members will recall that the purpose of the advertisement was to provide notice to the Public of the proposed fare increase and therefore comply with Council obligations under legislation.
- 2.4 Anyone wishing to object to the proposed Tariff increase could do so by making representation to the Council. In the event of objections being received, the matter would need to be referred back to Committee for due consideration before an increase could be implemented. If no objections were received, the proposed increase would have taken effect at noon on the 7th July 2017.
- 2.5 At the time of writing this report, a number of objections to the proposal were received, but only in the days after the date for submitting objections had closed. Only one objection was received within the consultation period. The objections are summarised in Appendix 2 to this report. The Committee will note that all the objections received are from licensed drivers and proprietors.
- 2.6 Members may also recall that the Committee decision from the 1st June 2017, in regard to Tariff increases, also included a decision to instruct the Food, Safety and Licensing Manager to conduct a review of the current mechanism for adjusting fares. The purpose was to examine whether there may be an alternative mechanism available that is more appropriate for the Committee to consider introducing for future years. This review has not yet been concluded, although a request has been sent out to other Licensing Authorities to share their fare review process as the first starting point. A summary of the responses received is included in Appendix 3 to this report.
- 2.7 Members should be aware that during the ballot the Licensing Service received 24 copies of an alternative Tariff put forward by some of the consultees and this was reported to the Committee on the 1st June 2017.

3.0 Conclusion

- 3.1 Members are asked to consider the objection received and to determine whether to vary the increase agreed by this Committee on the 1st June 2017, and if so, to determine in what manner, or to implement the increase as previously agreed and set a new implementation date.
- 3.2 Should Members decide to implement the previously advertised RPI Tariff Increase, then a new implementation date will need to be agreed. Officers suggest that any agreed date should include a reasonable notice period to allow time for the new Tariff charge adjustments to be made to vehicles, and suggest that an implementation date of the 1st August would be appropriate.
- 3.3 Should Members decide to set a substantially altered Tariff increase, it may be necessary to carry out the public consultation exercise again, and set a new implementation date.

CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT

(including Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, Sustainability and Rural Proofing)

None applicable to this report.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Financial Services have advised on the relevant RPI rate.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

The legal requirement to advertise any proposed change is covered in the report.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

None.

Contact Officer: Steve Sylvester

Telephone: 01524 582717

E-mail: ssylvester@lancaster.gov.uk

Ref: DL

Copy of advertised proposed Tariff changes for 2017/18

LANCASTER CITY COUNCIL
LOCAL GOVERNMENT (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) ACT 1976
PROPOSED VARIATION OF HACKNEY CARRIAGE FARES

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT Lancaster City Council in pursuance of the powers contained in section 65 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 proposes to vary the table of fares in respect of Hackney Carriages licensed by the Council as follows: -

Tariff 1

For hiring's commenced between 07.01 and 23.59	Revised Charge 2017
If the distance does not exceed 660 yards for the whole distance:	£2.58
For each of the subsequent 310 yards or uncompleted part thereof:	31p
Waiting Time: For each period of 40 seconds or uncompleted part thereof	10p

Tariff 2

For hiring's commenced between midnight and 07.00 For hiring's commenced between 19.00 and midnight on the 24 th December For hiring's commenced between 19.00 and midnight on the 31 st December For hiring's commencing on any Bank Holiday or Public Holiday	
If the distance does not exceed 660 yards for the whole distance:	£3.81
For each subsequent 220 yards or uncompleted part thereof:	31p
Waiting time: For each period of 40 seconds or uncompleted part thereof	10p

Tariff 3

For hiring's commenced between 00.01 25 th December and 07.00 27 th December For hiring's commenced between 00.01 1 st January and 07.00 2 nd January	
If the distance does not exceed 880 yards for the whole distance:	£5.05
For each subsequent 220 yards or uncompleted part thereof:	41p
Waiting time: For each period of 40 seconds or uncompleted part thereof	10p

For each passenger in excess of one [for the purpose two children aged 11 or under to count as one passenger for the whole distance]	21p
For each perambulator or article of luggage carried outside the passenger compartment of the vehicle	21p
Soiling Charge: A charge may be requested if the passenger[s] soils the vehicle. This will not exceed £75.00	

No other variations apply.

A copy of this notice may be inspected at Lancaster Town Hall, Dalton Square, Lancaster and also at Morecambe Town Hall, Marine Road, Morecambe.

Any objections to the variations in the Table of Fares should be made in writing by not later than 12 noon on 7th July 2017 to the address given below.

If no objection to the variation is duly made within the above period, or if all objections so made are withdrawn, the variation to the Table of Fares will come into operation with immediate effect or as soon as the meters have been calibrated to the new fare

The Licensing Department
Town Hall,
Dalton Square,
Lancaster, LA1 1PJ

Objection to advertised proposed Fare increase

June 2017

Objection dated 20th June 2017 and was received within the consultation period

Dear Mr Sylvester

I have just had a conversation with Carnforth Communications who are a company that fits and calibrates taxi meters. He actually asked me "which idiot put in for this fare increase?". The proposed increase is ridiculous on many levels. Firstly it takes us back to the 1980`s when we finally got rid of fares ending in odd pennies. Secondly it is not a balanced fare. The proposed yardage will alternately under charge and over charge for subsequent miles and therefore cannot demonstrate a fixed mileage rate. Thirdly contrary to the Primary Legislation the proposal does not represent any request from the trade and indeed represents a system introduced by the previous licensing manager without any consultation with the trade.

I believe we need a conversation about this before it all gets out of hand. Carnforth Communications rang me because he got a load of earache last year for a 10p rise and feels he may be the target for more flack this year.

This has clearly been instigated by people who neither understand what we do or how our businesses are run. It is in short ridiculous.

Regards

Andrew Kay

(follow up e-mails from Mr kay dated 20th June and 8th July received after above e-mail)

Dear Mr Sylvester

Thanks for the reply. Please take this and the previous email as an objection to the proposed increase for the reasons stated.

Dear Mr Sylvester

I have taken advice and must reiterate that the system put in place by Ms Peck ignores the primary legislation. Any increase has to be lead by the trade as we are the ones that understand the changes in costs and our customers. To impose an RPI increase leaving every fare ending in odd pence for the first time since 1983 is frankly stupid and unworkable. The proposed fare is not balanced and has not been proposed by ANY member of the trade. The "consultation" was in fact a binary question and did not consult in any way shape or form. A consultation requires input from those being consulted. Something or nothing is not consultation and is indicative of a complete lack of understanding of both the process to increase fares and the pressures of our businesses.

Objections received after the consultation period (received between 8th & 9th July)

(Elleran Hobart)

Hi

I would like to object to the fare increase for the following reason it was put forward years ago to have the tariff put to five pence or ten pence finish to make it easier for change.

I don't think you can even buy a coin holder for copper anymore please can this be looked at again common sense needs to be used in this case

Regards

Elleran Hobart

(Peter Hobart)

Hi

My name is Peter Hobart and i am a taxi proprietor of HV 184 and i would like to strongly object to the recent fare increase as i think it is ludicrous.

I have travelled in lots of taxis around the country and not once have i had to copper up to get the right amount it has always ended in a round number

whoever has put this forward obviously hasn't talked with the trade or doesn't have a clue.

Regards

Peter Hobart

(Paul Spencer)

I'm sending my objections against the rise in the meter price . it need rounding up and not in pennies.. We carry enough change we don't need more please look carefully at this thanks

(Neil Porter)..

I would like to strongly object to the proposed taxi fare increase and would be willing to attend a meeting to talk to the members of the LRC about the subject
Many thanks Neil Porter.

(Shaun Wilson)

As a Hackney carriage proprietor in the LCC area I'm not unaccustomed to being left in the dark about procedural changes to our working practices. However, when I saw the proposal for the new table of fares for HC vehicles I had to check the calendar to see it wasn't the 1st of April. Are you seriously considering that taxi fares can be priced in pennies? Surely modern businesses should be trying to eradicate the need for copper wherever possible. This proposed increased is just plain daft. I urge you to show some common sense.

Shaun Wilson
HV314.

(Craig Parker)

Mr Sylvester I would like to object to the proposed taxi fare increase, I personally think having to deal with coppers when giving change will only make working life harder than it already is.

(Tanya Muckle)

Please log this email as an objection to the proposed taxi fare increase.

Reverting fares to include copper change would make life incredibly awkward. To demonstrate this is easily done by the fact that all bus driver and taxi driver change machines now don't include sections for copper change. As drivers we rarely see any form of copper so we would have to purposely carry additional bags of copper change to give to customers.

It seems far more sensible to organise the fares in increments of 10p.

Yours

Tanya Muckle

(Joseph Muckle)

Please log this email as an objection to the proposed taxi fare increase.

Reverting fares to include copper change would make life incredibly awkward. To demonstrate this is easily done by the fact that all bus driver and taxi driver change machines now don't include sections for copper change. As drivers we rarely see any form of copper so we would have to purposely carry additional bags of copper change to give to customers. It seems far more sensible to organise the fares in increments of 10p.

Yours

Joseph Muckle

(Si Ball)

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am a taxi driver in Lancaster and Morecambe and have just been made aware of the proposed increase to taxi fares by LCC.

Are you as a Council really proposing to increase the minimum fare by 8pence and the incremental fare by 1p? This to me is ridiculous as we will now be forced to carry more coins in "copper."

This is going backwards instead of forwards! In 1983 the fare was changed to a "round" figure to avoid the need for copper change and in today's society, the country, as a whole is almost on the point of making copper redundant permanently.

I would like to oppose this change strongly. The cost to change it now and then possibly a few months down the line is just stupidity and is sure to annoy every single taxi driver and every single customer too. Already I have had the majority of my customers expressing their disbelief over "something so stupid!"

I look forward to your view on this matter.

Yours sincerely

Simon Ball

Sent from [BlueMail](#)

(Shane Walker)

17 Gleneagles Drive
Morecambe
LA4 5BN
Badge 0353
HV288 Proprietor

I am writing to object the proposed fare increase due imminently.

My reasons for objecting are as follows:-

1. Every Hackney carriage having to deal with copper is not viable, as we would need to reprogram the meters, buy alternate change holders, I personally think it would be confusing for the public and very time consuming for the workforce.
2. Taxi fares are in my opinion, are fair at their current rate.

I would like to suggest some alternatives, being :-

1. To increase the fares ten pence, or;
2. To leave the fares set to the current tariffs.

Please feel free to contact me if you require. Regards, Shane Walker

(Mr M Richmond)

Good morning Mr Richmond (HD7471) here I am contacting you today regarding the proposed tariff change . I personally object to this as the increase would be of no realisable worth. I would need to carry more loose change and would cost more to implement than it is worth. Thank you regards M RICHMOND

(Andy Kay)

Dear Mr Sylvester

I have taken advice and must reiterate that the system put in place by Ms Peck ignores the primary legislation. Any increase has to be lead by the trade as we are the ones that understand the changes in costs and our customers. To impose an RPI increase leaving every fare ending in odd pence for the first time since 1983 is frankly stupid and unworkable. The proposed fare is not balanced and has not been proposed by ANY member of the trade. The “consultation” was in fact a binary question and did not consult in any way shape or form. A consultation requires input from those being consulted. Something or nothing is not consultation and is indicative of a complete lack of understanding of both the process to increase fares and the pressures of our businesses.

(Judith181@aol.com)

To whome it may concern

I would like to object to the proposed fair increase, it is a ridiculous proposal and no increase would be better than this

Judith wilson

7 Westfield Grove

Morecambe

La44lq

3rd August 2017

Summary responses from other Licensing Authorities

A message was issued in July 2017 through the Institute of Licensing to other Licensing Authorities, requesting responses to share how fare increases for Hackney carriages and Private Hire vehicles is handled.

The responses received are outlined below.

Summary responses – 1 respondent uses RPI (and suggests that Carlisle do as well), 1 used to but dropped it (South Lakes), 1 had no increase since 2008, 1 uses the Transport for London method, 3 leave it to the trade to decide (including south lakes).

Sefton – Leave it to the trade. Last increase March 2017, before that 2011.

Harrogate – use the Transport for London mechanism. Complex but seems to be more representative of the real cost of operating the service

Bradford – No increase since 2008 (seem to think that this is to keep competitive)

South Lakes – Dropped the RPI approach last year. Leave it to Taxi Association – no request received to increase.

Wyre – Wait until trade request it and leave it to them. Last request in 2011. Believe that the trade know best. (also provided a national tariff list)

Barrow – apply RPI and believe that Carlisle do likewise.