

From: Tony Booth [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 July 2010 16:30
To: Peck, Wendy
Subject: RE: Draft Rules and Regulations

Dear Wendy,

I have a few points which I would like to raise as follows:

Vehicle Testing – Page 18

I am led to believe that what you are suggesting on here is that you are going to reduce the test fee off the annual Licensing fees, so i.e. the test at the moment £215 average M.O.T fee £65 leaves a balance of £150 Payable to Lancaster City Council. Am I correct in this? I am a bit concerned that we then have to take it to the V.M.U of Lancaster city council and then have the vehicle "mechanically tested and inspected by the council" like you quote in the Rules. Please can you tell me who will be paying for the test, as I would have already had it tested at my own garage. If you are saying that the "mechanically tested and inspected test and licence fee are going to be as I have said above i.e. £150 please can you tell me why I have been paying the extra amount totalling £65 a year on the annual test. Furthermore why can we not keep it as it is as I feel that there may be taxi that could have dodgy M.O.T and feel that it would be a backward step on the council's behalf. At the moment I feel the testing procedures in this area are one of the best and feel problems will start to arise through one garage saying it has passed the test and then the Council maybe saying that it is not up to their standard and then we would all end up in disputes. As I have already tested a private car with the Council, they issued me with their correct M.O.T certificate, can we if we would prefer, still use the City Council and roll them both into one as we are doing at present.

Furthermore I also think the six monthly licences on cars over two years old is a very good move.

Vehicles – Page -20

I would like to object to Access to all passengers seats must be unimpeded. As I understand from that a Ford Transit Torneo factory built eight seater mini bus would no longer be suitable. This has never been a problem before and I actually believe after many years of experience that these type of Minis buses should be like a role model, and there are a lot of mini buses in this category that would be unsuitable for an eight seater which I need to ply my trade. I have looked into the other mini buses and you cannot seem to get a factory fitted eight seater mini-bus.

I have looked at some other conversions of mini-buses and in my opinion they are not as good as the factory built mini buses. As you can imagine i.e. Ford, Fiat, Mercedes, Renaults etc go to a lot of research and crash testing these vehicles to make sure they can withstand an accident etc also health and safety as you suggest. In my opinion these factory built eight seater mini buses are safer for the public who are the most important people at the end of the day then a conversion mini-bus.

Furthermore I would like to add I fully understand and appreciate what you are trying to achieve in the industry like the two comments above, but it seems that you are trying to make too many changes, when things seem to have been running fine .

Thank you very much
 Tony Booth

P.S. As regards to multi-seater vehicles I own two six-seater doblo's and personally I think they should be down scalled to four seaters because I do not think they are suitable for more than four passengers. I would not have a problem in taking the seats out of my vehicles. The only reason I bought the vehicles

was because they were cheap. Once again if you told me to take the back seats out I would not have a problem because they are not suitable vehicles for a multi-seater.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject:

Draft Rules and Regulations <<Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Rules and RegulationsDRAFT2010.doc>>

Wendy Peck MLoL Licensing Manager, Lancaster City Council, Town Hall, Dalton Square, Lancaster, LA1 1PJ, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]