

Crawley Borough Council

	Report No: PES/42	D
--	-------------------	----------

Report to Licensing Committee

7th September 2011

Hackney Carriage Vehicles

Providing an Excellent Service for Our Customers

1. Key Points

- 1.1. On 9 September 2002 the Licensing Committee considered report ES/47 (minute 143 refers) and resolved to “de-restrict” the number of Hackney Carriage Vehicle licences issued by the Council. This meant that there was no limit on the number of vehicles that could be licensed within the Borough.
- 1.2. However, a proposal has been received from the Crawley Hackney Carriage Association to restrict the number of Hackney Carriage Vehicles that operate within the Borough of Crawley by restricting the number of licences that are issued by the Council.
- 1.3. During the consultation carried out in respect of this matter, a number of additional issues were discussed in respect of improving the service. A key one was the opportunity to raise awareness of the needs of disabled customers using the Hackney Carriage Service.

1.4. The objective of this report is to review the way the Hackney Carriage Service is provided, in respect of the two issues above, and to make recommendations to implement the improvements.

2. Recommendations

2.1 That the Committee consider all the information contained within this report and approve the following recommendations:

2.1.1 To implement a policy of limiting hackney carriage vehicle licences granted by Crawley Borough Council (such limit to be the number of current licences granted by the date of the Committee's decision), subject to any applicant demonstrating exceptional circumstances;

2.1.2 That the Head of Planning and Environmental Services determine all future applications for hackney carriage vehicle licences in light of this and any other relevant policy.

2.1.3 That should the Head of Planning and Environmental Services decide that the policy should not be followed due to the exceptional circumstances of an applicant and therefore grant the application, then he/she should report that fact to the next Licensing Committee.

2.1.4 That any person who applies for a hackney carriage vehicle licence and is refused because of this policy be given the opportunity to join a waiting list for when this policy is next reviewed.

2.1.5 That this policy be reviewed by no later than May 2014.

2.2 Further investigation be carried out to develop a number of options in respect of improving awareness of the needs of disabled customers using the Hackney Carriage Service, and that officers are to present options to the Committee within the next 6 months.

**ANGELA TANNER
Head of Planning and Environmental Services**

3. Background – limitation on numbers

- 3.1 Hackney Carriages provide an important service to the public. Crawley Borough Council aims to use the licensing legislation to ensure that a safe and good quality service is provided to customers in the area. The quality of the service would include considerations such as customers being able to hail a vehicle or find one at a rank with minimal delays, and also to have access to vehicles that meet their needs (e.g. accessible for wheelchairs).
- 3.2 There is, however, a balance to be struck between the needs of customers and those holding vehicle licences. For customers, it is ideal to have a full range of vehicles immediately available. For licence holders, a large number of vehicles means lower net income as income from fares is spread across many drivers.

Legislative scheme

- 3.3 Section 37 of the Town Police Clauses Act 1847 provides that a council may, from time to time, licence hackney carriages to ply for hire within their prescribed area. Section 16 of the Transport Act 1985 permits a council to refuse to issue a hackney carriage vehicle licence for the purpose of limiting numbers *“if, but only if, the person authorised to grant licences is satisfied that, there is no significant demand for the services of hackney carriages (within the area to which the licence would apply) which remains unmet”*.
- 3.4 Any person who is refused a hackney carriage vehicle licence has the right of appeal to the Crown Court.
- 3.5 It is a matter of policy as to whether a council chooses to exercise the discretion granted to it by the Transport Act 1985 to refuse a licence for the reason of limiting numbers within its area.
- 3.6 Section 161 of the Equality Act 2010 provides that a council cannot refuse to licence a wheelchair-accessible vehicle on the grounds of limiting numbers if the proportion of wheelchair-accessible vehicles operating in its area is smaller than the proportion prescribed by regulation by the Secretary of State. This provision specifically states that section 16 of the Transport Act 1985 would not apply in such a case, and consequently would override any decision of a

council to implement or maintain a policy of limiting numbers of HCVs. To date the Secretary of State has not made regulations which stipulate any requisite proportion of wheelchair-accessible vehicles.

Government guidance

3.7 The most recent government guidance issued in relation to this issue was contained in a document entitled Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Licensing: Best Practice Guidance published in March 2010 by the Department for Transport during the term of the previous government. This document is included as a background paper and the relevant paragraphs are 45 to 52 inclusive. It is noted that the report states the following:

3.7.1 It refers to the fact that most licensing authority do not impose quantity restrictions; and that the Department regards this as best practice.

3.7.2 Local authorities who impose restrictions on the number of hackney carriage vehicle licence issued are urged to regularly consider their position on this issue.

3.7.3 Addressing the issue of demonstrating whether there is significant demand which is unmet is usually done by way of survey; and that a 3 yearly interview is commonly regarded as the maximum reason period between surveys.

3.7.4 Refers to earlier (2004) guidance regarding relevant factors in conducting an unmet demand survey.

3.8 Members may be also aware that the Transport Select Committee recently conducted an inquiry into legislation relating to the regulation of taxis and private hire vehicles, however, delimitation was not within the main remit of its enquiry. The Committee's report published on 12 July 2011 commented on this issue briefly and stated that in their view issues such as whether or not to restrict the numbers of licences issued should be included in local authorities' transport plans. The Committee further recommended that the Government provide clearer guidance to local authorities on how taxis and private hire vehicles should be included in local transport plans.

3.9 To date, there has been no further guidance from Government on the issue of limiting numbers.

Crawley context

3.10 In September 2002 Crawley Borough Council decided to abandon its previous policy of restricting the number of hackney carriage vehicle licensed within the borough, and a new policy of “de-restriction” was adopted.

3.11 On 8th September 2010 the Environmental and Housing Policy Development Forum (PDF) discussed a proposal from the Crawley Hackney Carriage Association that the Council consider changing its policy and to again implement a policy of restricting of the number of hackney carriage vehicles licensed in the Borough of Crawley.

3.12 However, following the PDF, it was agreed that if the Crawley Hackney Carriage Association wished to arrange a survey from a reputable company in respect of ‘unmet demand’, the Council would consider the results as part of a review of the current Council policy.

3.13 The Crawley Hackney Carriage Association subsequently commissioned an unmet demand survey, and this is addressed further under item 4, below. At that time there were 122 licensed hackney carriage vehicles. As at the date of drafting this report there are still 122 hackney carriage vehicles licensed by Crawley Borough Council.

3.14 If a change to the policy does not decrease the number of vehicles, then the public should receive the same service. If a change to the policy does not decrease the number of vehicles, then the public should receive the same service. However, as circumstances may change, one of the prerequisites to restricting vehicle numbers is that there must be evidence available to the Council that there is no significant unmet demand and this is obtained through an “unmet demand” survey. Government guidance stipulates that such a survey must be carried at least every 3 years. Provided the Council is satisfied that there is no significant unmet demand, then the policy of limiting numbers can continue. However, if the Council is not satisfied of this (for example because there is no current evidence available), then it does not meet the statutory test and the Council cannot continue to refuse applications for

hackney carriage vehicle licences. “Unmet demand” surveys cost several thousand pounds and thus the Council have chosen not to enter into the regime of restriction and thus surveys. The Council may, however, use the results of the Hackney Carriage Association Survey, as it has been carried out by a reputable company to an appropriate specification.

3.15 One of the outcomes of introducing a policy of limiting hackney carriage vehicle licences is that it may produce a practical benefit to a licence holder. Where the market is restricted a licensed vehicle may be worth more than purely the cost of the vehicle and purchase of a hackney carriage licence: it also includes the cost of the taxi business that vehicle can generate within a restricted market. Anecdotal evidence indicates that “plates” (i.e. a licensed hackney carriage vehicle) have been transferred to another owner for over £30,000. The proprietor of a licensed hackney carriage vehicle has a right to sell it and the Council does not have any control over the payments made in the vehicle sale: this is a private business transaction. However, whilst members may be aware of this issue, it is not a relevant consideration and so should not be taken into account when making a decision about whether or not to introduce a policy of restricting Hackney carriage vehicle licences within the borough of Crawley.

3.16 The Taxi Association have indicated that if licence holders benefit from the restriction, the public will also benefit, as vehicles will be kept in a very good condition (e.g. cleaned and maintained to a very high standard) rather than just complying with the statutory minimum requirements.

Background – other issues

3.17 In respect of Disability Awareness issues, Hackney Carriage Drivers currently undertake a Driving Standards Agency driving assessment which includes that drivers have the following:

- The ability to safely load and unload a wheelchair into a vehicle
- That drivers can secure and unsecure the wheelchair using the brakes
- Fasten the seat belts or safety harness
- Secure any wheel belts or clamps fitted into the vehicle.

3.18 At present, no formal disability awareness training is currently required which goes further than the Driving Standards Agency Taxi Test. This focuses on

E:\Oracle\UCM_Test\IBR\vault\~convert\pub_live\3763\92338.doc

giving drivers an awareness of how to look after wheelchair users but does not consider those who may have different or greater disabilities.

4. The Survey Carried Out on Behalf of the Hackney Carriage Association

4.1 In May 2011, The Crawley Hackney Carriage Association submitted a draft report of a Survey carried out by Halcrow Group Ltd. This company was identified as a reputable supplier by the Council, as it regularly provides surveys to other councils and Trade associations. The survey aims "...:

- To determine what the demand for hackney carriages is in Crawley Borough;
- To determine whether or not the number of hackney carriages should be limited within Crawley and if so at what number; and
- Undertake consultation with a range of interested parties...."

4.2 The conclusions of the survey were that:

4.2.1 The 2011 study has identified that there is NO evidence of significant unmet demand for hackney carriages in Crawley. This conclusion is based on an assessment of the implications of case law that has emerged since 2000, and the results of Halcrow's analysis.

4.2.2 It was also identified that drivers would benefit from disability awareness training.

4.2.3 'Public perception' of the service was obtained through the undertaking of over 600 face to face surveys. Overall the public were generally satisfied with the service.

5. Conclusions Arising from Consultation Carried Out By Halcrow

5.1 Some key points arising from the consultation exercise carried out by Halcrow were that:

5.1.1 The majority of respondents consider there to be sufficient hackney carriage services in Crawley to meet the demand.

- 5.1.2 The consultation found that those with hearing impairments can often have difficulty booking a taxi. There needs to be a system whereby they can prebook a taxi, perhaps via a text service.
- 5.1.3 It was also identified that there is generally a lack of wheelchair accessible vehicles in Crawley and drivers would benefit from disability awareness training.
- 5.2 The report suggested that the Council had a number of options to consider. These were described in the survey:
 - 5.2.1 "...Continue to allow market forces to dictate the number of hackney carriage licences;
 - 5.2.2 Issue any number of additional plates as it sees fit, either in one allocation or a series of allocations; or
 - 5.2.3 Introduce a limit on the number of vehicles at 122 or higher"
- 5.3 However, 5.2.2 is not being recommended in this report as there is no evidence to date as to how many additional licences it might be appropriate to issue.

6. Developing a New Policy

- 6.1 The Council has conducted a consultation exercise to explore the views of particular groups and the public generally of introducing a policy to limit hackney carriage vehicle licence numbers within Crawley.
- 6.2 The consultation process offered all Hackney Carriage Drivers (i.e. those who are members of the Hackney Carriage Association and those who are not), other licensed drivers (i.e. Private Hire Drivers), the public and people with special requirements when using vehicles (e.g. wheelchairs) the opportunity to give their views. The results of the consultation exercise are appended to this report at Appendix A.

- 6.3 The Cabinet Member also arranged for this issue to be debated at a Policy Development Forum (PDF) on 10th August 2011. Representatives from the Hackney Carriage Association, the Town Access Group, the Members for the Environment and Prosperity PDF and the Licensing Committee Members were also invited to that meeting.
- 6.4 Presentations were given by the representatives and the options in respect of restricting numbers of hackney carriage vehicles were debated.
- 6.5 The Forum gave broad support in respect of both restricting the number of vehicles and the matter of disability awareness training.
- 6.6 There was also discussion regarding the proportion of saloon vehicles and wheelchair accessible vehicles. As the consultation had not produced any strong requests to change this, the Forum gave broad support for maintaining the current proportions.
- 6.7 A number of additional ideas to improve the service were also discussed and will be added to the Licensing team's work programme for development.

7. Conclusions

- 7.1 There has been a proposal from the Hackney Carriage Association for the Council to re-introduce a policy of limiting the number of hackney carriage vehicles to current levels.
- 7.2 Disability Awareness has also been raised as a key issue, with a proposal to improve this.
- 7.3 Consultation has been carried out and the matter debated at the Environment and Prosperity Policy Development Forum. These two proposals have been broadly supported, both by the Hackney carriage Association and elected Members.
- 7.4 Other ideas to improve the service have been noted and will be investigated further.

8. Ward Members' Views

- 8.1. No Ward Members views were conducted

9 Staffing, Equalities, Financial and Legal Implications/Powers

- 9.1 There are no extra staffing or financial implications to the Council.
- 9.2 If a decision is made by the Committee to restrict numbers, then as mentioned in paragraph 3.14, this policy could not continue unless within 3 years a further 'unmet demand' survey is conducted and concludes that there is no significant unmet demand. The current survey was commissioned by and paid for by the Hackney Carriage Association. These surveys usually cost in excess of £10,000, and as there is currently no budget for this, it is not recommended that the Council consider commissioning and paying for any future survey. Therefore, unless the Committee otherwise decides, it is recommended the limitation policy (if implemented) be reviewed no later than 3 years after the date of the current survey (May 2011), i.e. by no later than May 2014, and in light of any future survey which the trade may wish to commission (and bear the costs of) from a reputable survey provider acceptable to the Council.
- 9.3 Maintaining a waiting list for licences is not expected to incur any additional cost to the Council.
- 9.4 There will be an additional cost to the drivers for obtaining the relevant disability awareness training.
- 9.5 There are a number of equalities issues that have been considered as part of the Equalities Impact Assessment carried out when preparing this report. These included ensuring equal access to persons wishing to apply for a hackney carriage vehicle licence, the types of vehicles to be used to maximise their accessibility and also the provision of a good service for people who might have special needs when wishing to hire a hackney carriage.
- 9.4 The legal issues, as described above have been fully addressed.

10 Risk Implications

- 10.1 There is a risk that the public might be disadvantaged by the restriction of numbers of vehicles: if the number of vehicles remains restricted, but the population of Crawley increases, there would be proportionally less vehicles available for use. However, Government guidance addresses this by requiring that an unmet demand survey must be carried at least every three years. This ensures that the evidence to support a restriction is sufficiently up to date so that the Council can continue to be “satisfied” that it should be maintained. Should the survey indicate that there is a demand for more vehicles then the restriction would be removed.

11 Environmental Impacts

- 11.1 None

12. Other Implications

- 12.1 None

13 Links to the Sustainable Community Strategy and Corporate Plan

- 13.1 The proposals contained in this report relate to the following key areas of the Sustainable Community Strategy

Community Cohesion	n	Community Safety	y
Young People and Children	n	Health and Well Being	y
Older People	y	The Environment	y
The Local Economy	y	Social Inclusion	y

The following key principles are applicable:-

(i) Working together	y
(ii) Dignity, respect and opportunities for all	y
(iii) Involving People	y
(iv) Making it last	y

The report relates to the following areas in which the Council operates to enhance the town and the quality of life of local people:-

(i) Prosperity	y
(ii) Community	y
(iii) Environment	y
(iv) Value for Money	y

14 Reasons for the Recommendation

Limitation on Numbers

- 14.1 Hackney Carriages provide an important public service, over which the Council has control. The Hackney Carriage Association has approached the Council with a request to restrict the number of licences issues, as this may benefit the hackney carriage vehicle licence holders. It has also been indicated that if licence holders benefit from the restriction, the public will also benefit, as licence holders felt they would be able to keep their vehicles in a very good condition, rather than just basic compliance.
- 14.2 The report from Halcrow indicates that there is no significant unmet demand. The public should not, therefore, be put at a disadvantage if the number of licences are restricted to around the current level. The Council is allowed, therefore, to consider refusing licences for the purpose of restricting numbers.
- 14.3 Consultation has been carried out with those who might be adversely affected by a change in policy to restrict numbers of Hackney Carriage Licences. The results show a range of views (at Appendix A) and members should carefully consider these before making a decision in relation to the recommendation to limit numbers. Further, this proposal was discussed at the Environment and Prosperity Policy Development Forum and broad support given to the proposal.

Other Issues

- 14.4 During this process, increasing Disability Awareness has also been raised as a key issue. This will require further investigation to enable a range of effective options to be presented to the Committee within the next 6 months.

15 Background Papers

Crawley Hackney Survey final report May 2011 by Halcrow Group Limited.

Hackney Carriage Questionnaire Results

Notes of Policy Development Forum held on 10th August 2011

March 2010 Department of Transport guidance entitled Taxi And Private Hire
Vehicle Licensing: Best Practice Guidance

Contact Officer:- Angela Tanner

Direct Line:- 01293 438567

Appendix A.

Hackney Carriage Questionnaire

Q1	Are You:		
	Taxi or Private Hire Operator/Driver		68
	Taxi/Private Hire Car User		39
	Other		8
	Total		115
Q2	Are you	Male	88
		Female	21
	Total		109
Q3	Which Of The Following Age Groups Do You Belong To??	Under 20	0
		20-39	33
		40-59	45
		60-79	20
		80+	5
	Total		103
Q4	If you Operate Or Drive A Private Hire At The Moment Is It:	Saloon Car	37
		Wheelchair	19
		Other i.e Estate/MPV	12 Estate cars MPV
		N/A	18
	Total		86
Q5	If You Drive A Taxi/PH What Training Have You Undertaken In Providing Assistance To Disabled Passengers	None	20
		Yes	19 Wheelchair and NVQ. 19 Self taught. DSA test
Q6	Do You Think Training In Providing Assistance To Disabled Passengers Is	Unnecessary	24
		Necessary	58
		Very Necessary	23
Q7	If You Are a Taxi User How Do You Hire a Vehicle	Hailed	0
		Taxi Rank	17
		Telephone/Text	59
		Other	0
	Total		76
Q8	Have You Experienced Any Difficulty Using A Taxi Due To Disability (Public Only)	Yes	9
		No	37
Q9	Have You Ever Been Unable To Go To A Place Of Your Choice Because There Wasn't A Vehicle For Hire To Suit Your Needs	Yes	3
		No	43

Q10	What Do You Use A Taxi Service For	Visiting Family & friends	37	
		Shopping	30	
		Going out. Cinema, pub etc,	48	
		Train, bus station, Airport	47	
		School, College, day centre	11	
		Hospital, doctors appt	19	
		Other	4	I am a taxi driver
Total		196		
Q11	Which of The Following Features Would Be Essential For A Taxi To Have To Enable You To Use It?	Wheelchair Accessible	13	
		Low entry level/low seating	34	
		Swivel Seats	5	
		Entry Ramp	6	
		Other Please specify	5	WIFI Clean / Roadworthy
		None of the above	44	
Q12	Option 1 Stop Any Further Licences Being Issued		50	Trade 18 Public
		Option 2 Stop any further licences and convert all saloon cars to WAV	1	Trade 7 Public
		Option 3 Convert all saloon cars to WAV and no limit on WAV	3	Trade 1 Public
		Option 4 Keep current policy only WAV and keep existing saloon cars	5	Trade 12 Public
		None specified	9	Trade 9 Public
Q13	Any Comments Regarding The Above		Yes	No
			94	21
Q14	Do You Consider Yourself To Have A Disability (Public Only)	No	33	
		Yes	12	
		Physical or motor impairment	10	
		Mental Health issue		
		Learning disability		
		Hearing impairment Partial		
		Hearing impairment total		
		Visual impairment partial	1	
		Visual impairment total		
		Communication difficulties	2	
		Multiple disabilities		
Other				

Comments on Option 1**Stop Any Further Licences Being Issued**

This option would be suitable as it leaves a variety of vehicles for the public to use.

This option because of the huge number of existing cabbies

I think this option is the best. Bearing in mind that there's too many taxis in Crawley in the first place

Not enough taxi ranks. Not cost effective to be a taxi driver. Sold my house to pay the bills. Have to work 18hrs + and not safe for the public

Taxi numbers should be frozen at current level. New licences issued if demand survey shows there is a need for more taxis

I think its better to stop, there are nimer of taxis and no space to park. It takes a long time to get a job. Need saloon cars for elderly as its easier

In my opinion at this present time there are sufficient taxis to service the amount of footfall passengers that use this type of taxi service

I agree to above option 1

This is the best option. We don't need more taxis. The town is already overflowing with taxis. I think 40% is a correct proportion

I support this. I believe there are sufficient wheelchair accessible vehicles already available

This one will be the best option

Good

Yes

As I have noticed there are always lots of taxis on the rank. In the current climate taxi drivers are finding it difficult. The town has enough taxis

No more needed

This would be the most effective route to take

Option One, as 49 wheelchair vehicles is a very good percentage of the fleet, and in the current climate, changing from a saloon is not needed

There are more elderly people that can only get into saloon cars. They find it difficult to get into wheelchair cars. They prefer to sit in the front of saloon cars

Stop issuing more licences

I feel that due to the number of PHV there are too many taxi's and not enough rank spaces to make a living.

I think there are more taxis in Crawley now than the trade can support

Agree

This is the best option. There are sufficient WAV. Limiting numbers will enable drivers to earn sufficiently to maintain their vehicles in roadworthy condition

It feels to me that this might be to little too late. I would welcome the stop of new licences being issued even if it was for 5 years. Electric WAV only

There are not that many people in Crawley that use wheelchairs, far more that find it difficult to lift and bend their legs. More people want saloon cars

I am in favour of this option. There should be a limit introduced. The present system of mixed fleet is a better option as elderly can't get into high vehicles

This seems to be a sensible and balanced approach. 49 is a good provision of wheelchair accessible vehicles.

This is the best option. Not enough rank space, 40% is sensible number of wheelchair vehicles, older passengers do not like the bigger vehicles, protect our income

I am a private hire driver and there is no space to turn at Three Bridges Station as the rank is completely overcrowded.

A variation of taxis is important as is comfort and also able to access a taxi safely. I am strongly in favour of option 1 as we need to protect our livehoods.

There is no work in Taxi Trade. Over the last 6 years work has nose dived. Drivers earning only £3 per hour.

There are too many taxis for the work available and not enough spaces at the taxi ranks.

Enough HCV already. Only 20 spaces max at Three Bridges and 6 at M&S, the rest park on double yellow lines, any more cars, nowhere to park.

This is the best option, because it gives a choice to taxi users

Limit number of taxis, drivers struggle to make ends meet. Insufficient rank space. Limit could just be for a set period of time and reassess in 3 years.

Should be a limit and saloon cars be there, as they are.

Desperately needed. There is a massive over supply at ranks like Three Bridges. I feel guilty paying minimum fare as the drivers may have wait for hours

I think this is a fair balance, I think there are sufficient numbers of taxis available.

Preferred option.

This option is better than the other 3, whichis fair for the needs of the town.

Limit the number of Taxis. More than enough Wheelchair vehicles.

There are enough taxis already, passengers do not have to wait, but drivers do. Saloon cars are necessary for older people. vehicles, as we rarely get passengers in wheelchairs.

Need to consider whether this would lead to a monopoly and prices could increase as demand goes up and supply remains static.

40% is enough wheelchair access vehicles. Passengers moan that the wheelchair vehicles are too high to get into.

Best option and best of both worlds as I personally require a low entry to taxi

This would limit competition and encourage fare rises

There are too many plates issued for the town Option 1 also gives the public a choice

My wife and I took part in WW2 and now have mobility difficulties. We would prefer low level saloon cars as the higher cars can be difficult to in and out of.

This is the perfect option. There are too many taxis in Crawley and not enough work.

This is the most sensible option.

Yes they should be stopped because there is no space and too many taxis with no work.

No more licences should be issued. There is no demand and ranks are over filled. More than enough to cover demand.

I support this option. Taxis are over supplied compared to rank spaces. Enough taxis to serve wider community.

Enough Taxis. I request that no more plates are issued. Over crowding at ranks and High Street.

40% wheelchair is enough. Older people do not want wheelchair cars as they cannot get in and out.

The taxis around Three Bridges are an eyesore, there are way too many.

A fair balance, not necessary for all vehicles to be wheelchair accessible. Sufficient taxis at present.

Take a look at Three Bridges at 6pm every day. No room to move due to taxis - this is supposed to be a public waiting area - we need less taxis.

I have never had a problem getting a taxi from the rank whether in a wheelchair or not. I do not agree that there should be 100% wheelchair access vehicles.

No more taxi please, the town is clogged up with taxis. If you reduce the numbers, you will get better quality.

Option 2

Stop any further licences and convert all saloon cars to WAV

This would bring in a level playing field as at the moment there is a £15 to £20k premium on saloon cars and these drivers pick up behind WAV

I agree to above option 2

Its also good option

I think all taxis should be PCO approved

Good

Sounds OK

Excellent Idea this one

No more cabs needed in Crawley

This is the best option

I think that this is the best option. Less people are traveling by taxi and increasing the numbers doesn't make sense when drivers are struggling.

I cannot imagine the demand for wheelchair accessible vehicles is great enough to justify this measure.

Enough wheelchair vehicles already, very expensive to convert current vehicles to wheelchair access and will not be used. Very few wheelchair passengers.

I often have to wait up to 1 hour until a suitable car is available, so I choose option 2. Often people carrier is sent by mistake.

We have enough wheelchair vehicles in the borough

I disagree, some taxi users like to use saloon cars, especially the elderly and people with different health conditions.

This would not serve the people of Crawley, not enough choice as some do not like the bigger vehicles, especially elderly.

Not sure if there is any need or demand. The wheelchair cabs are plentiful and the converted vans some use are uncomfortable for disabled passengers.

Although I am not disabled I travel with a disabled person. There are enough vehicles but they should all be accessible to wheelchair users.

Would cost a lot to implement. Wheelchair customers can still order or arrange wheelchair vehicle.

This would be ridiculous as many people I know would not be able to use the higher level of taxi.

This would encourage fare rises as it would raise operating costs.

Too many taxis in Crawley, not enough work.

Many older people cannot get up the step into the wheelchair vehicles.

It is often the case that older people cannot climb into the higher stepped vehicles

The present fleet meets the needs of everyone. Older people like the low level cars.

It would be expensive to convert to wheelchair car. Most saloon drivers would not be able to afford the change.

My recently deceased father had a lot of difficulty obtaining a taxi to accommodate his buggy. Even if booked in advance, some were not big enough.

Option 3

Convert all saloon cars to WAV and no limit on WAV

Best option as not favouring anyone

I agree to above option 3

Umm Maybe

I like this option, as it give people to come to taxi trade but with some conditions. Nobody should be stopped to do what they like

Please consider rank space and drivers need to make a living.

I prefer this option, all vehicles should be accessible.

Disagree - we need a limit

I disagree with this, as I strongly feel there should be a limit.

Not necessary at all.

Unnecessary as I don't believe there would be such a large demand.

Not sensible, less choice for public

Option 4 Keep current policy only WAV and keep existing saloon cars

This seems a better idea. The more taxis for disabled the better now that buses are being stopped.

Even if you stop issuing more licences if more people move into Crawley still you can change the rules to issue more licences in the future

I think this is the best option. Pick random drivers no matter how much their numbers grow. They all make nearly same money.ph pay rent hc don't

It seems a better idea than other options

I believe that this option is the best one

No limits

As a private hire driver with a wheelchair vehicle this option would suit me if and when I update to a new vehicle. It will affect the HC drivers income

With an aging population, more rather than less vehicles may be required to accommodate needs of the elderly and disabled

This allows accessibility for all users the majority of disabled people do not use wheelchairs and wheelchair accessible vehicles can be difficult to access

You need to assess the demand for WAV as not every customer requires this facility. If current supply is adequate don't solve a problem that doesn't exist

Continue with current policy

This option would be nice. This will give a change for every to do what they like

Total deregulation of Taxi numbers would have a detrimental impact on existing drivers and would lead to poorer standards for all users including wheelchair

Disagree - need a limit

Best solution as allows competition and will gradually increase standard of taxis and the availability of wheelchair accessible taxis.

Preferred Option.

Not enough rank space and means drivers cannot make a living.

Can the Hackney Carriage vehicles operate from Gatwick Airport?

We are a growing town so why limit the number of taxis or job opportunities. Let the market decide.

Comments

A freeze on taxi numbers should be implemented without delay. Specification of wheelchair accessible vehicles could be better defined
There should be no licence restrictions on numbers but standards of either saloon or wheelchair as everyone has a right to use or own vehicles
Do not put any limit
Option 4 is the best
I disagree option 4 because too many drivers queue up for a fare to pound hill. Have to wait too long to get another job
All of the present PHV that operate at Gatwick should be converted to HCV with a special dedicated licence plate to identify the area of operation
There should be no limit on taxi licences. Change in rules should be made be considering current the job situation in market
The Council needs to pressure the new owners of the airport to put hackney carriage ranks at the airport. New company is most expensive in town
Think from both sides...customer and driver
I think a limit should come into force as soon as possible before the drivers become bankrupt
Too many vehicles are bad for everyone. With the availability of private hire vehicles no more hackneys need to be introduced other than with better access
It would be useful to know the number of disabled people in Crawley. Why convert if the stats do not show a need. The stats will help in this survey
Being charge different rate fees however using the same route daily. Dirty cars and not feeling safe with same drivers
Lack of knowledge of english language METRO CARS. having to direct driver. Same company, same location different price
Dirty cars and rude drivers
We need more wheelchair access without putting any more cabs on the road and forcing drivers out of business
I prefer to travel in a saloon car and prefer to get in a taxi when I want rather than wait for a PHV
No more cabs needed in Crawley already a vast amount of different taxi options
The Council needs to realise the cost of implementing these measures versus the price of fares that can be charged
You should consider the motor disability necessity. Not every disable customer is in a wheelchair. dont kill the industry and make lives of drivers harder
There are too many taxis in the town already. You must take into account the number of PHV. Most people phone for taxis and PHV
If any option other than 1 is chosen both drivers and the public will suffer
No , Although I am not disabled, my son is and I know many other families affected by disability. There are sufficient appropriate vehicles in Crawley
Many Councils that deregulated have done a u-turn and re-regulated. I hope you have the courage to do the same.
You got the option about HCV what about PH are you going to put a limit on that.
I think option 2 is best however I feel that it is not as simple as having WAV, Training for drivers in dealing with disabled users is essential
Wheelchair taxis are fraud.
Due to the size of my wheelchair, I would not fit, so avoid using them. Not enough roof space.
Enough taxis to serve the people of Crawley. We should limit and keep 73 saloon and 49 wheelchair vehicle.
As a regular fare from Three Bridges I feel sorry for the drivers, they need to make a living.
More than enough taxis. Please limit and we can have another survey in 3 to 5 years.
No more taxis needed in Crawley. Fees should also be reduced due to lack of work and recession.
Ther 44% wheelchair accessible vehicles is well balanced fleet and gives a good choice to wheelchair users and non users.
Don't see the point in more taxis. Very little work as it is. Changing from saloon to wheelchair vehicles would be expensive & not suitable for some customers.
Not all disabled people need a wheelchair. In fact some prefer a saloon if they have hip or back problems and cannot step up into big wheelchair cars.
The age of the vehicles should also be considered bringing in a 3 or 5 year rule ensuring up to date vehicles which would give better impression of Crawley.
More disabled friendly taxis but no increase in the total number. There is chaos at Three Bridges at peak times when members of the public are picking up.

Question 8 Yes	Unhelpful drivers Weekends waiting too long Speeding Some taxis are too high to get into. I always ask for saloon car. If all are wheelchair vehicles I will be unable to get out. I am unable to get into some disabled taxis. Once I had a nasty fall due to the height. If all vehicles are disabled I will be restricted.
Question 9 Yes	I use M&M taxis or R&S taxis but if they are busy I ring round but can't normally get any one to take a booking for a wheelchair