

HACKNEY CARRIAGE AND PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING POLICY REVIEW**List of Respondents and Comments**

1	Road Policing Unit, Cleveland Police
2	Mr Fidler, PH Operator on behalf of 2 Licensed Operators & Vehicle Proprietors
3	Mr Khazir, Stockton Hackney Drivers Association (SHDA)
4	Mr Snowdon, Private Hire Operator and Hackney Carriage Proprietor
5	Mr Hussain, Private Hire Operator, Vehicle Proprietor and Driver
6	Mr Dawson, Hackney Carriage Proprietor & Hackney Carriage Driver
7	Mr Leng, Hackney Carriage Proprietor & Hackney Carriage Driver
8	Mr Nightingale, Combined Driver
9	Mr Gaunt, Hackney Carriage Driver
10	Mr Nadeem, Hackney Carriage Proprietor & Combined Driver
11	Mr Hussain, Hackney Carriage Proprietor & Combined Driver
12	Mr Shafiq, Hackney Carriage Proprietor & Combined Driver
13	Mr Sajid, Private Hire Proprietor & Private Hire Driver
14	Mr Noori, Combined Driver
15	Mr Grassham, PH Operator, PH & HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver
16	E Butterfield, Private Hire Driver
17	Mr Taylor, Private Hire Proprietor & Private Hire Driver
18	Mr Ahmed, PH & HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver
19	Mr Smith, Private Hire Driver
20	Mr Rehman, Combined Driver
21	Mr Barfoot, Combined Driver
22	Mr Kightly, Combined Driver
23	Mr Sepehr, Combined Driver
24	Mr Ellis, Combined Driver
25	Mr Ghani, PH Operator, PH & HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver
26	Mr Fiaz, Combined Driver
27	Mr H Fiaz, Combined Driver
28	Mr Sabir, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver
29	Mr Granville, Private Hire Operator, PH Vehicle Proprietor & Private Hire Driver
30	Mr Tomoiaga, Private Hire Driver
31	Mr Mehmood, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver
32	Mr Bhatti, Combined Driver
33	Mr Hanif, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Hackney Carriage Driver
34	Mr Bashir, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver
35	Mr Kazi, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver
36	Mr Ali, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver
37	Mr Iqbal, Combined Driver
38	Mr Iqbal, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver
39	Mr Grant, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Hackney Carriage Driver
40	Mr Hussain, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver
41	Mr Wrench, Combined Driver
42	Mr Iqbal, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver
43	Mr Hussain, Combined Driver
44	Mr Shazid, PH Operator, PH & HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver
45	Mr Sakhi, Combined Driver
46	Mr Suleman, Combined Driver
47	Mr Blades, Private Hire Driver
48	Mr Akhtar, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver

49	Mr Zaman, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver
50	Mr Khan, Combined Driver
51	Mr Raooof, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver
52	Mr Khan, PH & HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver
53	Mr Matloob, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver
54	Mr Tomoiaga, Private Hire Driver
55	Mr Hall, Private Hire Driver
56	Mr Shabir, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver
57	Mr Ali, Combined Driver
58	Mr Ahmed, Hackney Carriage Driver
59	Mr Bashir, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver
60	Mr Sarwar, PH Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver
61	Mr Robertson, HC Vehicle Proprietor & HC Driver
62	Mr Jones, HC Vehicle Proprietor & HC Driver
63	Mr Tooke, HC Vehicle Proprietor & HC Driver
64	Mr Burlison, HC Vehicle Proprietor & HC Driver
65	Mr Ahmad, HC Vehicle Proprietor & HC Driver (SHDA)
66	Mr Qamar, PH Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
67	Mr Agha, Combined Driver (SHDA)
68	Mr Aziz, Combined Driver (SHDA)
69	Mr Agshar, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
70	Mr Saleem, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
71	Mr Majid, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
72	Mr Rafique, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
73	Mr Mahmood, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
74	Mr Hall, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
75	Mr Habib, Combined Driver (SHDA)
76	Mr Ali, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
77	Mr Fiaz, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
78	Mr Ahmed, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
79	Mr Parvez, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
80	Mr Anwar, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
81	Mr Mansurpur, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
82	Mr Shazad, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
83	Mr Akhtar, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
84	Mr Ahmed, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
85	Mr Arshad, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
86	Mr Grant, HC Vehicle Proprietor & HC Driver (SHDA)
87	Mr Ryves, HC Vehicle Proprietor & HC Driver (SHDA)
88	Mr Ahmed, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
89	Mr Loughan, HC Vehicle Proprietor & HC Driver (SHDA)
90	Mr Hamid, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
91	Mr Zaman, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
92	Mr Siddique, Combined Driver (SHDA)
93	Mr Hamid, Combined Driver (SHDA)
94	Mr Hanif, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
95	Mr Iqbal, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
96	Mr Ali, HC Vehicle Proprietor & HC Driver (SHDA)
97	Mr Khan, Combined Driver (SHDA)
98	Mr Saeed, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
99	Mr Hanif, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
100	Mr Shabir, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)

101	Mr Aurangzeb, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
102	Mr Rehman, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
103	Hr Hussain, Combined Driver (SHDA)
104	Mr Sharif, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
105	Mr Saddiq, Combined Driver (SHDA)
106	Mr Akhtar, HC Vehicle Proprietor & HC Driver (SHDA)
107	Mr Lakha, PH Operator, PH & HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
108	Mr Khizar, Combined Driver (SHDA)
109	Mr Ayub, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
110	Mr Ali, HC Vehicle Proprietor & HC Driver (SHDA)
111	Mr Anwar, HC Vehicle Proprietor & HC Driver (SHDA)
112	Mr Akhtar, HC Vehicle Proprietor & HC Driver (SHDA)
113	Mr Ahmed, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
114	Mr Shabir, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
115	Mr Iqbal, Combined Driver (SHDA)
116	Mr Farooq, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
117	Mr Ali, Combined Dirver (SHDA)
118	Mr Baig, Combined Dirver (SHDA)
119	Mr Hussain, HC Vehicle Proprietor & HC Driver (SHDA)
120	Mr Younas, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
121	Mr Saghir, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
122	Mr Fawcett, Combined Driver (SHDA)
123	Mr Ali, Combined Driver (SHDA)
124	Mr Yasin, Combined Driver (SHDA)
125	Mr Ghani, Combined Driver (SHDA)
126	Mr Khan, Combined Driver (SHDA)
127	Mr Mahmood, Combined Driver (SHDA)
128	Mr Ahsan, HC Vehicle Proprietor & HC Driver (SHDA)
129	Mr Ali, HC Vehicle Proprietor & HC Driver (SHDA)
130	Mr Hussain, Combined Driver (SHDA)
131	Mr Hussein, Combined Driver (SHDA)
132	Mr Ahmed, Hackney Carriage Driver (SHDA)
133	Mr Saghir, Combined Driver (SHDA)
134	Mr Hussain, Combined Driver (SHDA)
135	Mr Ali, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
136	Mr Farooq, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
137	Mr Akram, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
138	Mr Iqbal, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
139	Mr Amin, Combined Driver (SHDA)
140	Mr Jameel, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
141	Mr Wahid, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
142	Mr Ali, HC Vehicle Proprietor & HC Driver (SHDA)
143	Mr Khan, Hackney Carriage Driver (SHDA)
144	Mr Saeed, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
145	Mr Yaqoob, Combined Driver (SHDA)
146	Mr Hussain, HC Vehicle Proprietor & HC Driver (SHDA)
147	Mr Amin, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
148	Mr Tufall, Combined Driver (SHDA)
149	Mr Akhtar, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
150	Mr Anwar, HC Vehicle Proprietor & Combined Driver (SHDA)
151	Mr Mahmood, Combined Driver (SHDA)

Q1. Do you agree with the proposal to retain the requirement in respect of tinted windows and the amendment to consider allowing them in exceptional circumstances? If not please give your reasons below.	
1	Agree with proposal
2	<p>We suggest that the Council adopts the policy of North Tyneside Council which meets the need for a minimum level of glass transparency but allows normal production model cars in everyday use by the public generally to be licensed for use by Operators and proprietors.</p> <p>2.14 Tinted Windows 2.14.1 The windows (excluding the windscreen which must have a minimum light transmission of 75%) of any vehicle shall not have been treated so that less than the percentages detailed below of light is transmitted through it:</p> <p>70% minimum light transmission for front side windows 34% for all other windows</p> <p>Licensing Officers are able to exercise their discretion as to the suitability of a vehicle where the light transmittance of the windows is below 34%. This discretion however does not apply to the front windscreen or the front side windows.</p> <p>2.14.2 If the following criteria can be met in which case there will be no minimum light transmission:</p> <p>The vehicle is an executive hire vehicle operating under an Exemption Notice, and</p> <p>The vehicle will not be engaged at all in any contract or provision of vehicle for the carriage of minors or based around the carriage of unaccompanied children/young persons (under age 18 years). The driver must not act as the accompanying adult and</p> <p>Approval has been given by the Head of Development Strategy and Planning.</p> <p>The Operator must, unless such a vehicle has been specifically requested, inform a hirer that a vehicle with tinted windows as detailed above will be supplied.</p>
3	<p>The overall policy of not allowing vehicles with tinted windows was introduced despite the lack of any evidence that would suggest passenger safety was affected in any way. Since then the trade has borne the cost of window tint-testing either indirectly through license fees to cover the cost of equipment / officer time or directly as proprietors of a vehicle that could not comply and therefore was required to change the glass on their vehicle. Nevertheless we agree there must be some form of restriction on tinted windows. The current system of checking the window tint level using a 'light meter' is overly complicated and expensive. A much simpler system whereby any vehicle fitted with after-market window tint film/spray could not be licensed except in exceptional circumstances would be adequate.</p>
4	Yes
5	Majority of cars are all fitted with tinted windows and not all manufactures are providing clear glass, the expense is too high. Disagree
6	Tinted windows should not be allowed
7	Yes
8	No this according to licensing restricts vehicles that meet Construction and Use Laws. But they refer only to the front windows. Testing the rear glass would mean many vehicles would be excluded unnecessarily.
9	I agree with the proposal
10	Agree
11	Yes

12	Agree
13	No, not agree. I had to replace tinted windows on my car even though they were done by manufacturers. Manufactured ones should be allowed
14	Most vehicles are factory fitted, so they should be allowed
15	No Comment
16	I disagree as I think tinted windows look ok, and most modern cars come with tint's as standard
17	I disagree because all modern cars have tinted windows and there is currently cars with tinted windows licensed
18	I disagree with the tinted windows because: 1. your limited to which vehicles you can license 2. not all manufacturers make clear windows 3. most cars now days all come with tinted windows 4. if you say in exceptional circumstances, it means you would still license that vehicle 5. it is a very costly exercise if you found a car with tinted windows then to remove them to put clear ones in 6. limos and a lot of other types of cars now have to be licensed the objection the council is using not to allow would them objection not be maintained if the same was a taxi 7. tinted windows should be allowed only if factory fitted, you can understand the after market tint is very dark
19	I disagree that all windows should be tint free because of excessive sunlight in your eyes. They also look cleaner and butter with tint
20	I disagree because all modern cars have tinted windows and there is currently cars with tinted windows licensed
21	Disagree that tinted windows are not allowed as many are factory fitted by manufacturers
22	I disagree because the manufacturers fit them
23	I disagree because the majority of cars today already have tinted windows, it's an expense we could do without as doesn't cause any major problems
24	No, most vehicles are factory fitted with tinted windows. I agree fully blacked out windows should not be allowed
25	To costly to replace as all vehicles come with factory fitted tested windows
26	All vehicles now come with tinted windows from the dealers its to costly to replace and we have never had any complaints from customers about the windows
27	All vehicles now come with tinted windows from the dealers its to costly to replace and we have never had any complaints from customers about the windows
28	Yes
29	Agree
30	I don't agree to tinted windows. All cars these days are manufactured with tinted windows. Disagree
31	Yes
32	I do not agree because of new vehicles come factory fitted with tinted windows. Other authorities around the country allow this so I don't see the problem why Stockton Council can't allow it. Tinted windows benefit the customers because blacked out windows keep out the heat in the summer. Also the vehicle looks smarter
33	No tinted windows
34	Agree
35	Yes
36	Tinted windows should not be allowed unless fitted by manufacturer
37	Agree
38	Agree
39	No, factory fitted windows should be allowed if necessary to retained in the policy
40	No, because cars that are made like that so should be left alone
41	Yes
42	Tinted windows should not be allowed if been fitted by drivers. Factory fitted should be allowed

43	Disagree, manufacturers fitted windows are National Standard
44	I disagree with Council not allowing tinted windows because tinted windows these days are more a less standards on cars
45	I agree on blacked out windows but not the manufacturers tint because you can still see through them and everyone in the car is visible
46	No, vehicles which are not modified, but manufactured fitted should be accepted
47	Tinted windows serve as comfort for the passenger in all taxi vehicles; security for the passenger against all threats form a exterior source; plus no reason given
48	Disagree, most vehicles are already fitted with tinted windows and can be expensive and difficult to replace. They keep the heat at the summer and can keep the heat in winter, it looks smarter as well
49	No, factory manufactured and fitted glass should be acceptable as they are
50	Tinted windows should be allowed if they are fitted by car company
51	Yes, I agree
52	No I disagree because I don't see any reason for tinted windows to be enforced
53	Yes
54	I don't agree to tinted windows should not be allowed because all cars these days are manufactured with tinted windows. Disagree
55	I do not agree with this as all new cars are fitted with tinted windows as standard. Added to the cost of replacing the glass I think it is not necessarily worth it
56	The only circumstances that should allow tinted windows is when the vehicle has factory fitted EEC standards windows
57	I think the taxis should be able to carry on with tinted windows. Reason is that certain vehicles come with tinted windows as standard and it would cost a fortune to change them. Some Councils not far from Stockton allow all the windows to be tinted so why should Stockton Council be different
58	Disagree as manufactured fitted windows are national standard
59	No any standard vehicle as manufactured should be accepted. The Council should avoid making things difficult for drivers especially mattes out of our control
60	I have just put a Vauxhall on as a taxi which originally had tinted windows and I had to replace them with clear and it cost me £500. I strongly disagree because these cars have a factory fitted tint
61	I think it's a bit late now, you have approved these cars, are you saying you might have erred
62	Yes
63	I have no opinion regarding tinted windows. Its time we started talking about serious matters like rank spaces and wheelchair vehicles and dropped these trivialities like bus lanes and windows
64	You, Stockton Licensing permitted these vehicles you issued the licences. This is just another case of you moving the goal posts when it suits you
65	No, factory fitted tinted should be allowed
66	Yes, I agree window which have tint on them should be allowed to stay as long as they are from and made by makers manufacturers standards and pass DVLA standards
67	Manufacturer fitted windows should be okay
68	No, factory tinted windows
69	No, factory fitted windows standard
70	Tinted windows fitted by manufactures should be allowed
71	No
72	Yes, also to allow if fitted by manufacturer as standard
73	No I do not agree, present policy is adequate
74	I don't agree with the Council regarding the policy for tinted windows because the manufactures EEC standard windows will always pass this test
75	Tinted window policy should be scrapped. Tinted windows come as standard to manufacturers guidelines
76	Factory fitted standard should be allowed no matter what

77	Factory fitted standards should be allowed on
78	Agree with proposal to keep tinted windows
79	No, factory fitted should be fine
80	I do not agree with the proposals and strongly believe the current policy is adequate, and there is no need for any amendments
81	No
82	Yes, professionally fitted should be allowed
83	Do not agree
84	They should be okay
85	Do not agree
86	No, if professionally fitted it should be okay
87	No, there is no need for any amendments, should be left alone
88	Should be okay
89	No, do not agree
90	Tinted windows done by drivers should not be allowed
91	Tinted windows should not be allowed on new cars unless fitted by manufacturer
92	Manufacturers fitted windows should be okay
93	Manufacturers fitted windows should be okay
94	Not agree, existing should stay on until vehicle is changed. Factory fitted should be allowed in any case
95	Yes
96	All new vehicles come with tinted windows manufactured factory fitted so their must be a reason why manufacturers would fit tinted windows to the vehicle
97	No, factory fitted windows should be allowed
98	No, any standard vehicle as manufactured should be accepted. The Council should avoid making things difficult for drivers especially matters out of our control
99	If has been done by manufacturer is should be okay, but it its done by driver the it should not be allowed (Tinted film)
100	Factory fitted EEC standard tints should be allowed
101	No, any manufactured vehicle should be accepted
102	No, factory fitted should be allowed
103	Factory fitted windows should be passed. If the windows are totally blacked out that vehicle should not be give a licence. The grandfather rights for the 17 vehicles should stay until the vehicle comes off the road
104	Should be allowed on standard car, you can not get a executive care without tints
105	Manufactured by the company windows are okay
106	No, I believe factory fitted windows should be acceptable. If acceptable by DVLA it should be accepted by our Council
107	No, factory fitted windows should be allowed
108	Manufactured by the company windows are okay
109	I agree with the tinted widows with exceptional circumstances but if they are manufactured windows
110	No because it should be as standard to manufacturers requirements, no tinted window policy should be in force by the Council
111	Why do you need this? The vehicles comes with manufactured faction fitted windows
112	No, I believe factory fitted windows/manufactured fitted windows should be acceptable. If accepted by DVLA it should be accepted by our Council
113	No, any vehicle which is manufacturers standard should be accepted
114	The only circumstance that should allow tinted windows is when the vehicle has factory fitted EEC standard windows
115	I don't agree with this proposal and strongly believe that the current policy is fine and it should not be amended
116	No, factory fitted windows should be approved
117	Factory fitted should be allowed only
118	Fitted by manufacturer should be okay

119	No, I believe factory fitted windows should be accepted. If they are acceptable with DVLA they should be acceptable by our Council
120	I agree with the proposal to retain the requirements
121	Yes, only for new entrants to the trade
122	If a vehicle is fit for use by the manufacturer then why should tinted windows be a problem? If the requirement is to phase out said vehicles then this should be done at as they come off the road and are replaced. However like for like would seem to be the fairest way. My answer to this is Yes allow
123	Factory fitted windows should be allowed. After market window tint should not be allowed
124	Manufactured standard windows should be passed unless the windows are totally blacked out. The 17 vehicles with the grandfather rights should be retained until such a time when the vehicle comes off the road
125	Not agree, factory fitted car windows should be allowed. After market should not be allowed
126	Manufactured fitted window should be okay
127	Factory windows should always be accepted
128	No I do not agree wit this. I think the vehicle comes with this
129	If a vehicle is bought from showroom at manufacturers standards and has no objection from DVLA and the Police why should it fail a standard tinted window test from the Council
130	Factory fitted tinted windows should be acceptable – after market tints not acceptable
131	Factory fitted should be allowed only
132	I agree with the proposal to retain the requirements
133	Factory fitted should be allowed. If accepted by DVLA it should be accepted by our council
134	I think if the manufacturer of the vehicle is satisfied with the standard of tint on the window and it is to DVLA and VOSA standards then I have no complaint and neither should the council
135	If a car is bought from showroom at manufacturers factory fitted passed by DVLA should be okay. Only disagree with tined windows put on by driver's themselves. Agree with grandfather rights
136	No, any vehicle which has not been modified and is manufactured standards should be accepted
137	Yes, normal factory fitted should be allowed
138	I am in favour of the use of standard manufacturers fitted tinted windows as long as they are visible
139	No, it should be left as standard manufacture
140	I do not agree with the proposal and strongly believe the current policy is adequate and there is no need for any amendments
141	Yes, manufactured fitted should be allowed
142	No comment
143	No, I believe this is against the national government policy for council requirement, also there is not mentioned in the policy about the rear windows. It would be logical to allow any standard manufactured unmodified vehicles
144	No, factory fitted windows should be allowed, only the blacked out windows should not be allowed
145	I have no objection
146	I do not agree with the proposal, and strongly believe the current policy is adequate and there is no need for any amendment
147	I do not agree with the proposal and I believe current policy is okay, so there is no need for any changes in Policy
148	I am agree with the tinted windows with exceptional circumstances but if they are manufactured windows
149	No
150	Yes, but as long as the window are manufactured by the vehicle manufacturer and it is part of the original design
151	I agree with the tinted windows exceptional circumstances but if they are manufactured

Q2. Do you agree with the proposal to extend 'grandfather rights' to the remaining vehicles that do not comply with this requirement until the vehicle is either replaced or ownership transferred? If not please give your reasons below.	
1	No objection to this
2	See comments above
3	We agree that grandfather rights should be extended however these rights should last until the vehicle is replaced. A restriction on ownership transfer would unnecessarily create problems for any owner wanting to transfer ownership.
4	Yes
5	If the grandfather rights allow these vehicles to operate, then why can't other be licensed they don't seem to cause and problems. All vehicles should be allowed factory fitted tinted windows. Disagree
6	No
7	No, if the vehicle is replaced then Yes. If the vehicle is transferred, it will still have tinted windows and should be allowed until such vehicle is replaced.
8	No the requirement should be modified to restrict only those vehicles that have been modified
9	I agree with the proposal
10	Agree
11	Yes
12	Agree
13	Yes, agree with grandfather rights, but not with rest of question
14	Yes
15	No, they should remove tinted windows for the safety of passengers
16	This right should be extended to everyone, as if they were licensed before it should be continued
17	This should be extended to everyone
18	If these vehicles are used still maybe this should be allowed and used as a trail that if these vehicles being used cause any problems in being used as taxi and if there is that problem should be highlighted and if no problems are occurred then further vehicles should be allowed to help people in the economic crisis
19	It should never ever be one rule for one it should also be one rule for all
20	This should be extended to all vehicles
21	Grandfather rights should be extended to all vehicles
22	One law for all should be allowed
23	I disagree because this right should be allowed to everyone
24	Yes
25	Yes, I agree with extending grandfather rights
26	Yes
27	Yes
28	Yes
29	Agree
30	I do agree that all cars should be allowed factory tinted windows
31	Yes
32	I do not think that is fair because if vehicles are already running with tinted windows, I don't see why you cannot put a car on with tinted windows
33	No all active vehicles should meet all requirements
34	Agree
35	Yes
36	I agree with grandfather rights to stay
37	Agree
38	Yes
39	Yes, grandfather rights should be given

40	Yes, I think they should be left as
41	Yes
42	Agree with grandfather rights
43	Disagree, should not be in policy
44	All cars should be allowed grandfather rights because of the reason in question 1
45	No comment
46	Agree
47	My answer is Q1 and this is not democratic and bureaucracy over looking the rights and safety of others i.e. passengers (Madness)
48	Disagree, if cars have already been allowed to operate with tinted windows I can't see why recent vehicles should be disallowed if it doesn't affect the way the car operates it should not be a problem
49	Yes
50	Agree with grand father rights but should not be changed till replace the vehicle
51	Yes, I agree
52	I believe this right should be extended to all vehicles without prejudice
53	Yes
54	I agree that all cars should be allowed factory tinted windows
55	Yes, I agree
56	Agree
57	Yes, any vehicle already on the road should be able to remain on the road with tinted windows i.e. Galaxy's don't come as fully tinted anyway its just the back windscreens and couple on the sides
58	Disagree as it should not be in the policy
59	Yes I do agree
60	These grandfather rights should be extended to other people in the taxi trade
61	These cars should see out their lives, you passed them as okay
62	Yes on vehicles being replaced, but grandfather rights should also be granted on transfer a as already being a taxi it should cover the life of the vehicles
63	If it is the Councils intention to cancel grandfather rights to these 17 vehicles I think a period of notice to change the windows or the vehicle should be given. I would propose that the owners should be told that their vehicle will only tested one more time and then a six month notice of intention issued
64	If you change your decision now you are accepting that you made an error initially. I think you may be leaving yourself open to a compensation claim
65	Yes
66	Grandfather rights to stay please as I won't be able to comply to your new suggestions e.g. £22k to £35k for new car. Banks are not giving any loans and I will be out of work on the dole.
67	I am in favour of grand father rights
68	Yes
69	Yes
70	Agree with grandfather rights, but should be allowed till they change their vehicle
71	Yes
72	No, grandfather rights should apply in all occasions
73	Yes, grandfather rights should be granted
74	Grandfather rights should not be altered. Why change something which has worked well before
75	Yes, grandfather rights should apply to existing vehicles
76	I agree to extend grandfather rights
77	I agree to extend grandfather rights to all saloon hackney carriages
78	Yes
79	Yes
80	Grandfather rights should not be extended
81	Yes

82	Yes
83	Yes agree
84	Yes, I agree
85	Grandfather rights should not be extended
86	Yes
87	Yes
88	Agree
89	Grandfather rights shouldn't be extended
90	I agree with grandfather rights. Wheelchair accessible vehicles are too expensive to buy and run and not enough demand for them
91	Yes, agree with grandfather rights
92	I am in favour of grandfather rights
93	I am in favour of grandfather rights
94	Agree with grandfather rights
95	Yes
96	Yes, I agree to keep the grandfather rights to all the vehicles. Once having a right should always have a right to have
97	Yes
98	I do agree
99	I agree with grandfather rights to stay. I can't afford to spend £22k on wheelchair accessible vehicle
100	I agree
101	Yes, I agree
102	Yes
103	Grandfather rights should stay. Can't afford to buy a brand new wheelchair accessible vehicle and run it under the present economic climate. Over the number of years that I have been in the trade only two disables people needed a wheelchair accessible
104	Grandfather rights should remain
105	I am in favour of grandfather rights
105	I would like grandfather rights to apply
107	Yes, give them time until the car is off the road
108	I am in favour of grandfather rights
109	I agree with the proposal to extend grandfather rights
110	Yes, because that is how they are made so should be left as
111	We should keep the grandfather rights
112	Yes, I would like grandfather rights to apply
113	Yes I agree
114	Agree
115	Grandfather rights should be extended
116	Yes
117	Grandfather rights should be allowed
118	Grandfather rights should remain in tact
119	I accept that grandfather rights should be continued
120	I agree that the grandfather rights should continue to exist
121	Yes
122	Allow grandfather rights yes, in due course all cars will be replaced
123	Grandfather rights for these vehicles should be allowed
124	Grandfather rights should stay. I can't see myself buy a brand new wheelchair accessible vehicle under the present or any other climate to buy and run it. 4 out of 5 people walk away from wheelchair accessible vehicles to go to the saloon car. Past 8 years not one disabled person has come on to the rank to use my vehicle
125	Agree with grandfather rights
126	I am in favour of grandfather rights
127	Yes
128	Yes agree

129	I think grandfather rights should be allowed. As I cannot see drivers that can afford the upkeep of wheelchair vehicles. Due to high costs in fuel, finance and the up keeping of a large vehicle
130	Agree
131	Grandfather rights should be allowed
132	I do agree with the proposal of grandfather rights
133	Yes, I would like grandfather rights
134	Grandfather rights should stay because I can not afford to buy a wheelchair accessible vehicle
135	Grandfather rights full stop to stay. As I can't see me being able to afford to buy and run a wheelchair accessible vehicle in the modern climate; country's in debt; banks are not giving out loans; you are increasing my running costs and insurances and 2.5 million than the dole I could be next in this queue
136	Yes, I do agree
137	Yes
138	Yes
139	Yes, the manufacturers design the car to make it look smart so there is no need to change
140	Grandfather rights should not be extended
141	Yes
142	No comment
143	Yes, give them fixed time to change the windows according to the requirements
144	Yes
145	Yes, I agree with proposal to extend grandfathers rights
146	Grandfather rights should not be extended
147	Grandfather rights should not be extended
148	I agree with proposal to extend grandfather rights
149	Yes
150	Yes, previous licensed vehicles should be allowed to continue until the vehicle is replaced
151	I agree with extending grandfather rights

<p>Q3. Do you agree with the proposal to amend the driver training requirement to require all drivers and private hire operators (or a representative) who have not already successfully completed the previous BTEC or NVQ requirements be required to complete the new BTEC course at their own expense within three years from the grant or renewal of their next licence.? If not please give your reasons below.</p>	
1	Agree with proposal
2	<p>We note and support the intention to require driver training.</p> <p>The policy as drafted will lead to unequal periods of 'grace' where some drivers may re-license only a short while before the adoption of this proposal in May 2012. They could then have three years from 2015 to obtain the qualification.</p>
3	<p>No. At a well attended meeting, our members voted unanimously to object to the new BTEC course. The following concerns were noted:</p> <p>1. Overall, the number of licensed vehicles has increased substantially in the last few years. The affect together with the current economic climate has resulted in drivers incomes falling by over 60%. The estimated cost of the course is £400 however the time self-employed drivers will have take off work to attend the course will likely mean that the cost is far higher.</p> <p>2. Our members raised concerns that government funding is not currently for this/these courses and is likely to remain unavailable for the foreseeable future. Until such time as funding becomes available the requirement to complete the BTEC course must NOT introduced.</p>

	<p>3. Over 85% of the trade is made up of drivers whose English is not their first language. Many are unable to use a computer. Studying and successfully passing a BTEC course would be almost impossible and would put the driver at risk of refusal to renew the drivers' license.</p> <p>4. Members agreed unanimously that all NEW applicants should complete the course.</p>
4	Yes
5	Disagree – Taxi Drivers have been able to provide service without these qualifications, waste of government money.
6	No I don't. I have spent a lot of time completing this course already but I did not receive all the diplomas that I was supposed to get from the school and neither did other drivers that were on this course with me. I think it was just a big con and a waste of tax payer's money. The Asian drivers were shown how to fill in forms without reading or understanding the questions.
7	No – All drivers should have an NVQ & BTEC but nobody should have to pay for it themselves. There won't be any new drivers as they will be priced out. I think you should wait until the funding changes
8	Yes
9	I agree with the proposal
10	Agree for new drivers only
11	Yes, it should be new drivers only
12	Disagree, only new drivers should do course
13	New drivers should be doing this course. I have done BTEC and NVQ
14	I have been doing taxis for almost 5 years, so why should I do another qualification
15	I think the courses should be free and make them comply with requirements
16	I have had my badge for a year and half now without this so I don't see what difference it will make
17	Disagree – I already have a BTEC and it hasn't changed the way I handle, deal with customers
18	I have been driving a taxi for last 10 + years. I don't think BTEC or NVQ will make me a Driver or tell me anything that I already now I have had practical experience driving a Taxi. This course should be to new hackney driver coming on because they would have to experience all to come private hire should be exempt has they get a lot of backup from the operators if they where ever to fall into a problem. So I would say only new hackney drivers to do BTEC and NVQ
19	Total waste of money, the Council tests cover all the areas. Just common sense
20	I disagree because I have not done my BTEC and I already deal with customers
21	No necessary for this trade
22	Disagree because it does not make a better driver
23	I disagree due to the fact this is a waste of money
24	No, not at the cost of the driver, who pay's also for loss of earnings
25	Why do we need training when been driving for many many years
26	I have been driving a taxi for over ten years, why should I go for more qualifications when I have been doing taxis for ten years
27	I have been driving a taxi for ten years, why should I go for more qualifications when I have been doing taxis for ten years
28	No training for existing drivers
29	Having completed both the BTECH and NVQ I found these to be a complete waste of my time. I understand the Councils goal to improve the taxi trade but surely the customer will, by not using problem cabs, motivate firms to improve
30	I don't agree with BTEC or NVQ
31	Yes, only for new drivers
32	I have been driving taxis for 6 years, I have experienced all different types of customers. Therefore I think this is a waste of time and money. Disagree
33	New drivers only

34	Disagree, but only new drivers to complete course
35	Agree only new drivers to carry out courses
36	New drivers should be doing this course not existing unless they have not done BTEC or NVQ
37	It is good to train drivers to a high standard but it is not fair for someone who has already done the training to have to do the new course
38	Yes, for new drivers only
39	Yes, most drivers have already completed these courses two years ago, experience tells me it should only be for new drivers coming into the trade
40	I took all the tests at the time for by badge so no to driver training for existing. For new ones it could be introduced
41	Having completed this required course over a staggered time of about 48 hours, I and many other drivers found it of no use at all. What you are required to do as a taxi driver, is in the driver requirements/rules issued by the licensing department. Is it not possible to include most of these items in the written test when applying for driver licences
42	Not agree, new drivers should be doing this course
43	No, the taxi trade is quiet. Which ever organisation came up with the idea should pay
44	I disagree because it's a waste of public money, hasn't proved any benefits. Drivers can be prof and safe with out this qualification
45	I don't see how it would make a difference to enhance driver skills and after 18 years experience I would say time is experience and the NVQ and BTEC I have done has not improved my knowledge or skills
46	Yes agree, but for the new entrants to the trade, the existing licensed drivers should be exempted from courses such as NVQ and BTEC
47	This is not agreed or again evidence given by the above Trading Standards acting as bully boys to generate revenue
48	Disagree, it is a waste of time and money for drivers who have been working for years without this qualification and have done the job perfectly
49	No, they should be no driver training for existing drivers, only for new drivers could be introduced. BTEC should be only optional as they are no government funding available
50	If drivers have not done the BTEC or NVQ then should be doing this course. I think new drivers should do these courses
51	Yes I agree that all new drivers should do NVQ and BTEC
52	I have done my BTEC and NVQ but personally I didn't see or feel any benefit
53	Yes, but it should be retained for new entrants to the trade, as the existing drivers have no need to complete these courses. The Government has not make it mandatory it is just an extra option and there is no funding available at the moment
54	I don't agree with BTEC or NVQ
55	I do not agree with this as the cost will cause hard ship to many drivers and it will not enhance driver skills as many tests show
56	Agree
57	No, because some driver are not fully educated to pass courses and plus I've passed the course and some things don't even apply to taxi drivers
58	No, the taxi trade is quiet which ever organisation came up with the idea should pay
59	I do agree the course should be required but not for existing drivers only new drivers. I think it is an insult to the intelligence of those drivers who have been in this occupation for very long time. The course should not be at drivers expense in the current tough economic times
60	I have already done the NVQ which was previously required and then abolished. I don't see any purpose of these courses and strongly disagree with this proposal
61	I took mine and paid for 2 nd part myself everybody should take it or you reimburse me for my part 2
62	Yes
63	All drivers should take the course in fairness to those of us who have already. Many drivers had to pay so much towards their training, would we be now in a position to claim a

	refund from the Council for being discriminated against.
64	Those that have not done it should have to do it
65	No, only new drivers
66	I agree any new driver coming to the trade should do this training. Precious and already passed drivers have complied to your specifications when badge received
67	Agree with
68	No, only new applications
69	No, only new applicants
70	I have done both courses, so I should not be doing any more. I think new drivers should be doing this course
71	Yes, only for new drivers coming into the trade. Should only have to comply with BTEC course
72	No, there are people with 30 years experience and more, what can they be taught that they already don't know. If you want to introduce it, do it to new drivers
73	Yes, but existing drivers do already possess experience and knowledge to carry their jobs. Even the Government only proposes as an optional for those who need extra knowledge. So only new drivers should be encouraged to take courses
74	The Council made drivers sit this test 2 years ago at the drivers own expense. It was a total shambles set up by the council and was not run by regulated people. Drivers sat the test then had to go back because it was not done right in the first place. If a new test has to be introduced it should be for new drivers coming in to the trade and not for people who already have a badge.
75	Driver training should not apply to existing drivers, but could be enforced for new drivers
76	I object to the driver training requirements waste of money. Only new drivers should do it
77	I object to all hackney drivers should require to have a BTEC or NVQ. Only new drivers should do BTEC and NVQ
78	Agree with the proposal
79	No only new applications should be doing this course. We have got enough experience
80	This proposal undermines the intelligence and skills of existing drivers. Three years is a small period of time, and would be an added expense for a taxi driver working in a shrinking economy. Similar testing and introduction of vocational qualifications were poorly organised in the past and nationally these have been downgraded. It would be fair to expect new drivers to complete a test, but is patronising to expect drivers with a badge to re take the test. How many other trades or professions re take the same test
81	I've already taken the tests to get my badge, should not need to get tests done again
82	Only new drivers should take training
83	Only new drivers
84	Yes, I agree
85	No, done all tests already to get badge
86	Should not need to do test
87	No
88	Agree
89	No training for existing drivers should take place, only new drivers
90	I have done my BTEC and NVQ but I think new drivers coming into the trade should do this course, not existing drivers
91	No agree, new drivers coming to trade should be doing this
92	Agree
93	Agree
94	Nave done BTEC and NVQ so I don't need to do any more courses. New drivers should be doing it
95	Yes, existing licensed drivers should not be forced to complete these courses, as 80% of drivers have good knowledge of the current rules and legislations
96	No, the existing licence holders should not have to do BTEC or NVQS because they have been in the job, so new licensees should do the BTEC and NVQ
97	No, only new applicants

98	I do agree the course should be required but not for existing drivers, only new drivers. I think it is an insult to the intelligence of those drivers who have been in this occupation for very long time. The course should not be at drivers expense in the current tough economic times
99	No not agree existing driver should not be doing this, but new driver should be doing it
100	I agree
101	Yes, I agree
102	Yes, but only new entrants should have to do the course
103	Only for people who apply for new licences
104	BTEC and NVQ is good enough
105	Do not agree, only for new drivers will be okay
106	No, you can not teach a person with 30 years experience how to do their job
107	No, only new drivers should be tested
108	No agreed only for new drivers okay
109	I object to the driver training requirements. I think its waste of money and time I have done that course I didn't gain anything just common sense. Only for new drivers
110	I believe existing drivers should not be tested but new drivers should be because I fulfilled all relevant training requirements when I received my badge
111	I would say for new drivers not for existing ones
112	No as I believe drivers who have 20/30 years experience cannot be taught something now as no qualification can prepare you for this
113	Yes I agree, but should only be for new applicants not for drivers who have already done the BTEC or NVQ level 2
114	Agree
115	This proposal undermines the experience of the drivers who had kept the badge for along time. I think only new drivers should do it as they are the ones new in the trade not the experienced drivers
116	No only new applicants
117	Only new drivers should be asked to complete the course not existing drivers who have already completed their BTEC
118	Not agreed, BTEC for new drivers
119	No, as I believe that drivers who have 20/30 years experience can't be taught anything they already know
120	No, you can't teach a driver who has 30 years experience. What happens in real life is not what happens on paper
121	Yes, only new entrants should be made to comply
122	I disagree with any form of imposed test NVQ or BTEC to drivers with existing badges particularly if driving taxis 10 years of more. It appears that it would be a case of teaching my granny to suck eggs. New driver maybe , but a lot of expense in serious social times with a massive recession and lack of money, my answer is no
123	Existing drivers should not be forced into doing the course as they have been doing he job for years and have also done a course before. New drivers should do the course
124	I have done NVQ and BTEC as required. What I believe any new applicant for private hire or hackney drivers should take these training courses. The existing driver who have worked over a number of years have enough experience to do the job
125	Existing drivers shouldn't have to do BTEC or NVQ, only new drives should have to do the qualifications
126	Agree with it
127	BTEC for new drivers only
128	I would say for new drivers
129	I have passed the NVQ Level 2. I also think the new BTEC should be introduced to new drivers, not the existing drivers
130	BTEC only for new drivers
131	Only new drivers should be asked to complete this course not existing drivers who have already completed their BTEC

132	As I believe drivers who have 20/30 years experience can not be taught something now as no qualification can prepare for this
133	As I believe drivers who have 20/30 years experience can not be taught something now as no qualifications can prepare you for this
134	I have done the NVQ level 2 and I am waiting for my certificate
135	I've already done both BTEC and NVQ. I think only new drivers coming into the trade should have to do this. Trade members and drivers with over 10 years experience should be exempt
136	Yes I agree, but only for new applicants. Those drivers who have already completed the BTEC or NVQ Level 2 should not be required to do it again. Also the drivers should not have to do these course at their own expense, especially considering the present economic climate
137	Yes, but it should not be compulsory, as it was only government suggestion as an option to enhance the knowledge further. The existing licensed drivers should be exempt and the new drivers should be encouraged to complete the courses for future, put presently they should be suspended from the policy
138	Yes
139	No, if I was good enough o get the badge then with my experience I have only got better. I have nothing against future drivers getting training
140	This proposal undermines the intelligence and skills of existing drivers
141	The council made drivers take this test two years ago and which the driver paid for it as well. Can I ask if council did it, I don't thing so because it was organised badly. The people who were taking it didn't have a clue what they were doing. A lot of drivers lost couple of hundred pounds for something that council didn't want any more in the end. A driver who has been working for lot of years doesn't need training. I think only new drivers should do it
142	It should be for any new driver that will be coming on board to obtain a licence
143	No, but only new applicants
144	No, only new entrants should have to complete the course. Throughout the country these courses are not meant to be compulsory but an option to improve and educate the drivers further if they wish to increase their knowledge. The governments does not support his as compulsory course for the trade and that is why it has stopped the funding
145	I object driver training requirement because I think its waste of money and waste of time
146	This proposal undermines the skills of existing drivers. As the testing and introduction of vocations qualification were poorly organised in the past. BTEC should only be imposed to new drivers
147	This proposal undermines the intelligence and skills of existing drivers. Three years is a small period of time and would be an added expense for a taxi driver especially in today's financial circumstances, but for the new drivers I support the BTEC
148	I object to the drive training requirements. I think waste of money and time I have done that course I didn't gain anything, just common sense. But only for new drivers
149	The council made drivers do this test two years ago. It did not work because of the poor management of the whole process. As the drivers had to pay themselves, some people took this opportunity to make money and charge drivers a lot of money, so at the end it was the drivers who lost the money. I think if Council wants to train the drivers then Council should pay for it and it should be run by local qualified people
150	No, it is not necessary to make a requirement to have a BTEC as there is no Government funding available, this shows that it is proposed only as optional to educate further
151	I object to the driver training requirement because waste of public money. I've don that course I think I didn't gain anything. I think its common sense. Only for new drivers

Q4. Do you agree that drug testing of drivers should be retained as part of the policy? If not please give your reasons below	
1	Agree with proposal
2	We support retention of the power to require drivers to submit to testing BUT this should only be used where there is intelligence which suggests abuse of substances.
3	<p>NO. It remains our view that the council does not have the necessary legal authority to administer drug tests and refer the council to the submission made by the hackney trade in June last year :</p> <p>There is no express power to undertake drug testing of drivers under the provisions of the Town Police Clauses Act 1847, the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 or, as far as I can see, under any other statutory provision.</p> <p>If the Council believes it is expressly or impliedly empowered to undertake such drug testing, my client and I would be most obliged if you would kindly refer us to any such legislation under which the Council considers itself to be so empowered, so that we might have the opportunity of considering and commenting further upon that matter.</p> <p>Furthermore, whilst it might be suggested that a requirement can be created by making a request under section 57 of the 1976 Act, may I respectfully draw to your attention that the power to require the provision of information applies only to persons applying for a licence; and is only for the provision of information that is reasonably necessary to enable the authority to determine the application. As the drug testing only applies to licensed drivers, the provisions of section 57 are of no effect.</p> <p>If it were suggested that a requirement could be created by the attaching conditions to a drivers licence that would not be possible in relation to hackney carriage drivers, because the Council agrees with the vast majority of councils that there is no statutory power to attach conditions to a hackney carriage drivers licence.</p> <p>Whilst I have not been consulted by or on behalf of any member of the private hire trade in this regard, for the sake of completeness, I would suggest that, even if it were lawful to attach conditions relating to drug testing – and I do not accept it is – it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, for a council to justify attaching such conditions to the licences of only private hire vehicle drivers.</p> <p>Furthermore, unlike officers who are employed under contract by the Council, drivers are licensed (and not contracted to or with the Council). If drivers were employed by the Council, it may well be the case that drug testing could be a term of such contract of employment, but they are not and accordingly, a requirement to submit to drug testing cannot be contractually required either.</p> <p>With regard to the need for statutory empowerment, if it were not the case that a public authority required statutory empowerment to undertake drug testing, the police would not have needed to be expressly empowered by statute to take urine or non-intimate samples of detained persons for the purposes of testing for only Class „A“ drugs. In case you are unfamiliar with the statutory provisions that apply to the police, you may care to refer to Section 63B of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984, which was inserted into the Act by section 57 of the Criminal Justice and Court Services Act 2000.</p> <p>If the police have only those very limited powers to take samples to test for Class „A“ drugs of a person in police detention, no council has the statutory power to test licensed drivers (who are neither under police arrest nor in police detention) for all classes of illegal drugs.</p> <p>On this ground alone, I respectfully suggest the Council ought to abandon its drug testing policy; and I urge it to immediately suspend its drug testing of drivers, pending</p>

	<p>determination of the current review of policy.</p> <p>In this regard, may I draw to the Councils attention the fact that any act it has done without jurisdiction is a nullity and void, rather than voidable pursuant to the ruling of the High Court in <i>Credit Suisse v Allerdale Borough Council</i> [1997] QB 306; and that, following the decision in <i>Mayes v Mayes</i> [1971] 1 WLR 679, the waiver of another party (i.e. a driver that has been drug tested) cannot convert a nullity into a validity.</p> <p>The (perceived) need to undertake driver drug testing-</p> <p>It is appreciated that the current policy was implemented because it was suggested that there was a high level of illegal drug taking amongst members of the trade. However, now that the Council has engaged in (unlawful) drug testing of drivers for about two years, it has the benefit of actual results (as opposed to un-evidenced concerns), which I understand show that the levels of detected drug taking is almost nil. Irrespective of whether the concerns of the Council were reasonable when the current policy was determined and implemented, I submit that the evidence the Council now possesses clearly demonstrates that there is no reasonable need to engage in such testing.</p> <p>Proportionality-</p> <p>If it had been shown that there was a “need” to undertake drug testing (and if it had been lawful to do so), it would still have been necessary for the Council to balance the benefits to the public of doing so against the inconvenience, embarrassment and loss of earnings suffered by drivers who were found not to have taken illegal drugs. Again, irrespective of whether the testing was proportionate when the current policy was determined and implemented, I submit that the evidence the Council now possesses clearly demonstrates that it would now be disproportionate to continue with driver drug testing.</p> <p>Furthermore, with regard to the issues of “need” and “proportionality”, it is noted that the Council has never proceeded to drug test members of its own staff, despite the fact that they will be no less statistically likely to take drugs than licensed drivers and, of course, such drug testing would be lawful. It is also noted that, when it was proposed to also drug test staff and officers of the Council, anyone found to be taking illegal drugs were to be offered support and counselling, whereas drivers faced disciplinary action and the possible suspension or revocation of their drivers licence.</p> <p>No matter why the Council did not proceed with the testing of its own staff and officers, the public perception (and it is clear from the above how wrong perceptions can be) is bound to be that “there is one rule for them and one rule for the rest of us”!</p>
4	No
5	Only on intelligence otherwise random drug test should not be allowed, this time and money should be spent on other materials. A lot of organisations (professional) don't have drug testing in force. Disagree
6	Yes I do
7	Yes
8	No I don't think licensing is a competent body for this activity
9	I agree with the policy
10	Yes
11	No
12	Yes, if there is complaints only
13	Yes, agree
14	If taxi drivers get drug tested why don't other employees who work under Stockton Borough Council regulations
15	No comments
16	I disagree with this as it is too time consuming, this should only be done when information is given from police or complaints are made from the public

17	I disagree because it is only targeting taxi drivers
18	I think it a waste of public money and Council time doing random tests, the only time is if the Council received information or complaint of a certain driver, that driver then should be pulled in and tested. This should minimize costs and would be more effective. If taxi drivers were to be drug tested randomly this would discriminate as other companies and organisations do not demand drug testing to their employees.
19	I don't think there is no point because total waste of time and money
20	I disagree because it is only targeting taxi drivers and I think it is a waist of time and money
21	Seems to be time used better and resources
22	Waste of money so I disagree
23	I disagree due to the fact this is too time consuming also drivers will lose money taking the test
24	Only with a doctor present, as you have already admitted 19 were false due to medication
25	Don't agree at all. I was embarrassed to have my drug test when I never been on drugs. It's costly to council to do and waste of time
26	Drug testing is a waste of council money which could be spent elsewhere
27	Drug testing is a waste of council money which could be spent elsewhere
28	Yes, should be dismissed from policy
29	Agree
30	I don't agree with the drug testing because it's a waist of time and money if you have no information about drivers doing it, disagree
31	Yes
32	If someone has been reported of using drugs, I think the council should act upon that. There is no need for random tests, it is waste of time and government money. If you do not have any information on a taxi driver taking drugs it is pointless to do a test. Disagree
33	Yes
34	Agree
35	Disagree
36	Agree with drug testing
37	There is no problem with drugs testing providing the taxi trade is not singled out. Should be the same for all drivers involved in and around the council
38	Agree only if there are complaints
39	Yes, should only be carried out by the Police or Doctors and only on drivers if there is complain
40	No because no other council dept does so why only taxi drivers. I everybody does it so will I
41	No comments
42	Yes, agree with drug testing
43	No, should be intelligence led basis only. As the Council's trying to save money and if testing becomes a everyday thing then Council staff time will be wasted. As it says 131 tests carried out and only 3 positive
44	I disagree because again is a waste of money, when its not necessary in other organisations
45	I agree it should be part of the policy anybody under the influence of drugs would not be in charge of a vehicle and risking their passengers lives and other road users
46	Disagree, a waste of money and important driver and office time, but drivers could be tested if there is genuine complaint on driver
47	Yes, disagree
48	Disagree, it's a waste of time and money doing random tests, If the council is given information that a driver is using drugs then he/she should take a test to prove that they are innocent. Drivers also will be losing money while the time for the test is taking place
49	Yes, should be dismissed from policy, but in certain cases, only if there is a serious complaint on a particular driver
50	Yes, agree
51	Yes, I agree
52	I believe drug testing is a waste of public money. I believe drug testing should only be

	done on drivers suspected of taking drugs or drivers that have been reported for taking drugs
53	No, drivers should only be tested if there is genuine complaint
54	I don't agree with the drug testing because it's a waste of time and money if you don't have any information about taxi drivers doing it. Disagree
55	Disagree with drug testing. The testing is not 100% accurate and may give false results. Will the Licensing Committee pay compensation to drivers they wrongly take licences from
56	Only if all Stockton Council Employees are subject to the same random drug testing policy. It should not be limited to drivers. Drivers should be afforded the same equal rights as all Council Employees
57	Yes, but certain drugs might be prescribed by the doctor might fail the test
58	Disagree, should be intelligence led basis only
59	No I do not believe SBC Licensing is competent enough to carry out this work. The testing should be carried out at your own GP due to data security. I also think enforcement officer should be breathalysed before out door enforcement duty
60	I disagree with this drug testing as this is another waste of tax payers money which could be used more effectively elsewhere and believe this is targeted at taxi drivers
61	I agree with drug testing on intelligence led only
62	I agree on intelligence led basis, I was one of the 19 false positives; I undergo treatment at James Cook Hospital every 8 weeks and will always come up positive. I also carry a Biological Therapy Alert Card which I showed to the Enforcement Officer prior to testing. My total time off road was 30 minutes on night and 45 minutes next day
63	Until such time as the National Government and the Department of Transport come up with a safe and acceptable way of roadside random drug testing, Stockton council should be careful not to exceed their powers
64	Until there is a national standard accepted by the Government drug testing should be withheld
65	No, drug testing should not be allowed until there is evidence of complaint on a particular driver
66	Yes, as long as every employee of SBC gets tested randomly. Equal rights
67	No issue with this, to apply to all Council workers
68	No
69	No
70	I agree with drug testing, but it should be applied on all Council workers not only on taxi drivers
71	No
72	No, the Council needs to prove that it is possible for them to store my information safely
73	No I disagree, the SBC has gone up the wrong tree, they should leave these issues for Police and Health officials
74	I was one of the first people to be drug tested. The Council seem to pick on hackney drivers all the time. This is discrimination and should cover all Council employees at random
75	I think all council workers should be drug tested along with people who work under them not just for taxi drivers
76	I agree to the drug testing because I have not it myself and it is necessary
77	Disagree to drug testing because discrimination to taxi drivers
78	Should not be part of the policy if necessary it should be an intelligence led basis
79	No
80	I strongly believe that drug testing should take place, as a few defiant drivers give the rest of us a bad name
81	No
82	Do not agree
83	Yes agree
84	No
85	No
86	No other council department do, so why should we

87	Yes, drug testing should take place
88	Only if all employees are to do the same
89	Yes, should only be carried out if a serious complaint on a particular driver
90	I agree with drug testing but should apply to all council workers
91	I agree with drug testing
92	I have no issues if this law applies to all workers under the council
93	I have no issues if this law is to apply to all council workers as well
94	Agree
95	No, with good reasons, only if there is a complaint on any particular driver
96	No I disagree, there should not be any drug testing. It seems that the drivers are doing something wrong. The testing does not take 10 minutes, it has been taken 20-25 minutes for each test and taken at least 3 attempts to do each, it looks like your licensing officers are not qualified to do the test
97	No, drug testing should not be allowed unless there is particular evidence or complaint on a particular driver
98	No, I do not believe SBC Licensing is competent enough to carry out this work. The testing should be carried out at your own GP due to Data security. I also think enforcement officers should be breathalysed before outdoor enforcement duty
99	Yes
100	Drug testing should only be retained if all Stockton Council employees are subject to the same random testing. Drug testing should not be limited to hackney drivers but all council employees and hackney drivers should have the equal rights afforded to any other council employee
101	No, I don't believe it should be part of the policy
102	No, it should not be included in the policy
103	Only if the testing goes across all Council employees
104	I agree to drug testing
105	Happy for drug testing, but should be for Council employees also
106	No, Council needs to prove to me that they are capable of handling my data
107	No
108	No make the law first drug test for Council people then come to drivers, also police can stop anytime
109	I agree with drug testing, I don't mind
110	I believe that drug testing should be as standard throughout the Council workforce and people who work under their guidelines. No one organisation should be singled out
111	Why do you need drug testing it is not your job. Not happy with this
112	No, Council needs to prove that it is capable of handling my personal data
113	No, SBC is not qualified to carry out drug testing it should only be done by a GP
114	Only if all Stockton Council employees are subject to the same random drug testing policy. I should not be limited to drivers. Drivers should be afforded the same equal rights as all council employees
115	Yes
116	No drug testing should not be allowed unless they have positive evidence
117	No I don't agree with drug testing just for taxi drivers, it should be carried out for all Council employees not just taxi trade
118	No, because the police already have powers to do drug testing
119	No, I believe the Council should not control this as it is out of their remit. If it doesn't drug test its employees why should it test us
120	No, Council hasn't proven that it has the capabilities of handling my information
121	No, this should be dismissed from the policy
122	Yes, agree with drug tests random or otherwise why not "Block drug test taxi ranks" i.e. Police/Enforcement officers shut ranks and test all cars. Also any PH parked nearby or ranked on their unofficial ranks we all know where these are!
123	If all Council workers are randomly tested including transport workers then there is no problem. Taxi drivers should not be singled out
124	I do not agree with drug testing policy, it only applies to the hackney trade if all the council

	employees are tested randomly. I don't have a problem with that
125	Council don't have legal right to do drug testing. Before council asks taxi drivers they should ask all public sector workers to have drug resting too. Don't single out taxis drivers, don't agree
126	No issue if it is same for every council worker
127	No drug testing is unlawful
128	No drug testing
129	I agree but disagree also, it should be equally tested through all the trade private and hackney also the employees of SB Council so it has no discrimination against any one
130	Drug test of self employed licensees is illegal and open to claims for damages
131	No council has not proved to me that it is capable with of handling my personal information
132	No, I believe the Council should not try to control this as it is out of their limits. If is doesn't test its employees why should they do it
133	No, I believe the Council should not try to control this as it is out of their controls
134	I don't mind drug testing but why only the taxi trade, for equal rights it should be done across council employees
135	If you are going to persist with this to the taxi trade then you should test every employee at random who are employed by SBC. We do not want any discrimination against anybody, so everybody is inline. Equal Opportunities
136	No, I believe SBC licensing department is not competent enough to carryout drug testing nor is it appropriate qualified. I also believe that SBC staff should be drug tested first before they consider testing taxi drivers
137	Yes, but only drivers when there is complaint
138	No, only if its tested by the police and tested only public service drivers, council drivers, bus drivers. Law should be the same for everybody, why only taxi drivers
139	No, the police has the authority to drug test me whenever so why does this need to be done by the Council
140	I strongly believe drug testing policy should comply for all Stockton Borough employees and not just drivers
141	I don't agree with this proposal
142	No I disagree wit this because it did not take your licence officer 10 minutes on average it took 20-25 minutes for each test. Also a lot of tests took more that 1 to 3 attempts to get a positives reading and also your officers are not qualified to do the drug testing.
143	No, I do believe SBC licensing is competent body to do this test
144	No, drug testing should not be allowed until there is evidence or complaint on a particular driver
145	I agree with drug testing, I don't mind
146	Agree
147	I strongly believe drug testing policy should comply for all Stockton Borough Employees not just drivers
148	I agree with the drug testing I don't mind
149	No
150	Yes, but only on intelligence basis, it does not make sense to carry out this exercise, as it is both time consuming and costly
151	I agree with the drug testing, I don't mind

Q5. If you do agree should the testing still include random testing arrangements or should it be carried out on an 'intelligence led' basis only?	
1	Testing should still include random testing arrangements
2	Intelligence based only
3	See above
4	Should be carried out on intelligence led basis only if this "intelligence" is from a satisfactory and legitimate source
5	Only should be carried out on intelligence
6	On an intelligence led basis
7	Random testing and intelligence led
8	No
9	Random testing should be carried out
10	Yes
11	Intelligence only
12	Intelligence basis only
13	When somebody makes a complaint
14	Drug testing should be taken if solid proof is given
15	The test should be carried out random
16	As above
17	No comment
18	Yes, only if the council receive information should the drug testing then be carried out.
19	It should be carried out on an intelligence basis because money matters
20	It should only be carried out if the police or council have any information
21	Only if prior information
22	Only if you are aware from Police
23	No comment
24	No Comment
25	Yes
26	Drug testing should be taken if solid evidence is given
27	Drug testing should be taken if solid evidence is given
28	Intelligence basis only
29	Random
30	Only if you have information on drivers doing drugs
31	Intelligence basis only
32	Only if you have information on someone taking drugs
33	Random testing
34	Agree
35	Disagree
36	Intelligence led basis only
37	No comments
38	Agree
39	Yes, intelligence led only
40	On information led testing fine
41	Yes
42	Random testing
43	Intelligence led only
44	Only if you have information from police or member of public
45	I don't fully understand the intelligence led basis but I think that drivers should be tested
46	Intelligence led basis only
47	Not only intelligence, but on any offence of the highway or accident (Yes)
48	Should be carried out if some one has information that a taxi driver is taking drugs
49	Intelligence basis only
50	Random testing
51	Yes, we should do random drug testing

52	No I believe that the whole operation should be carried out on an intelligence led basis
53	Yes, intelligence led basis only
54	Only if you have information
55	No comment
56	If it has to be implemented then it should be random
57	Intelligence led basis only
58	Disagree intelligence led only
59	This should only be necessary on intelligent led basis. Sufficient evidence should be available before any request
60	I disagree with this and believe it's the police who should carry out these tests in intelligence led basis
61	Until all Police and Government and DOT have a national accepted test
62	Intelligence led basis only
63	Only if you have received safe intelligence
64	No comment
65	Yes, intelligence basis only
66	It is against human rights to force anybody for a drug test randomly
67	No comments
68	No
69	No
70	On an intelligence led basis
71	No comment
72	On intelligence based only, but only if they have capabilities of storing information safely and accurately
73	If absolutely necessary then on intelligence led basis only
74	No comment
75	I have no problem with intelligence led testing
76	I agree with random testing arrangements
77	Disagree to random testing because I am working at this time
78	Intelligence led basis
79	No, I worry about data protection, don't trust
80	I agree with a random testing approach
81	Intelligence led basis only
82	No comment
83	If someone makes complaint only
84	No
85	Led testing fine
86	Led testing is okay
87	Yes, random testing should take place
88	Only if applied to all employees
89	Intelligence basis only
90	Yes, random testing
91	Should be done when there is a complaint
92	No comment
93	No comment
94	Agree but should be done when complaint is received
95	Intelligence basis only
96	No I don't agree because we are working at the time of random testing so we are losing money
97	No, intelligence basis only
98	This should only be necessary on intelligent led basis. Sufficient evidence should be available before any request
99	It should be done when there is a complaint
100	Random testing if it is to be applied to all employees
101	If absolutely necessary, then intelligence led basis only

102	Intelligence led only
103	Drug testing is illegal, against human rights
104	Intelligence led basis only
105	No Comment
106	Do not agree
107	Should not be tested by the Council, data protection criteria
108	No comment
109	I agree because its good for driving safety
110	Random should be abolished but intelligence sounds fine
111	No I don't agree
112	No, let the police do its own job
113	Testing should only be on an intelligence led basis
114	If it has to be implemented then it should be random
115	Only intelligence led
116	No
117	No comment
118	No comment
119	Should not be tested by Council. The Council needs to meet data protection criteria
120	No, council needs to prove my information is safe
121	No comment
122	No comment
123	No comment
124	Again random drug testing is illegal against human rights
125	Don't agree
126	No comment
127	No
128	No, I don't agree
129	It should be tested as an intelligence led
130	See above
131	Do not agree
132	No comment
133	No Council needs to prove my information is safe
134	It should be intelligence led basis
135	Don't mind drug testing but does the council have the data protection e.g. fire proof safe, contamination, files
136	It should be intelligence led basis only
137	Intelligence led basis only
138	No comment
139	Intelligence led would be a better option
140	Personally I do not agree at all with drug testing policy, no intelligence base or random
141	No comment
142	No not when working hours, because you are stopping us working
143	No
144	Yes, intelligence basis only
145	I agree with random testing and intelligence led basis
146	It could be carried out on intelligence
147	Personally I do not agree at all with drug testing policy, no intelligence base or random
148	I agree because it is good for driver safety
149	No comment
150	Yes, intelligence led basis only
151	I agree with intelligence led basis and random

Q6. Do you agree with the retaining the target that 25% of the hackney carriage fleet should be wheelchair accessible vehicles? If not please give your reasons below.	
1	No professional/organisational opinion with regard to this matter
2	NO. Subject to any ministerial orders, any 'target' adopted for the future should be based upon a proper evaluation of the demand for such vehicles in Stockton Council area, supported by evidence of past usage. If a new target is adopted it should be delivered by requiring renewals of existing vehicle licences, on an age-related basis, to be WCA types until target achieved. i.e. oldest saloon vehicles to be required to be replaced by WCA's. as licences fall due for renewal.
3	AGREE - subject to review every 3 years.
4	No, the target of 25% of the hackney fleet is excessive. A more reasonable percentage would be 7.5% - 10%. It is exceptional to have a person in a wheelchair use a hackney, either flagged down or from a rank. The majority of wheelchair users pre book a private hire vehicle in advance.
5	Disagree – it is too expensive to have wheelchair vehicles. The council wants more hackney wheelchair they should encourage people by putting the emission levels down for these vehicles, then people would afford the cheaper older vehicles.
6	No I don't – I believe that most disabled passengers will call a private hire company if they need a taxi, so I think the private hire companies should have a percentage of wheelchair accessible vehicles on their fleets and not the hackney ranks. I also believe it should be the elected Government who decides if we are to change saloons for WAV's not the Council.
7	No – the percentage is too high. If all the hackney fleet were WCA what about all the disabled people not in wheelchairs. I can't remember the last time someone came to me in a wheelchair and a lot of people with walking sticks etc walk past black cabs to get into a saloon vehicle, what I make of this is the council catering for a tiny minority and not the majority.
8	Not necessary should none collapsible chairs be used (not able to get in the boot) then it is 99% certain a private hire firm would be called.
9	Although the target of 25% has not been reached I consider that there is amply amount of vehicles equipped for the demand that is required. Most specialist vehicles are used by people with pushchairs and shopping a fact in itself that is illegal as the pushchairs can not be restrained properly. Also elderly people not yet disabled but with the mobility problems of the elderly can not access these vehicles properly.
10	No, saloon hackney carriages to be given grandfather rights as at present
11	Saloon hackney cars should be granted grandfather rights
12	Disagree, this target need further consultation, there is no hackney carriage demand in the town centre and ranks
13	Don't have hackney carriage
14	To replace a saloon would cost a fortune
15	Most people that have wheelchairs they do so in their own vehicles ready made. To ask us to get wheelchair vehicles would the council make the ranks bigger to accommodate the size of all the vehicles
16	I disagree as it is such a big expense for such a small town and no help is given by the Government
17	It is a big expense to put an adapted vehicle on. Stockton on Tees does not have enough work to warrant this
18	Yes we agree with the target of the council needs to meet but this is a very costly exercise and in this economic crisis the council should understand that the emission levels and the age restriction of wheel chairs accessible should be dropped so it is more affordable to license and I believe this would achieve the 25% that the council require.

19	Very expensive for this facility also no funding from Local Council, I disagree
20	I disagree because it would not be affordable for any one to put an adapted vehicle on
21	Expensive to purchase not enough use or revenue return in this area
22	No work in Stockton for the amount of cars, so I disagree
23	I do not agree with this, the town I work in is small and to spend all that money to make 25% of the fleet wheelchair accessible would be pointless and an utter waste of time and money
24	There are many older people who can't manage to get in wheelchair accessible vehicle. Private hire firms should have at least two each smaller firms, more for larger firms
25	I cannot replace all my hackneys and there is no work in Stockton. Times have got worse than last policy review
26	To replace a saloon would cost a fortune and there is no work in Stockton and its very hard to get loans
27	To replace a saloon would cost a fortune and there is no work in Stockton and its very hard to get loans
28	Disagree
29	I do not agree with forcing owners to have wheelchair accessible vehicles on replacing their current vehicle. This would restrict the type of vehicles available. Having said that, if this must be implemented I feel all small businesses that have under 5 cars should be exempt. I have been trading for just over 5 years now and have only had requests for wheelchair vehicle on 3 occasions
30	I don't agree because it's too expensive and not enough work. Disagree
31	Disagree, this target need further survey for future demand. Saloon hackneys must be given grandfather rights to continue as at present
32	I don't agree because there is not enough work in Stockton and it is too expensive
33	No need for them as I drive one and no demand for the higher percentage there if anything Private Hire companies should put them on because disabled people usually ring for a taxi
34	Disagree, there is no demand in Stockton. Yes grandfather rights to be given to saloon taxis
35	Disagree, need further consultation for future demand. Yes to grandfather rights for saloon hackney carriages
36	Not agree, too expensive to buy and run and private hire companies need to increase their fleet as most wheelchair users ring for the vehicle
37	Nearly all disabled passengers book a car from home to destination and return. Therefore, do not use the rank or flag down taxis. Is there the volume of custom for Hackneys to warrant a need of 25%. I think not
38	Disagree with this target, saloon taxis should have grandfather rights
39	No, there is no demand on the ranks and people with disability do make arrangements with the private hire company or other means. This 25% target should be abolished from the policy and the existing hackney carriages be granted as at present grandfather rights to continue. There is evidence saloon taxis are most preferred by the elderly and family
40	There is no need for wheelchair vehicles in our trade so 25% is too much
41	No, one assumes that if the target is 25%, then 25% of the people who use taxis are disabled which I find hard to believe. Most public transport has low access. There are council buses available for invalids. People can apply for WAVS instead of mobility cars. Personally have never seen any disabled person looking for a WAV. People can get out of wheelchair into taxi and store chair in boot. Why don't licensing advertise a list of telephone numbers of drivers who own WAVS, do the council realise the cost of a WAV compared to an ordinary saloon. The only people I see looking for a WAV are families with one to two pushchairs loaded with shopping bags to save unloading/reloading. People often walk past WAVS and get in saloon taxis. What about the risk of injury to driver pushing a wheelchair into a WAV
42	Not agree too expensive to buy and run in current climate. Can't afford it if council willing to give subsidy I might think about it
43	No, totally disagree. As the taxi trade is quiet as it is. They why have a need for 25%. It should be up to the driver rather than the council making policies on how many wheelchair

	accessible vehicles there need to be
44	Wheelchair accessible are very expensive to buy, maintain, run and repair, there not enough work in Stockton to put such expensive vehicles, maybe if older wheelchair vehicles were allowed and drivers then may consider it
45	I disagree for the simple reason I have been a hackney driver for about 12 years plus with the exception of the last few years I spent nearly £1000 on a disabled swivel seat in my taxi which I had for nearly 7 years which I never used once and it should be driver preference to a saloon vehicle or wheelchair accessible vehicle
46	Disagree – this 25% of the fleet is not adequate for the Stockton Hackney fleet, as there is not sufficient demand at present. Future survey and proper consultation is needed for any new legislation is to added to the new policy. At present situation the demand for WAV's on the ranks is minimal, so saloon hackney s should be allowed to continue
47	I do not agree this figure is to high per capata per disabled persons using such transport in this town or area
48	Disagree, it is to expensive to update/replace vehicles to make them wheelchair accessible and not enough work in Stockton for taxi drivers to afford this
49	Disagree, this target of 25% needs to be abolished and further consultation is needed for future. There is no demand for wheelchair taxi on the ranks. A private hire sector is the one where WAV's are needed most, as people call t hem for transport
50	Not agree. I just bought a house and don't have money to buy that kind of vehicle
51	No I do not agree
52	I believe that there is not sufficient work for wheelchair accessible vehicles at the moment, I also believe that it is a very expensive change in these recessionary times
53	No, there is not enough demand in Stockton for WAV's and this 25% target should be abolished, as it is created from not enough evidence of demand
54	Disagree, because its too expensive and not enough work
55	Disagree with this as it will be better in the long run, but it will be expensive to update the vehicle to wheelchair accessible
56	No, I don't agree, in my experience disabled customers who require wheelchair accessible call private hire companies
57	As a taxi driver of 16 years in Stockton they are no demand for wheelchair accessible vehicles at all. Not as much as the Council think there is. 9 out of 10 disabled people don't get taxis anyway the ones who do ring private hire firms. Disabled never go on ranks for a taxi at all
58	No disagree as the taxis trade is quiet, should be up to the driver
59	No, there is no demand for wheelchair accessible vehicles. These kind of vehicles are used for push chairs, these issues are only relevant to Private Hire companies. This is merely a technique to reduce the number of hackney cars under Stockton Borough Council
60	I disagree with this because this is a high cost and the council isn't willing to subsidise any costs towards this
61	The few cabs that we have now are not getting wheelchair jobs. They pick up a few mums with pushchairs each day not enough to warrant the cost of these vehicles
62	No, wheelchair accessible vehicles should be covered by private hire not hackney. I had a wheelchair vehicle over a period of eight years, all I carried was pushchairs off the rank. The only times I carried a wheelchair were booked fares through a Private Hire office therefore wheelchair vehicles should be private hire and not hackney
63	The cost of these vehicles is beyond most drivers, it will cause drivers to take on more hours when many are already working 60 hours a week (safety concerns). Please remember the last time you tried to brink in these cabs, drivers when bankrupt, drivers lost their homes, marriages broke up at least two cabs mysteriously caught fire as drivers tried to get rid of the massive financial burden. In Stockton we do not have enough trade to finance such on outlay.
64	There is no demand for these vehicles. I had a cab from March 2009 to September 2011 and I worked on the main rank Monday to Saturday every week. In two years and six months I have used by ramps on less than five occasions
65	No, this target should be dismissed as it is not viable number and produced without any

	evidence
66	Not really as in my experience most people who want a wheelchair accessible vehicles ring a private hire company
67	I don't think we need many wheelchair accessible vehicles
68	No
69	No
70	Not agree, I had wheelchair accessible vehicle but I think there isn't demand on ranks. More demand is on private hire side
71	No, the Council should do further consultation as there is no need for many wheelchairs accessible. The Private Hire should be encouraged to fulfil any further demand
72	No, live cases are present that there is no requirements for these wheelchair accessible vehicles on the ranks. Why pay three times as much for a wheelchair accessible for the work of a saloon car.
73	No I disagree, 25% target has been obtained without evidence of WAV's demand fro Stockton. A proper consultation is needed for future demand and a burden should not be just put on the hackney carriages. Private Hire carryout more jobs and door to door, so they should be encouraged to have some percentage of WAV's
74	I disagree with the Council strongly because they have never done a proper survey of how many wheelchair accessible vehicles are required. It the Council asked the drivers themselves they would find it was very rare that disable people went to any rank to be picked up. I wonder where the council get their figures from. If they need more proof I have a list of wheelchair accessible vehicles and how many times they have picked up wheelchair people at the ranks.
75	In my view even 25% is too much for the trade as there is no need for it, so its no
76	I do not agree with the targets because there is no work for wheelchair accessible vehicles
77	Don't agree to 25% of hackneys to be wheelchair accessible vehicles
78	No, target should be achieved through Private Hire Vehicles
79	No these should be encouraged to private hire
80	I strongly disagree with this proposal; there is currently adequate provision for wheelchair users. Further evidence should be provided to rationalise this decision. I think there is greater value in requesting private companies who have contracts with health centre, hospitals etc to increase there wheelchair accessible vehicles. The council is being hypocritical on the one hand they are changing rules for blue badge holders, allowing hospital to charge car parking fees for disabled people and penalising taxi drivers
81	There is no need for wheelchair taxis, no demand for them
82	Strongly disagree
83	Do not agree
84	No
85	Wheelchair vehicles are not in demand. Private hire is booked for them
86	There is no need for wheelchair vehicles
87	Disagree, there is no demand for wheelchair users
88	No
89	Do not agree
90	Not agree, Private Hire companies should have wheelchair accessible vehicles because most people ring them for that
91	Not agree, Wheelchair accessible vehicles are very expensive to buy and run. I can't get a loan. If this goes ahead then you will be putting me out of work
92	I don't think we need the many wheelchair accessible vehicles
93	I don't think we need the many wheelchair accessible vehicles
94	No, in my experience private hire companies get calls for this kind of work so private hire companies should have fleet of such vehicles
95	No, this 25% target should be abolished because it is not produced from a genuine demand survey. The disabled public is easily served with their own adapted vehicles and they normally call Private Hire firms to be picked up so the disabled person do not call on a rank to be transported
96	No I don't agree there is no work for the wheelchair accessible vehicles, there is no

	demand for 25% of vehicles to be hackney carriages
97	NO, they should be dismissed, the private hire should be encouraged to move towards the WAV's
98	No, there is no demand for wheelchair accessible vehicles these kind of vehicles are used for pushchairs. These issues are only relevant to private hire companies. This is merely a technique to reduce the number of cars under Stockton Borough Council
99	No strongly disagree. Grandfather rights for saloon cars must be given to existing drivers. To expensive to buy, not enough demand
100	No, in my experience disabled customers tend to book private hire vehicles. I have been hackney driver for over 7 years and I have yet to pick up a customer who requires wheelchair assistance
101	No. To my knowledge in Stockton there is not enough demand for wheelchair accessible, so this 25% target should be abolished from the policy. The existing saloon HC should be allowed the existing grandfather rights
102	No, this figure should be dismissed and PH should be encouraged to have WAV's
103	People who require a wheelchair accessible vehicle should ring a company
104	What would the 25% wheelchair accessible vehicles be used for
105	We hare happy with saloon cars
106	No, there is not work for this type of vehicle as proven, so why pay for a wheelchair accessible for work of a saloon car
107	No
108	No, we are happy with saloon cars
109	I do not agree with the target that 25% because that's not enough business in Stockton on Tees. Because the credit crunch is affecting everybody unless the Council gives half of the money because the economy isn't good enough. The driver has to pay from his own pocket
110	There is no demand by any group or organisation for wheelchair accessible vehicles so even 25% is too much
111	No need for wheelchair accessible vehicles in today's financial climate
112	No, there is no work for this as live cases prove, why pay these extortionate prices for the same work as a saloon car
113	No, there is not a great demand for wheelchair accessible vehicles especially not form wheelchair uses who will quite happily get into a saloon car and who mainly use a Private Hire firm when they want a taxi
114	No I don't agree, in my experience disabled customers who require wheelchair accessible call private hire companies
115	Totally disagree with this. People using wheelchairs hardly use hackneys. It is easier for them to ring a vehicle from a private hire company. So this target should be imposed on private hire operators not the hackneys
116	No they should be private hire side because disabled people need to be picked up from home
117	I don't agree with retaining the target, because in my opinion there is no demand and the Council has not done any form of survey on this issue
118	No
119	No as this is not in line with inflation which is against the law
120	No, this is not inline with inflation and so why pay for something if there is now work for it
121	No, this target should be dismissed, as there is no evidence that this percentage is required within the Borough. The PH trade should fulfil the demand and it is time the Council should encourage the local firms
122	No, some vehicles never use facility
123	No, a survey should be done to find out if there is a need for this percentage as I thing 99% of disabled people use private hire vehicles
124	At present economic crises I do not agree that 25% wheelchair accessible vehicles should not be retained. People who require a wheelchair accessible vehicle ring a company
125	No don't agree. Survey should be done, 99% of disable people use private hire vehicles. Private hire companies should provide more

126	No need for wheelchair accessible vehicles
127	No we cannot afford these vehicles, they are too expensive to run, buy, insure, and cannot get a loan to buy a £390k car
128	No need for wheelchair cars
129	I think we have enough wheelchair vehicles trading from the ranks but I think private hire vehicles should have more percentage in this market, because they make more hospital, school runs, door to door pick ups of disabled customers
130	Wholly unacceptable, wheelchair cars have no demand
131	No, this is not inline with inflation, which would show that Council would be in a breach of legislation
132	No, as this is not in line with inflation which is against the law
133	No, as this is not in line with inflation which is against the law
134	I believe no
135	I think private hire companies should comply to this legislation the council is requiring. 9 time out of 10 if a disabled person rings for a wheelchair accessible vehicle they phone a private hire company. I don't think there is a need for more hackney wheelchair accessible vehicles. Do a survey
136	No, wheelchair accessible vehicles are and will be used mainly by mothers with pushchairs. From a health and safety point of view this is unsafe as the child is not strapped in safely. Secondly wheelchair users mainly ring private hire firms to pick them up so I think this issue needs to be directed to the private hire firms
137	Disagree; this target of 25% should be suspended till further consultation is carried out for future demand. At present there is no demand at ranks. The private hire company should be encouraged to make up for the rest of the WAV's demand when in future a reasonable percentage of WAV's should come from Private Hire sector
138	No, in my experience, the disabled use private hire companies, dial a ride, but they do not use hackney for their journey
139	No, because no organisation has a major requirement of wheelchair accessible vehicles. Also there is not enough work for wheelchair accessible vehicles and they are very expensive
140	I strongly disagree with this question I think there are enough wheel chair vehicles. If you have a study, very few and far between disabled people come on the rank. Personally I have no disabled customer for last three years
141	I strongly disagree with council in this matter. I would like to know here the council has got the figures from. I work from ranks and the number of disabled people using ranks is nothing. They use private hire companies and I think this target should be imposed to private hire operators and not hackney carriages as mentioned above the disabled people don't come to rank it is easier for them to be picked up by private hire vehicle
142	No I don't agree because there is not a demand for wheelchair vehicles. There is no work for hackney carriage to be wheelchair vehicles, as I have had one I may be get one passenger every other month and the cost of running a wheelchair vehicle is not viable so I had to sell up and go back to a saloon vehicle
143	This is a ill conceived plan. People using wheelchair that go out in town, they do not come to the ranks to use accessible vehicles. I am doing this job yearly only 1% people require these vehicles and old people always order taxi at home/door (private hire). Passengers are easily serviced with by having a folding chair; on the ranks these vehicles used only for push chair (baby) not for disabled. Forcing people to change these vehicles will be very expensive so many will be unemployed and will be burden on the public funds. Please leave the policy as it is just like grandfather rights
144	No this target should be dismissed as it is not viable number and produced without any evidence. The PH sector are the one who need to provide more WAV's to fulfil any future demand, as no one comes to ranks to use a WAV
145	I don't agree with the target that 25% because not enough business in Stockton on Tees. Credit crunch is effecting everyone unless the Council gives half of the money because the fuel economy isn't good for disabled carriers the driver has to pay from his own pocket
146	I strongly disagree with this I think there is enough wheelchair vehicles and this target should

	be imposed only on private hire operators as they do carry contracts with the local hospitals
147	I strongly disagree with this question. I think there are enough wheelchair vehicles if you have a study very few and far between disabled people come on the rank, personally I have had no disabled customers for last three years
148	I do not agree with the target of 25% because that's not enough business in Stockton because the credit crunch is affecting everybody unless the council give half the money, because the fuel economy is not good for disabled carriers the driver has to pay form his own pocket
149	I strongly disagree with this comment needs to be a proper survey in this matter and I do hope that the Council will respect or at least listen to my view as well. I have worked most of my time from ranks and I do hardly see any disable person being picked up at the ranks. I think this rule should only apply to private hire operators as disabled people tend to use private hire companies than go on rank
150	No, this percentage is not correct; I do not understand where the Council has got this figure from. In this economic climate hackney drivers should not be forced to change vehicles to WAV's especially when there is no demand. There has never been a demand for hackneys at ranks, but rather people call PH to get picked up, so PH sector should be encouraged. Saloons are ever popular amongst the disabled and the elderly
151	I don't agree with the target that 25% of the hackney because that's not enough business in Stockton because the credit crunch is affecting everybody, unless the Council give half of the money because the economy isn't good for disabled carriers the driver has to pay from his own pocket

Q7. If you agree with this target, which has not been achieved, do you agree with the proposal that all applications that will replace an existing saloon hackney carriage vehicle as well as all new applications must comply with the specification for wheelchair accessible vehicles until the target is met, when the policy will be reviewed? If not please give your reasons below.

1	N/A
2	NO - see above
3	<p>Our members voted unanimously to reject the proposal. The proposal, if accepted would immediately put the proprietor of all saloon hackney carriages at risk of having to purchase a significantly more expensive WCA vehicle in the event that his existing vehicle comes to the end of its useful life or the vehicle or is written-off following an accident.</p> <p>Whilst it is accepted the number of hackney carriage wheel-chair accessible vehicles has not increased, it must be remembered that there is no mandatory requirement on any council for WCA taxis.</p> <p>Since the last policy review the economic climate has further deteriorated. The UK is now under £1trillion in financial debt which is reflected nationally. Unemployment has increased to 2.5million, businesses both large and small are closing down almost every day and large-scale redundancies are announced on an almost daily basis.</p> <p>Locally, the North-east region has been the hardest hit which in turn has had a substantial effect on disposable incomes not only for taxi drivers but also the general public who might otherwise have used taxis. These are obvious reasons why only a small number of hackney carriage drivers moved to WCA cars which are inherently more expensive to buy and have substantially higher running costs when compared with saloon vehicles. Nevertheless for the purposes of this consultation, we contacted three separate disability awareness and/or disabled persons groups. Unfortunately we did not receive a reply.</p> <p>Our members raised a number of concerns/comments in relation to WCA vehicles:</p> <p>1. No public demand for these types of vehicles; Members cited 5 proprietors who had purchased WCA vehicles at a cost of £25,000 - £29,000 each. Unfortunately none of the</p>

	<p>proprietors were able to maintain the monthly repayments on their vehicles (approx. £500 p/m) which resulted in the vehicles being repossessed. At least one proprietor was not able to maintain mortgage repayments and lost his home. The details of those drivers are available on request.</p> <p>2. In line with private car insurance, premiums for taxi have also increased by 50% in 3 years. The average cost of an annual policy is £2500. The cost of insuring a WCA vehicle is significantly higher.</p> <p>3. As a much larger vehicle, WCA vehicles incur higher running costs. A typical example is fuel consumption. WCA vehicles return on average 22-26mpg compared to saloon vehicle returning 35-38mpg.</p> <p>3. As a result of the large increase in the number of private hire vehicles, the market share for all drivers decreased substantially further reducing incomes.</p> <p>4. Due to the current economic climate and strict lending criteria applied by most banks, loans for small businesses such as taxi-driving are almost impossible to obtain. Those loans that are available must be secured on the proprietors home or at a very high interest rate.</p> <p>5. Our members support the current policy that allows for all currently licensed saloon hackney carriages to be replaced with a saloon vehicle, subject to the replacement vehicle being able to meet new exhaust emissions Euro 4 criteria.</p> <p>6. Our members would support that applications for all NEW vehicles must be wheel-chair accessible.</p>
4	Do not agree with proposal. SBC believe the market for disabled access vehicle is greater than is required and it is our belief that whatever "market" there is should be serviced using private hire vehicles as well as hackneys. The majority of people do not want to be transported in larger, uncomfortable vehicles and prefer saloon cars especially on the longer journeys.
5	Disagree – it's too expensive to replace and people would have to take finance on these vehicles, people in past have had repossessed on these vehicles, not enough work to carry such expense
6	As above
7	No comment
8	No as above
9	No comment
10	Disagree
11	No comment
12	Private Hire should fulfil the rest of the target
13	No comment
14	Do not agree with what has been said because it is too costly
15	No, I don't agree as the cost for wheelchair accessible with today's climate, the running costs of a vehicle and my older clients don't like the vehicles they can't lift their legs up. Price saloon £15k, price wheelchair £22k
16	As above
17	I disagree because of the current economic climate
18	I disagree because saloon cars should be replaced with wheelchair accessible because it is too costly and pressurize taxi driver to take finance on new vehicles to meet the requirement which previously there has been a number of taxi drivers had finance on vehicles and had not made enough to pay for instalments and have their car taken from them. This is due to lack of work in our area.
19	For all cars
20	I disagree because of the current economic climate
21	Disagree, policy okay at present
22	No

23	No comment
24	No comment
25	Saloon should stay saloon and Council should put emissions down for wheelchair vehicles
27	I do not agree with what's been said because it is too costly
27	I do not agree with what's been said because it is too costly
28	Important that SBC allows grandfather rights to saloon existing hackney carriages
29	No cost! Fuel costs have soared in the last 5 years from 0.899ppl to 1.309ppl. A wheelchair accessible vehicle at best will deliver 35-40mpg where a saloon car will deliver up to 60mpg. How can the council ask drivers to in effect take a pay cut? Also the cost of a new wheelchair vehicle can be up to 22k where a saloon/estate 6k
30	I disagree because there is not enough work in the area. Policy should remain as it is
31	Disagree, private hire must also be part of the percentage
32	There is not enough work and demand for this. Also too expensive. Disagree
33	No because there is not enough work and wheelchair accessible is too expensive
34	Disagree
35	Disagree, Private hire should be encouraged to meet demand
36	Not agree
37	No comments
38	Private hire must fulfil their targets
39	No, the existing saloon HC are a unique part of the taxi industry and popular vehicles, so private hire firms should have to and should encourage to play their part in providing service to the disabled people as well
40	No because there is no need for these vehicles, they are too expensive to buy/run or own and no business out there to make it practical
41	No
42	Not agree altogether
43	No disagree
44	As above I disagree for the same reason, things should be left alone as they are, there no money in taxi people just barely making a living and to enforce such expensive measures, its just not fair
45	Disabled passengers are a minority, a very low percentage, yet all considerations are not looked upon thoroughly as over 70% passengers do not like travelling in wheelchair accessible vehicles
46	The existing saloon hackney carriages cannot and should not be replaced with WAV's. Saloon hackneys are and have been ever popular taxi through the country (outside London) for nearly a century and should be granted grandfather rights as at present
47	I do not agree
48	Disagree it is far too expensive
49	It is important that SBC allows grandfather rights to saloon existing hackney carriages. Saloon taxis have the vital part of the fleet in the past and should continue so. The WAV's are needed occasionally only and the quota should be spread across the trade, HC and PH
50	Not agree as I am thinking to buy used saloon hackney carriage vehicle because they are a lot cheaper than the wheelchair accessible vehicles. I can't afford to pay £22k for that
51	There is no demand for Cabs and very expensive to buy and there is now work for them
52	I disagree
53	The existing saloon hackney carriages should be allowed to continue and "grandfather rights" should be retained as present
54	I disagree because there is not enough work in the area. The policy should remain as it is
55	Disagree, causes hardship
56	I could only agree with this percentage required if it also applies to the Private Hire companies. It should not be limited to Hackneys
57	No not at all because customers hate the big thing they prefer normal cars
58	Disagree
59	No, this is unaffordable, unnecessary and completely unacceptable. Where do you propose drivers are already struggling financially? I propose SBC fund 90% of the cost of these vehicles then we are willing to put these vehicles on the road

60	I disagree with this because when the current policy was reviewed, the taxi trade has got worse in terms of business and the current policy should remain in force
61	Saloons should stay saloons; hackneys should stay hackneys. It works in Middlesbrough or are you wearing blinkers
62	No, should be private hire, people in wheelchairs phone into offices for a taxi which therefore allow hackney to be saloon cars. People who walk to the rank prefer saloons, whilst I had a wheelchair accessible people by-passed me on rank as they think they are too big for one person
63	I think in the current financial climate ways should be found to help the drivers and not impose massive costs upon us. We like many other self employed trades are struggling to find work and until the economy starts to grow no changes should be made
64	Please set up a camera at the high street rank before you make any decision. You will see disabled passengers prefer saloon cars.
65	No
66	I would target if you ask private hire companies are asked to comply to the specified targets required
67	No comments
68	No
69	No
70	No not agree, too expensive to run and buy
71	No comment
72	No
73	The existing saloon taxis should be given grandfather rights as in a current policy. The new entrants should comply with WAV's requirements as in the current policy
74	I disagree as mentioned above. If you have a saloon you should be allowed to change or upgrade it for a new saloon. The cost of replacing it with a wheelchair accessible vehicle is ridiculous, for example a second hand one ranges between £16k - £18k or a new one £25k - £33k. No one in the current economic climate could afford to take on a debt like that
75	I believe no new applications for saloons or even wheelchair accessible should be accepted
76	I do not agree because a disabled person will phone for a wheelchair taxi rather than go to the rank
77	Don't need 25% of wheelchair accessible vehicles because there is no work
78	No comment
79	No, can't afford it
80	No, I do not agree as the investment required to purchase such a car in comparison to a saloon is disproportionate. If a thorough equality assessment was undertaken you would realise that many taxi drivers are classed as low income. Expecting drivers to invest in such vehicles would drive many into debt and poverty
81	The vehicles are too expensive to run
82	Strongly disagree. Should be able to keep vehicle they have
83	Do not agree
84	No
85	No
86	No, they are too expensive to run
87	No, there is not need for these vehicles. They are too expensive
88	No, the target set should include private hire too
89	Its important for SBC to allow grandfather rights to saloon existing hackney carriages
90	I would agree with this, but it would be better if private hire companies (trade as whole) will contribute in that
91	Not agree
92	No comment
93	No comment
94	No not agree, wheelchair vehicles are too expensive to buy and run. I won't be able to get a loan for this and I don't think there is a lot of demand out there but new vehicles should be wheelchair accessible vehicles

95	No, it is a target based on no evidence of demand within Stockton Borough
96	No, there is no demand for replacing existing hackney carriage for wheelchair accessible vehicles. The cost involved in buying a wheelchair vehicle is over the odds, can't afford it in a recession
97	No
98	No, this is unaffordable, unnecessary and completely unacceptable. Where do you propose drivers obtain this value of money? Drivers are already struggling financially. I propose SBC fund 95% of the cost of these vehicles then we are willing to put these vehicles on the road
99	Disagree
100	No, if the target has been set it should have included private hire companies
101	To meet any future demand if any, Private Hire should be encouraged to make up and fulfil WAV's requirements
102	No comment
103	Only if private hire companies come in line with the target
104	For you to meet the target of 25% on my expense is not on
105	No comment
106	No, this would become above the rate of inflation which is not legal
107	No, the Council should prove that there is demand
108	No
109	I don't agree because cost of disabled carrier vehicle is too expensive and the business is not much and the fuel economy is expensive
110	As above no call or need with wheelchair accessible vehicles so renewable should be like for like
111	No
112	No, there is no work for this type of vehicle
113	No, most of the wheelchairs work is carried out by private hire firms. Once again, I have not once in my career as a taxi driver seen a wheelchair user flag down a taxi. They always use private firms when they need a taxi
114	I could only agree with this percentage required if it also applies to the private hire companies. It should not be limited to hackneys
115	Wheelchairs cost a lot of money to buy even second hand ones. It is not fair to the drivers as it is already hard to earn
116	No
117	The existing vehicles are enough to meet demand
118	No, maintain grandfather rights for saloon vehicles. All new apps must be WCA
119	No Council needs to prove that there is a demand for this. As I believe this is not true
120	No, there is no work as I have one and wouldn't wish this on anyone
121	No comment
122	No, what's up with saloons, you will impose debt misery and hardship. Ultimately will put taxis driver out of work as they cannot afford cabs of any sort
123	No, the existing wheelchair vehicles are more than enough to cater for wheelchair users
124	Only if Private Hire firms are also come in line and provide the target required. Not only hackney carriages should be across the trade. Has the council done any survey if a 25% target required. My understanding from Ombudsman report is only 4.5%
125	No don't agree, existing vehicles are enough for wheelchair users
126	No comment
127	There is no mandatory requirement so we do not agree on any such target
128	No I do not agree
129	I object to the council requirement in this question. I should be allowed to change from a saloon to saloon, which is like for like. I also think you should do a survey
130	There is no demand for this fictitious target
131	No, council needs to prove that there is a demand for this as live cases show different
132	No, council needs to prove that there is demand for this as I believe this is not right for us
133	No, council needs to prove that there is demand for this as I believe this is not right for us

134	No, I don't agree with target
135	No if you are a saloon car I think under our working and human rights I should and will be able to replace my car from saloon to saloon. Which is affordable to my need and demands of the public,. Do a Survey, see Ombudsman report it only 4.5 % required
136	No, we have enough wheelchair accessible vehicles they would cover pushchair jobs. Any jobs that are wheelchair related are covered by drivers who work for private hire companies. If the council still insists on this policy then it should fund 90-95% of the cost of the vehicle, just as it funds bus routs, CCTV in buses and so on
137	The existing hackney carriages are vital part of public transport and the saloon hackney carriage is most popular taxi and it is requirement of the elderly and family with children who want to travel from door to door. Therefore saloon hackney carriage should be granted grandfather rights and should continue as the current policy
138	No comment
139	No, I do not agree because there are not many disabled customers coming to the rank
140	No I do not agree again disabled wheelchair vehicle cost between £20k to £26k and at present time nobody can afford. Disabled customers do not use. Taxi drivers already facing difficulties to make both ends meet
141	I disagree as stated above. Saloon should be replaced or upgraded with saloon. The main thing is the cost of wheelchair accessible vehicles. Driver like me can't afford to buy a wheelchair accessible vehicle as they cost nearly £20k for a second hand one. I think council should keep the current economic climate in mind as well as if is already hard for drivers to earn enough for a living.
142	No I don't agree with replacing existing saloon vehicles to wheelchair vehicles as there is no demand for it and also with the recession and the costing that we are going to incur. There is no work provided for the hackneys carriage vehicles that the council have a care of duty to look after us hackney carriage vehicles as we pay your wages
143	No it is a target on no evidence. For the push chair trade perhaps. The vehicle we have these are enough. W have more than enough as it is and will probably find that hackney that do a fair amount of work in wheelchair area associated with private hire pre booked jobs. Existing saloon hackney should have their grandfather rights leave the policy as it is
144	No, a further consultation needs to be completed and carried out to determine the future demand and it is financial issue, that is why the government has not issued any mandatory proposals
145	I don't agree, I object because the cost of disabled carrier vehicle is to expensive fuel economy is expensive as well and the business is not much
146	No I don't agree with this. Saloon cars should be replaced with a saloon car and it is un fair on drivers as the wheelchair vehicles cost a lot of money. Most people who need these vehicles do ring private hire companies, so this target should be imposed only on private hire companies
147	No, I don agree again disabled wheelchair vehicles cost between £20k and £26k and at present time no body can afford. Disabled customers do not use taxis, drivers already facing difficulties to make both ends meet
148	I don't agree because cost of disabled carrier vehicle is too expensive and the business is not much and the fuel economy is expensive
149	As stated previously I don't agree with the Council. The main reason is the cost. If some drivers got a saloon vehicle it should be allowed to upgrade or replace with a saloon. I am sure that Council know about the price of wheelchair accessible vehicles and drives can't afford to buy them. I think it is not fair on drivers to buy a WAV in this current economic climate as it will not only hit on the drivers themselves but on their families as well who rely on them
150	Stockton has a reasonable representation to meet the current demand for WAV's. It has been accepted through out Europe that mixed fleet of saloon and WAV's is a popular choice of taxi fleet. Therefore existing saloon hackney carriages should be given the grandfather right to be replaced when there is need to change a vehicles
151	I don't agree because the cost of vehicle is expensive and there is no business

Q8. Do you agree with the proposal to improve the minimum emission level standards for all exiting licensed vehicles to Euro 3 and for new and/or replacement vehicles to Euro 5? If not please give your reasons below.	
1	No organisational opinion
2	For Replacement vehicles this should only be raised to Euro IV NOT Euro V. Additional plates could be set at Euro V.- but see our detailed comments attached.
3	Members agreed that all currently licensed vehicles must meet Euro 3 emissions levels by 2014 however members did not see any reason why taxi drivers and/or proprietors must be required to purchase an inherently more expensive vehicle to meet Euro 5 levels in the absence of any evidence that a small number of compliant vehicles licensed with the council could in any way affect the environment in the Borough. Members proposed that all new and/or replacement vehicles must meet Euro 4 emissions levels.
4	Whilst this proposal carries merit, it should be postponed until a later review because of the current financial climate.
5	Disagree – A euro 5 car would cost approx £9k to replace a Euro 3 car and if I was to replace these Euro 3 cars I would be out of business. Not affordable to me.
6	No I don't. It will mean we will have to spend more money that we are not making on more expensive cars that we can't afford. My car runs on LPG and because of this I get a discount on my licence fees. But I have been told that may be stopped this year. We should be given an incentive to lower our emission levels by raising the fees for LPG cars that doesn't do this. If you don't know this there are not emissions from LPG cars.
7	No, I thought the ministry of transport set the levels not the Council
8	I think it will cost too much for some drivers although I agree that standards can be increased to say Euro 4.
9	I agree with the proposal
10	Euro 3 and Euro 4 for new cars
11	Yes
12	Agree with Euro 3 and Euro 4 for new vehicles
13	Euro 4 should be for all the vehicles
14	Euro 5 are expensive to buy and expensive to maintain
15	No comments
16	I strongly disagree as I have one car and would not find it easy to just suddenly change to a brand new car. If taxis are well maintained and kept in good conditions why would there be any need to change car, if a car can pass an MOT then it should be okay as a taxis
17	I don't agree it is too much of an adjustment and should be left as is now
18	I strongly disagree with this as the jump is too high, I believe that euro 3 should be replaced with euro 4 as it would be very costly to replace cars with euro 5's , taxi drivers will find it extremely difficult to replace their current car with a euro 5 on their salary as euro 5 cars are very expensive especially with the current recession. 8 seater mini buses should be still be considered as euro 3 as euro 4 are very expensive to replace and as said above on taxi driver earnings this would be difficult to achieve. I believe that this part of the policy should remain un changed because the current economic state has worsened in the last few years since the policy was last changed.
19	Yes I agree, very good for the environment
20	I disagree because it is too much of an adjustment and should be left as it is
21	Disagree, no revenue available to purchase low emissions vehicle
22	The jump is too high for level and also expensive
23	I disagree because its too much of a big expense for such a small town things should be left alone as they are
24	No, due to cost, customers mistreat vehicles
25	It should stay at Euro 3 as there is no work in Stockton and I cannot afford to buy emission 4 never mind 5. I will be out of business
26	Euro 5 cars cost over £5k and there's no work in Stockton and people had loans on cars and give them back

27	Euro 5 cars cost over £5k and there's no work in Stockton and people had loans on cars and give them back
28	Agree
29	I agree to the Euro 3 minimum but feel Euro 4 is adequate for the current climate due to the cost implication of getting a Euro 5 vehicle and Euro 5 still might not benefit the environment anyway. For example: 2 years ago, due to miss communication between myself and Licensing, I purchased a Euro 4 Peugeot Expert Tepee 1.6L to replace my X Reg Peugeot 806 which had been written off. The new Tepee 57 plate has a carbon emission of 192g/km where the 806 had 186g/km. The 806 also did a third more to the gallon, ultimately, I am using more fuel, producing more carbon.
30	I don't agree because this would increase fumes and reduce wages. Disagree
31	Yes, but Euro 3(min) and Euro 4 (max)
32	I do not agree because to put on a Euro 5 car you would at least £20 - £30k which nobody would be able to afford. Disagree
33	No because they are ok as they are
34	Yes, min Euro 3 – max Euro 4
35	Emission 3 and Euro 4 for new cars
36	To be fair Euro 4 emission for new and existing should stay on emission 3
37	Emission (4) is adequate enough for our needs
38	Agree Euro 3 and Euro 4 for new vehicles
39	No, the present emission levels do comply with the national average, so should be retained
40	Euro 5 is definitely not acceptable or needed but Euro 4 is fine
41	What difference will this make? The number of taxis compared to all vehicles in the Borough is minute. So why discriminate taxis from other vehicles. Engines are getting more fuel efficient every year
42	Big no Euro 5
43	New or replacement vehicles should be Euro 3 rather than 5 as the council needs to understand Taxi business is quiet as it is (I hope my comment gets took into consideration)
44	I disagree. Please leave this alone and not enforce this, the country is in recession. We just don't have money to buy these expensive cars or take finance when there's no work in this town
45	I can't comment because I don't understand all the different Euro issues
46	Agree with present level, which meets the national standard
47	This is not agreed to as it singles out taxi transport and therefore unfair on a business factor and national factor and does not reflect income in these austere times
48	Disagree, euro 5 cars are for too expensive to buy on a normal taxis drivers wage. They may also have their car repossessed if they cannot make payments
49	Agree, minimum Euro 3 would be higher standard compared to national averages and Euro 4 be for replacement and new vehicles
50	Euro 3 for existing, Euro 4 for new
51	All taxis should be euro 4 because euro 5 is too expensive at this time
52	I disagree with this proposal, I believe the current emission levels to be satisfactory
53	Yes, it is reasonable to have Euro 3 and max Euro 4 for the replacement vehicles or new
54	I don't agree because this would increase fares and reduce wages
55	It will be too expensive to replace Euro 3 vehicles to Euro 5 as most drivers do not get enough work to cover that expense it would be very difficult to replace their current vehicle with a Euro 5
56	No, Euro 5 is not recognised by DVLA standards and therefore not acceptable. Euro 4 is acceptable. All existing vehicles should stay at the current standards as the cost in replacement would be unfair.
57	No because every other Council up and down the country still use Euro 2 so why should Stockton Council be different as long as the car is road worthy it should be okay. If it is okay for the general public to drive Euro 2 vehicles about why should it be not okay to driver Euro 2 for taxis
58	New or replacement vehicles should be Euro 3 not 5. As the Council needs to understand the taxi trade is quiet

59	No existing vehicles Euro 3, new vehicle Euro 4 due to current economic climate
60	I disagree with this because taxi business is suffering and therefore cheaper cars should be allowed to be licensed therefore current policy should be unchanged
61	I asked your officer if my car was okay before I applied for a licence – you cannot change your rules for cars you have already approved
62	No, once a vehicle has been granted a licence it should be given grandfather rights to cover life of vehicle. New applications should be Euro 5
63	No comment
64	Many large engine cabs have lower emissions per litre of fuel used by as they use more fuel per mile they actually have higher emissions per journey than smaller engine vehicles. Simple arithmetic
65	Yes, but min 3 and maximum 4 is reasonable
66	Euro five not in any framework in any MOT and DVLA guide lines yet. Why are you asking this question, No
67	Euro 4 is acceptable for replacing vehicles
68	No, existing vehicle Euro 3 and new Euro 4
69	No, existing vehicle Euro 3 and new Euro 4
70	Euro 4 for new or replacements
71	Yes, agree with minimum Euro 3 and maximum Euro 4 for new vehicles
72	No, Euro 3 for existing and Euro 4 for new vehicles
73	Yes, but the current emission standards are adequate for the next 5 years at least
74	Why should the Council set higher standards for hackney drivers. If the vehicle passes a standard DVLA test that should be adequate
75	Minimum Euro 4 should be enforced not Euro 5. So no to Euro 5
76	Euro 3 for existing cars, Euro 4 for new cars
77	Euro 3 emissions is adequate for the vehicles that are on the fleet
78	Agree, min 3, max 4
79	No existing vehicle to Euro 3, new vehicle to Euro 4
80	No, I do not agree with this proposal. Why are taxi drivers been targeted specifically, are bus companies, council workers or elected councillors expected to pass this standard
81	Euro 4 is fine, not Euro 5
82	No
83	No
84	No, Euro 3 and 4 is okay
85	Euro 4 is fine
86	Euro 4 is fine
87	No, why are taxi drivers being targeted?
88	No
89	Agree euro 3 would be higher standard compared to national averages
90	No I think euro emission 4 would be appropriate
91	Should be 3 emission level may be 4 for new cars
92	Euro 4 is acceptable for us as a replacement vehicle
93	Euro 4 is acceptable for us as a replacement vehicle
94	Minimum 3 and Max 4
95	No, the existing emission level standards are above the national standard
96	Don't agree to change to Euro 5 emission vehicles, the Euro 3 emission is adequate for the vehicles already licensed
97	No, existing licensed vehicles to Euro 3 and new Euro 4
98	No, existing vehicles Euro3, new vehicles Euro 4 due to current economic climate
99	No agree it should be minimum 3 and maximum 4. Five is expensive to buy at the moment
100	No, Euro 5 is not recognised as a DVLS standard. Euro 4 is recognised and accepted. All existing vehicles should remain at the current standards as the cost in replacement would be unfair
101	Yes, the existing Euro 2 as min and Euro 3 is satisfactory to be retained in the policy
102	Yes, min 3 and max 4 is reasonable

103	Euro 5 is not in force in any MOT garage or any DVLA guidelines. Disagree with this
104	Not on my expense
105	Euro 4 is acceptable for changing the car
106	No, Euro 3 for existing vehicles and Euro 4 for new applicants
107	No, it should remain Euro 3 for vehicles , Euro 4 for new
108	Euro 4 is acceptable replacing the vehicle
109	I don't agree with Euro 5 emission proposal because Euro 4 emission is better. Euro 5 emission is too expensive for the trade. I think the Council should retain the Euro 4 emission
110	Emission levels could be brought up to Euro 4 but definitely not Euro 5 because it is not required by central Government or EEC laws
111	Don't agree with this only Euro emission 3 for licensed vehicles
112	No, Euro 3 for existing cars and Euro 4 for new vehicles
113	No, the existing vehicles should be Euro 3 and new vehicle should be Euro 4
114	No, Euro 5 is not recognised by DVLA standards and therefore not acceptable. Euro 4 is acceptable. All existing vehicles should stay at the current standards at the cost in replacement would be unfair
115	No I don't agree
116	No existing licensed vehicles on Euro 3 and new applications should be on Euro 4
117	Existing vehicles Euro 3, new vehicles Euro 4
118	Euro 3 for existing cars, Euro 4 for new cars
119	No, it should remain Euro 3 for existing vehicles and Euro 4 for new applicants
120	Euro 3 should apply to existing vehicles and Euro 4 for new applications
121	Yes, min 3, but Euro 4 should be the maximum
122	Why fix it if it isn't broken, leave well alone newer vehicles will comply eventually
123	Existing vehicle Euro 3, new vehicles Euro 4. Euro 5 should not be introduced yet
124	Euro 5 is not in force in any MOT garage or any DVKA guidelines, therefore I disagree with this proposal
125	No don't want Euro 5. Existing vehicles Euro 3 should be allowed and for new vehicles too. Don't agree
126	Euro 4 is acceptable for us replacing vehicles
127	Euro 4 is acceptable, Euro 5 is too expensive to buy
128	I do not agree with this Euro emission 3 only please
129	I think in the current climate it is not affordable to keep changing these requirements it is not a DVLA or VOSA requirement for a taxi
130	Euro 4
131	No, Euro 3 should be applied to existing vehicles and Euro 4 to new applications
132	No, should remain Euro 3 for existing cars and Euro 4 for new vehicles
133	No Euro 3 for existing cars and Euro 4 for new vehicles
134	I agree with Euro 3 emission I don't agree with Euro 5 because DVLA and VOSA don't have this
135	Too expensive to run and insure, will do if the council will help me to subsidise buying Euro 5 because this is not in force, go to any independent MOT garage Euro 5 is not in the framework. See DVLA guidelines
136	No, the existing vehicles should be up to Euro 3 and new vehicles Euro 4. It will be interesting to see what stance the council takes when it comes to the emission levels of its own vehicles and also what is the council's view on the buses emission levels especially those routes the council subsidises
137	Agree, min Euro 3 and Max Euro 4 for new and replacement vehicles is of very high standard
138	No, too expensive to buy new cars at the present time. We can't buy new cars with Euro 5 emission
139	No, Euro 5 emission is not required by the central government or the EEC. However, it could be brought up to Euro 4
140	No I do not agree with this proposal.
141	Council should not set higher standards for hackney drivers. Min Euro 3 and Max Euro 4 is

	sufficient enough to meet national standards
142	Yes I agree with the Euro 3 level of vehicles but I don't agree to change to Euro 5 emission vehicles because off the cost, cost, cost a major factor of Euro 5 emission vehicles
143	No, I am agree in modernising the licensing department but it is unfair in tying to impose standards that their own employees don't meet
144	Yes, but min 3 and maximum 4 is reasonable for the new and replacement vehicles
145	I don't agree with that with Euro 5 emission proposal because Euro 4 emission is better. Euro 5 is going to be too expensive for the trade. I think the council should retain the Euro 4 emission
146	No, I do not agree with this proposal. I think only taxi drivers are being targeted
147	No I don agree with this proposal, taxi is a public service, think about bus fleets, every Council worker, Councillors, again in very hard times I think intentionally taxi drivers are been targeted
148	I do not agree with Euro 5 emission proposal because Euro 4 emission better. Euro 5 emission is too expensive for the trade. I think the Council should retain the Euro 4 emission
149	Council should not set higher standards for hackney carriage drivers
149	Agree with min Euro 3 and Euro 4 for new and replacement vehicles
150	I don't agree with that, I don't agree with Euro 5 emission proposal because Euro 4 emission is better. Euro 5 emission is too expensive for the trade. I think the Council should retain the Euro 4 emission

Q9. Do you agree with the proposal to introduce NCAP ratings for licensed vehicles? If not please give your reasons below.

1	Agree with proposal
2	<p>NO. Many existing licensed vehicles which are commonly used by the public as private motor cars in the family saloon category will not meet the standard proposed.</p> <p>Small volume models do not have NCAP ratings (WCA's and small MPV's, Transit types etc.)</p> <p>This policy would remove a considerable percentage of currently acceptable vehicles from the licensed fleets and ALL WCA vehicles.</p> <p>See also our detailed comments.</p>
3	NO. NCAP ratings are not available for minibuses (Ford Transit), people carriers (Ford Galaxy etc), some MPV's, London Taxis, or for any other wheel-chair accessible vehicle i.e Peugeot Eurocab/E7. Such a policy would likely be unworkable and create problems for proprietors and the council.
4	Not at this moment in time, it should be perhaps introduced when the UK is in a better financial climate
5	Disagree – Our cars are tested 3 times in the year (2 x council test, 1 x MOT) a car tested 3 times a year is surely safe. All cars have a certain safety test before they are sold from new.
6	No I don't. I don't think the cars are the problem. I think the drivers are to blame for driving to fast and dangerously especially the young Asian drivers. If doesn't matter what the Euro MCAP Rating is if the car is not involved in an accident.
7	No, I think the rating is too high. Surely, it is up to the vehicle manufacturer to make a vehicle as safe as possible, they don't make unsafe vehicles on purpose. I understand 5 star to be the top rating, but very few vehicles achieve this.
8	This will make most of the fleet redundant therefore should be phased in gradually.
9	I agree with the proposal
10	Disagree
11	No
12	Disagree

13	Don't know about NCAP
14	Why should we have NCAP Ratings when the cars are getting tested twice a year and MOT once a year. If this is not safe what is?
15	No comments
16	It's an expense we could do without
17	Don't agree because new cars have built in safety features as standard, and it would again be a big expense
18	All cars that are currently on the road have all met the British Safety Standards. If they have been proved to be road worthy and safe to drive we believe that over the years these vehicles have been licensed with Stockton Council if British standards allow you to drive your family in the same car it should be no different to drive as a taxi. Therefore I do not believe that NCAP should be enforced.
19	I disagree its expensive measure all cars are tested on MOT and on services
20	I disagree because the current vehicles have safety features as standard, it would be to expensive
21	Disagree as cars already most NCAP by manufacturers on production
22	All cars are tested and I disagree
23	I disagree this is a small town with high standards being enforced without enough revenue
24	No, due to cost
25	No need for NCAP unless Council fund the drivers. We can't afford it
26	Why should we have NCAP ratings when the cars go for test two times a year and it has an MOT one a year. If that's not safe what is
27	Why should we have NCAP ratings when the cars go for test two times a year and it has an MOT one a year. If that's not safe what is
28	Disagree
29	I do not agree with this. Again it's a cost implication and also I would like to see how many injuries having a NCAP 5 star rating would have prevented in this borough for the last year
30	No because taxis are tested frequently, disagree
31	Disagree
31	I don not agree because this means buying a new car which many drivers cannot afford. Disagree
33	No okay as it is
34	Disagree
35	Disagree, don't understand why this has to be in the policy
36	I don't even know what this is
37	Disagree
38	Disagree should not be part of policy
39	No, a completely unnecessary to include NCAP ratings in the policy
40	NCAP ratings should not apply to the taxi trade, if a car is safe for an ordinary person it is safe for a taxi driver
41	No, car safety is getting more publicity now at point of sale. Car safety has improved drastically with ABS, side impact airbags as well as standard airbags. Again the cost is an issue from a car at the lower scale to the higher we can't all afford to drive around in top of range motors
42	I think there is no need to worry about NCAP ratings, Manufacturers do this before car comes on the road
43	No I disagree, as an overall NCAP rating of 5 stars will make taxi drivers pay extra when buying there vehicles
44	I disagree because it simply not feasible when cars these day have ABS, airbags etc all has standard
45	All cars are manufactured to a high safety standard. I disagree and that should be drivers choice
46	Disagree should not be included in the policy
47	It is not a reasonable proposal as the industry can not support this kind of expense, further it is just bureaucracy being over and above the monetary fact
48	Disagree, all cars are tested for maximum safety before being sold, if it is safe for a normal

	person to drive then it should be safe enough to drive the public in
49	Disagree, should not be part of the policy
50	Vehicles already done this NCAP rating. I don't think there is any need for that
51	They get NCAP rating before they go onto the road
52	I disagree with this proposal because all the vehicles that are on UK roads have gone through a rigorous safety checking routine at source. I believe this proposal would put unnecessary financial strain on drivers that are already struggling to make a living
53	No, NCAP ratings should be abolished from this policy, there is no need to add extra categories as the manufacturers carryout the crash testing themselves
54	No because taxis are tested frequently
55	I don agree as it is a waste of time, all vehicles are checked to make sure they are the safest they can be. If it is safe to drive a family around then its safe to drive the public
56	No, it is unfair to introduce an NCAP rating system for hackney but no other council vehicles such as Council minibuses and private hire vehicles. NCAP for all vehicles or none at all
57	No, as long as the car meets all the safety checks in a MOT test it is perfect to drive for a taxi
58	No I disagree, as an overall NCAP rating of 5 star will make taxi drivers pay extra when buying a vehicle
59	No I do not think it is a wise idea to introduce Euro NCAP rating and put extra financial burden on the taxi driver in a recession. These proposal would only make taxis drivers life hard
60	I disagree because NCAP again is a high cost for taxi drivers to find extra cash. Current cars are checked frequently
61	Do not talk about safety until you stop cabs carrying pushchairs still upright with children sat in them. Cabs not suitable and cab manufacturers do not approve this type of use
62	No comments
63	How can you consider these five star child rating when you are closing your eyes to London Cabs and purpose built transporting pushchairs and buggies with children still seated in them. These vehicles have no way of clamping these pushchairs/strollers/buggies safely. Sharp cornering and braking pushes buggies against doors and interior passengers. What would happen in an accident to a buggy and the baby?
64	You talk about safety but you still permit cabs to carry pushchairs with children in. How many more crashes do you want before you stop this practice? These cars are not insured to carry prams/pushchairs in the upright position. Please remember a crashed on Victoria Bridge carrying pushchair in black cab, insurance company would not pay out damages because cab not suitable to carry buggies erect. The vehicle owner settled out of court for £40k
65	No, there is no reasonable evidence to produce this in the Policy there is no need as the manufacturers have already tested the vehicles
66	Not really, Council can't justify doing this cross border for all trade vehicles. So why hackney vehicles?
67	No agree
68	No
69	No
70	I don't know what is NCAP
71	No
72	No, you cannot provide NCAP ratings for minibus or wheelchair accessible vehicles so why try to introduce it to saloons, is this not discrimination against saloon vehicle drivers
73	I disagree, Euro NCAP ratings are a commercial rating for public use and it does not provide any evidence of real safety of individual vehicles. It would be waste of space to include it in the policy
74	The council keep coming up with new rules but do they ever check that the vehicles they want us to change to have never been crash tested or passed the tests that the council require
75	NCAP ratings should not apply to any vehicles as they can not enforced along the board,

	so No to NCAP rated vehicles
76	I do not agree NCAP 5 ratings because NCAP 4 is okay
77	I don't agree NCAP rating because the existing vehicles are NCAP anyway
78	No
79	No every car in the UK passed by DVLA
80	For whose benefit would this NCAP rating be? Surely manufactures undertake such tests, this would be an added job, administration to the Council who are supposedly cutting budgets and reducing staff
81	NCAP rating should not apply to the taxis trade
82	No
83	No
84	No
85	No comment
86	NCAP should not apply to taxi trade
87	NCAP rating should not apply to the taxi trade
88	NCAP to be introduced should be done to all Council establishments
89	Disagree, shouldn't be part of the policy
90	Not agree, car manufacture s do NCAP so no need for this
91	Don't have a clue what this is
92	Not agree
93	Not agree
94	I don't know what this is
95	No, abolish from the new proposed policy
96	No, NCAP rating of 5 stars. All the vehicles are rated all ready to be safe on the road
97	No
98	No, I do not think it is a wise idea to introduce euro NCAP rating and put extra financial burden on taxi drivers in a recession. These proposal would only make taxi drivers life hard
99	No agree manufactures do this service before anything comes on the road, so there is no need for this
100	No, if NCAP has to be introduced it should be done through out all Council establishments. Council vehicles such as minibuses should also be NCAP rated or else it is unfair
101	No should not be included in the policy
102	No, the manufacturers do testing already, so all vehicles do comply with the national standards
103	No comment
104	No to NCAP
105	Not agreed
106	No, there is no NCAP rating for wheelchair accessible or minibuses so this would be discriminating against saloon vehicles
107	No
108	Not agree
109	I do not agree with the proposal to introduce NCAP rating for licensed vehicles because these vehicles are very expensive if the council pay half the money then that's fine. Then the drivers can afford the vehicles NCAP
110	No NCAP ratings on vehicles. I feel if cars are safe for an ordinary person to drive its safe enough for taxi driver
111	No thank you, can you keep all the vehicles as they are
112	No, NCAP ratings cannot be found for wheelchair accessible or minibus, so this cannot work. This would be discrimination against saloon vehicles
113	No by introducing NCAP ratings you will force many drivers to give up taxing and sign on, which I am sure is something the Council does not want
114	No, it is unfair to introduce NCAP rating system for hackneys but no other council vehicles. Such as council minibuses and private hire vehicle. NCAP for all vehicle or none at all
115	I don't know what NCAP means
116	No

117	No, I don't agree with this proposal. The cars in my view are safe and replacing the vehicles would cost money which taxi driver don't have
118	No
119	No, this has no weight as wheelchair accessible don't have rating and so saloon drivers would be discriminated against
120	No, the wheelchair accessible vehicles and minibuses cannot be NCAP rated. This would prove that discrimination against saloon vehicles is taking place
121	No comment
122	No basically because you are making things too complicated and creating problems which may never happen
123	NCAP 4 is safe enough. NCAP 5 there is no need or it yet as most cars on are NCAP 4
124	NCAP? Can a survey do done on this for all plated borough councils across the board
125	Don't agree, if safe e.g. Vauxhall Vectra for general public why isn't it safe for taxis
126	No agree
127	No NCAP 4/5 can not work on all cars
128	No we can keep the existing vehicles
129	NCAP ratings should be done across the line example hackney, private, council vehicles also PSV vehicles fairly and equally
130	Euro NCAP cannot work for minibus, London taxis, euro cab etc so must be dropped
131	No, there is no NCAP ratings for minibuses or wheelchair accessible vehicles so saloon vehicles would be discriminated against
132	No, this has no weight as wheelchair accessible buses don't have rating so saloon drivers would be discriminated against
133	No, this has not weight as wheelchair accessible vehicles don't have rating so saloon drivers would be discriminated against
134	NCAP ratings already done on cars for them to be on the road by the manufacturer
135	NCAP? Please do a survey if you can do this for all plated SBC vehicles, taxi trade e.g. wheelchair accessibly vehicles; ford transit vans (minibuses); and all council vehicles. Can you do this? Across the Border!
136	No, I think the Council will be hell bent on making taxi drivers redundant by introducing NCAP rating for licensed vehicles considering the present economic climate
137	Disagree – Euro NCAP should not have been proposed as the vehicles are already tested for safety by taking crash tests by the manufacturers
138	No
139	No because if a vehicle is safe enough to be driven by an ordinary person then it must be safe enough to be driven by a taxi driver
140	No, I think it will add extra financial burden on council in my point of view. Present system is doing a good job
141	As the council keeps bringing new rules but have they thought about polices this time because in the past council has been proven wrong on few occasions. I don't agree wit this proposal
142	No because the vehicle we already have will be NCAP UK speck anyway all vehicles will be crash tested to a standard. The council are putting us at a cost incurring again, in the recession
143	No I do not agree as the manufacturers already test the vehicle. The council should except the manufacturers rating as a national standards
144	NO, there is not reasonable evidence to produce this in the policy, there is no need as the manufactures have already tested the vehicles
145	I don't accept the proposal of NCAP ratings for licensed vehicles, because these vehicles are very expensive. If the council pay half of the money then that's okay. Then the drivers can afford the vehicles
146	What does NCAP mean?
147	No, I think it will add extra financial burden on council, in my point of view present system is doing good job
148	I don not agree with the proposal to introduce NCAP rating for licensed vehicles because these vehicle are very expensive if the Council pay half the money then that's fine. Then

	the drivers can afford the vehicles NCAP
149	The Council keep coming up with new rules but do they every check that the vehicles they want us to have never been crash tested or passed what council requires
150	No, because it is not necessary to include NCAP rating in the policy, all vehicles have been crash tested and are safe for public to use. NCAP rating should not be included in the policy
151	I don't agree with this proposal to introduce rating for licensed vehicles because these vehicles are very expensive. If the Council pay half o the money then that would be fine, then the drivers can afford the WAV vehicles

Q10. If you agree with this proposal do you agree with the ratings set for renewal and new vehicle applications? If not please give your reasons below.

1	Agree with proposal
2	See above
3	With regards for replacement/new vehicles, currently only a small number of saloon vehicles suitable for use within the taxi trade meet the NCAP 5-star rating. The vast majority of vehicles favoured by the taxi trade i.e Vauxhall Vectra , Skoda Octavia have and NCAP 4-star rating. Until such time as these fundamental concerns can be addressed, the policy should not be changed.
4	No, see above
5	Disagree – The vehicles Euro 3 should remain the same as it is unchanged. Things have got worse since the last policy was introduced.
6	No comment
7	No comment
8	I don't know enough to comment
9	I think the 5 star rating could be to high as it could restrict types of vehicles for use. 4 star rating is more appropriate
10	Disagree
11	No comment
12	No need for Euro NCAP Rating to be included in the Policy
13	No comment
14	See above
15	No comments
16	As above
17	No to expensive not enough trade around
18	I disagree, I believe that the policy should be remained unchanged because of the expense
19	Again very expensive
20	I disagree because it would be too expensive and there is not enough trade in Stockton
21	Asking for too much, low returns on running vehicle at present
22	No, it's a big expense
23	No comments
24	No comments
25	Don't agree
26	I do not agree, same reason as above
27	I do not agree, same reason as above
28	Unnecessary to include NCAP ratings in the policy
29	No comments
30	Disagree, policy should remain as normal
31	Disagree
32	I do not agree because there are cars already on which have no problem with the safety wise and it would be too expensive
33	No comments

34	Disagree
35	Disagree
36	No comment
37	Disagree
38	No comment
39	SBC should leave these issues to DFT
40	No comments
41	No comments
42	Not agree
43	No disagree
44	The new proposals are just too high of a jump in such a small town its Stockton not London. I totally disagree, just things as they are are hard enough
45	No comments
46	No
47	No comments
48	Disagree, there are cars already on the road which have not taken this test and do not have a safety problem. It will also be to expensive
49	It is unnecessary to include NCAP ratings in the policy
50	No comment
51	I do not agree with this
52	I disagree
53	Please do not add unnecessary items into the policy
54	Disagree policy should remain as actual
55	The cost would cause hardship – disagree
56	No comment
57	Like I said above as long is it meets a standards MOT test it should be okay for a taxis. Not every car on the road is a new car so why do taxis have to be different
58	No, disagree
59	Not al all for any application for renewal or new vehicle
60	I disagree because this will put extra financial pressure which would mean drivers taking financed cars then working longer hours to cover the instalments. Longer working hours means tired drivers
61	The word hypocrite comes to mind you talk about safety but you permit this practice of carrying pushchairs an prams
62	Yes, safety is more important than car design
63	I think the Council is putting children's lives at risk. Not one of the vehicle manufactures recommends carrying pushchairs erect with children. Are you waiting for the accident to happen? Using live babies for your own crash test dummy trials horrifies me.
64	Any changes should be for new licences only. You have already approved my car, how can you move the goal posts now, I asked you if my car was suitable and now you are wanting to change the rules
65	No comment
66	Don't agree to this, full stop
67	No comment
68	No
69	No
70	No comment
71	No comment
72	No
73	No, these rating do not provide evidence of safety
74	I disagree as mentioned above. Many years ago the council made all hackney drivers have disabled chairs fitted to the cabs. These chairs were never tested to UK standards but if not fitted you could not work. I took years to proved the Council wrong and the policy was eventually dropped
75	No comment

76	I do not agree, cars with NCAP 4 are sufficient for taxis
77	I don't agree NCAP 4 is not adequate for taxis because of cost to be occurred
78	No comment
79	No
80	I don't agree, has the council thought about how they would adopt it. Would a customer be told, would taxi drivers have to turn away from a job because a customer only wanted to travel in a 4 star car? This is impractical and is bureaucracy for the sake of it.
81	No comment
82	Do not agree
83	No
84	No comment
85	No comment
86	No comment
87	Do not agree
88	No comment
89	Not necessary to include NCAP rating in policy
90	No comments
91	No comment
92	No comment
93	No comment
94	No comment
95	It is unsatisfactory to add Euro NCAP in the policy
96	No don't agree, the existing vehicles are rated to UK standards
97	No
98	Not all for any application for renewal or new vehicles
99	Not agree
100	No comment
101	All vehicles are crash tested by manufacturers and are deemed to be safe
102	No comment
103	No comment
104	No comment
105	No comment
106	No
107	No
108	No comment
109	I do not agree
110	No comment
111	No I don't the existing vehicles are okay
112	No
113	No I don't agree, not for renewal or new vehicle applications
114	No comment
115	No comment
116	No
117	Don't agree with this proposal
118	No comment
119	Do not agree
120	No
121	No comment
122	No
123	Don't agree
124	I don't agree with this proposal
125	Don't agree
126	No comment
127	No
128	No I don't agree. The existing vehicles are rated, so we don't need to

129	I will only agree if it is fairly done across the full structure Council, Private Hire, Hackney Carriage, otherwise I disagree
130	No comment
131	Do not agree
132	No
133	No
134	If you persist this then it should be done across all council public vehicles
135	Will agree if all vehicles across the border can comply to this and all the council vehicles comply to this right across the border. Don't agree to this
136	No I do not agree. Not for renewal or new vehicle applications, If the council is making cut backs in every department why is it trying to make taxi drivers spend money they haven't got
137	No comment
138	No comment
139	No comment
140	Again I do not agree with this proposal. I think the existing emission level standards are about the national standards
141	I disagree as stated above. I would like to repeat myself reminding the Council about the wheelchairs. The policy brought up by council many years ago and a driver could not work without it. It did not work at the end and the council was proven wrong but sadly a lot of hackney drivers and myself had lost money for something which was of no use. Council should listen to driver's views as well on this occasion.
142	No don't agree with this proposal as all the existing vehicles are all safety approved and safe for all our customers
143	No
144	No comment
145	I don't agree
146	No comment
147	Again I do not agree with the proposal. I think the existing emission level standards are above the national standards
148	I do not agree
149	I don't agree as mentioned above. In the past drivers could not work unless they had disabled chair in the car. In the end council was proven wrong and complete waste of money and time for drivers
150	It is unnecessary to include NCAP rating in the policy and it will lead to further complications in future, what the driver can not afford at this time of recession
151	I don't agree

Q11. Do you agree with the proposal that the best practice guide be endorsed as the minimum standard acceptable to the Council? If not please give your reasons below.	
1	Agree with proposal
2	<p>NO - this Best Practice Guide includes conditions and 'failures' which are a 'counsel of perfection' and wholly impractical in respect of vehicles which are used on a 24 hour basis covering up to 50,000 miles a year.</p> <p>Testing should be restricted to safety critical issues and reasonable comfort/ needs of passengers.</p> <p>See - Section 48 - Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976</p> <p>We suggest the Council retains its current standards and policies.</p>
3	No. Our members support the current high standard i.e that all licensed vehicles must be 'exceptionally well maintained' and do not see any reason to move away from this standard.

	Members voted unanimously for the current testing and inspection regime to be retained.
4	Yes
5	Disagree – Cars are tested 3 times a year (2 council tests, 1 MOT)
6	Yes
7	Yes
8	Yes
9	I agree with the proposal
10	No, disagree
11	No
12	Disagree
13	Current standards are very good
14	Do not agree
15	No comments
16	I disagree things should just be left as they are
17	We don't need any more measures because Stockton Council has a high policy anyway. Two council and one MOT should ensure they are already of a high standard
18	No comment
19	Cars are tested enough on MOTS and Services so I disagree
20	I disagree because taxis get tested three times a year
21	Disagree as vehicle already tested three times
22	Stockton Council are high already, so I disagree
23	We believe standards are high already so I would disagree with this
24	No comment
25	Why should we need fourth test when the cars have 3 tests, 2 council and 1 MOT
26	I do not agree
27	I do not agree
28	Disagree
29	Agree
30	I don't agree because taxis are tested by the council twice a year, disagree
31	Disagree
32	No because the council check every vehicle frequently, disagree
33	Yes
34	Disagree
35	Disagree
36	Existing standards are good
37	No comments
38	Disagree
39	No, the best practice guide only suggests for Councils that do not have good standards, but SBC already have standards above the national minimum
40	The testing that we do now is good so should be left alone
41	No comment
42	Current standards are very high anyway
43	Disagree, should not be part of the policy
44	I disagree, taxi tested 3 times a year, what more minimum can you get
45	Again its more cost and don't see the great advantage of this
46	Disagree, the current council standard is okay and should continue as it is of higher standard
47	Yes, disagree
48	Disagree, the Council checks all the taxis frequently
49	Disagree as the SBC present testing standard is of higher standard and should be maintained
50	I don't have my own car but I think current standards are acceptable
51	The current standards are high enough, I think they should stay the same
52	I believe that the current policy is sufficient
53	No, the present council test is of good national standard

54	I don't agree because taxis are tested by council twice a year
55	Disagree, standards are already high
56	I agree with calendar controlled meters
57	I think the meters should be calendar controlled cause then it keeps the jobs right and customers know what they are paying
58	Disagree, should not be part of the policy
59	I do not agree with this proposal because there is already high standards and procedures to inspect hackney carriages so please leave it as it is
60	I disagree because Stockton Council has already a high standard when cars go for test at Cowpen
61	The taxis should be tested outside our garage once a year and inside your garage once a year
62	Yes
63	Your garage is not meeting requirements. Long delays for tests, long delays for retests, too many licences. Its time to revert back to annual tests at your garage and a bi annul test at local MOT stations chosen by the council. This would keep 6 monthly test and relieve your over stretched garage and help local businesses.
64	To ease the congestion at your Cowpen Lane garage, you should let us MOT at a local garage of your choice and an interim 6 month test at your depot. This will keep your 6 month rota and assist Cowpen
65	There is no need for this to be introduced in the policy as the Councils current test both (MOT and taxi test) complies with the national standards.
66	Agree with calendar controlled meters
67	Agree calendar meters
68	Yes
69	No
70	I think current standards are very good
71	No
72	No, this system currently works so why change it
73	Disagree, the current council tests are adequate and meets the national standards
74	I think the test should be left the way it is
75	I believe existing testing is sufficient so should be kept
76	No present council standards is sufficient
77	I don't agree with the practice of the council that we have 2 tests also MOT
78	Agree
79	No
80	I think the test is already an example of good practice. Adopting National Guidelines dismisses issues about locality and can differ from small towns to large cities
81	The testing is good enough
82	Test should be left as it is
83	Yes, I agree
84	Yes, I agree
85	NCAP should not apply to taxi trade
86	The tests are good now, no need to do them
87	The testing should be left alone
88	Agree
89	The tests done already are fine
90	No, I think current standards are higher then normal MOT so those standards should be carried on
91	Not agree, current standards are good, better then normal MOT
92	Agree on calendar controlled meters
93	Agree with calendar controlled meters
94	Not agree, current standards are good
95	No, the DVLA standards as at present are satisfactory to be retained
96	No, having a MOT and 2 taxi test for the year

97	No
98	I do not agree with the proposal because there is already high standards and procedures to inspect Hackney Carriages, so please leave it as it is
99	No current standards are acceptable
100	I agree
101	No,, I think the current council test is satisfactory
102	No, we do not need this to be included in the policy
103	Agree with this policy
104	Current standard is good enough
105	Agreed calendar meters
106	No, if it ain't broken don't fix it
107	No
108	Agreed on calendar meter
109	I don't agree because the inspection of the vehicle at the Cowpen Depot is good enough, and the MOT. I think that's good for the vehicles safety
110	No I think this will cause problems so existing testing should stay in force
111	I think we have 2 tests and an MOT a year, I say no
112	No, if it ain't broken don't fix it
113	No I don't agree. Stockton Council already has set standards that are probably one of the toughest in the country so it doesn't need to go any further
114	I agree with calendar controlled meters
115	Test already work fine
116	No
117	I agree with this proposal so that customers are charged the right fare. Testing of vehicles should be kept the same
118	Not agree, current standards are fine
119	No, if it ain't broken don't fix it
120	No, if it ain't broken don't fix it
121	No, this should be dismissed from the policy. The council test does already comply with the national standards
122	The Police force of this Country are criticised for not being on the beat and too much paperwork. It appears that local authorities are bombarding the taxi association with similar paperwork by imposing rule after rule. Is this a case of just thinking of more silly rules to enforce to keep somebody in a job
123	No, calendar meters should be fitted so driver charge customers the correct tariff. Testing of vehicles should be kept as they are
124	Agree with calendar controlled meters
125	Agree with calendar meters, testing vehicle should be kept the same
126	Agree with calendar meters
127	No, current standard is acceptable i.e. exceptionally well maintained
128	I think two test are okay and one MOT
129	I agree with calendar controlled meters
130	No current standard must be maintained
131	No, if the system is not broken, don't fix it
132	If it ain't broken don't fix it
133	If it ain't broken don't fix it
134	I agree with calendar controlled meters
135	Agree with calendar controlled meters
136	No, I don not agree. Stockton Borough Council has for a number of years already set high standards and procedures to inspect hackney carriages and it is probably one of the toughest in the country. So it will be appreciated if the council can give us a little space to breath
137	Disagree, Stockton council already has high standard of tests, it is only recommended to councils with less regulated taxi tests
138	Yes

139	No, the current taxi testing is working. The new proposals will only cause problems
140	No I think DVLA standards, as at present are satisfactory to be retained
141	Test should be left as it is
142	Yes the minimum standard is to have 2 taxi tests a year also to have a MOT as well its just a money making scheme. If the MOT is a government body approved for all vehicles, why do the taxis have 2 tests and also a MOT test a year
143	No leave as it is
144	There is no need for this to be introduced this in the policy as the councils current test both MOT and taxi test complies with the national standards
145	I don't agree because the inspection for the vehicles at the Cowpen depot us good enough for the vehicle safety
146	I think test is already an example of good practice
147	No, I think DVLA standards as at present are satisfactory to be retained
148	I don't agree because the inspection of the vehicle at the Cowpen depot is good enough of the MOT. I think that is good enough for the vehicles safety
149	Test should be left as it is
150	No, the national MOT standard and present Council test meets the requirements, so that should be continued
151	I don't agree because the inspection of the vehicles at the Cowpen depot is good enough for the vehicles safety

Q12. Do you have any other comments on or suggestions for changes to the policy? If so please provide further details below.

1	No further comments
2	<p>Please see also our detailed commentary on certain matters above AND other issues we would wish to see considered by the Committee</p> <p>Specific comments</p> <p>36 – List of ‘designated’ vehicles to be maintained under regulations (yet to be made). Will the Council confirm that subject to the regulations (when made) NO information of a personal nature in respect of drivers will be released to the public, in any general publicity around the maintenance of the list, without their express written consent?</p> <p>66 – Trailers and tow bars. AMEND wording tocarriage of luggage and/or personal effects Is the Council proposing to issue a second or ‘trailer’ plate in addition to the usual rear licence plate? What is the testing regime proposed for the testing of trailers?</p> <p>99 – Testing – presentation of vehicle We support this proposal</p> <p>100 – Testing regime for vehicles- Adoption of PATN criteria for testing of vehicles. We have noted in our response to the Council’s pro-forma enquiry document our opposition to the blanket adoption of the PATN test guidelines.</p> <p>Taxis are driven up to 24 hours per day over 7 days. It is impractical to propose that in a working life which can include covering up to 50,000 miles per annum a vehicle will not sustain cosmetic damage to paintwork, bumpers and road wheels.</p> <p>Provided the vehicle remains safe and comfortable AND satisfies the test criteria of the VOSA – ‘MOT test’ we do not believe the Council should be seeking to introduce a counsel of perfection for vehicles providing a valuable public service and subject to heavy daily use.</p> <p>106 – Vehicle Licence renewals. We are concerned that the Council wishes to see applications for annual renewals</p>

submitted as much as 28 days before expiry of the current licence.

In the recent Scrutiny review process we were promised and to date have had honoured an undertaking to issue vehicle licences within 24 hours of submission of all relevant paperwork for the vehicle licence renewal.

We believe this requirement is an unreasonable requirement. In the current financial climate having to submit an application and fee as much as a month prior to the expiry of the current licence is burdensome and unreasonable.

130 – Tinted glass (windows)

We have set out on the Council's pro-forma enquiry our view that the current conditions should be relaxed and a minimum light transmission commensurate with the normal range of light transmission in production motor cars should be acceptable for the licensing of taxis and private hire vehicles.

146 – Age restriction on licensing- Emissions standards.

The proposal to introduce a maximum age for vehicle licensing (from first registration?) should be replaced simply by the setting of the Euro III emissions standard, as that is the objective of the policy as stated.

We do not agree that all replacements for existing licensed vehicles should meet Euro V emissions standard as this will place a severe financial burden on existing licensees at a time of reduced trade in the current economic situation.

We believe that at most an incremental step change to requiring Euro IV standards for emissions should be adopted to replace the current Euro III requirement for replacement vehicles.

Where a new vehicle is to be licensed NOT replacing a currently licensed vehicle it should be noted a requirement to meet Euro V standard will present a strong disincentive to anyone seeking to gain employment in the trade.

Car safety and NCAP ratings

153 – Introduction of a minimum 4 star rating for existing vehicles at renewal AND five star rating for replacement vehicles or New plates.

We believe this is an unreasonable condition and unworkable.

- i) Many perfectly acceptable vehicles which are in use as family saloon vehicles **will not be licensable under this condition** including all Skoda models and almost all Vauxhall Vectra models.

These vehicles are used widely in the trade as private hire saloons and for non-WCA Hackney Carriages.

- ii) Many low production volume vehicles including

- iii) 'Transit' type mini-buses and specially adapted Wheel-chair accessible vehicles do not have NCAP ratings at all. Are all of these to be excluded from licensing as Hackney Carriages or Private Hire vehicles?

167 – Driving licences – renewal.

What purpose is served by requiring a driver who has not previously passed the DSA Taxi Driver test to do so if he fails to renew his existing licence within 7 days of expiry?

If a driver renewing every year for many years, not having previously satisfied the DSA test is a fit and proper person what makes him unfit 8 days after expiry of a Stockton driver licence? There may be extenuating circumstances for a driver failing to renew his/her licence. The imposition of this test can be extremely stressful for existing drivers with many

years of practical driving experience and years without motoring conviction or any disciplinary issues in respect of hi/her conduct as a driver licensed by Stockton on Tees Council.

Criminal Record checks.

We note that the Council is requiring **enhanced level** checks for **ALL** applicants and at three yearly intervals after grant of a licence. This is not in line with guidance issued by the Criminal Records Bureau.

We fully support the proposed policy but note that at present the legislation is not clear in its definitions, which in terms of the Practice Notes issued by the CRB are in fact unworkable for the purposes of licensing of drivers to ensure as far as possible the protection of children and vulnerable adults.

CRB Application process.

Following the transfer of the administration of Licensing for taxi-related licences to the Council Customer Service offices we are concerned that the processing of these applications is now in the hands of a large number of council staff. Are all of these staff themselves entitled to handle CRB applications and associated documents presented by applicants which, *inter alia*, may contain details of past convictions including those normally regarded as '*spent*' but required to be declared on applications for taxi driver licences.

Can the Council confirm that only employees who have been subject themselves to Enhanced level disclosures are involved in or have access to application documentation?

Validity of CRB enhanced disclosures.

The process of obtaining a Stockton driver licence is complex and includes the provision of a number of documents and certificates which can involve application to third party bodies where the time taken to obtain the necessary evidence of 'fitness' to hold a licence is outside the control of the applicant and in many cases is indeterminate.

We do not believe the limitation of the validity of a CRB disclosure to one month from the date of issue is reasonable.

The Council requires a CRB application obtained through its own offices before grant of a licence. Provided an application has not been delayed through any neglect on the part of a driver/applicant we believe the Council should accept a CRB disclosure obtained as part of that application. The current situation where both CRB applications and availability of appointments to sit the DSA Taxi driver tests can involve delays of more than 6 weeks it could be difficult to progress an application if this time limit on the validity of CRB disclosures was enforced.

Currently the Council only permits an applicant to undertake its own Knowledge test before accepting submission and commencing processing of a completed driver licence application.

We believe the Council should –at the applicant's risk- accept and begin to process applications for the grant of a licence whilst awaiting an appointment to sit the DSA test. Provided an applicant satisfies the DSA test in not more than two attempts then the CRB disclosure should be valid notwithstanding the date of issue. Always provided an applicant failing a DSA test has re-booked a further test within 7 days of a first test

179 – Statutory declarations.

We do not believe these are necessary when applicants are subject to the Enhanced CRB disclosure process.

	<p>Why can drivers renewing licences (or annually where they hold a three-year licence) not simply complete a signed declaration of NO convictions or confirmation of convictions which ought to have been declared during the previous 12 months? The current licensing conditions require disclosure of ANY conviction received during the currency of a licence within 7 days of imposition by the court or other authority.</p> <p>Are these declarations to continue to be sworn before an authorised solicitor?</p> <p>195 Medical Assessments</p> <p>We are concerned that detailed medical information about an individual may be disclosed on the Councils Medical assessment form completed by the applicant's General Practitioner.</p> <p>We believe the Council should simply require the GP to complete a certificate stating that the subject has no matters of health which call into question his/her fitness to carry out the duties of a licensed driver. The GP can complete and retain in the patient's notes the form issued by the Council. Only a simple statement of fitness or otherwise should be submitted to the council administrative staff handling applications. Council employees are not medically qualified to interpret the significance or relevance of any medical information on an assessment form.</p>
3	<p>The current cost of licensing vehicles and drivers with Stockton Borough Council remains amongst the highest in the region. Whilst we welcome the recent reductions offered in some aspects of vehicle licenses, we would draw the council's attention to cutbacks and costs saving most other local authorities are currently undertaking and urge the council to reduce costs in the licensing departments.</p> <p>With regards to private hire vehicles. It would appear an increasing number of operators allow their private hire vehicles to queue in public places. This gives the impression that a rank is available for the public with obvious risks that this presents. Operators should be encouraged to bring the vehicles back to the operating base where there is no other job for the vehicle to proceed to.</p>
4	<p>With regard to previous comments, any private hire company operating more than ten vehicles, should accept a proposal to incorporate a certain number of wheelchair accessible vehicles within their fleets.</p>
5	<p>We have a problem with new taxi driver application and believe that the private hire test should be made easier or if possible removed because private hire drivers have the facility of Sat Nav, A to Z book, Data Systems and Operator back up. DSA test should be done while waiting for CRB check and application is being processed.</p> <p>I have a strong objection to Euro 3 cars to be replaced with Euro 5. This is because I believe if the procedure were emphasized I would certainly be out of taxi business. It would just not be affordable for myself, which would mean either selling up to a bigger company for the very minimum price and take a huge loss. If a seller was not found this would mean I would have to deduct the number of cars which would mean no profit will be made, resulting in possible closure. I refer to the Euro 5 emission investigation results reports which clearly state the harm it would have on myself and taxi industry.</p> <p>I would suggest if the old policy on Euro 3 continue into the new policy and to remain as it is in present because things have not improved in the current economic crisis since last revamp of the policy. I request that you consider my views and accommodate the old policy standards to help us earn a living in the current recession.</p>
6	<p>I think you should be concentrating on providing more hackney ranks and spaces so that we are able to go to work and provide a service to the public, and making a living and not on finding WAVS for us to have to spend more money on our vehicles. Things are very hard at the moment and we are having to work 60 hours per week just to make a living, not like you who work a 40 hours week and get good holidays and sick pay and a good pension paid for by our hard work.</p>

	If the council hadn't given out so many hackney plates to saloons in the first place you would have a better percentage of WAV's than you have and also the drivers would have been doing this job for a lot of years would till be able to make a decent living.
7	I refer to question 6: Wheelchair accessible vehicles. In the Stockton area the revenue created by having a WAV does not make financial sense. Stockton in not London. If you had to replace your saloon for a WAV people would hang on to them for as long as they possibly could, so instead of replacing saloons. You would end up with a very old fleet. The drivers that have WAV have a very slight advantage now for wheelchairs, pushchairs etc. If everyone had them, there would be no advantage.
8	Licensing puts many passengers at risk because they do not carry out a campaign to make them aware of the insurance rules of Public versus Private Hire.
9	No further comments
10	No further comments
11	No further comments
12	No further comments
13	No further comments
14	Sort yourselves out, don't treat us like kids
15	No comments
16	No further comments
17	No further comments
18	I believe that licensing taxi drivers should be made easier to achieve and more flexibility to a person wanting to become a taxi drive. Any purposed driver should be allowed to follow up documents like medical and DSA test while waiting for a CRB check to be done.
19	I think the policy should be left alone because if they start changing things its going to be expensive and also there is a lot of competition and money is so tight
20	Please listen to us and leave the policy
21	No further comments
22	No further comments
23	No further comments
24	No further comments
25	No further comments
26	Sort yourselves out, don't put us taxi drivers on the dole
27	Sort yourselves out, don't put us taxi drivers on the dole
28	No further comments
29	No further comments
30	No further comments
31	No further comments
32	Disagree to the full lot. Stockton is a small town. There is not enough money in it as it is so stop making peoples lives worse
33	No further comments
34	No further comments
35	No further comments
36	No further comments
37	More consultation could have been undertaken with the Trade, the new measures seem to have been drawn up by someone with limited knowledge of the taxi trade
38	No further comments
39	SBC must no try to complicate things by adding unnecessary items in the hackney policy
40	No further comments
41	I am concerned about the number of driver licenses being issued, flooding the Borough with taxis means our income falls, which means having to work longer hours to make a living. This causes fatigue and increases the risk to us and passengers of accidents. Stockton Borough Licensed Private Hire Companies are using cars from other Boroughs. Do these cars meet Stockton standards? Again this also adds to the above problem of diluting business, more spot checks should be carried out to stop overcharging, poor treatment of customers and unlicensed drivers

42	No further comments
43	Some policies need changing and amended, or be scrapped as say for example having 25% wheelchair accessible vehicles will not make the taxi trade busier. Basically drivers will loose more as the vehicles are expensive. Bus lanes need to be open for taxis drivers
44	I think the council should leave things as they are for the moment, country is struggling financially, and enforcing new cars/rules is only making things hard, for new and old drivers. Please help us
45	No further comments
46	No further comments
47	No further comments
48	I think it is difficult to make enough money to make a living in Stockton as it is a very small town and not enough custom
49	No further comments
50	No further comments
51	No further comments
52	I believe that the current system works and should be left alone at this time. These times are hard enough without the Council putting more pressure on the trade. I believe the trade is providing a safe, efficient and quality service overall and I believe that we should be allowed to carry on doing so without any changes being made.
53	No further comments
54	No further comments
55	No further comments
56	No further comments
57	No further comments
58	Should be up to the drivers if they want saloon or wheelchair accessible vehicle. Bus lanes should be open for taxi drivers. Drug testing should become intelligence led only. As looking at the figures it suggest out of 131 drivers tested only 3 failed negatives. Funding should be sought for NVQ and BTEC. Licensed vehicle emissions should stay at 3 rather than 5. Most policies can only work if the economy is moving of which Stockton is the opposite (quiet)
59	SBC Licensing Department should support hackney driver by providing more spacious ranks in busy locations especially in Yarm outside Cross Keys. It is not fair to not allow hackney drivers to pick up form such a prime location. Unauthorised private hire ranks to be immediately stopped (Tees Valley outside Swallow Hotel lay-by, Royal Cars outside Cross Keys in Yarm)
60	The current policy is just sufficient with cars and should be untouched on these matter as it is only creating extra pressure to driver to find extra money when work in Stockton is limited
61	I am over 60 years old. I have just had my house repossessed because of financial difficulty. I don't have the means to pay for one of these cabs. The taxi trade in Stockton does not offer enough money to pay for theses cabs unless you are lucky enough to get a good school contract, not enough to go round (school contracts)
62	The only other comment is that whilst we have to comply with rules and regulations, the Council also are obliged to enforce them, i.e. Private Hire Drivers when they drop off they are supposed to return to officer/designated parking area, not park up outside pubs or in Yarm High Street as they were allowed to do on Saturday 28 January 2012 outside Cross Keys in Yarm, with Council Officers present
63	Nobody can afford these £26k cabs, only a few drivers who got lucrative school contracts can pay off this amount of dept. You have licensed a large number of private hire 8 seaters and these have taken the school contracts. There's I no demand for cabs on our ranks. Look for yourself set up a camera and watch. I am on Stockton rank most days and I cannot recall the last time I saw a wheelchair go in a cab. The disabled passengers I have spoken to prefer saloon cars they feel safety sat in a proper car seat with a seatbelt on. As I said a large number of the school contracts previously done by cabs have gone to private hire vehicles and also to a growing number of mini bus owners. The large influx of higher carrying capacity vans and mini buses has taken the work for the cabs. In the last two months two more cabs have been sold because owners did not get school contracts.

	There is no demand in Stockton for these cabs.
64	There are many drivers who are over 50 years old and are looking to retire within the next 5 to 10 years. I think asking them to take on massive bank loans at this time in life is disgraceful, these purpose builds are over £24k each and with finance that will exceed £32k. Many drivers cannot get this finance and will end up unemployed. You're messing with people's livelihoods, families and children. Are you trying to put more people out of work? Stockton is dying and you're trying to kill it off completely.
65	The current Policy 2009 does comply with national standards and it should continue. The Council trying to introduce new points in the Policy are not viable as some are only just suggestions and has no evidence to back these proposals.
66	Changes and charges, also why do council no sit with SHDA to comply with suggested changes. Instead you hide it and do it very quietly and sneaky
67	No further comments
68	No further comments
69	No further comments
70	No further comments
71	No further comments
72	No further comments
73	SBC should continue with the current policy, its legislations and rules are of the highest standards when compared nationally
74	The Council appear to be trying to make our jobs harder then it is already. They would like us to spend thousands of pounds on vehicles that have never been tested. It would be preferable to leave us alone to do our job that we have already passed all the tests for. I also owned a TXI black cab for twelve and half years and never once picked up a wheelchair passenger in all that time from the ranks.
75	No further comments
76	No further comments
77	No further comments
78	No further comments
79	No further comments
80	I think that taxi drivers are targeted and are often the first group when fees and charges want to be increased. Across the council new charges are being invented, however, driving a taxi is often the only option for those who do not have confidence to get a vocational job. They are already earning less, are unfairly affected by petrol rises, depreciation of the value of car and find it harder to find alternative employment.
81	No further comments
82	No further comments
83	No further comments
84	No further comments
85	No further comments
86	No further comments
87	Taxi drivers are the first to be targeted when fees need to be increased
88	No further comments
89	No further comments
90	No further comments
91	No further comments
92	No further comments
93	No further comments
94	No further comments
95	No further comments
96	Don't agree with wheelchair accessible vehicles; Don't agree with drug test; Factory fitted Tint Test; NCAP already in force by manufacturer
97	No further comments
98	SBC Licensing Department should support Hackney Drivers by providing more spacious ranks in busy locations especially in Yarm outside Cross Keys. It is not fair to not allow hackney drivers to pick up from such a prime location. Unauthorised Private Hire ranks to

	be immediately stopped (Tees Valley outside Swallow Hotel lay-by and Royal Cars outside Cross Keys in Yarm)
99	No further comments
100	No further comments
101	No further comments
102	No further comments
103	No further comments
104	The Council (Licensing) has done a bad job and need an independent review
105	Drivers should be consulted
106	No further comments
107	No further comments
108	Drivers should be consulted with all the time
109	No further comments
110	No further comments
111	I do not agree with wheelchair vehicles; don't agree with drug test at all; why do you need tint test; NCAP already in force by Government
112	No further comments
113	I think that Stockton Council should listen to taxi driver's views who are also public servants and give taxi drivers more rank spaces instead of taking the existing ones away for them. Stockton Council should also look at the antics of certain private hire firms who operate in the town, especially when its blatantly obvious that the firms (private hire) are flouting the rules set down by the Council
114	No further comments
115	Taxi drives should not be targeted as it is not fair. It will not help drivers to learn
116	My suggestion is Council should make the things easier for hackney carriage drivers instead of making their life worse. Things we are not agreed with reason is we can't afford to do them
117	No further comments
118	Drivers should be taken on board in each and every part of the policy so that the policy can be more reflective to the need of the trade
119	No further comments
120	No further comments
121	No further comments
122	What upsets me the most is this, when the Licensing Department was set up it was to work with the trade hand in glove for the better of all concerned. For the drivers and local authority to benefit by cooperation and enjoy freedom of signs and ultimately provide a taxi service well policed with honest drivers providing the public with what it needs. Over the years idiotic taxi drivers and stubborn Councillor Officials have fallen out over matters which should have been dealt with and handled easily instead of going to court. Surely things should be sorted across the table
123	No further comments
124	The licensing authority every year comes up with all these proposals. More hackney carriage on the road less rank places. The council fees for the plates and the tests of the vehicle and the badge fees are far higher than the surrounding borough councils. The council should look into reducing the fees
125	No further comments
126	No further comments
127	Stop wasting money on ridiculous stuff like this
128	Today's problems with the country I think we do not need wheelchair; No drug testing; no window testing; the Government has NCAP already in force; can you please take some points from the drivers
129	Plate test fees also badge fees – SBC £370 plate £120 two tests – total £490; Badge fees £85 (1 year) £206 (3 year) other authorities cheaper -Why?
130	The Council should find up to 95% of the purchase cost for any driver willing to purchase a WCA car
131	No further comments

132	No further comments
133	No further comments
134	Badge fees is too expensive for SBC £210 for 3 years. Plate fees also too expensive £490 a year. Please check all council prices in the north east
135	Plate fees, can you justify SBC charges
136	I think SBC should listen to the trade who also provide a public service and not have this cavalier attitude that the council is right and without proper consultation bring in legislation that affects peoples livelihoods. SBC should think about providing more rank spaces in prime locations and not take or reduce spaces. They should also use their resources in tackling the touting of fares by a particular private hire firm in the town instead of turning a blind eye
137	SBC would be making a big mistake if they ever thought of not allowing grandfather rights to saloon hackney carriages. The Council has higher standard taxi test which already exists in the policy and they should maintain this standard. In this time of economic hardship the council should not force any burden on the taxi trade to make too many changes. Why change when a good service is provided within the Borough
138	So many people are out of work due to some with financial hardship. Make policy simple and encourage unemployed people to work, to look after their families, not to stay unemployed
139	No further comments
140	I think in this questionnaire taxi drivers been targeted at present financially hard time. Stockton Council should give support to driver. Driver puts themselves under debt give support not make life hard
141	I don't understand why Council is trying its best to make hard to earn a living. Saloon cars should be replaced with saloon cars and the training should only be for new drivers not the already experienced drivers. The council should realise that many taxi drivers are classed as low income. Expecting drivers to buy or to replace with wheelchair vehicle will drive many drivers into debt and poverty
142	The lack of care of duty to hackney carriage; we are paying the council a yearly fee for out licence for our vehicles and all I can see is we are loosing all our rank spaces and PH's are allowed to park up anywhere and apply for hire and nothing is said in Stockton and Yarm etc; We have only 96 rank spaces and there is 300 hackney carriage licensed and how do you justify this what the council are doing; The Council should be working for us hackney drivers but hey are not. I my eyes they are all for the private hires
143	The licensing department should educate the public through advertisements. Also do some concrete efforts to stop the private hire s to pick up from the street and should not allow the private hire firm to put their phone close to the ranks such as the Cross Keys, Yarm
144	The current policy 2009 does comply with the national standards and it should continue. The Council tying to introduce new points in the policy are not viable as some are only just suggestions and has no evidence to back these proposals
145	No further comments
146	I think that taxi drivers are targeted and are often the first group where fees and charges want to be increased. Council should listen to the SHDA as it is not fair on hackney drivers
147	I think in this questionnaire, taxi drivers been targeted. At present financially hard times Stockton Council should give support to drivers, but one can feel things are totally opposite. Job is really very quiet, but council wants drivers put their selves under debt. Give support not make life hard
148	No further comments
149	The Council should leave the drivers alone as it is already hard to earn just to meet the needs and never mind new cars or wheelchair accessible vehicles. In past the Council made policies which were proven wrong in the end or they didn't work, so this time Council should listen to drivers
150	No further comments
151	No further comments