

# Licensing Committee

A meeting of Licensing Committee was held on Tuesday, 2nd February, 2010.

**Present:** Cllr Jim Beall, Cllr Dick Cains, Cllr Mrs Eileen Craggs, Cllr Ken Dixon, Cllr Miss Tina Large, Cllr Colin Leckonby, Cllr Alan Lewis, Cllr Mrs Kath Nelson, Cllr Maurice Perry, Cllr Roy Rix, Cllr Fred Salt, Cllr Bill Woodhead

**Officers:** M Vaines, S Mills, P Edwards (DNS) J Nertney, P K Bell (LD).

**Also in attendance:** For agenda item 6 - Mr I Q, Mr I R (Witness), Mrs E C (Witness), Mr C H and Mrs J H (Support for Mrs E C); For agenda item 7 - Mr M B; For agenda item 8 - Mr I D W, Mrs J W (Support for Mr I D W), Mr J Lynch (Local Authority Designated Officer); For agenda item 9 - Mr S M H; For agenda item 10 - Mr A M K; For agenda item 12 Mr S A L.

**Apologies:** Cllr Mrs Jean Kirby and Cllr Paul Kirton.

## **L 71/09**      **Declarations of Interest**

Cllr Miss Large declared a personal prejudicial interest in respect of agenda item 8 - Private Hire Driver - Mr I D W and withdrew from the meeting and left the room during consideration of the item.

Cllr Mrs Craggs declared a personal prejudicial interest in respect of agenda item 8 - Private Hire Driver - Mr I D W and withdrew from the meeting and left the room during consideration of the item.

## **L 72/09**      **Private Hire & Hackney Carriage Licensing Policy - Introduction of Drug Testing of Licensed Drivers**

Consideration was given to a report that informed Members of the progress made to date in respect of the introduction of a scheme for the drug testing of hackney carriage and private hire drivers.

The proposal to introduce random drug testing of hackney carriage and private hire drivers was introduced in the revised Private Hire and Hackney Carriage Licensing Policy which was approved by Cabinet on 5 March 2009 (Minute 158/08 referred).

Following this decision enquiries were made with another local authority who already carried out such testing and when it was decided to purchase the Councils own DDS (Drug Detection System) machine, which was an on-site oral fluid CE marked screening device, and to have Licensing Officers trained in the use of the equipment. The machine was available at the meeting for demonstration.

The screening machine would analyse a saliva sample for the following range of drugs and provides an instant result:-

- Cannabinoides
- Cocaine
- Opiates
- Ecstasy
- Amphetamines

- Benzodiazepines

The global drug testing services of Concateno plc had been used for the purchase of the drug testing equipment; the training of Licensing Officers and the laboratory analysis of samples when required.

Following consultation and meetings with the trade a drug testing procedure had been drafted a copy of which was attached to the report for Members information.

Whilst formal planned drug testing exercises had not yet been carried out, five drivers had however been tested. Of these, four proved negative and one positive for amphetamines. The positive driver was subjected to the second stage formal sample which was sent for laboratory analysis and this also proved positive for amphetamines. This driver had been suspended and was the subject of a separate report for consideration by Members.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

**L  
73/09**      **Exclusion of the Public**

RESOLVED that under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

**L  
74/09**      **Private Hire Driver Licence - A.S.**

The Licensing Officer informed Members that Miss A S had informed the Licensing Unit that she was in hospital and would be unable to attend the meeting. Members agreed that as Miss A S was already suspended with immediate effect on the grounds of public safety the item be deferred to a future meeting.

RESOLVED that the item be deferred.

**L  
75/09**      **Combined Driver - I.Q.**

Consideration was given to a report on a licensed combined Hackney Carriage/Private Hire Driver who had been complained about by two members of the public. The complaint was with regard to Mr I Q's manner of driving.

Mr I Q was a combined Hackney Carriage/Private Hire Driver with the authority and had been licensed with the Authority since March 2008. His licence was due to expire on 30th June 2010.

In October 2009, the licensing department received two complaints from members of the public with regard to the manner of driving of Mr I Q. The first complainant was the passenger in his vehicle at the time. The other complainant was the van driver. A copy of the witness statements were attached to the report.

Mr I Q was interviewed on 9th December 2009 regarding the complaint. During interview Mr I Q gave a similar account of the events. A summary of the transcript of the interview was attached to the report.

Mr I Q advised officers that he did not believe he did anything wrong in his manoeuvre he did change lane in front of the van driver but he indicated and there was plenty of room. He then advised officers he was frightened for his own and his passengers safety, when the van driver started to follow him.

The female passenger advised in her statement that the taxi driver was driving with only one hand on the steering wheel and then giving the two-finger gesture to the van driver. Mr I Q advised this was not the case and that at no point did he give that gesture to the van driver. The female passenger also advised in her statement that she had health problems, angina and high blood pressure, and the experience she had during this car journey had her so frightened she was worried she may suffer a heart attack.

The van driver advised during his statement the reason he followed the taxi was because he was worried for the safety of the passenger and he wanted to ensure she was OK.

Mr I Q contacted the police and he advised this was because he was concerned for his and his passengers safety. He also contacted his Operator using their 'panic button' in the car. Following checks made with the Operator the 'panic button' was a number that was typed in to their data system, which informed the operator that the driver was in trouble. It was then normal protocol for the operator to dispatch any drivers in the vicinity to the location. This was to ensure that the driver in trouble is not being a victim of any physical abuse, as sometimes it can take time for the Police to arrive.

In Mr I Q's interview, he did confirm that when the van driver approached his vehicle, and tried to access the taxi he did approach the right hand rear door first. Officers did put it to Mr I Q that perhaps this was confirmation that the van driver was concerned for the safety of the passenger in the taxi and was not intending any malice towards the driver.

The Police Officer advised both parties that they would not be taking any action against either party involved in the incident and it would be treated as a Road Traffic Accident and both parties must exchange insurance details.

According to Council records, Mr I Q's driver history showed he had not received any other complaints or enforcement visits.

Members were reminded that under the provisions of Section 61 (1)(a) of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 the Council may suspend or revoke or refuse to renew the licence of a hackney carriage and/or private hire driver on any of the following grounds: -

(a) that he has since the grant of the Licence:-

(i) been convicted of an offence involving dishonesty, indecency or Violence; or

(ii) been convicted of an offence under or fails to comply the provisions of the

Act of 1847 or of this part of this Act; or

(b) any other reasonable cause.

Members were also advised of the revisions to Section 61 introduced under the Road Safety Act 2006 as follows:-

(2a) Subject to subsection (2b) of this section, a suspension or revocation of the licence of a driver under this section takes effect at the end of the period of 21 days beginning with the day on which the notice is given to the driver under subsection (2)(a) of this section

(2b) If it appears that the interests of public safety require the suspension or revocation of the licence to have immediate effect, and the notice given to the driver under subsection (2)(a) of this section includes a statement that that is so and an explanation why, the suspension or revocation takes effect when the notice is given to the driver.

A copy of the adopted guidelines relating to the Relevance of convictions was attached to the report for Member's information.

Mr I Q, Mr I R (Witness), Mrs E C (Witness), Mr C H and Mrs J H (Support for Mrs E C) were in attendance at the meeting and were given the opportunity to state their case.

After giving due consideration to the facts of the matter the Members preferred the evidence of the witnesses. Members took a very dim view of the incident and would not tolerate this type of behaviour by a hackney carriage / private hire driver licensed with Stockton Borough Council.

Members felt Mr I Q's actions were serious enough to revoke his combined hackney carriage and private hire driver's licence. However, following much deliberation of the facts and since Mr I Q had not received any other complaints since the grant of his licence, Members decided on this occasion, to allow Mr I Q to keep his combined hackney carriage and private hire driver's licence and to issue him with this severe final written warning. This was also conditional that Mr I Q writes a letter of apology to Mrs E C and hand deliver it to the Licensing Unit, who would ensure that Mrs E C received it.

Members had serious concern with regard to Mr I Q's manner of driving which fell short of what was expected of a licensed driver and they determined Mr I Q must therefore complete the Driver Improvement Course, at his own cost, as a matter of urgency.

The letter was a warning as to Mr I Q's future conduct. The letter would remain on Mr I Q's file and would be referred to should any further complaints or disciplinary matters come to the attention of the Licensing Unit.

RESOLVED that:-

1. Mr I Q receive a severe final written warning.
2. Mr I Q writes a letter of apology to Mrs E C and hand deliver it to the

Licensing Unit, who would ensure that Mrs E C received it.

3. Mr I Q attend the Driver Improvement Course at his own expense and as a matter of urgency.

**L  
76/09**

### **Application For A Private Hire Drivers Licence - M.B.**

Consideration was given to a report on an application for a private hire driver's licence from an applicant who had relevant convictions.

Mr M B had submitted an application to become a licensed private hire driver with the Authority. A copy of his application was attached to the report.

An important part of the vetting process was to undertake a Criminal Record Bureau check. The CRB disclosed that Mr M B had a number of serious convictions, dating back to 1964. It was noted that the last serious relevant conviction was in 1994. There had been no relevant convictions since that time.

A copy of the CRB disclosure was available at the meeting.

Mr M B was interviewed, regarding his convictions, on the 16th December 2009.

Mr M B also explained the circumstances surrounding his conviction in 1994.

A summary of the transcript was attached to the report.

Mr M B had provided references from recent previous employers and these were attached to the report.

A copy of the Council's guidance on the Relevance of Convictions was attached to the report Members information.

Members were respectfully reminded that under the provisions of section 51(1)(a) of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provision) Act 1976, District Councils are instructed not to grant a licence to drive private hire vehicles, unless they are satisfied that the applicant is a fit and proper person to hold such a licence.

Mr M B was in attendance at the meeting and was given the opportunity to state his case.

Members took into account the references Mr M B had provided in support of his application and the comments he had made during the meeting.

Members noted Mr M B's history of serious criminal convictions and had concerns regarding this previous record. Members took into consideration the period of time that had elapsed since his last serious conviction and therefore as a result of their deliberations decided, on this occasion, to put their trust in Mr M B and to grant him a Private Hire Driver's licence with a written warning.

This licence was therefore issued with a serious warning as to Mr M B's future conduct. The letter would remain on his file and may be referred to should any complaints, disciplinary matters or further convictions come to the attention of

the Licensing Unit.

RESOLVED that Mr M B be granted a Private Hire Driver's licence with a written warning as to his future conduct.

**L  
77/09**

**Private Hire Driver - I.D.W.**

Consideration was given to a report on a private hire driver who had his licence suspended by officers following notification from Cleveland Police that he had been arrested. The driver had not been charged with any offence and the police had confirmed that no further action would be taken. The drivers licence had expired and a renewal application had been submitted.

Mr I D W was a licensed private hire driver. He had been licensed with the Council since 1988, and his licence had expired on 30th November 2009. An application to renew this licence had been received and a copy was attached to the report.

On 29 June 2009 Notification was received from Cleveland Police that Mr I D W had been arrested. The circumstances related to an alleged incident that took place on 1st January 2007. A copy of this notification was attached to the report.

On receipt of this notification the Principal Licensing Officer using delegated powers suspended Mr I D W's private hire driver's licence pending the outcome of the criminal investigation. Due to the serious nature of the allegation and in the interests of public safety the suspension was with immediate effect. Mr I D W did not appeal against this notice and his licence remained suspended. A copy of the suspension notice was attached to the report.

On 3 November 2009 notification was received from the police that a decision had been made to take no further action but no explanation or further information was provided. A copy of this letter was attached to the report.

In an attempt to obtain further information Mr I D W agreed to sign consent to the police releasing relevant information relating to their investigation, which he did, and a letter was sent to the police requesting additional information. A copy of this letter was attached to the report.

On 19th November 2009 a reply was received from the police advising that the only information they were able to provide was that which had already been given. A copy of this letter was attached to the report.

Contact was made with the Councils acting LADO (Local Authority Designated Officer) in the Safeguarding Children Board to ascertain whether this allegation involving a licensed taxi driver met the criteria for evaluation and management through a LADO meeting which would involve all agencies that had been involved in the investigation of the complaint.

It was agreed by the LADO that the allegations did meet the criteria and a multi agency meeting took place in accordance with guidance in the "Procedures for Working together to Safeguard Children in Stockton on Tees" on 16th December 2009. Details of this meeting were contained within the report.

Additional information was also provided at the meeting by the police representative regarding an incident that took place on 1st September 2009 but after further investigation the police took no further action.

On 20th January 2010 further information was received from the LADO and this information was detailed within the report.

Council records showed that there had been no previous complaints against Mr I D W during the period he had been licensed.

Members were reminded that under the provisions of Section 61(1)(a) of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 the Council may suspend or revoke or refuse to renew the licence of a hackney carriage and/or private hire driver on any of the following grounds:-

(a) that he has since the grant of the licence:-

(i) been convicted of an offence involving dishonesty, indecency or violence; or

(ii) been convicted of an offence under or fails to comply with the provisions of the Act of 1847 or of this part of this Act; or

(b) any other reasonable cause

Members were also advised of the revisions to Section 61 introduced under the Road Safety Act 2006 as follows:-

(2A) Subject to subsection (2B) of this section, a suspension or revocation of the licence of a driver under this section takes effect at the end of the period of 21 days beginning with the day on which the notice is given to the driver under subsection (2)(a) of this section

(2B) If it appears that the interests of public safety require the suspension or revocation of the licence to have immediate effect, and the notice given to the driver under subsection (2)(a) of this section includes a statement that that is so and an explanation why, the suspension or revocation takes effect when the notice is given to the driver.

The LADO (Mr John Lynch) Mr I D W and his wife Mrs J W were in attendance at the meeting and were given the opportunity to state their case.

Members decided to lift the suspension of Mr I D W's Private Hire Driver's Licence and approved his renewal application for the same licence.

Members arrived at their decision after giving due consideration of the report and to the comments made at the meeting by Mr I D W and by the Council's Local Authority Designated Officer (LADO) Mr Lynch.

Members agreed that officers had acted correctly in suspending Mr I D W's driver's licence because of the serious nature of the allegations. They listened carefully and were influenced by what Mr Lynch had to say regarding the conclusions reached at the LADO meeting following the deliberation of information provided by the Police and Social Workers regarding their

investigations into the allegation. They agreed with their finding that on the balance of probabilities Mr I D W did not commit the alleged offence.

With regard to the information from the Police regarding the allegation on 1st September 2009 Members accepted Mr I D W's explanation and also his offer to undergo drug testing. Mr I D W's licence renewal was approved subject to satisfactory testing.

RESOLVED that:-

1. Mr I D W's Private Hire Driver's Licence suspension be lifted.
2. Mr I D W's Private Hire Driver's Licence application be approved subject to Mr I D W taking a drug test and providing a negative response.

**L  
78/09**

#### **Combined Driver - S.M.H.**

Consideration was given to a report on a licensed hackney carriage and private hire driver who had received a final severe warning from the Committee in September 2008 and had since then been convicted of a motoring offence namely driving whilst using a hand held mobile and as a result has 12 penalty points on his DVLA driving licence, but had not been disqualified due to exceptional hardship.

Mr S M H was a licensed hackney carriage and private hire driver, driver number 114. Mr S M H had been a licensed driver since January 2005 and his licence expired on 31 January 2010.

On 4th December 2009, a notification of a Motoring Conviction was received from Mr S M H, regarding an offence, which he committed on the 18th June 2009. Mr S M H was requested to attend an interview with officers to establish the facts surrounding conviction. However, Mr S M H explained he would rather make written submissions than attend an interview to save time and a copy of his submission letter was attached to the report.

A copy of Mr S M H's driving licence was attached to the report.

Members were advised that Mr S M H appeared before the Licensing Committee in September 2008 and he received a final severe warning as to his future conduct. Copies of the meeting minute and Committee decision letter were attached to the report.

Members were reminded that under the provisions of Section 61 (1)(a) of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 the Council may suspend or revoke or refuse to renew the licence of a hackney carriage and/or private hire driver on any of the following grounds:-

(a) that he has since the grant of the Licence: -

- (i) been convicted of an offence involving dishonesty, indecency or Violence; or
- (ii) been convicted of an offence under or fails to comply the provisions of the



Act of 1847 or of this part of this Act; or

(b) any other reasonable cause.

Members were also advised of the revisions to Section 61 introduced under the Road Safety Act 2006 as follows:-

(2a) Subject to subsection (2b) of this section, a suspension or revocation of the licence of a driver under this section takes effect at the end of the period of 21 days beginning with the day on which the notice is given to the driver under subsection (2)(a) of this section

(2b) If it appears that the interests of public safety require the suspension or revocation of the licence to have immediate effect, and the notice given to the driver under subsection (2)(a) of this section includes a statement that that is so and an explanation why, the suspension or revocation takes effect when the notice is given to the driver.

A copy of the Council Guidelines on the Relevance of Convictions was attached to the report for Members information.

Mr S M H was in attendance at the meeting and was given the opportunity to state his case.

Members had regard to the documentary evidence Mr S M H provided regarding the health of his parents, however public safety was paramount and this was not an adequate excuse for using a mobile phone whilst driving.

It was noted at the meeting that Mr S M H had received a final warning from the Licensing Committee in 2008. The Committee considered Mr S M H's driving standards as appalling and were minded to revoke his licence. However, they decided to give Mr S M H one last chance and to issue him with a final severe warning as to his future conduct.

A copy of the letter would be placed on Mr S M H's driver file and would be referred to should any future complaints or convictions be brought to the attention of the Council.

RESOLVED that Mr S M H be issued with a final severe warning as to his future conduct.

**L  
79/09**

**Combined Driver - A.M.K.**

Consideration was given to a report on a licensed hackney carriage driver/private hire driver who had since the grant of his licence received a Police Caution for Handling Stolen Goods.

Mr A M K was a Combined Hackney Carriage/Private Hire Drivers Licence with the Authority and his licence was due to expire 30th June 2010.

As part of the ongoing fitness of assessment a licensed driver they were required to undertake a Criminal Record Bureau (CRB) check every three years. This was done and returned to the applicant with a copy being sent to the Local

Authority on the 15th July 2008. This revealed that Mr A M K had a received a Police Caution for handling stolen goods on the 7th December 2005 and failed to notify the Licensing Department within 7 days as per his driver licence conditions. A copy of the CRB was available at the meeting.

Due to the serious nature of the caution Mr A M K was interviewed under caution on the 13th August 2008, during the interview he explained that he was not aware that he received a Police Caution. A transcript of the interview was attached to the report.

Mr A M K then wrote a letter to the Licensing Department informing them that he was disputing the caution that was on his a CRB. A copy of the letter was attached to the report.

A letter was received from the Criminal Records Bureau on the 19th August 2008 which confirmed Mr A M K had disputed the caution as he believed the information to be inaccurate. A copy of which was attached to the report.

On the 24th September 2009 the Licensing Unit received a further letter from the Criminal Records Bureau which confirmed that the CRB for Mr A M K was accurate. A copy of this letter was attached to the report.

Members were advised that before Mr A M K was first licensed his application became before this Committee for determination because Mr A M K had a relevant serious motoring conviction. Members resolved that Mr A M K be given the benefit of doubt and his application to drive private hire/hackney carriage vehicles be approved with a written warning as to his future conduct. A copy of the meeting minute which referred was attached to the report.

Member were reminded that under the provisions of Section 61 (1)(a) of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 the Council may suspend or revoke or refuse to renew the licence of a hackney carriage and/or private hire driver on any of the following grounds:-

(a) that he has since the grant of the Licence: -

(i) been convicted of an offence involving dishonesty, indecency or Violence; or

(ii) been convicted of an offence under or fails to comply the provisions of the Act of 1847 or of this part of this Act; or

(b) any other reasonable cause.

and Section 61(2)

(A) Subject to subsection (2B) of this section, a suspension or revocation of the licence of a driver under this section takes effect at the end of the period of 21 days beginning with the day on which notice is given to the driver under subsection (2)(a) of this section,

(B) If it appears in the interests of public safety require the suspension or revocation of the licence to have immediate effect, and the notice given to the driver under subsection (2) (a) of this section includes a statement that that is so

and an explanation why, the suspension or revocation takes effect when the notice is given to the driver.

A copy of the adopted guidelines relating to the Relevance of convictions was attached to the report for Member's information.

Mr A M K was in attendance at the meeting and was given the opportunity to state his case.

Members had regard to what Mr A M K had to say in relation to the Police caution and also the fact that Mr A M K had agreed to act as a police witness and against the person he had bought the radio off. Although the caution was a dishonesty offence which was considered to be a serious offence Members noted that Mr A M K had stated that he was allegedly unaware he had received a caution. After giving due consideration to the facts of the matter and the period of time which had elapsed from the date of the caution Members decided to issue with Mr A M K with a final written warning as to his future conduct.

RESOLVED that Mr A M K be issued with a final written warning as to his future conduct.

**L**  
**80/09**      **Application For A Private Hire Drivers Licence - R.S.**

The Licensing Officer informed Members that Mr R S had been present in the morning of the Licensing Committee but as the meeting had ran into the afternoon Mr R S had been requested to return to his place of work. Members agreed that the item should be deferred to the next meeting of the Committee.

RESOLVED that the item be deferred.

**L**  
**81/09**      **Application for Licence to Drive Private Hire Vehicles - Mr S H L**

Consideration was given to a report on an applicant for a private hire driver's licence who had relevant convictions for dishonesty offences and who had had a previous application refused for submitting false documentation.

Mr S A L had submitted an application for a licence to drive private hire vehicles with this Authority. A copy of his application was attached to the report.

Mr S A L had been subject to a Criminal Record Bureau (CRB) check which disclosed relevant convictions for offences of dishonesty. A copy of the CRB disclosure was available at the meeting.

Mr S A L was interviewed on 8th January 2009 and a summary of the transcript of the interview was attached to the report.

On the 11th January 2005 Mr S A L was convicted under Section 35 of the Road Traffic Offences Act for using a driving without insurance and received a 6 month disqualification. Mr S A L said he was under financial pressures at this time and he could not afford the insurance on his vehicle and was pulled over by a police officer and found to have no insurance on his vehicle.

On the 6th June 2006 Mr S A L was convicted of Using Licence with intent to

deceive under the Road Traffic Offences Act and received a caution. Again Mr S A L said he was under financial pressures at this time; he could not afford the road tax on his vehicle and made a photocopy of a tax disc to use until such time as he could afford to tax his vehicle legally. A police officer spotted the forgery whilst patrolling the street where the vehicle was parked.

On the 26th June 2006 Mr S A L was convicted of 2 counts of Using False instrument for other than prescription for scheduled Drug S.3 Forgery and Counterfeiting Act for which he received a 6 month conditional discharge. Mr S A L submitted an application for a private hire license to the authority, during the course of the application process Licensing Officer Simon Mills found a discrepancy with the names stated on Mr S A L's birth certification and other documents. He advised the applicant that he would need to talk to the registry office and get another birth certificate in his own name. Mr S A L resubmitted his birth certificate with amendments he had made himself. The Licensing Officer prosecuted Mr S A L for this forgery offence and his application was refused by officers using delegated powers.

In his current application Mr S A L did not declare his caution on the 6th June 2005 or his convictions on 26th June 2007. Mr S A L said he forgot to list the offences at the time, and was waiting to see what convictions came back on his CRB. Although he did complete the application with a solicitor, the solicitor did not ask him if he had any other offences to declare other than those listed on his driving license.

Mr S A L had no live motoring convictions and a copy of his DVLA driver's license was attached to the report for Members information.

A copy of the Council's guidelines on the Relevance of Convictions was attached to the report for Members information.

Members were respectfully reminded that under the provisions of Section 51(1)(a) of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 District Councils are instructed not to grant a licence to drive private hire vehicles unless they are satisfied that the applicant is a fit and proper person to hold such a licence.

Members were advised that Mr S A L had passed both the driving standards and medical requirements and if considered to be a fit and proper person at this time based on his CRB disclosure, his application would proceed and on successful completion of his knowledge test his licence would be granted.

Mr S A L was in attendance at the meeting and was given the opportunity to state his case.

Members decided to refuse Mr S A L's application for the grant of a Private Hire drivers licence on the grounds that he was not considered to be a fit and proper person at this time because of his convictions. Members arrived at the decision after consideration of the report and to Mr S A L's comments made at the meeting.

On hearing Mr S A L's comments Members concluded that Mr S A L had not provided any sufficient reason to depart from the guidelines on the relevance of

convictions and Members recommended that Mr S A L should demonstrate 3 years free from conviction before reapplying for a licence, i.e. not before July 2010.

RESOLVED that Mr S A L's application for the grant of a Private Hire Drivers Licence be refused on the grounds that he was not considered to be a fit and proper person at this time because of his convictions.