

# AGENDA

## Regulatory Committee

Date: **Friday 27 April 2012**

---

Time: **10.00 am**

---

Place: **The Council Chamber, Brockington, 35 Hafod Road,  
Hereford**

---

Notes: Please note the **time, date** and **venue** of the meeting.

For any further information please contact:

**Pete Martens, Committee Manager Planning & Regulatory**

Tel: 01432 260248

Email: [pmartens@herefordshire.gov.uk](mailto:pmartens@herefordshire.gov.uk)

---

If you would like help to understand this document, or would like it in another format or language, please call Pete Martens, Committee Manager Planning & Regulatory on 01432 260248 or e-mail [pmartens@herefordshire.gov.uk](mailto:pmartens@herefordshire.gov.uk) in advance of the meeting.

# Agenda for the Meeting of the Regulatory Committee

## Membership

<b>Chairman</b>	<b>Councillor JW Hope MBE</b>
<b>Vice-Chairman</b>	<b>Councillor RC Hunt</b>
	<b>Councillor CM Bartrum</b>
	<b>Councillor PL Bettington</b>
	<b>Councillor BA Durkin</b>
	<b>Councillor Brig P Jones CBE</b>
	<b>Councillor PJ McCaull</b>
	<b>Councillor C Nicholls</b>
	<b>Councillor FM Norman</b>
	<b>Councillor GA Powell</b>

## GUIDANCE ON DECLARING PERSONAL AND PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS AT MEETINGS

### What is a personal interest?

You have a personal interest in a matter if that matter affects the well-being or financial position of you, your relatives or people with whom you have a close personal association more than it would affect the majority of other people in the ward(s) to which the matter relates.

A personal interest can affect you, your relatives or people with whom you have a close personal association positively or negatively. If you or they would stand to lose by the decision, you should also declare it.

You also have a personal interest in a matter if it relates to any interests, which you must register.

### What do I need to do if I have a personal interest?

You must declare it when you get to the item on the agenda headed "Declarations of Interest" or as soon as it becomes apparent to you. You may still speak and vote unless it is a prejudicial interest.

If a matter affects a body to which you have been appointed by the authority, or a body exercising functions of a public nature, you only need declare the interest if you are going to speak on the matter.

### What is a prejudicial interest?

You have a prejudicial interest in a matter if;

- a) a member of the public, who knows the relevant facts, would reasonably think your personal interest is so significant that it is likely to prejudice your judgment of the public interest; and
- b) the matter affects your financial interests or relates to a licensing or regulatory matter; and
- c) the interest does not fall within one of the exempt categories at paragraph 10(2)(c) of the Code of Conduct.

### What do I need to do if I have a prejudicial interest?

If you have a prejudicial interest you must withdraw from the meeting. However, under paragraph 12(2) of the Code of Conduct, if members of the public are allowed to make representations, give evidence or answer questions about that matter, you may also make representations as if you were a member of the public. However, you must withdraw from the meeting once you have made your representations and before any debate starts.

## AGENDA

	<b>Pages</b>
<b>1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> To receive apologies for absence.	
<b>2. NAMED SUBSTITUTES (IF ANY)</b> To receive details any details of Members nominated to attend the meeting in place of a Member of the Committee.	
<b>3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b> To receive any declarations of interest by Members in respect of items on the Agenda.	
<b>4. MINUTES</b> To approve and sign the Minutes of the meeting held on 21st February 2012.	1 - 2
<b>5. TO CONSIDER OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED INCREASES TO THE TAXI LICENCE FEES AND CHARGES</b> To consider objections to the proposed increases in fees and charges for Hackney Carriage and Private Hire licences.	3 - 20
<b>6. DATE OF NEXT MEETING - 8TH MAY 2012</b> To note that the next meeting is at on Tuesday 8th May, 2012 at 2:00 pm.	



## **The Public's Rights to Information and Attendance at Meetings**

### **YOU HAVE A RIGHT TO: -**

- Attend all Council, Cabinet, Committee and Sub-Committee meetings unless the business to be transacted would disclose 'confidential' or 'exempt' information.
- Inspect agenda and public reports at least five clear days before the date of the meeting.
- Inspect minutes of the Council and all Committees and Sub-Committees and written statements of decisions taken by the Cabinet or individual Cabinet Members for up to six years following a meeting.
- Inspect background papers used in the preparation of public reports for a period of up to four years from the date of the meeting. (A list of the background papers to a report is given at the end of each report). A background paper is a document on which the officer has relied in writing the report and which otherwise is not available to the public.
- Access to a public Register stating the names, addresses and wards of all Councillors with details of the membership of Cabinet and of all Committees and Sub-Committees.
- Have a reasonable number of copies of agenda and reports (relating to items to be considered in public) made available to the public attending meetings of the Council, Cabinet, Committees and Sub-Committees.
- Have access to a list specifying those powers on which the Council have delegated decision making to their officers identifying the officers concerned by title.
- Copy any of the documents mentioned above to which you have a right of access, subject to a reasonable charge (20p per sheet subject to a maximum of £5.00 per agenda plus a nominal fee of £1.50 for postage).
- Access to this summary of your rights as members of the public to attend meetings of the Council, Cabinet, Committees and Sub-Committees and to inspect and copy documents.

### **Public Transport Links**

- Public transport access can be gained to Brockington via the service runs approximately every 20 minutes from the City bus station at the Tesco store in Bewell Street (next to the roundabout junction of Blueschool Street / Victoria Street / Edgar Street).
- The nearest bus stop to Brockington is located in Vineyard Road near to its junction with Old Eign Hill. The return journey can be made from the same bus stop.

## **HEREFORDSHIRE COUNCIL**

**BROCKINGTON, 35 HAFOD ROAD, HEREFORD.**

### **FIRE AND EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE**

In the event of a fire or emergency the alarm bell will ring continuously.

You should vacate the building in an orderly manner through the nearest available fire exit.

You should then proceed to Assembly Point J which is located at the southern entrance to the car park. A check will be undertaken to ensure that those recorded as present have vacated the building following which further instructions will be given.

Please do not allow any items of clothing, etc. to obstruct any of the exits.

Do not delay your vacation of the building by stopping or returning to collect coats or other personal belongings.



Where possible this agenda is printed on paper made from 100% Post-Consumer waste. De-inked without bleaching and free from optical brightening agents (OBA). Awarded the Nordic Swan for low emissions during production and the Blue Angel environmental label

HEREFORDSHIRE COUNCIL

**MINUTES of the meeting of Regulatory Committee held at The Council Chamber, Brockington, 35 Hafod Road, Hereford on Tuesday 21 February 2012 at 11.00 am**

**Present:** Councillor JW Hope MBE (Chairman)  
Councillor RC Hunt (Vice Chairman)

Councillors: CM Bartrum, PL Bettington, Brig P Jones CBE, PJ McCaull, C Nicholls, FM Norman and GA Powell

**20. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor BA Durkin.

**21. NAMED SUBSTITUTES (IF ANY)**

There were no named substitutes present at the meeting.

**22. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest made at the meeting.

**23. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED:** That the Minutes of the meeting held on 15th November, 2011 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**24. SINGLE ENFORCEMENT AND PROSECUTION POLICY**

A report was presented by the Regulatory Services Programme Manager about proposals for the introduction of a single enforcement and prosecution policy for all relevant activities undertaken by the Council. He thanked the Democratic Services Officer who had helped to prepare the policy.

The Regulatory Services Programme Manager said that the Policy set out the general principles to be followed by the Council in relation to regulation, enforcement and prosecution. It focused on what businesses, individuals and the community could expect from the Council's regulatory services and its enforcement/investigation officers. The main function of the Council's regulatory and enforcement work was to protect the public, public funds, the environment and groups such as consumers, residents and tenants, workers and businesses. A single policy would enable all enforcement to be undertaken in a clear, consistent, equitable and practical manner for the benefit of those who needed to comply. He explained the extensive process that had been used to develop the policy, the different stages that had been gone through and the consultations that had been undertaken. He also explained the legislation and guidance that had been taken into consideration in preparing the policy, together with the policies and best practice developed by other councils.

Members discussed the proposals and asked a number of questions. It was also noted that The Committee still had an important roll to play in monitoring the performance of officers and the effectiveness of the policy. The Regulatory Services Programme Manager advised that the report would next be submitted to the Planning Committee and then to Cabinet in late March/early April. The Committee welcomed the proposals set out in the policy and thanked the officers for all the work that had been undertaken to prepare it.

**RESOLVED**

**THAT:**

- (a) the principle of a Single Enforcement and Prosecution Policy is supported;**
- (b) the detail contained within a Single Enforcement and Prosecution Policy is supported.**

**25. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

To be arranged.

The meeting ended at 11.30 am

**CHAIRMAN**



<b>MEETING:</b>	<b>REGULATORY COMMITTEE</b>
<b>DATE:</b>	<b>27 APRIL 2012</b>
<b>TITLE OF REPORT:</b>	<b>TO CONSIDER OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED INCREASES TO THE TAXI LICENCE FEES AND CHARGES</b>
<b>REPORT BY:</b>	<b>MARC WILLIMONT ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH &amp; TRADING STANDARDS HEALTH &amp; WELLBEING SERVICE</b>

**CLASSIFICATION:** Open

### **Wards Affected**

County-wide

### **Purpose**

To consider objections to the proposed increases in fees and charges for Hackney Carriage and Private Hire licences, these increases being proposed to obtain 'full cost recovery' for the Council. To further consider the additional costs of implementing a Taxi Marshalling Scheme.

### **Recommendation**

**THAT COMMITTEE:**

**Agrees the proposed fees as scheduled in Appendix 2 excluding the additional cost of £52 per hackney carriage renewal application for implementing a Taxi Marshalling Scheme.**

### **Key Points Summary**

- The fee increases intend the service to achieve 'full cost recovery' i.e. so that it is no longer subsidised. This follows the resolution made at Cabinet in June 2011.
- Full details of the proposed fee increases together with a consultation letter was sent to the trade and made available for public comment for 28 days.
- The increase was also advertised in the Hereford Journal.
- Before this 28 day consultation period commenced, the Taxi Association's committee was briefed at a meeting with the Cabinet Member and Director of People's Services.
- A Taxi Marshalling Scheme was also mentioned in the consultation letter, at a proposed additional cost of £52 per Hackney Carriage to deliver, if it were to be cost neutral to the Council Tax Payer. Although there were a number of supportive comments for such a scheme, overall

---

Further information on the subject of this report is available from  
Marc Willimont, Acting Head of Environmental Protection & Licensing (01432) 261986

the consultation responses indicate that the trade were not prepared to cover its cost. Therefore a Taxi Marshalling Scheme is not being recommended by this report.

- Since the release of the consultation letter, revised corporate support service costs are now available which have enabled the original proposed and consulted increases to be significantly reduced for full cost recovery.

## Alternative Options

There are a number of alternative options available to the Committee:

1. **Reject the proposed 'Full Cost Recovery' increases in Appendix 2 in their entirety and keep the fees the same as for 2011/12 or with only an RPI uplift.**

**Advantages:** Keeps the costs the same or similar to 2011/12 for the taxi trade.

**Disadvantages:** Will mean that the regulation of taxis will remain subsidised by the Council Tax Payer, thereby not fulfilling the resolution and instruction of Cabinet.

2. **Reject or amend some of the increases proposed in Appendix 2.**

**Advantages:** Does allow some increases to offset the current subsidy, but keeps other fees the same.

**Disadvantages:** It is likely that the Taxi Licensing service costs will still be greater than the fees and charges recovered, thereby not fulfilling the resolution and instruction of Cabinet.

3. **Agrees to the additional funding for a Taxi Marshalling Scheme**

**Advantages:** Improves traffic congestion and public safety in Commercial Road.

**Disadvantages:** Adds additional costs for trade and does not reflect the opinion from the consultation responses.

4. **Defer the decision.**

**Advantages:** Keeps the costs the same for the time being and could allow more time to resolve any disputes or conflicts with the trade.

**Disadvantages:** Any deferral will postpone the service's ability to achieve full cost recovery and make this more difficult in the remainder of the 2012/13 financial year.

## Reasons for Recommendations

5. Cabinet resolved at their meeting in June 2011 that all services should seek to increase their fees to secure 'full cost recovery'.

The consultation responses indicated that the Taxi Marshalling Scheme should not be recovered from an increase in licence application fees. This is because there appears to be a general feeling amongst the trade that taxi marshalling does not benefit the trade as a whole, but only those trade members who operate the nightshifts in Hereford City.

## Introduction and Background

6. The Council has the power to levy certain discretionary fees and charges for several of the regulatory services it provides. Taxi licensing is one such service area. For the past two years these fees have increased at an agreed inflationary uplift of 2%, although for several years

before this, they remained static.

7. A new fees and charges policy was agreed by Cabinet on 30<sup>th</sup> June 2011. This included moving towards full cost recovery.
8. Full cost recovery was therefore proposed for taxi licensing as shown in [Appendix 1](#) and this was consulted upon. This used the best and most up to date financial information available at that time. Since this consultation, the 2012/13 budget has been finalised and a better prediction of support service costs has become available which have both been used to recalculate more favourable fees and charges. These revised proposed fees are presented in [Appendix 2](#). Supporting work has been undertaken to individually map a number of these fees (e.g. taxi driver applications) to ensure that full costs are reflected in these individual charges, i.e.

*Officer time x total officer full costs + management overheads + material costs + hidden support service costs.*

9. If approved and once set, it is the intention to uplift these individually reset fees thereafter in accordance with the amount annually set and agreed by cabinet.
10. Benchmarking (see [Appendix 3](#)) shows that staffing costs are comparable and tend to be cheaper than our neighbouring councils.
11. Benchmarking (see [Appendix 4](#)) also shows that a number of these fees are comparable with our neighbouring councils.
12. In order to keep costs to the trade at the lowest possible level, Environmental Health & Trading Standards expenditure has been reduced from 2011/12's budget, being achieved through the Council's Organisational Design Project and the reduction of a senior management post. Support service costs to Hoople for 2011/12 have also been reduced, further bringing costs down. In addition to this, the Council is also undertaking a 'root and branch review' of all the Council's regulatory services, which includes taxi licensing, and this should hopefully enable future annual rises to be kept to a minimum, although the outcome of this will not be known until later this year.
13. The finalisation of a draft 2012/13 budget and the more up to date support service costs means that the unit cost for taxi licensing full cost recovery can be reduced, meaning that the fees can be altered as presented in [Appendix 2](#). This results in a reduction from £31k to £25k in extra income that needs to be found to balance this service area. Although there is still an increase required to attain full cost recovery, this recalculation has significantly reduced the burden on the taxi trade.
14. The Council is also looking to reduce the burden to the trade further by re-examining certain costs, including the need for the £30 medical fee check and the need for taxi drivers to hold a County Transport Badge if they already hold a taxi badge (dual drivers licence). This is work in progress.
15. Legislation & case law requires that taxi income cannot exceed the total expenditure of running the taxi licensing service, although enforcement action cannot be recharged. Legislation requires that any new fees are advertised for 28 days and that any challenge made to a public advertisement is put before the local authority for reconsideration. That is why the Regulatory Committee are hearing the objections at today's public hearing.
16. In the recent past, the council has heard cases put by the trade against fee increases of 2% in 2010/11 and 2% in 2011/12, despite no increases being implemented for several years

proceeding them. In both cases, and despite objections from the Taxi Association, the Regulatory Committee agreed the 2% uplifts.

17. It is estimated that in 2011/12 the taxi licensing service was subsidised by £39k. This is shown in the table below:

**TABLE 1 – 2011/12 Extrapolated Financial Situation**

Service Area	Budgeted EHTS cost of providing this service for 2011/12 + estimated below line (corporate support service costs)	Income for 2011/12	Predicted 2011/12 subsidy (cost to Council Tax Payer)	Percentage recovery of total predicted expenditure
Taxi licensing	£127k + £31k	£130k	£28k	82%
	<b>TOTAL = £158k</b>			

18. The revised accounts available after consultation reveal that £6k less income now needs to be recovered to balance predicted expenditure and income to be cost neutral. The table below therefore outlines the predicted financial position of the taxi licensing service in 2012/13 if full cost recovery is adopted:

**TABLE 2: Taxi Licensing Service – 2012/13 Predictions**

Taxi Service	Predicted total above and below line expenditure 2012/13 (£000s)	Predicted total income 2012/13 at present rates (£000s)	Extra income 2012/13 predicted from proposed increases (£000s)	Total predicted income 2012/13 (£000s)	Predicted subsidy (cost to Council Tax Payer) in 2012/13 (£000s)	Percentage recovery of total predicted expenditure
Full Cost Recovery: a range from 6% to 55% increases	155	130	25	155	0	100%

19. The fees and charges devised for full cost recovery incorporate materials, overall officer time with management overheads and corporate support service costs (based on last year).
20. Members should be aware that prior to consultation an additional full cost recovery option was also recommended for the implementation of a taxi marshalling scheme, should one be adopted. This meant that the fee for Hackney renewals would have incurred a further increase of £52 per year (See hackney option in [Appendix 1](#)). Such a scheme would operate every weekend of the year in the Commercial Road area of Hereford, with two marshals directing taxis into the bus station behind the cinema and marshalling them to a rank(s) in Commercial Road. A pilot scheme in December 2011 proved successful with unanimous

approval from the Taxi Association and strong support from the police, due to the very significant reduction in crime and disorder resulting from effective dispersal of revellers. Such a scheme would equate to £1 per weekend per taxi, i.e. 50p per Friday and 50p per Saturday night. A taxi marshalling scheme would not only help reduce crime and disorder and alcohol related admissions to A&E, but would also help fulfil several of the aims of the joint corporate plan. However, following consultation with the trade, responses have indicated that the trade does not wish to pay for this scheme as it does not benefit the whole County but just a small area within Hereford City. Therefore this report recommends that if the trade will not pay for the scheme, the scheme will not be implemented.

## **Key Considerations**

Whether or not to accept the fee increase.

## **Community Impact**

It is felt that any decision will have only a minor impact on the community as a whole as it relates specifically to the taxi trade.

## **Equality and Human Rights**

The diversity issues have been discussed with the Equality, Human Rights & Partnership Team and it is considered that a full equality impact assessment is not required, as no 'relevant' section of the community will be disproportionately discriminated against or disadvantaged as a result of a change in fees. An equality analysis undertaken by EHTS supported this assumption.

## **Financial Implications**

The increase in income to the Council would amount to about £25k, making total income predicted to be £155k. The taxi licensing service and its corporate support costs are predicted to fall in the region of £155k. Therefore the service should be cost neutral to the Council Tax Payer, although this is a best estimate only. If Committee wish to also implement the additional £52 levy on hackneys to cover taxi marshalling, this will again secure cost neutrality for this scheme which is estimated to cost around £14k per year.

## **Legal Implications**

Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976, section 53(2), allows control of the dual drivers and section 70 for hackney carriage proprietors, vehicles and operators. The case of R v Manchester City Council ex p King states that the cost of a licence has to be related to the cost of the licensing scheme itself.

## **Risk Management**

The taxi service has a real risk of costing the Council in the region of £25k in 2012/13 unless full cost recovery is implemented.

However, if member's approve full cost recovery, the taxi trade may wish to legally challenge the council's case although it is EHTS's understanding that the fee increases would not be suspended until the outcome of this were known.

## Consultees

The increase was posted to every taxi driver, operator and vehicle owner. It was also advertised in the Hereford Journal and the fees were placed on the Council's consultation web page. A number of representations were received as shown in [Appendix 5](#).

27 responses were received, including an in-depth response from the Taxi Association. One response had to be discounted, leaving 26.

The overall responses show that although 23% of respondents were accepting of the increase, the vast majority objected. However, this is not unexpected as the consultation letter proposed an increase in charges.

The consultation exercise also showed that about 38% of respondents were generally supportive of taxi marshalling and a number ambivalent, although most did not want to pay for it. Prior to formal consultation, the Taxi Association had inferred that this would be the likely response from the trade and again this is not unexpected.

## Appendices

Appendix 1: Consulted Proposed Fees and Charges

Appendix 2: Revised Proposed Fees and Charges

Appendix 3: Benchmarking of service costs with other councils.

Appendix 4: Benchmarking of fees with other councils.

Appendix 5: Responses from the 28 day consultation exercise.

## Background Papers

None identified.

## APPENDIX 1

### CONSULTATION ON FEES AND CHARGES

#### TAXI LICENSING FEES from April 2012 with comparison to 2011

#### Taxi and Private Hire Licensing

TAXI AND PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING		2012 fees	2011 fees
Hackney Carriage vehicle	New / Renewal/Transfer plate (inc vehicle compliance test)	295.00 + 52.00 for Taxi Marshall Scheme = 347.00	239.00
Private Hire vehicle	New / Renewal/Transfer plate (inc vehicle compliance test)	295.00	239.00
Private Hire Operator	1 vehicle	122.00	83.00
	2-5 vehicles	182.00	124.00
	Over 5 vehicles	243.00	187.00
	Plus (Annual Standard CRB cost if applicant has not had one previously)		
Dual driver badge	New (including CRB, medical and knowledge test as part of this fee)	339.00	206.00
	3 year renewal (plus medical fee and/or CRB if due)	195.00	157.00
	Annual Self declaration renewal (not new or 3 year renewal)	50.00	47.00
Change of Proprietor of vehicle		107.00	67.00
Change of vehicle on plate (3 months or less)	(inc vehicle compliance test)	230.00	217.00
Change of vehicle on plate (6 months or less)	(inc vehicle compliance test)	170.00	155.00
Change of vehicle on plate (9 months or less)	(inc vehicle compliance test)	100.00	88.00
Application for a certificate of readiness	(inc vehicle compliance test)	202.00	145.00
Application for temporary insurance vehicle replacement	(inc vehicle compliance test)	142.00	135.00
Replacement of driver badge		12.00	11.00
Replacement of vehicle plate	without brackets	6.00	5.50
Replacement of vehicle plate	with brackets	13.00	12.50
CRB		47.00	44.00
DVLA check		6.00	6.00
Knowledge test		13.00	12.50
Vehicle Test Rotherwas		47.50	47.50
Doctors examination	Cost payable by applicant to own GP		
Occupational Health Doctors paper medical referral		30.00	30.00
Application that varies from standard conditions	(Plus new application fee)	160.00	153.00





## APPENDIX 2

### REVISED PROPOSED FEES AND CHARGES

#### TAXI LICENSING FEES from April 2012 with comparison to 2011

#### Taxi and Private Hire Licensing

TAXI AND PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING		2012 fees	2011 fees
Hackney Carriage vehicle	New / Renewal/Transfer plate (inc vehicle compliance test)	285.00  (£52.00 extra if Taxi Marshall Scheme i.e. £337.00)	239.00
Private Hire vehicle	New / Renewal/Transfer plate (inc vehicle compliance test)	285.00	239.00
Private Hire Operator	1 vehicle	110.00	83.00
	2-5 vehicles	170.00	124.00
	Over 5 vehicles	233.00	187.00
	Plus (Annual Standard CRB cost if applicant has not had one previously)		
Dual driver badge	New (including CRB, medical and knowledge test as part of this fee)	320.00	206.00
	3 year renewal (plus medical fee and/or CRB if due)	185.00	157.00
	Annual Self declaration renewal (not new or 3 year renewal)	50.00	47.00
Change of Proprietor of vehicle		97.00	67.00
Change of vehicle on plate (3 months or less)	(inc vehicle compliance test)	230.00	217.00
Change of vehicle on plate (6 months or less)	(inc vehicle compliance test)	170.00	155.00
Change of vehicle on plate (9 months or less)	(inc vehicle compliance test)	100.00	88.00
Application for a certificate of readiness	(inc vehicle compliance test)	190.00	145.00
Application for temporary insurance vehicle replacement	(inc vehicle compliance test)	142.00	135.00
Replacement of driver badge		12.00	11.00
Replacement of vehicle plate	without brackets	6.00	5.50
Replacement of vehicle plate	with brackets	13.00	12.50
CRB		47.00	44.00
DVLA check		6.00	6.00
Knowledge test		13.00	12.50
Vehicle Test Rotherwas		47.50	47.50
Doctors examination	Cost payable by applicant to own GP		
Occupational Health Doctors paper medical referral (being reviewed)		30.00	30.00
Application that varies from standard conditions	(Plus new application fee)	160.00	153.00



## APPENDIX 3

### STAFF AND EXPENDITURE BENCHMARKING

#### Taxi Licensing comparison between Herefordshire, Worcestershire and Shropshire

	Herefordshire	Worcestershire	Shropshire
<b>Number of licensing staff (all disciplines)</b>	6 staff Ratio per head of population 6:176,000 1 staff to 29,333 people	15.85 staff Ratio per head of population 16:560,000 1 staff to 35,000 people	15 staff Ratio per head of population 15:292,800 1 staff to 19,520 people
<b>Number of taxi staff</b>	2.5 staff	8	Data requested
<b>Budgeted Full Taxi expenditure 2011/12</b>	£158k	£517.4k	£190k not including below line (support & management etc) costs
<b>Population</b>	176,000	560,000	292,800
<b>Taxis</b>	650 taxi drivers 250 hackneys 100 private hires 40 operators	Total taxis 1400 Drivers. 3000	566 taxi drivers 92 hackneys 291 private hires



## APPENDIX 4

### BENCHMARKED FEES WITH NEIGHBOURING COUNCILS

	<b>New Hackney Plate</b>	
Worcester (2011/12)	399	
<b>Herefordshire (Consulted)</b>	<b>295</b>	
<b>Herefordshire (Proposed)</b>	<b>285</b>	
Malvern	278	
Telford & Wrekin (2011/12)	269	
<b>Herefordshire (Current)</b>	<b>239</b>	
Gloucester	183	
Forest of Dean	165	
Wychavon	160	
Shropshire	130	committee proposed on 17th Jan: full cost recovery = £410

	<b>New Private Hire Plate</b>	
Worcester (2011/12)	399	
<b>Herefordshire (Consulted)</b>	<b>295</b>	
<b>Herefordshire (Proposed)</b>	<b>285</b>	
Malvern	278	
Telford & Wrekin (2011/12)	258	
<b>Herefordshire (Current)</b>	<b>239</b>	
Gloucester	183	
Forest of Dean	165	
Shropshire	145	committee proposed on 17th Jan: full cost recovery = £336
Wychavon	151.2	

	<b>Private Operator (1 car) 3 year licence</b>	
Gloucester	240 to 930	
Telford & Wrekin (2011/12)	223	
Shropshire	150	(full cost recovery = £250)
<b>Herefordshire (Consulted)</b>	<b>122</b>	
<b>Herefordshire (Proposed)</b>	<b>110</b>	
<b>Herefordshire (Current)</b>	<b>83</b>	
Wychavon	78.75	

**New Driver Badge  
Adjusted to 3 years**

Worcester (2011/12)	789
Telford & Wrekin (2011/12)	451.50
Malvern	432
Herefordshire (Consulted)	<b>339.00</b>
Forest of Dean	330
Herefordshire (Proposed)	<b>320.00</b>
Shropshire	140
Wychavon	264.6
Herefordshire (Current)	<b>206.00</b>
Gloucester	200.00

committee proposed on 17th Jan: full cost recovery =  
£351

**Driver Badge Renewal  
Adjusted to 3 years**

Malvern	294
Gloucester	200.00
Wychavon	198.45
Herefordshire (Consulted)	<b>195.00</b>
Herefordshire (Proposed)	<b>185.00</b>
Herefordshire (Current)	<b>157.00</b>
Shropshire	110

committee proposed full cost recovery =  
£321

## APPENDIX 5

### CONSULTATION RESPONSES ON FEES AND CHARGES – APRIL 2012

Number	Name	Address	Comment
1	Andrew Simpson	Hereford	Doesn't agree with fee increases. I see no need for any increases. It is another go at taxi driver's pockets and you reduce where we can park. Why don't traffic wardens move private cars on in Bewell St instead of moaning at taxi drivers.  Marshalling is a good idea but why should he pay for a service he won't be using.
2	Neil Watkins	Hereford	Agrees with fee increases if we need it.  Agrees marshalling is needed on Commercial Road.
3	Keith Preen	Hereford	Disgraceful proposal to increase fees. Taxi licensing has issued too many taxi licences and this is a way to put people out of business. This is constructive dismissal which is illegal and court action will follow.
4	Paul Baker	Leominster	Marshalling is useful but not everyone works on those nights. I cannot disagree with this.
5	M J Pember	Hereford	Not currently doing hackney work but a good scheme. These charges will need to be passed on to our customers.  Happy with marshalling scheme.
6	Paul Rone	Hereford	Fees increase ok but change of proprietor should be higher. This would stop the dealing in plates. Temp insurance vehicle should also be a lot higher as it is always short notice and a rush to get done.  Marshalling scheme is excellent.
7	D.J Aubrey	Marden Hereford	The fee increases should match inflation. Knowledge test should be a lot higher and be a proper test costing £50-£60 not a tick box exercise.  Marshalling only benefits a few vehicles when everyone is expected to pay.

<b>8</b>	W.D Astbury	Moreton on Lugg Hereford	Fee increases should be introduced in smaller amounts.  Hereford Council has issued too many licences and should therefore be responsible for the costs involved in marshalling. The fee increase is too much especially with the cost of fuel and a lack of trade.
<b>9</b>	D.F Probert	Hereford	Only drivers that work when the scheme is on should pay extra. No comment regarding fee increase.
<b>10</b>	KF Francis		I would be happy to pay an extra £1 a week for the marshalling scheme. The scheme works well but other ranks need attention too.
<b>11</b>	Vasko Grpovski	Hereford	The proposed fee increase is good.
<b>12</b>	Bromyard Taxis	Bromyard	The proposed marshalling scheme is good. Proposed increases seem exceedingly high; a breakdown of costs should be shown. Fuel and insurance price increases already hit the trade.
<b>13</b>	Peter Kinton		Those who do not work in Hereford City should not have to pay for a service they don't use. No incidents have occurred rurally. Please distinguish between Hereford & rural Herefordshire. The only thing that concerns me is the cost of the 3 year renewal which at nearly 25% more than 2011 is excessive.
<b>14</b>	Anonymous		No comments on taxi marshalling. Excluded from table as it was deemed to be racist.
<b>15</b>	K.S Harris Transport	Hampton Park Hereford	How can you justify such increases when we are already struggling to survive. Increases should be smaller.
<b>16</b>	Mrs MacGillivray	Hereford	We do not operate taxis in Hereford so should not participate in any fee for marshalling scheme. The fee increase is ok.
<b>17</b>	Patrick Meredith	Sutton St Nicholas Hereford	The taxi marshalling scheme is a good idea. Fees should be reduced in recession to help a vital service. Cut the red tape. The £30 medical check is a disgrace especially to the over 65's who have to have an annual check.
<b>18</b>	PW Addis Fuller	Belmont Hereford	I do not work nights and oppose the taxi warden scheme at suggested costs. Fine with proposed fee increase.  The taxi marshalling scheme is a good idea.



<b>19</b>	Brian Morris	Hereford	<p>Hackney carriages from outside the area should pay more per year to be allowed to come to area.</p> <p>Marshalling is not the problem; it's the attitude of the drivers who think they are above the law.</p>
<b>20</b>	John Jones on behalf of Hi Town Taxis	Hereford	<p>Would like more time allowed for all the relevant facts to be compiled before a rise is implemented.</p> <p>Would like to compare with other licensing authorities.</p> <p>Requests a copy of the latest audit which shows the increases needed.</p> <p>Hereford is a small city and should not be compared to Worcester.</p> <p>It can be argued and evidenced that there has been a colossal waste of time and resources by the licensing department and licence holder should not pick up the tab.</p> <p>Would like to be informed of the cost to the licence payer of all the various premises moves the council has made over the last few years and has it had an impact on costs.</p> <p>Are we receiving best value because I doubt it.</p> <p>Why do we have to share the cost of having such an inefficient system for making contact with the licensing department?</p> <p>In today's economic climate it is commonly understood that councils need to reign their spending back to more realistic levels. The rise is unsustainable and is sucking the life blood from those of us who are trying to earn a living.</p> <p>Taxi Marshalling is an enforcement issue and should be carried out by licensing outside of normal office hours. Should not pass on costs to the trade.</p>
<b>21</b>	Philip J Davies	Hereford	<p>Exorbitant.</p>
<b>22</b>	Goldline Taxis	Leominster	<p>The proposed fee increase is impudent nonsense and varies considerably from other Council's. Proposed fee increases are unjustified. Taxi drivers do not make as much money as council staff and the proposed increase is quite offensive. We ask the fees to be reduced to a reasonable level.</p> <p>This increase is a problem for drivers who are not based in Hereford City. Taxi firms/drivers have extremely difficult times and cannot afford to keep Herefordshire Council Staff in the comfortable style they have become accustomed.</p>
<b>23</b>	Scott Downs		<p>I have concerns about increases as business is hard and costs, particularly fuel and insurance costs, are spiralling upwards. I accept that there may be a need for increases but these are quite substantial.</p>

<b>24</b>	Herefordshire Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Association		<p>At a recent meeting of the Herefordshire Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Association your proposal was widely discussed and the general feeling is that an increase by the amounts you are suggesting would be totally unacceptable, as well as being well above inflation. We note the Council has not asked for a council tax rise this year, Licensing now operate from a shared office therefore costs should be reduced. We are often told by yourselves best practice is to look at what our neighbouring Council's do, we have and find we are by far the highest, even compared to authorities with similar demographics. Therefore, we contend if Licensing go ahead with this increase it will only have a detrimental result on a trade already struggling with an economic down turn, and the net effect will be loss of jobs, less maintenance, longer driving hours, and that is bad for all of us. The Government is calling for austerity, we would ask you to look for ways to save money.</p> <p>Marshalling is an enforcement issue and the responsibility of the Licensing Authority. Would like an electronic system installed. It is an abuse of the law to make people pay for a service they will not use. Would like more rank spaces.</p>
<b>25</b>	Philip Burgess	Kerrys Gate Herefordshire	<p>Many of the proposed fees exceed 20% of the present fee. This is a scandalous and unacceptable increase. Any increase in fees should be reflected in taxi tariff. The licensing office should be re-structured in order that costs could be reduced.</p> <p>Marshalling has become essential. A small number of drivers now persist on illegal ranking outside the Barrels pub and Commercial Road.</p>
<b>26</b>	Mr M Davies	Grafton, Hereford	<p>Wishes to object to the very high increase. We have only had a 7% increase in fares, have the other licence fees gone up?</p> <p>Marshalls are not our responsibility to pay for. What about all the other ranks?</p>
<b>27</b>	Roger Jones	Clehonger, Hereford	<p>Do you think we are made of money? Our fare increase was minimal and the cost of fuel is increasing all the time. Why do we have this ridiculous increase?</p> <p>We do not need marshalls on Friday and Saturday nights other than in Commercial Road, the ones who use it should pay.</p>