

Darren Mountford

From: Darren Mountford on behalf of Licence Team
Sent: 05 October 2016 13:11
To: Lisa Jones; Darren Mountford
Subject: FW: New conditions etc

Darren Mountford
 Senior Licensing and Markets Officer

Gloucester City Council T: 01452 396240
 Herbert Warehouse, F: 01452 396340
 The Docks, darren.mountford@gloucester.gov.uk
 Gloucester, GL1 2EQ www.gloucester.gov.uk

From: Chas Rodgers [mailto:c
Sent: 04 October 2016 15:30
To: Licence Team
Cc: Zeya Ahmed; Hannah Norman
Subject: New conditions etc

Hello,

The email address supplied in your letter 27th September is incorrect. it should read licence.team@gloucester.gov.uk

I write to comment and suggest the following with regard to your proposals:

1.1B Surely this condition was decided years ago, why has no action been taken?

1.2 Good idea but not far enough. Taxi drivers should have enough life experience before starting out. PH drivers should be 21 and HC drivers 24.

I have always advocated that PH is a good introduction to the trade and then PH drivers can become proper taxi drivers on passing the required tests and having a good proven driving record.

1.4 RIDICULOUS. The licence should be absolutely clean and a full UK licence should have been held for a minimum of 2 years. Standards have been constantly eroded over the years. Just being able to behave for the 40 minutes of a driving test is no substitute for a proven good driving record. When PH drivers apply to be HC drivers then the application should be regarded as a new one and the clean licence requirement should again apply - so no concession for having passed another test but the clean licence rule should be enforced.

I suggest that any driver accruing 6 DVLA licence points should be aware that further points would lead to loss/suspension of the Gloucester HC or PH licence.

To say that drivers have to be tested while allowing proven offenders to have a licence is a strange form of hypocrisy. I also suggest that losing the DVLA driving licence after being banned for any dangerous action i.e. Reckless Driving, Drinking and Driving (or the drug equivalent) will always disqualify without any chance of re-licensing. Gloucester has previously re-licensed drivers after a drink drive ban, that is ludicrous and further demonstrates a lack of proper application of proper standards. No licensing authority is required to have a lower standard of requirement simply because a sentence has been served. There are those of us who regard serious driving offences as tantamount to Attempted Murder with a dangerous weapon. Would you license a convicted murderer or such? The namby pamby politically correct view that a serious criminal should be welcomed with open arms is a nonsense. Remember your misused principle "Would you...allow your daughter etc". Now properly apply that!

3.18.C Nothing shall be taken as an offence where a driver shows reasonable anger when any Officer or Member fails to apply reasonable commonsense or equitable fairness in decision making and it will not be an offence for a licensee to disagree in a forceful manner when political correctness is applied. In this mutuality of licensing all parties must not be constrained to agreeing just to please each other. As long as it is deemed by the trade that policy is made by officers and not committee members then there is sure to be a level of disquiet and resentment.

3.39 to have added "But no driver will be required to make use of either the fire extinguisher or first aid kit where such action might bring any liability or responsibility in any ensuing insurance or compensation claim."

Some years ago the GHCA suggested, your senior officer and a senior Cabinet Member agreed, that new vehicle should be licensed as follows:

Any previous months fees should be taken into account but the new license would start inline with the date of the new vehicle. This would lead to all the tests and licence renewals being in line and sensibly effected at the same date each year. A simple thing to do and a most sensible way of conducting affairs.

More use of DVLA systems to be accessed to reduce the paperwork required to be produced at renewal and to maintain proper supervision of all insurance, MOT and road tax.

The statement made by the senior officer was "I'll look into it".....and what has happened?

Is there really no desire to reduce and simplify the anomalies in renewal procedures? Does nobody want to move into the 21st century?

I have now been a licensed taxi driver in Gloucester for 42 years.

I have seen standards lowered without proper thought and some standards raised in conjunction with my trade.

Let's get back to the best, raise the rest where it is meet and proper so to do and return to proper consultation and discussion with the members of the licensing committee. Let the officers suggest but not formulate nor legislate for conditions as they feel the whim might take them.

Some years ago the Ministry of Transport inspectors declared the City of Gloucester to have one of the very best Taxi and Private Hire fleets in the country. That standard should never have been dropped.

Let's lose the vehicle age rule and replace it with a proper high standard requirement. If a lovingly serviced and cared for vehicle meets the standard after even 20 years then it should continue but any vehicle, even if only 1 year old, should fail then it should be replaced. Put an incentive to care in place.

Likewise with driving standards. Abandon your lowest common denominator policy of desperation with a high standard policy of improvement and aspiration.

I wish you good fortune in any endeavour to truly improve the taxi and private hire trade in our City.

Best Regards,
Chas Rodgers

Sent from [Mailbird](#)

Darren Mountford

From: Licence Team
Sent: 14 October 2016 10:17
To: Darren Mountford
Subject: FW: Proposed Revised draft conditions for HC and PH Licensing

Categories: Red Category

From: Zdravko Yakimov [[mailto:](#)]
Sent: 13 October 2016 20:40
To: Licence Team
Subject: Proposed Revised draft conditions for HC and PH Licensing

Hello,

I am writing to express my views about the new proposals for HC and PH licenses.

I'm led by my believes that all additional restrictions to any businesses have negative effect on them.

In point 1.4 from ph and hc rule book (draft 2016). I don't think that the new applicants having 3,6 or 9 points on their DVLA license should stopping them entering the business. There is not an evidence of that he/she is better or worse(safer or more dangerous)than the experienced HC or PH driver with more or less points on their license. As the new applicants pass the knowledge and driving test and she /he is mentally and physically fit,DBS approved, there should be no reason for refusing the applicant to be granted with license.

I'm aware of the negative feelings and frustration about the growing number of drivers but if the market doesn't need it, the number would be lower.

It is nice that we have rules. They have to be followed for sure but making them tough don't help anyone. We all will benefit from better CONTROL than tougher rules.

More licensed drivers mean more income for the Gloucester City Council. Having granted a license mean you as council created a new job. This means more for HMRC and so on for more local businesses.

There is that the bigger competition is responsible for making the service more affordable and easy accessible. But the level off the service goes up as well. The drivers and the operators are allowed to deliver better, quicker, reliable, responsible, helpful, QUALITY service to the customer.

Why instead of making tougher rules, increasing penalties and additional tests, don't you introduce EDUCATION course specially for PH and HC drivers. Something like the 35h for PCV and LGV drivers. From that kind of courses the drivers will be benefitted, the customers, the services dealing with a driver and GCC.

Finally I would suggest to rethink about the proposal and do a new better one in 2017. I read an article about that the DVLA stop doing the assessments for PH and HC from 31/12/16.

So new rules will be needed in 2017 anyway.

Regards

PHD128

Darren Mountford

From: Licence Team
Sent: 21 October 2016 12:21
To: > EHLIC
Subject: FW: response for new draft.

From: Orhan Ucar [[mailto:](#)]
Sent: 21 October 2016 11:45
To: Licence Team
Subject: Fwd: response for new draft.

----- Forwarded n

From: **Orhan Ucar** <licencing.team@gloucester.gov.uk>
Date: 21 October 2016 at 10:54
Subject: response for new draft.
To: licencing.team@gloucester.gov.uk

Thank you for informing me about these changes. I've read through the draft conditions and as far as i thing, its necessary and useful changes . My comment is going to be positive about the changes.

Darren Mountford

From: Zeya Ahmed · 1>
Sent: 20 November 2016 18:03
To: Darren Mountford
Subject: Licensing Conditions Consultation

Hi,

I have already gone on record as supporting the need for the licensing conditions to be updated, however I have thought of something to add.

Private hire drivers who apply to become hackney carriage drivers should be treated as new applicants when looking at their DVLA issued driving licences, therefore the number of points are set out in 1.4 should be used as the maximum allowable for anyone applying to become a hackney carriage driver, whether as a completely new applicant or as a private hire driver wishing to upgrade. The only exception would be if the endorsements were present when the driver gained his/her private hire licence and therefore have been previously addressed by the Licensing Committee or the Licensing Department under delegated powers.

I realise the above point could possibly be considered as an operational issue rather than a condition, but I feel that it should be clearly added to the conditions as an addendum to 1.4. the reasoning for this additional condition is that without it any private hire driver could conceivably apply with multiple new points on the licence as they would be treated as a renewal applicant. I feel it is important for any applicant to demonstrate their commitment to be safe drivers by ensuring that they have not accrued any new endorsements in the time immediately preceding their application.

Thank you.

Zeya Ahmed