



# Licensing and Health and Safety Enforcement Committee

**TUESDAY 28 FEBRUARY 2017 AT 7.30 PM**

**Council Chamber, The Forum**

The Councillors listed below are requested to attend the above meeting, on the day and at the time and place stated, to consider the business set out in this agenda.

#### Membership

|                                    |                     |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Councillor Gbola Adeleke           | Councillor Link     |
| Councillor Barnes                  | Councillor Mills    |
| Councillor Mrs Bassadone           | Councillor Peter    |
| Councillor Conway                  | Councillor R Sutton |
| Councillor Fantham (Vice-Chairman) | Councillor Taylor   |
| Councillor P Hearn (Chairman)      | Councillor Whitman  |
| Councillor Howard                  |                     |

For further information, please contact Trudi Angel - 01442 228224

## **AGENDA**

**1. MINUTES** (Pages 3 - 5)

To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 13 December 2016.

**2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

To receive any apologies for absence.

**3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

A member with a disclosable pecuniary interest or a personal interest in a matter who attends a meeting of the authority at which the matter is considered –

- (i) must disclose the interest at the start of the meeting or when the interest becomes apparent

and, if the interest is a disclosable pecuniary interest, or a personal interest which is also prejudicial

- (ii) may not participate in any discussion or vote on the matter (and must withdraw to the public seating area) unless they have been granted a dispensation.

A member who discloses at a meeting a disclosable pecuniary interest which is not registered in the Members' Register of Interests, or is not the subject of a pending notification, must notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest within 28 days of the disclosure.

Disclosable pecuniary interests, personal and prejudicial interests are defined in Part 2 of the Code of Conduct For Members

[If a member is in any doubt as to whether they have an interest which should be declared they should seek the advice of the Monitoring Officer before the start of the meeting]

#### **4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

An opportunity for members of the public to make statements and ask questions in accordance with the rules on Public Participation.

#### **5. CHANGES TO TAXI/PRIVATE HIRE DRIVER LICENSING ARRANGEMENTS & PRIVATE HIRE SIGNAGE (Pages 6 - 75)**

#### **6. PUBLIC SPACES PROTECTION ORDERS (PSPO'S) (Pages 76 - 79)**

#### **7. COSMETIC BODY PIERCING AND SKIN COLOURING (Pages 80 - 90)**

#### **8. LICENSING LEGISLATIVE UPDATE (Pages 91 - 94)**

\*\*\*\*\*

## DACORUM BOROUGH COUNCIL

### LICENSING AND HEALTH AND SAFETY ENFORCEMENT COMMITTEE

13 DECEMBER 2016

\*\*\*\*\*

Present-

#### MEMBERS:

Councillor P Hearn (Chairman), Adeleke, Mrs Bassadone, Conway, Fantham, Howard, Link, Mills, Peter, R Sutton, Taylor and Whitman

#### OFFICERS:

|         |                        |
|---------|------------------------|
| R Hill  | Licensing Team Leader  |
| T Angel | Member Support Officer |

The meeting began at 7.32 pm

#### 1. MINUTES

There were no minutes available to be signed at this meeting.

#### 2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

#### 3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

#### 4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There was no public participation.

#### 5. REVIEW OF LICENSING POLICIES

R Hill advised the report followed on from the meeting in September where it was agreed they would begin consultation on the draft Licensing Enforcement Policy and Sex Establishment Licensing Policy. He said they had now carried out the consultation and had received minimal responses back. He explained they had made a couple of changes in light of the responses; one was an omission on his part and one was a legislation change from the Group Manager of Resident Services. As there were no significant changes he recommended that the committee adopt the policies for a five year period as detailed in the agenda.

The Chairman referred to page 13, paragraph 1.19c and queried if we had any establishments in the same place. R Hill advised there was a sexual entertainment venue on the A5 near Flamsted, and a sex shop in Apsley. He explained they had

exercised those powers the paragraph had referred to as there were areas that they would consider to be unsuitable; the Old Town High Street, Berkhamsted and Tring. The Chairman asked what the view would be if a second application was made for within Apsley as an example. R Hill advised the application would be considered on its own merits by the sub-committee.

Councillor Mrs Bassadone recalled an application being made to the sub-committee for a sexual entertainment licence in the Old Town and asked if it had got off the ground. R Hill advised that the application was granted but he didn't believe it was being used for sexual entertainment purposes. He said they were able to have up to 11 sexual entertainment events per year before applying for a licence.

Resolved:

1. That the Licensing and Health and Safety Enforcement Committee adopt the document at Annex A as the Council's Sex Establishment Licensing Policy for a 5-year period from the 23 February 2017.
2. That the Licensing and Health and Safety Enforcement Committee adopt the document at Annex B as the Council's Licensing Enforcement Policy for a 5-year period from the 14 December 2016.

**6. LICENSING FEES AND CHARGES 2017/18**

R Hill advised he had made structural changes to the fees and charges due to a European Court Judgement that had been ongoing for several years but was now finalised and concluded. He advised that the Legal team have confirmed they were happy that the fees and charges complied with the European Court Judgement.

Councillor Taylor highlighted that the committee had spent lots of time preparing a camping licence but he couldn't see it included within the fees and charges report. R Hill advised that camp site licences weren't dealt with by his department and it fell under the remit of Environmental Health. He said the fees and charges within this document were only the ones that his team dealt with and had responsibility for.

Councillor Whitman referred to the European Court Judgement and queried what effect us leaving the EU would have on this. R Hill advised that the Judgement had full and immediate effect and the European Courts were a completely different treaty and wasn't part of the EU. Councillor Whitman asked if we would still be bound by the Judgement when we've left the EU. R Hill advised they were only looking at the next financial year for these fees and charges.

Resolved:

1. In pursuance of the fee-setting powers conferred upon the Council as specified in Annex A of this report, that the Licensing, Health & Safety and Enforcement Committee set as the fees and charges payable by applicants in connection with applications and other processes for licences, registrations and permits the fees and charges as set out in Annex B, for the period from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2017 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2018.
2. That authority to consider any objections arising from statutory notices pertaining to these fees be delegated to the Solicitor to the Council in consultation with the Chairman of the Licensing, Health & Safety and Enforcement Committee.

The meeting ended at 7.45 pm.

# Agenda Item 5



## AGENDA ITEM: 5

|                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| Report for:         | Licensing and Health & Safety Enforcement Committee |
| Date of meeting:    | 28 February 2017                                    |
| PART:               | I   |
| If Part II, reason: |   |

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| Title of report:      | <b>Changes to taxi/private hire driver licensing arrangements &amp; private hire signage</b>  |
| Contact:              | Ross Hill – Licensing Team Leader, Legal Governance   |
| Purpose of report:    | To report the results of consultation on proposed changes to the Council's current arrangements for testing the knowledge and skills of taxi and private hire driver licence applicants; medical requirements for taxi and private hire drivers; and on private hire vehicle signage.   |
| Recommendations       | <i>See paras 6.1 – 6.6</i>  |
| Corporate objectives: | <p>Safe and Clean Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain a clean and safe environment</li> </ul> <p>Dacorum Delivers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance excellence</li> </ul>  |
| Implications:         | <p><u>Financial</u><br/>A longer and more in-depth training day would cost more to deliver, and as such there would need to be an assessment of the fees charged to reflect this. It is too early at this stage to quantify these costs/fees.</p> <p><u>Value for Money</u><br/>Any changes to arrangements would be delivered on a cost neutral basis, with licence applicants paying a fee commensurate with costs incurred.</p> <p><u>Risk/Health And Safety Implications / Community Impact</u><br/>None identified</p> |
| Consultees:           | This report details the responses received during consultation.   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Background papers:  |  |
| Glossary of acronyms and any other abbreviations used in this report: |  |

## 1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1. This report follows on from a report presented to Committee on [20 September 2016](#), which detailed a number of proposed reforms to arrangements and requirements for testing the knowledge and suitability of prospective hackney carriage and private hire drivers; of medical certificate arrangements; and of signage required to be displayed on licensed private hire vehicles.
- 1.2. These proposals were put forward against a background of falling numbers of licensed drivers in Dacorum, contrary to national and regional trends, as there appears to be a perception that it is easier for new drivers to obtain licences elsewhere. Local taxi operators are increasingly facing pressure from firms in neighbouring areas, as well as national operators such as Uber. This competition has been exacerbated by legal changes which have legalised the sub-contracting of bookings between private hire operators in different areas.
- 1.3. The Council's current arrangements for knowledge tests have grown up over a number of years, and currently consist of:
- A local and legal test, covering geographic knowledge as well as understanding of the applicable legal requirements involved in working as a licensed driver;
  - A communication skills test, taken by telephone from the council offices, testing English skills in reading, listening and speaking (candidates with previous relevant qualifications may be exempted from this requirement);
  - A driving skills test, from a list of assessments approved by licensing officers.
- 1.4. All of these test components must be completed before a licence application will be considered. Although all three components are available on a regular basis, the overall process of learning 'the knowledge' and passing the overall test can take up to a year to complete (according to anecdotal evidence), requiring a significant investment of time, money and commitment by the applicant.
- 1.5. Further details regarding the current test arrangements, including comparisons between the knowledge test requirements of neighbouring authorities, are contained in the original September report, available via [this link](#).

## 2. CONSULTATION PROPOSALS

- 2.1. The proposals which were put forward for the purpose of consultation were:
- To replace the current geographic / legal knowledge test for new private hire drivers with a new one-day training and awareness course
  - To retain a revised geographic / legal knowledge test for new hackney carriage / dual drivers, in addition to the training and awareness course

- To consult on introducing refresher training for current drivers, covering issues included in the training and awareness course for new drivers
- To reduce the frequency at which medical certificates are required from licensed drivers, in line with the recommended frequencies for other Group 2 drivers (bus/lorry/emergency vehicle drivers)
- To adopt the DVLA's standard D4 medical report form for use for taxi drivers
- To consult on replacing the signage displayed on licensed private hire vehicles with alternative in-car signage, or similar

2.2. Details of these proposals were published alongside 7 consultation questions:

**Consultation question 1**

Do you think that we should replace our current knowledge test for new private hire drivers (who may only undertake pre-booked journeys) with a training and awareness course, delivering more in-depth knowledge of key issues affecting drivers?

**Consultation question 2**

Do you think that hackney carriage drivers and dual drivers, who may accept immediate fares, should still be required to pass a local knowledge test, in addition to a training and awareness course?

**Consultation question 3**

Should current licensed hackney carriage and private hire drivers be required to complete a refresher training and awareness course?

**Consultation question 4**

Do you think that we should reduce the frequency at which taxi and private hire drivers must undergo medical checks, to the frequency suggested above?

**Consultation question 5**

Do you think that we should require taxi and private hire driver's medical reports to be completed on a version of the DVLA's standard driver medical form (form D4)?

**Consultation question 6**

Do you think that we should continue to issue plastic licence plates for our licensed private hire vehicles, or should we begin to issue alternative signage for private hire vehicles, along the lines of that used on vehicles licensed in London?

**Consultation question 7**

If we were to issue alternative in-car signage in place of private hire plates, do you think that any other signage should be required to be displayed on the exterior of private hire vehicles, to make clear that they are licensed by us on a pre-bookable basis? If so, what form should this signage take?

2.3. Consultation took place between September and November 2016, and a total of 122 individuals responded, with a number sending multiple responses. A number of responses followed a pro-forma template, or were otherwise duplicated. Of those who gave information as to their identities:

- 4 are private hire operators
- 98 are current drivers in Dacorum (hackney carriage driver: 44, private hire driver: 18, dual driver: 36)
- 2 are applicants who are currently undertaking the knowledge test
- 1 is a ward councillor who spoke to a number of drivers at a ward surgery
- 1 is a council officer responsible for safeguarding matters



- 2.4. The anonymised responses are reproduced at [Annex A1 \(operators\)](#), [Annex A2 \(drivers\)](#), and [Annex A3 \(others\)](#).
- 2.5. A petition, organised by the Dacorum Hackney & Private Hire Association, was also received opposing the proposals. This is reproduced at [Annex A4](#), but has not been included within the summaries below.
- 2.6. Many of the responses received did not answer all of the consultation questions posed. However, officers have tallied those responses to particular questions which were discernible, for the tables below. (N.B. %ages are measured from discernible responses, not total responses)

### 3. CONSULTATION RESPONSES – KNOWLEDGE TESTS

- 3.1. The responses showed significant opposition to the complete removal of the geographic knowledge test for new private hire drivers, with more than 90% opposed to such a move. A large number of respondents suggested that such a test could be carried out alongside or as part of the proposed training course, for which there was widespread support, with some also appearing to suggest that the test should cover the material included on the course to ensure it had been understood. Some responses also recognised concerns around the complexity of the current test and supported limited simplification of the test.

| <b>Question 1: Replace the private hire local knowledge test with a course</b> |                |                  |
|--|----------------|------------------|
| <b>Respondent category</b>   | <b>Yes</b>     | <b>No</b>        |
| Private hire operator  | 2              | 1                |
| Hackney carriage driver  | -              | 44               |
| Private hire driver  | 1              | 17               |
| Dual driver  | 1              | 35               |
| Current applicant  | 2              | -                |
| Other  | 1              | 2                |
| Unidentified   | 4              | 11               |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>11 (9%)</b> | <b>110 (91%)</b> |

- 3.2. In addition to the fall in numbers of licensed drivers detailed in the original report, the original proposal was also made with regard to the Department for Transport's [guidance to taxi licensing authorities](#), which states (at paras 75-76):

*75. Taxi drivers need a good working knowledge of the area for which they are licensed, because taxis can be hired immediately, directly with the driver, at ranks or on the street. So most licensing authorities require would-be taxi-drivers to pass a test of local topographical knowledge as a pre-requisite to the first grant of a licence (though the stringency of the test should reflect the complexity or otherwise of the local geography, in accordance with the principle of ensuring that barriers to entry are not unnecessarily high).*

*76. However, PHVs are not legally available for immediate hiring in the same way as taxis. To hire a PHV the would-be passenger has to go through an operator, so the driver will have an opportunity to check the details of a route before starting a journey. So it may be unnecessarily burdensome to require a would-be PHV driver*

*to pass the same 'knowledge' test as a taxi driver, though it may be thought appropriate to test candidates' ability to read a map and their knowledge of key places such as main roads and railway stations.*

- 3.3. Additionally, in September last year (after the Committee considered the original report), the Competition & Markets Authority [wrote to Sheffield City Council](#) in respect of its knowledge test arrangements (pg 4-5), stating that it was generally unconvinced of the necessity for comprehensive topographic knowledge testing as a prerequisite to the licensing of drivers; that it considered such requirements to be a barrier to entry which raised prices for customers; and that its predecessor body, the Office of Fair Trading, had previously found that passengers were unwilling to pay a premium for a higher-quality taxi service. This echoed earlier submissions by the CMA to [Transport for London](#) (para 28-29).
- 3.4. Despite the government's position on this issue, it appears clear from the responses received that there is significant local concern and support locally for the retention of a topographic assessment, as a prerequisite to licensing new private hire drivers. **It is therefore now proposed to retain such an assessment for new private hire drivers, albeit reformatted from the current test both to make the test simpler to administer and complete, and to more clearly differentiate it from the hackney carriage test.**
- 3.5. The precise format of the revised new test remains to be finalised, but as an indication it is envisaged that it would contain in the region of 20-30 multiple choice questions, in a computer-based test, with a pass mark of 50% and marks deducted for incorrect answers (by comparison, the current test has a pass mark of 53% across 106 questions).
- 3.6. A number of responses indicated support for the proposed training day provided it was delivered alongside a knowledge test. It is therefore proposed to introduce this new requirement, and for the knowledge test to be completed at the conclusion of the course.
- 3.7. The original proposal envisaged retaining a geographic knowledge test for new hackney carriage and private hire drivers, alongside the proposed training day. There was universal support for this proposal among those who answered this question.

| <b>Question 2: Retain the local knowledge test for new hackney/dual drivers</b> |                  |           |
|---|------------------|-----------|
| <b>Respondent category</b>  | <b>Yes</b>       | <b>No</b> |
| Private hire operator   | 1                | -         |
| Hackney carriage driver   | 12               | -         |
| Private hire driver   | 5                | -         |
| Dual driver   | 10               | -         |
| Current applicant   | -                | -         |
| Other   | 1                | -         |
| Unidentified  | 6                | -         |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>35 (100%)</b> | <b>0</b>  |

- 3.8. Again, the precise format of the revised new test remains to be finalised, but it is envisaged that it would contain in the region of 40-50 multiple choice questions, a

pass mark of 75%, with marks deducted for incorrect answers (by comparison, the current test has a pass mark of 76% across 106 questions).

- 3.9. If Committee accept the recommendations of this report, it is proposed that the precise formats of these tests be determined by officers following the above guidelines and any others made by the Committee. This will allow the speediest possible deployment.
- 3.10. The consultation questions asked whether a shorter version of the training and awareness course should be introduced as a refresher course for current licensed drivers. There is mounting pressure on licensing authorities from external bodies to introduce such training, particular following exposure of taxi drivers' involvement in several high-profile cases of child sexual exploitation nationwide, and ongoing campaigns by disability rights groups to increase awareness of legal requirements for taxi drivers to carry passengers in wheelchairs, and with assistance dogs. Among those who answered this question, there was a smaller majority opposed to the introduction of such requirements, with a number of respondents citing previous vocational training they had undertaken (NVQ / BTEC courses).

| <b>Question 3: Require current drivers to complete refresher training</b> |                 |                 |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|
| <b>Respondent category</b>  | <b>Yes</b>      | <b>No</b>       |
| Private hire operator   | 1               | -               |
| Hackney carriage driver   | 3               | 15              |
| Private hire driver   | 5               | 1               |
| Dual driver   | 4               | 8               |
| Current applicant   | -               | -               |
| Other   | 1               | -               |
| Unidentified  | 2               | 4               |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>16 (36%)</b> | <b>28 (64%)</b> |

- 3.11. Officers remain of the opinion that there is merit in such training, which is now being mandated by an increasing number of councils, including others in Hertfordshire, despite legitimate concerns around duplication of learning, and time and cost burden. However, since the consultation began, [section 177 of the Policing and Crime Act 2017](#) has become law, empowering the government to issue statutory guidance to taxi licensing authorities on the protection of children and vulnerable adults, and it is understood that this may well include provisions relating to the periodic training of licensed drivers. That clause is due to be commenced in April 2017, and guidance is expected to be published shortly thereafter. **It is therefore proposed to defer a decision on this issue for 6 months, or until such guidance is published, whichever is later, so as to ensure that any training requirement for current drivers made by the Council is compatible with the new guidance.**

#### **4. CONSULTATION RESPONSES – MEDICALS**

- 4.1. The Council currently requires applicants for drivers licences to produce certificates from a registered doctor confirming that they satisfy the DVLA's national medical standards for Group 2 (vocational) drivers, which also apply to other professional drivers such as bus and lorry drivers. At present, applicants must produce a

certificate with every application (i.e. 3 yearly). The consultation questions asked whether this period should be relaxed to match that of other Group 2 drivers (generally, one medical every 5 years from 45 to 65).

- 4.2. Unfortunately, a number of respondents misunderstood the phrase 'reduce the frequency', believing that they would have to have more regular checks carried out, which was not the intention. As such, issues of time and cost burden were raised, with a majority of respondents opposed to the change. Concerns were also raised around a general reluctance to seek medical help or to admit to a health issue among the male population, as well as more regular tests providing greater reassurance to the public as to the safety of licensed drivers.

| <b>Question 4: Reduce the frequency of medical checks</b> |                 |                 |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|
| <b>Respondent category</b>                                | <b>Yes</b>      | <b>No</b>       |
| Private hire operator                                     | -               | 1               |
| Hackney carriage driver                                   | 9               | 8               |
| Private hire driver                                       | -               | 4               |
| Dual driver   | 5               | 10              |
| Current applicant   | -               | -               |
| Other   | 1               | -               |
| Unidentified  | 1               | 4               |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>16 (37%)</b> | <b>27 (63%)</b> |

- 4.3. As it is clear from the responses that this proposal may well result in confusion if progressed, **it is now proposed that medicals will not change from the current schedule – i.e. to be supplied with each 3-yearly licence application, or more regularly if a specific issue is identified by the completing doctor.**
- 4.4. A question was also asked around the medical form to be completed by doctors. At the moment the Council uses a bespoke medical form, but a growing number of taxi licensing authorities have begun to use the DVLA's standard medical form, as used for other Group 2 drivers, and the question asked whether the Council should follow this approach. Far fewer respondents answered this question with a couple observing that they did not feel able to give an answer on this. Others, including some of those who answered negatively, stated that they ultimately wanted a cost-effective solution.

| <b>Question 5: Use the standard DVLA D4 medical form</b> |                 |                 |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|
| <b>Respondent category</b>                               | <b>Yes</b>      | <b>No</b>       |
| Private hire operator                                    | -               | -               |
| Hackney carriage driver                                  | 3               | 8               |
| Private hire driver                                      | 1               | 1               |
| Dual driver  | 4               | 5               |
| Current applicant  | -               | -               |
| Other  | 1               | -               |
| Unidentified   | 1               | 3               |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>10 (37%)</b> | <b>17 (63%)</b> |

- 4.5. Noting the responses, **it is proposed to proceed with the introduction of the D4 medical form with immediate effect** (current forms have already been sent out to licensees expiring in March and April, so any new form would be sent to May renewals onwards). As the D4 form is standardised nationally, adopting it does give drivers the option of completion by national doctor-led services who specialise in driver medicals, at a lower price than that charged by many local GP surgeries. It is also intended that any future updates to the main body of the D4 form will be reflected automatically. A version of the D4 form, with localised cover and declaration pages, is attached at [Annex B](#).

## 5. PRIVATE HIRE VEHICLE SIGNAGE

- 5.1. The final area on which consultation questions were asked concerned signage required to be displayed upon private hire vehicles. The Council currently issues hard plastic plates which are required to be displayed externally on the rear of the vehicle, and internally in the front windscreen, and the consultation questions concerned whether signage should remain in this format, or an alternative.
- 5.2. Around two-fifths of respondents answered this question, with a clear majority favouring retention of the plastic plates, with many respondents citing that these were more visible to passengers, and gave a clear identity to the vehicles bearing them.

| <b>Question 6: Retain current plate type</b> |                 |                 |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|
| <b>Respondent category</b>                   | <b>Yes</b>      | <b>No</b>       |
| Private hire operator                        | 1               | -               |
| Hackney carriage driver                      | 14              | 1               |
| Private hire driver                          | 7               | 1               |
| Dual driver                                  | 10              | 8               |
| Current applicant                            | -               | -               |
| Other  | 2               | -               |
| Unidentified                                 | 5               | -               |
| <b>Total</b>                                 | <b>39 (80%)</b> | <b>10 (20%)</b> |

- 5.3. The current requirements to display plastic plates on the exterior and interior of the vehicle will therefore remain unchanged. Officers do intend to review and update the designs of the current plates, and preliminary discussions have taken place with suppliers around options for doing so which will reduce production and material costs, while ensuring that plates remain immediately and easily recognisable for what they are. In particular, it is understood that the police favour the inclusion of the licence expiry date on plates, to allow immediate recognition of expired vehicle licences – Dacorum is the only Council in the area not to include this data on its taxi plates at the present time.
- 5.4. For the sake of completeness, a question was also asked about the display of additional vehicle signage if plates were discontinued. A majority of the small number of respondents did not feel that additional signs would be necessary. Some mentioned the possibility of putting roof signs on private hire vehicles – as there is a legal duty to differentiate the appearance of hackney carriages and private hire

vehicles licensed by an authority, and all of Dacorum's hackney carriage bar a few purpose-built taxis currently use roof signs, this concept is not supported by officers.

| <b>Question 7: Additional signage if plates discontinued</b> |                |                 |
|--|----------------|-----------------|
| <b>Respondent category</b>                                   | <b>Yes</b>     | <b>No</b>       |
| Private hire operator  | -              | -               |
| Hackney carriage driver                                      | -              | 6               |
| Private hire driver  | 1              | 1               |
| Dual driver  | 2              | 4               |
| Current applicant  | -              | -               |
| Other  | 1              | 1               |
| Unidentified   | 2              | 1               |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>6 (32%)</b> | <b>13 (68%)</b> |

## 6. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.1. At the earliest opportunity, to introduce a new training and awareness course as a requirement for all new applicants for private hire, hackney carriage and dual drivers licences, covering a range of relevant issues as determined by officers. This will be a prerequisite to obtaining a licence, alongside existing requirements including a communications skills assessment and an advanced driving qualification;
- 6.2. To retain a revised geographic knowledge (theory) test for new private hire drivers as a prerequisite to licensing, the format of which shall be determined by officers in line with the provisions of this report and any guidance given by Committee;
- 6.3. To retain a revised geographic knowledge (theory) test for new hackney carriage and dual drivers as a prerequisite to licensing, the format of which shall be determined by officers in line with the provisions of this report and any guidance given by Committee;
- 6.4. To defer any decision on the introduction of refresher training for licensed drivers, pending the publication of government guidance, for 6 months or until the publication of such guidance, whichever occurs later;
- 6.5. To require all applicants for new or renewals of private hire, hackney carriage or dual drivers licences to supply a medical certificate, completed by a registered doctor, as a requisite to every application, or at lesser intervals if stipulated by the completing doctor, in the format attached at [Annex B](#) (such form to be updated automatically in line with any changes to the original DVLA D4 form);
- 6.6. To make no further changes to the frequency of such medicals, nor the requirements for the display of plates on licensed private hire vehicles.

**Consultation responses – private hire operators****Request reference number: 506545****Record: 1**

Dear Ross

After reviewing your proposals I think it is long overdue to make certain changes to the current licensing regulations to keep up with modern technology and outside competitions.

**KNOWLEDGE TEST FOR NEW DRIVERS**

I think introducing new training and awareness courses for all new drivers would be a long overdue step covering a range of legal and safety requirements for taxi and private hire drivers, abandoning the current knowledge test for private hire drivers only and making it harder for hackney carriages.

We also ask that to implement this we would ask that we can choose a panel of approved suppliers to carry out the health and safety courses and would like these courses take place at our own premises.

**REFRESHER TRAINING FOR CURRENT DRIVERS**

I think that for current drivers there should be a half day course provided by the council, free of charge, to get up to date with current legislation. If not I think we should abandon this idea.

**DRIVER MEDICALS**

I think for health and safety reasons all medicals should be done every 3 years, as this way it guarantees the drivers health and mental capacity.

**SIGNAGE ON PRIVATE HIRE VEHICLES**

I think the current system we have in place is a lot more visible than the TFL system so therefore for health and safety reasons THIS SHOULD DEFINATELY NOT BE CHANGED.

**LICENSING AND ENFORCEMENT POLICY**

As we are all aware that the current enforcement policy is too relaxed and we will be demanding that extra enforcement officers should make their priority to stamp out illegal practices within our borough and all operators licenses should have a point system where after 12 points they should be revoked. This will ensure good practices and safety for the public of Dacorum. I feel currently we are to lenant towards wrong doing of operators and driver behaviour.

I look forward to receiving your comments on my thoughts and proposals and I am willing to come before the committee to explain and reiterate that health and safety is imperative for our local people of Dacorum.

Kind regards

---

**Request reference number: 506581****Record: 2**

To whom it concerns. Dear Sir/ Madam.

I am pleased to receive the Dacorum Taxi E-Mail Newsletter. In the September 2016 edition I was very interested to learn of the proposals.

May I ask:

1. Re "Knowledge tests and driver awareness", is it the case that the council believes that to a very large extent it is ONLY THE DEGREE OF DIFFICULTY of the current knowledge test that is responsible for deterring significant numbers of drivers who reside within Dacorum BC, from getting themselves licensed by Dacorum BC? It is NOT the comparative cost of the test for example, OR OTHER FAFACTORS?

2. Re "Signage [plates] on private hire vehicles", what would be Dacorum BC's objectives in "moving away" from hard plastic plates? To what problems might this be a solution? Are there examples of

other licensing authorities that have moved away from hard plates? [my assumption has always been that Transport for London – “the elephant in the corner of the room” – did NOT move away from hard plates; they introduced diamond-shaped stickers where previously there was nothing at all on the vehicles & the London trade was poorly regulated. Exemption from the newly introduced congestion charge facilitated proper regulation of the trade].

3. Is there another context to Dacorum's proposals, namely the advent & phenomenal growth of "appersators", in particular UBER? It occurs to me that Dacorum might be in a situation in which potential drivers are getting badged & plated by TfL & registering to work with the UBER app. Such a driver can then accept UBER bookings within TfL boundaries, but significantly he can also accept bookings in districts outside TfL's, including Dacorum. This contrasts with drivers who get badged & plated with Dacorum, who can also register to work with the UBER app. However the UBER app does not offer bookings to such a driver when he is within TfL's boundaries. If he takes someone into London, he will not be able to get a fare to take him home again. The TfL-licensed driver has far more flexibility & scope to practice opportunism.

I would be much obliged for any comments or additional information you are able to offer in respect of the above. Thank you in advance.

---

**Request reference number: 506624**

**Record: 3**

To Dacorum borough taxi and private hire licensing department,

I am very happy to take part in this survey

And I agree with all the changes and I also know I might be only one of few Drivers who will welcome these changes as most of my colleagues will have different opinions but I would like to express myself that is an good idea and these changes are due to the modern world where technology is playing very important part.

Reasons why I like your ideas.

1. this will stop ubba snatching our work and our local Driver which as we all know it is easy for them to buy a car and start working for them with no knowledge test. These Drivers will no longer be working for them if they know that knowledge test is not hard as it use to be in Dacorum.

2. All those companies who have more than one operators license may not need any other license and all the work will stay with local Drivers and the Drivers working for other district will have license from Dacorum which will generate more money for our own Council.

3. I personally think hard knowledge test does not mean that new Driver knows what they are doing , they still need a lot of learning and this is operators duty to teach them but also that one day course will help them .

4. i dont think with modern technology Driver needs to have knowledge test and if London private hire can work in London without knowledge test I am sure Driver will be OK in Dacorum area which is not big as London.

I think it will be not fair to keep expressing about things which you already know.  
I am going to say , please carry on with good work.

---

**Request reference number: 506779**

**Record: 4**

Dear Sir/Madam,

We have discussed about the new changes, the drivers are against about this new idea as they have studied hard to get their license and feel as it is unfair for them. If there are plenty of new drivers coming to work , the old drivers will struggle to maintain the family because they would have less working time. In conclusion , our company disagrees with these new changes.

THANK YOU



**Consultation responses – taxi/private hire drivers****Request reference number: 506451 Record: 1**

Hi

Ans q1

I believe it should not be replaced .there should be a knowledge test and then further do the one day course as well.

Ans q2

They should passed the test as we are gone through a tough test so new drivers hackney and private should pass the test and in addition the awareness course as well.

Ans q3

Its a good idea to complete refresher course for the current drivers.

Ans 4

For young drivers u must reduce the frequency but after the age of 50 u must take annually.

Ans5

If its cheaper to do in a dvla way that's fine if its expensive then why to follow that as already doctors charging 80pounds for doing nothing. The checkup they do for 80 pounds I believe the authority officers can do as well.

Ans6

No need to do the changes as its easier to recognise the council plate n driver .london is different .

Ans 7

Its just to make things complicated for you and others the current plating system is working well .why to make it complicated.

I would request council to keep the current system as hemel is a very small town with extra drivers we cannot compare it with London Watford luton or other populated towns .still many drivers from outside currently working here and plenty of drivers wanted to come in .the only barrier is a knowledge test and other communication skills they have to do in hemel .still they can do work here if they pass the test and additional skills which seems quite fair as we have gone through this test as well and still many passing and working in decorum which means this test is still easy enough as plenty of drivers working in decorum.

Hackney drivers are suffering with the change of taxi rank in hemel town .there is no rank in berko and the train is occupied by the company and they don't let anyone stand there and tring station as well.

I would request the council to give the town rank back to the drivers atleast on the weekend night time as they did in the past in front of function rooms which was only a rank during Friday Saturday night only.

=====

Hi

I believe this would be quite harsh for the taxi industry especially the hackney drivers who are struggling at the moment with the new town rank and station.

We went through a hard and difficult knowlege test when we passed our taxi test why the new drivers dont go through this test .they should know the area and go through the test which would be fair i believe as there are already plenty of drivers and all the work is taken by the companies .there is not much work left in the town and station for hackney drivers .if more private hire enters without a test it would b a disaster .atleast a knowlege test should be a criteria for the new arrivals.

The new one day course should be an additional after clearing the knowlege test but please keep applying the knowlege test for all the new drivers interested in taxi business.

I personally believe its not a good idea and i request the authorities to keep the current knowlege test procedure for both hackney and private hires.

Thanks

Dear sir/madam

Im writing in regard to the proposed changed to the private hire knowledge test. As a private hire driver myself i do not agree with the removal of the dacorum knowledge test for the private hire drivers.

One of the main reason which had been highlighted is that the driver can "check the route before hand because its pre-booked". Thats fair enough the the driver can check the route but it does not mean they will go the shortest route and that includes sat navs. This will affect the price on the meter which means drivers more likely to get into bad situations when customers complain.

Also when a customer is on board they change their mind on the destination which means you require knowledge of local roads to get there. This also happens when a booking is misheard on the phone. Also customers sometimes only give the area they are going to as they didn't have road name at the time of booking.

The points above are some of the reasons why the knowledge test should be kept and this means the quality of drivers stays good for the customers. Many other drivers agree that there are enough taxi drivers as it is, and if more drivers are to join the circuit they should be of the same quality or better.

I don't agree with your new set up of no test for private hire I don't want any changes to test.

My reason not agreeing to your new proposal.by doing this you will the market with loads of drivers and there is no work in hemel.

=====

We all taxi drivers Hackney and private hire don't agree with new proosal

=====

Dear sirs

It with a heavy heart today I email you

I have been a taxi driver for almost 20 years in Decorum have certainly seen my trade Ebbed a way by policies adopted by our local licensing authority the lack of policing by enforcement officer's in the Bough has ended up with a free for all cross-border working by a number of neighbouring licensing authorities that have a lower standards.

To add insult to injury our Licensing department wish to abolish the one thing that prevented a free for all maintained the very high standard's that the Dacorum taxi and private hire trade have The local knowledge tests

It insures that all drivers have a good knowledge of the local area ensuring that all customers receive a good safe Service The elderly the vulnerable the disabled The blind

it is in the interest of public safety that we do not allow this knowledge test to be swept aside in the name of technology it helps maintain a balance of numbers against available taxis and Private hire's and customer demand at the moment the market place is oversaturated the removal of the knowledge test will exacerbate this situation

There is just not any more room for more taxes or private hires on decorum streets

I'm looking for your support as my local councillor in maintaining the high standards already set out by the licensing

=====

I don't agree with proposal that will cause lot of problem in hemel.

I didnt agree with new proposal.

=====

Knowledge test is the best way to educate drivers regarding the area. New awareness course may bring health and safety issues as we have seen the model in Transport for London. London liecensing authority requires drivers to take a knowledge test which has been a success and I believe this should be in our council too. Not having knowledge test created problems and new knowledge test was implemented and it has been a success since then.

Current test is very successful as it is very educating and informative. I think if there is any incidents these should be dealt with individually with the drivers and extra efforts should be placed in that instance. Otherwise the current liecensing system has been very good.

I don't think it is a necessity for current leicesnce holders to take any additional courses.

Current medical test require is sufficient. Every 45 50 55 60 65 birthday is a good option to consider.

Current medical test frequency is good and is good enough.

I think current docoters medical reports are good and will explain an applicant medical position more clearly. As DVLA form stricts the user to a limited information.

I think side stickers and plate format is a good idea. This makes the taxi stands out and helps the users to identify the vehicle. This can help in reducing confusing when picking up the client.

I do not agree with the new licensing policy changes proposed, as I believe all new drivers should part take in a written knowledge and legal assessment, as it was carried out previously.

I am not happy u changing the knowledge test for taxes please keep has same one because not enough work in town

=====

we all don't want to change new rolls for test to open we don't want that please leave has it is thanks I hope u get my point

Could you please explain the idea of not having a knowledge test I thought that this was all part of being a Hackney carriage driver  
Without this we might just as well be rouge cabs  
As there are enough of these operating in dacorum already  
I though the test was there to ensure public security and safety

Hi i would like to express my views and opinion in regards to the new knowledge test which you are looking to introduce and propose.

I do not agree with this and believe that it should be kept the same as it currently is.

The reason for my opinion is that the current mass of drivers in the borough are sufficient I believe, also the knowledge test signifies you as a driver, gaining knowledge of the area, also making the

customer feel comfortable with a driver who knows the area they are working in.

I hope you take this into consideration before making your final verdict.

=====

Dear sirs,

I write in relation to the proposed changes in relation to taxi licensing for Dacorum Borough Council.

Firstly in relation to point number 1, the knowledge test which has been working for a period of 25 years. I see no reason why the council cannot amalgamate the two tests, I do not feel that it would be a wise or suitable decision to remove the requirements of the test altogether. All current taxi drivers have passed this test and are competent within their roles. If the council feels that the next intake of taxi drivers need extra training, this should be in addition, not in replacement of the tests and training that all current drivers have gone through.

Though it may not be as important to have knowledge of the routes due to technology, every taxi driver should have a basic understanding. To try and argue that due to the availability of satellite navigation system drivers would not need knowledge of roads and routes is equivalent to saying that a doctor would not need a degree because self diagnosis is available on the internet, it is an absurd argument.

In relation to the point regarding companies subcontracting work after passing their test in other area, this is regulation which should be enhanced and made more stringent. The taxi drivers in the borough pay fees to be able to work and make a living, the council need to do more to ensure that those who pay their fees to the borough are earning a living, this ought to be the primary focus. The focus should not be in ensuring that the test is easy enough to pass so people don't go elsewhere.

In response to question 2, yes all drivers regardless of private and hackney ought to pass the a local knowledge test if they will be working in the borough.

In relation to current drivers, there is no reason to believe that they are unable or incompetent to carry out their jobs. If allegations have been made against individual drivers, the council ought to look at training individuals as opposed to wasting tax payers money on training those who do not need it.

My response to consultation question 3 is similar to the above. Unless there is a real reason to believe that an individual driver need to undertake a training and refresher course, it is a waste of resources to put everyone through such training when clearly there are other areas where this money could be put to use.

In relation to medical checks, you have yourselves pointed out that 'where a doctor recommends more frequent checks... we will require this.' It is unclear on what basis the council feel that more frequent checks would be necessary or the purpose of these more frequent checks. Clearly if there is an issue this will be raised by the GP, apart from the extra money which the council would make it is difficult to see any real benefit to this.

Consultation question 5, the GP's are paid to undertake these medical checks, the questions covered are essentially the same, apart from making the GP's life easier, there is no real benefit to changing the form unless it would be more cost effective for drivers by making this change.

Consultation question 6, there has been no complaints by current drivers or indication that we wish to change to a London system, we are happy with the way the current sign system is and there is no real advantage or changing apart from to fit a status quo which is essentially not needed because we are not a part of London.

The current system in relation too signs, changing of the system and issuance of new signs to such an extensive number of drivers is again a money wasting exercise. Essentially we work in the borough and our customers know how our signs work and those who use the taxis regularly know what they are looking for. Change is not only inconvenient for the drivers but may also cause

confusion for our customers.

I request that you take the above into consideration when making any decision to the proposed changes.

---

**Request reference number: 506570** **Record: 10**

I like to keep current licencing policy and practice.

---

**Request reference number: 506571** **Record: 11**

I don't agree with new proposal if that happens Hemel will be flooded with private hire and there is no work in Hemel.

---

**Request reference number: 506574** **Record: 12**

Dear sir/madam

Im a hackney carriage driver who works for XXXX and i do not agree with proposed changes to the private hire knowledge test.

I believe that reliance on sat navs is one of the biggest problems for customers, who pay extra for drivers not knowing the shortest route. sat navs never take you the shortest route because they have to be learnt. Sat navs also are wrong sometimes and especially in hemel where estate back onto each other.

One of main reasons which had been highlighted is that the driver can "check the route before hand because its pre-booked". Local routes should be known to drivers as i have 14 years experience and customer change their mind all the time. They expect you to know how to get there.

Also when a job is booked areas are given instead of road names so you require knowledge of local roads to get there. This also happens when a booking are mistaken on the phone.

I believe some form of the knowledge test should be kept, whether a lower pass mark to be implemented but it should still exist in some form.

Hope there is some understanding on the matter.

---

**Request reference number: 506575** **Record: 13**

I don't accept your new proposal first there are too many taxis in hemel not enough work so I'm happy to carry on as it is. Secondly we elected a committee to represent all Hackney drivers plus Private Hire Drivers, whatever the decision the committee makes we have accepted. So why we do we need to have a consultation,,this is counter productive and not beneficial. The committee should decide.

---

**Request reference number: 506577** **Record: 14**

Ref knowledge tests should stay for new private hire drivers because even though there is technology to get them AtoB but if they are not familier with roads they get to their destination on and the employers do not have giving direction facilitie...

What you do need is proper English courses for new drivers so that they can comunicate with customers and hit conversations customers complain to me that they don't like sitting with robot drivers as many auber drivers don't speak english and most of auber drivers and private hire drivers are picking fares of the streets on Marlows and old town when fares are not booked them late night's so should give hackney drivers rank in front of mode might club from 11pm to 5am on week ends there is no buses at that time at the hackney drivers wait for long time on rank in water street before they get a fare and private hire and auber drivers are ranking on front of crazy chicken peri and full house and are picking fare when they are not booked

Dear Sir/Madam,

I have been a taxi driver in Dacorum for the past 6 years. I would like to express my concerns regarding the licensing authority which is planning to scrap the taxi knowledge test making it easier to pass the private hire test, resulting in an inflated level of taxi drivers.

For the past decade, there has been a progressive drop in demand for taxi services in Hemel Hempstead. The reason behind the decline in business is due to a number of events which have occurred over the years, this includes the explosion in Buncefield which saw a decline in business. In addition, the closure of the nightclubs in Jarman Park and the relocation of the taxi rank in the town centre supported this decline. I would like to highlight the relocation of the taxi rank as a major decline in business, as it is now located in an inconvenient location where it is unsafe especially for elderly customers to get a cab. As a collective, these reasons have led to a decrease in the salary of taxi drivers.

Therefore I strongly urge the licensing department to reconsider their proposal to remove the knowledge test, and realise the bigger impact it will have on all the taxi drivers in Dacorum.

I thank you very much for taking the time out to read through my concerns, and hope this will be acted upon.

Question 1

No, as the current knowledge test puts drivers at ease once they have passed and makes them more confident, greatly improving the taxi services.

Question 3

No, this is due to drivers being on the road for many years, and over the years as a taxi driver our knowledge increases without the need for additional training.

Question 4

I strongly believe that the frequency at which taxi and private hire drivers must undergo medical checks should be reduced and should be similar to that of other professions.

Question 5

No, as the current one has no problems.

Question 7

No, I believe that displaying a sign on a private hire vehicle will lead to more confusion between hackney vehicles and private hire vehicles.

Hi Sir Or Madan

Regards to your message about the new policy for private hire's, my personal view on this is the knowledge test for new Private hire's drivers shouldn't be removed because this gives customers a good customer service to all communities including elderly, blind and disabled. I also strongly believe we should not just rely on technology, e.g. If a customer wants to change his/her destination and the driver has to take out there map constantly this will not have a good impact on the driver and will be waste of time and journey. The knowledge test is extremely important for all new drivers. If this new policy goes ahead this will have a big impact on all old hackney drivers.

---

Dear sirs,

I write in relation to the proposed changes in relation to taxi licensing for dacorum borough council.

Firstly in relation to point number 1, the knowledge test which has been working for a period of 25 years. I see no reason why the council cannot amalgamate the two tests, I do not feel that it would be a wise or suitable decision to remove the requirements of the test altogether. All current taxi drivers have passed this test and are competent within their roles. If the council feels that the next intake of taxi drivers need extra training, this should be in addition, not in replacement of the tests and training that all current drivers have gone through.

Though it may not be as important to have knowledge of the routes due to technology, every taxi driver should have a basic understanding. To try and argue that due to the availability of satellite navigation system drivers would not need knowledge of roads and routes is equivalent to saying that a doctor would not need a degree because self diagnosis is available on the internet, it is an absurd argument.

In relation to the point regarding companies subcontracting work after passing their test in other area, this is regulation which should be enhanced and made more stringent. The taxi drivers in the borough pay fees to be able to work and make a living, the council need to do more to ensure that those who pay their fees to the borough are earning a living, this ought to be the primary focus. The focus should not be in ensuring that the test is easy enough to pass so people don't go elsewhere.

In response to question 2, yes all drivers regardless of private and hackney ought to pass the a local knowledge test if they will be working in the borough.

In relation to current drivers, there is no reason to believe that they are unable or incompetent to carry out their jobs. If allegations have been made against individual drivers, the council ought to look at training individuals as opposed to wasting tax payers money on training those who do not need it.

My response to consultation question 3 is similar to the above. Unless there is a real reason to believe that an individual driver need to undertake a training and refresher course, it is a waste of resources to put everyone through such training when clearly there are other areas where this money could be put to use.

In relation to medical checks, you have yourselves pointed out that 'where a doctor recommends more frequent checks... we will require this.' It is unclear on what basis the council feel that more frequent checks would be necessary or the purpose of these more frequent checks. Clearly if there is an issue this will be raised by the GP, apart from the extra money which the council would make it is difficult to see any real benefit to this.

Consultation question 5, the GP's are paid to undertake these medical checks, the questions covered are essentially the same, apart from making the GP's life easier, there is no real benefit to changing the form unless it would be more cost effective for drivers by making this change.

Consultation question 6, there has been no complaints by current drivers or indication that we wish to change to a London system, we are happy with the way the current sign system is and there is no real advantage or changing apart from to fit a status quo which is essentially not needed because we are not a part of London.

The current system in relation too signs, changing of the system and issuance of new signs to such an extensive number of drivers is again a money wasting exercise. Essentially we work in the borough and our customers know how our signs work and those who use the taxis regularly know what they are looking for. Change is not only inconvenient for the drivers but may also cause confusion for our customers.

I request that you take the above into consideration when making any decision to the proposed changes.

Dear DBC Taxi Licensing

I am writing this letter / complaint in disagreement to the suggestion of removal of the Private Hire Knowledge test in the Borough of Dacorum.

I am in strong disagreement to the opening of the Private hire test and making it a "free for all trade". I have been a private hire driver in the borough for over 14 years, I have personally experienced the increase of hours per shift to earn a decent living. The increase of new drivers would increase due to the "easily" available license, this in turn will mean that the current fleet of taxi drivers would have to double hours to earn a decent living. As you are aware already the borough has a good number of taxis available and there is never a shortage of taxi available to the public. I am struggling to grasp the concept of why DBC would like to open the private hire test and make it hard / impossible to earn a livelihood for the current drivers who have worked / studied hard to become taxi drivers.

I am in agreement that current drivers should undertake additional training to strengthen their current skills and customer services, this could benefit the driver which in return will mean a safer experience for customers.

Leading onto driver medicals I personally think that the current medical conditions is sufficient enough and should stay the same.

I would also like to say that the signage in DBC for taxis is good and unique and we should keep to the way the current taxis are signed.

I hope my opinions and concerns will be taken into consideration upon making the proposed change by the Council.

Today i write to you in regards to the current changes of policies which you have proposed to implement. I have been private hire driver for twelve years, the trade is going bad.

The changes in knowledge test will affect both current drivers and customers. There should be knowledge test like when i did, so the driver should know which is best cheap route for the customer sometimes there is elderly and blind customer as well. So the driver should know whole of dacorum boroughs road. This is also in public interest as well.

There is just not any more room for taxis/private hire vehicles on the streets of Dacorum.I hope you can take my issues and suggestions into consideration and hope you review the prospect of eliminating the knowledge test.

Hi sir/madam,

I would like to give my opinion about the changes to the current Licencing policies,I agree with the new training and awareness course,but it should be add with the written test of local and legal knowledge for private hire drivers and written test should be as computerised test.because the Dacorum area is country side area(places like ashridge,little gaddsen and feldon postcode doesn't take drivers by sat Nav to the right place and mostly houses are by name and there is hardly network service in these areas,so I think private hire drivers need to give local knowledge test.I am against to finish the local and legal knowledge test.

I agree and appreciate the medical proposals and haven't got any issue with the drivers medical.

About the signage plates on private hire vehicles,I would say yes and agree that it should change to alternate as the TFL for private hire vehicles in London.

=====



Hi sir I would like to give my opinion on the new proposals of the council for the private hire Licencing.

I think the Dacorum council shouldn't replace the current knowledge test for new private hire drivers .Dacoram council can add the training and awareness course with the knowledge test,I am against to finish the knowledge test,replacing with one day training course.

2)yes I think the current taxi and private hire drivers should undertake a shorter version of this training course with the knowledge test.

3) Yes current licensed hackney carriage and private hire drivers be required to complete a refresh training and awareness course.

4)Yes we should require taxi and private hire drivers medical reports to be completed on a version of the DVLA'S standard driver medical form.

5)Diamond shaped stickers on the front and rear windscreen is a very good proposal, Its gonna be better then the plastic plates.

---

**Request reference number: 506596**

**Record: 21**

Dear Dacorum Borough Council,

I am writing to you with regards to the recent changes being made to taxi tests. I am very dissapointed to hear about the recent changes to the structure of courses being implemented. I am completely against new drivers merely sitting training an awareness courses and existing drivers having to sit refresher courses. I believe the new structure is unfair and is a dissspointing that new drivers will not be required to sit knowlege based examinations as previously were necessary.

I do hope you take my comments on board as I do not support the new changes.

---

**Request reference number: 506598**

**Record: 22**

I am a hackney taxi driver in Dacorum Borough Council. I feel that by abolishing the theory test would not benefit the taxi driver or the customer. By having the current test in place, provides in depth knowledge of the area and the regulations that need to be followed.

Also provides a blanket of safety to the customer by re-insuring them that the taxi drivers have gained the required training before becoming a taxi driver. Having done the test myself, I feel this had encouraged me to study the area in depth and especially with regards to understanding the rules and regulations that every taxi driver must know and follow.

---

**Request reference number: 506602**

**Record: 23**

I have been a Taxi driver for around 16 years over that time we have seen our livelihoods affected with more & more Taxis being licensed.

We now hear that there is a proposal to remove the knowledge test for private hire.

I am strongly against this as this will flood more Taxis in our area which there is already more than enough we work for the council & pay our rents on our homes also to the council, I ask how can we be expected to survive & keep our roofs over our heads is this happens.

It's also my belief that every taxi driver in Hemel at this moment can & should be proud of their achievement in passing the knowledge test. This keeps relations between the drivers & the general public in good stead with each other, the knowledge was put in place so that customers got the real deal & the right prices

The general public of Hemel Hempstead do not want or deserve to have to direct the driver to their destinations

The old system is better than the new one why you are causing all this headache for no reason we have enough cars in the town and we have lost of work since past few weeks and months.

Dear sir/madam

I am writing this email to register my strong opposition against the new proposals set by yourselves.

I have been a taxi driver for 7 years and seen the work go downhill. I feel there are too many private hire drivers on the circuit and feel if you scrap the knowledge test the flood gates will open and there will not be enough work to go round.

I request to you to please not to scrap the knowledge test and keep things as they are.

To the licensing officer.

Dear Sir, I'm a hackney and private hire driver I'm writing this email regarding this consultation about the taxi licence. This is my humble request that you should not remove this knowledge test for hackney or private hire licence because it will over flood this business in dacorum as we are already struggling. Also I don't think that you should send all the old drivers for anymore course. And about medical test I don't mind any of these suggestions or even the old process. And lastly I think the current Hackney and private hire signage process is quite appropriate. And at the end I will again strongly not in favour of removing the knowledge test for either of licence.

To whom this may concern,

I am writing this email in regards to the new proposed changes set out by the council in relation to the licencing changes.

I am currently a taxi driver for the last 15 years within Dacorum borough council.

I have read the new changes in detail and I strongly disagree with them. I have never seen so many bizarre proposals which make no sense.

Firstly introducing a one day test for private hire licence means drivers will be going out on the road without any local knowledge of the area. Also there is no standard with just having a one day test, it takes away all the experience and professional of the area which is carried by the current drivers in the borough.

I absolutely disagree your proposals and I am very concerned that these are the kind of ideas which the licencing team are coming up with without addressing more important issues.

It is a matter of common sense, if you have a driver who has 30 years experience or a driver who has attended a course for 8 hours one day, who would you rather sit with ?

It's not exactly rocket science to understand.

I also think the changes for the refresher course should be optional.

I look forward to your reply.

---

I like the Old system nothing Chang as the old one is the best one  
thank you very much

Dear Sirs,

It is with deep regret that I am contacting you once again about proposed changes to taxis/private hire vehicles in Dacorum.

As recently as 6 months ago the trade produced a petition against proposed changes that were put forward.

The new proposals are of a similar nature and seem to be reflecting a stance taken by the council of not really caring about the drivers or the trade and more interested in revenue.

#### 1. Knowledge Test.

Removal of this is a atrocious suggestion or proposal, and goes against the fundamental part of being a taxi driver, going against the fact the public should have trust in drivers having adequate knowledge of routes and places. Not only this, but this will damage the trade in its entirety as it would potentially allow many more drivers when there is no need.

This will flood a market/trade that is already operating at its optimum.

I feel very upset by this and feel the local authority instead of being stringent in cross border hiring is trying to legalise illegal trade in the borough by allowing those without a Dacorum taxi badge to acquire one without having to do any form of test or possess the relevant knowledge.

You stipulate the use of PDAs and Sat nav so you will expect drivers to do this every time on the job, this is dangerous unprofessional and hazardous. Most operators in Dacorum use PDAs but none have paid for the navigation feature.

By saying only Hackney drivers will require a test defeats the object as the Hackney trade will all but be killed off by the influx of private hire drivers.

Additionally, I would like to ask when was the last time a feasibility study was taken out. This would clearly show there are too many taxis operating within Dacorum. Why are other professions protected.

I strongly oppose this proposal.

#### 2. Refresher course.

Having a training course in addition to a knowledge test is something the trade may consider. This can also be for existing drivers.

#### 3. Driver Medical.

This is a proposal that I have no comment on bar for supporting it, but a question on renewal forms may need to be inserted in relation to health around the driver and notification of this to DBC if anything arises.

4. Signage. Public safety is key and why are we constantly trying to replicate what happens in London. The reasons why TFL don't allow exterior signage on private hires in London is because they don't want confusion . The London Hackney cars are prestigious and an iconic figure representing the UK globally as do yellow taxis in New York nothing should deter the naked eye otherwise. This is Dacorum, signs are needed on all vehicles especially private hire vehicles. This is because there is limited rank space in town or at the station so how will the public know it is their booked car. This will only increase and offer opportunities to those without licences to operate.

Finally, I don't understand the constant need to keep tampering with a system that has served Dacorum so well. The need is to stop any further testing and issuing of licences a waiting list should be implemented until such time arises where there is a genuine and honest need of further taxis. Dacorum could become a benchmark for the country with this position, reduce admin costs and be able to focus its efforts on regulation and enforcement. Drivers would be supportive and co operative and revenue could be generated by introducing stringent measures/ higher fees for drivers who are operating in a fair environment and not in the current oversubscribed local industry.

I am more than happy to assist the council in discussing this further.

Kind regards

---

**Request reference number: 506609** **Record: 30**

Dear sir/madam

I am writing this email to register my strongest protest against your proposal Of changes to licencing requirements.

By stopping the knowledge test you will open flood gates. We have enough drivers on the circuit as it is we don't any more.

Please i request you keep the things as they are.

---

**Request reference number: 506610** **Record: 31**

Dear Sir/Madam,

I have been a taxi driver in Dacorum for the past 6 years. I would like to express my concerns regarding the licensing authority which is planning to scrap the taxi knowledge test making it easier to pass the private hire test, resulting in an inflated level of taxi

Therefore I strongly urge the licensing department to reconsider their proposal to remove the knowledge test, and realise the bigger impact it will have on all the taxi drivers in Dacorum.

I thank you very much for taking the time out to read through my email

---

**Request reference number: 506612** **Record: 32**

As ataxi driver of many years , my observation of the taxi industry in Dacourum has been one of the best.. It very sadens me to hear that the knowledge test is being abolished, although many changes over the years have been for the best , thus change howeve has compromised the quality of drivers knowledge ..why make such s change that will be no good to the public ,, you can have a one day course in addition to the existing knowledge test..

---

**Request reference number: 506613** **Record: 33**

Dear Sirs

Please see my responses to your driver consultation questions .

Consultation question 1

I absolutely think that all new drivers should have to take a knowledge test.

Over reliance on navigation systems is folly you hear of cases of drivers taking people to a town with the right name but in the wrong geographical area.

Consultation question 2

Yes I do feel Hackney carriage and dual drivers should be subject to the same test for the above reasons .

I do not believe existing drivers should be subject to any further training unless he or she is in breach of licensing regulations.

I believe that vocational qualifications should be recognised and not ignored as they seem to be at the moment.

Consultation question 3

No I do not feel existing drivers should have to undergo additional training for reasons given above.

The medical examinations every 3 years are more than sufficient, there is absolutely no need to have further checks. I feel this is discrimination against older people. If there are health issues they will be picked up on the 3 year medical check anyway. If despite this they are enforced the very least licensing should do is negotiate a flat fee with local gp's for carrying this out.

Consultation question 4

It is not reducing the frequency it is increasing it and I do NOT agree with that for the above reasons.

Consultation question 5

A standard form recognised by all appears to make sense.

Consultation question 6

Signage in front and rear widescreen is preferable and makes sense.

Consultation question 7

No I do not think any additional signage is necessary.

---

**Request reference number: 506614**

**Record: 34**

Hi

Having written my response below I relayed my response to my drivers who were working and they wished me to add their names to my own as they expressed the same views. Other drivers are going to write in themselves and some drivers didn't care so I have not added their name to the list and they will undoubtedly not be writing in.

Regards

*[15 DRIVERS LISTED]*

Q1

Although the training and awareness course is a great idea you should not do away with the knowledge test. Sat Navs can be set up to take the quickest or shortest route which would enable the driver to set the quickest route setting until you catch them through complaints.

They also don't always know about roads you can't turn into or out of in certain directions like the small road between the Cotterells and the Leighton Buzzard Road. Also what happens if, and this can happen quite often, the device loses satellite connection. How long would it be before all private hire drivers are tarnished with the same brush of 'not knowing where they are going' and customers aiming only to use 'Taxi only' companies in order to receive a professional service. I believe that it is in the best interests of the good people of Dacorum that our council continues to deliver the highest quality of service that they have grown to depend on. Therefore you should keep the knowledge test but also introduce the measures proposed to ensure that new drivers are fully aware of the service levels required. I, as have a vast majority of my drivers, have passed an NVQ & BTEC in taxi driving so any measures you may introduce to maintain the public's safety are welcomed.

I suggest you copy the Mayor of London, Sadiq Khan, into lobbying parliament to regain control of your Borough by confirming that to transport a customer to or from a Licensing Borough, the operator, vehicle and driver should be licensed by that Borough.

(<http://content.tfl.gov.uk/taxi-and-private-hire-action-plan-2016.pdf>)

Q2

Yes Hackney drivers should keep their knowledge test and any refresher course in training and

awareness course should be welcomed.

Q3

Yes they should.

Q4

As most drivers are male I would suggest keeping it as it is as they are less likely statistically to get themselves seen if their health deteriorated. Therefore keeping the checks to a maximum of 3 year intervals is in the public's interest.

Q5

If they are testing for exactly the same standard of health I have no opinion either way.

Q6

Maintain the current signage as it looks more professional..

Q7

I find these signs virtually obsolete as the customer only considers the convenience of the car in front of them and won't care about the pre-booked basis. Unscrupulous drivers will continue to take the 'flag down' making any signs superfluous.

---

**Request reference number: 506615**

**Record: 35**

To whom it may concern

I have been a taxi driver for 13 years in Dacorum and have seen my trade Robbed away by local polices adopted by our council's licensing authority, The lack of policing by enforcement officers in the brough has ended up with a free for all cross border working by numbers of neighbouring licensing authorities that have lowered the standards.

To add insult to injuries our licensing department wish to abolish the knowledge tests for private hire which had high standards for taxis the local knowledge tests ensured customers received good service. It is in the interest of public safety that we do not allow this knowledge tests to be abolished in name of technology it helps to maintain balance of numbers against available taxis and private hire and customer demand at the moment the market place is oversaturate. The removal of knowledge tests will exacerbate this situation there is too many taxis and private hire in the brough I'm looking for your support in maintaining the high standards already set out by the licensing department.

---

**Request reference number: 506616**

**Record: 36**

Dear Sir madam

Here is my point of you regarding your proposal for the changes into taxi and private hire licensing

Consultation Question No 1

I am absolutely not in favored of it if added with the current knowledge test Will more affective

Consultation question No 2:

As far as hackney driver concern I would suggest the only Hockney driver who doesn't Go through the vocational training they should attend either the vocational training or The course you are proposing

Consultation question No 3:

No Only those driver who doesn't attend the vocational training.

Consultation question No 4: That's absolutely practical and agreed with

Consultation question No 5: Either way fine

Consultation question No 6: There no need to change current plate system

Consultation question No 7: N/A

---

I am a taxi driver in the borough of Dacorum. I have been a taxi driver for 6years and we have all noticed that work is decreasing more and more. There is currently an overload of taxi drivers Hackney and private. By making the changes you have planned it will affect our income massively. Please think about this as this is not just mine but hundreds of people's livelihoods.

I am a taxi driver in the borough of Dacorum. I have been a taxi driver for 6years and we have all noticed that work is decreasing more and more. There is currently an overload of taxi drivers Hackney and private. By making the changes you have planned it will affect our income massively. Please think about this as this is not just mine but hundreds of people's livelihoods.

=====

Dear sirs

It with a heavy heart today I email you I have been a taxi driver for almost 20 years in Decorum have certainly seen my trade Ebbed a way by policies adopted by our local licensing authority the lack of policing by enforcement officer's in the Bough has ended up with a free for all cross-border working by a number of neighbouring licensing authorities that have a lower standards.

To add insult to injury our Licensing department wish to abolish the one thing that prevented a free for all maintained the very high standard's that the Dacorum taxi and private hire trade have The local knowledge tests It insures that all drivers have a good knowledge of the local area ensuring that all customers receive a good safe Service The elderly the vulnerable the disabled The blind it is in the interest of public safety that we do not allow this knowledge test to be swept aside in the name of technology it helps maintain a balance of numbers against available taxis and Private hire's and customer demand at the moment the market place is oversaturated the removal of the knowledge test will exacerbate this situation There is just not any more room for more taxis or private hires on decorum streets I'm looking for your support as my local councillor in maintaining the high standards already set out by the licensing Thanking you

Today I write to you in regards to the current change of policies which you have proposed to implement. I have been a taxi driver for just over a year now however been apart of the industry as a taxi controller for as long as 6 years. I have certainly seen my trade ebbed away by policies adopted by the local licensing authority and the lack of policing by enforcement officers.

The borough of dacorum is edging towards a free for all cross-border working borough with a number of neighbouring authorities whom have a lower standard than us.

To add insult to injury our licensing department propose to abolish the one factor which prevented a free for all type scenario, 'the knowledge test.' The local knowledge test ensures that all drivers that have a license have knowledge and understanding of the local area, this also makes certain that the general public and fare paying customers receive a proficient and safe service, customers such as the elderly, the vulnerable and the disable. This is also in public interest as well as public safety that we do not allow the knowledge test to be swept aside.

As far as the signage for private hire vehicles go, I strongly believe that the current structure in which the taxis is made visible and accessible to the customer is exceptional. For instance if the customer can only see the rear of the vehicle, they will mostly look for the exterior plate attached to the vehicle, the option of having stickers affixed to the rear windscreen may be beneficial to drivers as it will be discreet however a disadvantage to customers who look out for the plate as a form of landmark.

To sum things up, there is just not any more room for more taxis/private hire vehicles on the streets of Dacorum. I hope you can take my issues and suggestions into consideration and hope you review the prospect of eliminating the knowledge test.

Hi I'm one of the taxi drivers just wanted to comment on the recent changes that Dacorum Borough Council want to make for the knowledge test. I think they should keep the knowledge test for all the new taxi driving. And limit the taxi drivers because of the size of the town and not enough work for everyone. To my knowledge all the taxi drivers are not happy about this changes hopefully you will keep this in consideration thank you very much.

Today I write to you in regards to the current change of policies which you have proposed to implement. I have been a taxi driver for just over a year now. I have certainly seen my trade ebbed away by policies adopted by the local licensing authority and the lack of policing by enforcement officers.

The borough of dacorum is edging towards a free for all cross-border working borough with a number of neighbouring authorities whom have a lower standard than us.

To add insult to injury our licensing department propose to abolish the one factor which prevented a free for all type scenario, 'the knowledge test.' The local knowledge test ensures that all drivers that have a license have knowledge and understanding of the local area, this also makes certain that the general public and fare paying customers receive a proficient and safe service, customers such as the elderly, the vulnerable and the disable. This is also in public interest as well as public safety that we do not allow the knowledge test to be swept aside.

As far as the signage for private hire vehicles go, I strongly believe that the current structure in which the taxis is made visible and accessible to the customer is exceptional. For instance if the customer can only see the rear of the vehicle, they will mostly look for the exterior plate attached to the vehicle, the option of having stickers affixed to the rear windscreen may be beneficial to drivers as it will be discreet however a disadvantage to customers who look out for the plate as a form of landmark.

To sum things up, there is just not any more room for more taxis/private hire vehicles on the streets of Dacorum. I hope you can take my issues and suggestions into consideration and hope you review the prospect of eliminating the knowledge test.

I am replying to the request for comments about the taxi licensing department are considering, Having read the proposals that is published on the website. I have been in this field for over 12 years as a driver and controller and quite proudly would like to say DBC taxi licensing department have had a very good reputation and trust from all drivers. Overall you talk about eliminating the knowledge test but I don't think you properly understand the affects of this. You want to let a limitless number of taxis onto the streets of Dacorum, Have you thought through that the trade is already on its knees because of Uber, combined with high fuel cost and vehicle costs.

I personally think that a Knowledge test & Communication skills assessment is compulsory for all applicants reason being one of key causes of disputes and arguments is in not knowing your way around and taking your customers by the wrong route. This will get passengers angry, and disputes can quickly turn into assaults, or worse. It is very important that all drivers study and remember all the routes and streets so that you minimize any negative action by the customer.

I agree that many vehicles/operators do have the dispatch equipment now including navigation and route planner but at the end of the day we can't rely on the technology as I have mention before that I have experienced the downfalls on all the latest dispatch equipment as a controller on many occasions , For example certain areas in Dacorum when you enter you don't have no signal which results to navigation not working, another example I can give you last Saturday night there was a power cut at the taxi office where I work for over 2 hours, So drivers had to rely on there own knowledge on what route to take due to the dispatch equipment was down, Therefore the geographical knowledge is absolutely vital, This also makes certain that the passengers receive a proficient and safe service.



Communication skills assessment is very important as all passengers prefer a taxi driver who has good communication skills for instance, who are new to a certain area or country, appreciate having a pleasant conversation with their driver. Furthermore, taxi drivers who know how to communicate well can help their passengers find their way around a particular location. When you hire a taxi, you expect the driver to understand where you want to go. With excellent communication, you can expect great results and you are likely to reach your destination without any hassle.

Passengers prefer a driver who is courteous and respectful. They appreciate drivers who greet them politely, as it helps customers feel at ease while inside the vehicle.

The bottom line is we can't afford to lower our standards just because other neighbouring authorities have done so by eliminating the knowledge test and communication skills assessment. If you kill the taxi trade in Dacorum you will lose the committed drivers who care about the job and end up with the lowest common denominator in terms of drivers and vehicles.

Thank you in advance for your attention to this matter.

---

**Request reference number: 506626**

**Record: 43**

The proposal to scrap the taxi and private hire knowledge test is, in my view, a retrograde step.

In the present uncertain financial climate, there are already too few customers for the amount of drivers available. I think this will get worse as Brexit approaches. At least the test helps to limit the number of drivers, and to make it a free for all would be catastrophic for everybody. To have drivers taking fares to destinations they don't know and perhaps not being able to speak English seems stupid to me. I have been doing the job for over 40 years, so I know what I am talking about. Please re-consider, and leave things as they are.

We don't want to finish up like Uber, look at the problems they have caused.

---

**Request reference number: 506628**

**Record: 44**

dear sir madam,

i seen on ur web site that the council is planning to make some changing in to the taxi licencing. i read all consultration question very deeply,as far i understand im not happy with the one of the consultation question that instant-knowledge test the council is planning to give one day training to get the taxi lissenc,the reson why i am not agree with this because it will effect on my work , if we have planty of work then its difrent, but council knows that already we have more taxi then we are required.its only in over area that we have theree line at station because we have alot of taxis. i did spend alot of time and money and really hard work to get the decorum badge , ,since i start work as a taxi driver i naver had problum to find the distination,it was only possible because of knowledge test,also that is very usefull to give good customar service if rhe driver knows the area,with my experience as a taxi driver it wont be good for saffy as wel.as longer the knowledge test is remaining same it will be helpfull for me , because i am not making even bassic per hour percentage. if it happend i wont be able to run my faimly.for the other 6 qustion you ask with respect i dont mind to follow the council if its good for driver and for the saffy .  
best regard

---

**Request reference number: 506633**

**Record: 45**

Hi,

I am currently working as Private Hire driver in dacorum.

I am completely against the change in the knowledge test. Knowledge test was much better because when driver coming after getting the knowledge he can perform much better than a person who is going to rely on sat nav.

As a driver I speak to different individuals during. A majority of customers says they are impressed by the taxi service in Hemel. It is only because the drivers are well trained.

They tell about the funny stories of Uber guys.

Again in the end I Condemned about this change.

---

I just wanted to say as a taxi driver my colleagues agree with me, you should keep the previous knowledge test as it was before not the current one that has been decided.

We personally do not require any more taxi driver in this town (hemel hempstead) it is a small town and does not require any more drivers.

We believe that old private hire taxi drivers should be given hackney badges as they have done knowledge test, so they shouldn't have to complete more tests. There are too many drivers and this is when this environment becomes negative as everyone is competing for too much which involves people picking up steps they shouldn't.

Hopefully you our worries and concerns we have for our town can get sorted and our opinions are taken into consideration.

I been to decorum web site where i seen that the council are making some chages to taxi licence. i am totally ddisagree with this , because it will effect badly on my trade. i did spend alot of my time and money to learn knowledge test i was driving to every single road to learn the roots, and this not fair with us, already there are more taxi then the area is required. to check this you should visat to train station the have three line ..he same station and on the ranks as wel. with new policies the driver we'll be more then customers ,and i wont b able to run my faimly. thats why its huge request to council to not make any changes.

I believe that it is a good idea to have training and awareness course for new drivers, but I am not in favour of removing the knowledge test for private hire. Yes, they take pre booked jobs but what if the customer changes their destination on the way, they have to stop and look at a map or put it in the navigation system, which is not professional. Therefore local knowledge is essential. Furthermore if the knowledge test is abolished drivers from other counties will be able to do taxi in Hemel. This will cause this small town to be flooded with taxis. There are private hire sub contracting jobs from other counties although there are only a few drivers they should return to their licencing area after completing their job. So I oppose the idea of abolishing the knowledge test.

Hackney carriage should pass local knowledge test, and awareness course should only be for new drivers as most of the old drivers have already passed their NVQ and Btec courses approximately 4 years ago.

I am in favour of reducing the frequency of the medical check ups.

The current medical form is fine as it has been for a long time and the doctors are also familiar with it.

I prefer the current plastic plates for private hire but don't mind either way.

In response to your consultation:-

1. I totally disagree with the removal of the knowledge tests for private hire drivers in Dacorum. This test was brought in for reasons of public safety, nothing in this respect has changed. New drivers should be suitably tested in all areas of their competetness for the job. It is in everyone's interest, both the public and the trade.

2. Hackney Carriage drivers should be required to sit a knowledge test also. They should need to demonstrate a slightly better standard of knowledge of the borough, due to the fact that they can be 'hailed' in the street.

I do not believe current drivers should retrospectively be asked to complete a course in relation to the job, they have clearly been meeting current standards or there would have been complaints to deal with, due to their poor conduct standards.

3. As above, I do not agree that current drivers in either license should be asked to retrospectively complete a course. Except in the circumstances that they have been found to be sub-standard through complaint.

4. I do not believe medical frequency should be reduced. Again in terms of public safety it is important that the driver's health is checked regularly. I believe the current frequency is about correct. I am in favour of bringing our medical standards in line with the DVLA D4 form.

5. As above I am in favour of bringing our standards in line with DVLA's, so yes to their D4 form.

6. I have no opinion either way on the changing of private hire license plates. So London as they are clearly marked and definable as NOT hackney carriages.

7. Yes I believe they should display something other than the license plates for distinguishing. The usual magnetic door stickers should be fine in my opinion.

---

**Request reference number: 506639**

**Record: 50**

Hi I think we should remain with old knowledge test for new drivers so they can have better knowledge of local area customer feel better and it cost cheaper for their journey .regarding private hire sign for roof it is not good idea because customer get confusion between private hire & Hackney drivers and should not rely on navigation systems for local area because it always take the longest route .

---

**Request reference number: 506640**

**Record: 51**

Today I write to you in regards to the current change of policies which you have proposed to implement. I have been a taxi driver for just over a year now however been apart of the industry as a taxi controller for as long as 6 years. I have certainly seen my trade ebb away by policies adopted by the local licensing authority and the lack of policing by enforcement officers.

The borough of dacorum is edging towards a free for all cross-border working borough with a number of neighbouring authorities whom have a lower standard than us.

To add insult to injury our licensing department propose to abolish the one factor which prevented a free for all type scenario, 'the knowledge test.' The local knowledge test ensures that all drivers that have a license have knowledge and understanding of the local area, this also makes certain that the general public and fare paying customers receive a proficient and safe service, customers such as the elderly, the vulnerable and the disable. This is also in public interest as well as public safety that we do not allow the knowledge test to be swept aside.

As far as the signage for private hire vehicles go, I strongly believe that the current structure in which the taxis is made visible and accessible to the customer is exceptional. For instance if the customer can only see the rear of the vehicle, they will mostly look for the exterior plate attached to the vehicle, the option of having stickers affixed to the rear windscreen may be beneficial to drivers as it will be discreet however a disadvantage to customers who look out for the plate as a form of landmark.

To sum things up, there is just not any more room for more taxis/private hire vehicles on the streets of Dacorum. I hope you can take my issues and suggestions into consideration and hope you review the prospect of eliminating the knowledge test.

---

I think the test should be made harder Not easier because if the drivers don't have the knowledge of places and roads they cannot take all the customers to the distanation by short route

Dear Sirs,

I am formally expressing my disagreement with your proposed removal of the taxi knowledge test for taxis operating within the Dacorum borough.

The taxi market within the Dacorum borough is currently flooded, with many licensees concentrated within a small area.

The current knowledge test not only ensures the competence of current and future license holders but also ensures the taxi market does not become flooded with drivers who aren't able to service the public transportation sector of the Dacorum borough.

Feel free to contact me if you require further details in regards to my opposition to the proposed changes.

Q1. I do not think it is a good idea to get rid of the current knowledge test.

Q2. If you think the the course is important then implement it in conjunction with the current knowledge test.

Q3. A number of your current drivers have been doing this job for a number of years and do not need to go on the course.

Q4. Yes, I think it should be changed to what is being proposed.

Q5. Yes, as it would standardise the process.

Q6. I have no objection.

Q7. I have no objection.

I hope you will consider my views.

Good Afternoon, I have been a taxi driver for almost 12 years in Dacorum have certainly seen my trade evaporate a way by policies adopted by our local licensing authority the lack of policing by enforcement officer's in the Borough has ended up with a free for all cross-border working by a number of neighbouring licensing authorities that have a lower standards.

To add insult to injury our Licensing department wish to abolish the one thing that prevented a free for all maintained the very high standard's that the Dacorum taxi and private hire trade have The local knowledge tests It insures that all drivers have a good knowledge of the local area ensuring that all customers receive a good safe Service The elderly the vulnerable the disabled The blind it is in the interest of public safety that we do not allow this knowledge test to be swept aside in the name of technology it helps maintain a balance of numbers against available taxis and Private hire's and customer demand at the moment the market place is oversaturated the removal of the knowledge test will exacerbate this situation

There is just not any more room for more taxes or private hires on dacorum streets I'm looking for your support in maintaining the high standards already set out by the licensing

Dear Licensing,

I believe the scrapping of the knowledge test will lower the standard of P/H Driving and be a step backwards.

I can only think the reason to do this is to bow to the pressure of Uber.

You may also find a passenger in a private hire car with a Driver who literally has no idea outside of his sat-nav where he is !

I passed the knowledge test and as a English speaking driver I find it strange to allow English speaking proxies at a knowledge test given they would need to understand English when being given the destination, understanding road signs etc and effectively defrauding people because they don't know the most efficient routes.

If the knowledge test is dropped I have concerns for passengers and how they get around Dacorum in the cheapest way.

At peak periods of time the shortest route is not always the quickest route.

I still think it is important that private hire drivers to pass a knowledge as well as Hackney carriage and an spoken English test for new taxi drivers and private hire drivers . Some years ago due to pressure from decorum borough council I took an NVQ for taxi driving which I passed I do not see why I should take another test as I already passed this one . If the council and hackney carriage committee are done their jobs properly this would be in place for all new taxi drivers and Private hire drivers can you explain why are you ceased doing this.

As a driver from Dacorum I have been a driver for almost 8 years in this council. I strongly disagree with the not having a knowledge test as the driver should know which is the shortest route for the customers.

All the other concerns I have no issue with.

I am against the new council decision to take away the knowledge test in dacorum.

Dear sirs,

I write in relation to the proposed changes in relation to taxi licensing for dacorum borough council.

Firstly in relation to point number 1, the knowledge test which has been working for a period of 25 years. I see no reason why the council cannot amalgamate the two tests, I do not feel that it would be a wise or suitable decision to remove the requirements of the test altogether. All current taxi drivers have passed this test and are competent within their roles. If the council feels that the next intake of taxi drivers need extra training, this should be in addition, not in replacement of the tests and training that all current drivers have gone through.

Though it may not be as important to have knowledge of the routes due to technology, every taxi driver should have a basic understanding. To try and argue that due to the availability of satellite navigation system drivers would not need knowledge of roads and routes is equivalent to saying that a doctor would not need a degree because self diagnosis is available on the internet, it is an absurd argument.

In relation to the point regarding companies subcontracting work after passing their test in other area, this is regulation which should be enhanced and made more stringent. The taxi drivers in the borough pay fees to be able to work and make a living, the council need to do more to ensure that those who pay their fees to the borough are earning a living, this ought to be the primary focus. The focus should not be in ensuring that the test is easy enough to pass so people don't go elsewhere.

In response to question 2, yes all drivers regardless of private and hackney ought to pass the a local knowledge test if they will be working in the borough.

In relation to current drivers, there is no reason to believe that they are unable or incompetent to carry out their jobs. If allegations have been made against individual drivers, the council ought to look at training individuals as opposed to wasting tax payers money on training those who do not need it.

My response to consultation question 3 is similar to the above. Unless there is a real reason to believe that an individual driver need to undertake a training and refresher course, it is a waste of resources to put everyone through such training when clearly there are other areas where this money could be put to use.

In relation to medical checks, you have yourselves pointed out that 'where a doctor recommends more frequent checks... we will require this.' It is unclear on what basis the council feel that more frequent checks would be necessary or the purpose of these more frequent checks. Clearly if there is an issue this will be raised by the GP, apart from the extra money which the council would make it is difficult to see any real benefit to this.

Consultation question 5, the GP's are paid to undertake these medical checks, the questions covered are essentially the same, apart from making the GP's life easier, there is no real benefit to changing the form unless it would be more cost effective for drivers by making this change.

Consultation question 6, there has been no complaints by current drivers or indication that we wish to change to a London system, we are happy with the way the current sign system is and there is no real advantage or changing apart from to fit a status quo which is essentially not needed because we are not a part of London.

The current system in relation too signs, changing of the system and issuance of new signs to such an extensive number of drivers is again a money wasting exercise. Essentially we work in the borough and our customers know how our signs work and those who use the taxis regularly know what they are looking for. Change is not only inconvenient for the drivers but may also cause confusion for our customers.

I request that you take the above into consideration when making any decision to the proposed changes.

---

**Request reference number: 506696**

**Record: 60**

Dear sir, I am pleased to listen that council has asked for Dacorum Hackney carriage / Private hire drivers for their views on proposed taxi licencing changes and I am sure the council will value their comments and will take into consideration.

**HACKNEY CARRIAGE /PRIVATE HIRE KNOWLEDGE TEST,**

I think it is equally important for Hackney carriage and private hire drivers to take knowledge test as this way they can take their passenger to exact location safely and confidently . This procedure is very good and ensures public interest as they can safely arrive on their destination because of drivers local knowledge as many times passengers book a taxi or private hire car for one location and than change their destination or many time there are more than one passenger and say at destination that drop the other to such and such pub or hotel and without local knowledge how it can work.

Many time private hire cars are booked by pub / hotel receptionist and just say passenger is going to Apsley / Hemel / Berkhamsted / Bovingdon so it doesnot look good that private hire driver is unable to drive them to their destination specially if they are drunk or in hurry.

So in my view , the current knowledge test of Hackney / private hire drivers system of Dacorum Council is necessary and working excellent for its purpose.

I think additional training can be added along with knowledge test for new drivers only but it is not necessary for existing drivers as they are experienced .

There are enough taxis / private hire cars to cover local business as we can see always number of taxis queuing in Hemel town / train station as well as private hire vehicle , but with no knowledge test of private hire there will be no quality of drivers and too much drivers in Dacorum and not fair on trained drivers which are already worried to meet th ends financially.

#### DRIVERS MEDICAL,

I agree with proposer that if driver is under 60 and fit in a doctor view in a medical checkup and he doesnot has a medical condition than it can be delayed Upto after every 5 years .

I think current medical form is very good and covers detailed observation of Doctor .

Again for private hire sinage , Dacoram taxi plates should be continued and are very important as our passengers are used to see these plates. They can recognise that it is a taxi or private hire car with confidence while London type stickers are not very prominent and not good for people with weak vision or elderly people to recognise and with no rear or front display plates they can go to a wrong private car especially at night time when road is not properly lit or when passengers are drunk than they cannot see small stickers .

On rear plates there is another 2 or 3 digit number of vehicle along with Dacorum council writing which can be noted by a mum if she is sending child in a taxi / private hire car so it is easy for her to pin point a car.

---

**Request reference number: 506697**

**Record: 61**

Hi All,

Regards to your message about the new policy for private hire's, my personal view on this is the knowledge test for new Private hire's drivers shouldn't be removed because this gives customers a good customer service to all communities including elderly, blind and disabled. I also strongly believe we should not just rely on technology, e.g. If a customer wants to change his/her destination and the driver has to take out there map constantly this will not have a good impact on the driver and will be waste of time and journey. The knowledge test is extremely important for all new drivers. If this new policy goes ahead this will have a big impact on all old hackney drivers.

---

**Request reference number: 506701**

**Record: 62**

Dear sir/madam

I have been a taxi driver for almost 15 years in Decorum and i am totally against to terminate knowledge test.we do not allow this knowledge test to be swept aside in the name of technology it helps maintain a balance of numbers against available taxis and private hair's and customer demand at the moment the market place is oversaturated.

The removal of the knowledge test will exacerbate this situation.There is just not any more room for more taxes or private hires on decorum streets.

Thanks

---

I am writing this letter in regards to the proposed changes to the taxi licensing policy in dacorum borough council.

I believe the current knowledge test for private hire and hackney carriage drivers should not be replaced. The main reason being a knowledge test ensures that all drivers have knowledge and understanding of the local area ensuring professional service provided to the fare paying customers. Also the knowledge test ensures that drivers are not ripping off fare paying customers by taking them through the longer routes which by following a SatNav at times can do. This is also in public interest and safety that we keep the knowledge test as it will eliminate any customer complaints to the council. However, I welcome the idea of introducing additional stricter course which will cover key aspects for working as a taxi driver to improve an individual's learning of various aspects such as customer service, equalities law etc.

The current structure of issuing of plastic license plates for our license private hire vehicles should remain as it is the most easiest and visible method. The main reason being an exterior plate can help all customers including the elderly look out for a taxi with ease.

Having worked as a Private Hire driver in Dacorum for almost a year, I hope you can take my views into consideration and review your decision of removing the knowledge test.

Q1: NO- because replacing the test means lowering the standards of the policies of Dacorum which would result in:

- competetion of new drivers with the highly skilled existing professional drivers for the jobs
- less frequency of jobs for the existing drivers resulting disappointment from the profession
- meeting the Bread and Butter Expenses difficult as majority or almost all of the existing drivers depend, whole and sole, on this job for their survival
- If they think for another business, they would have the fear of being not issued the licence due to Monopoly Law which does exist in Dacorum
- drivers would claim for the Benefits if the survival is difficult which would be another consequence of the replacing test.

Q2: Yes- the new hackney carriage and dual drivers should still be required to pass a local knowledge test in addition to a training and awareness courses because if the satellite or navigation, for instance, doesn't work, they'd have to use their knowledge to provide the best services as would have been offered by existing highly skilled professional drivers. Otherwise, the customers would suffer both, in terms of, time and money

Q3: As far as the training courses for the existing drivers is suggested, I Agree to this. It would definitely contribute to the standards of the customer services and professionalism further,

Q4: No- because Council already has a very strict policy reagarding Health and Safety issues. Reducing the frequency means increasing the financial burden on the drivers.

Q5: I don't think so, as a qualified professional medical officer from NHS carries out the Medical Checks. Any change means the council doesn't rely on NHS Certificates.

Q6: No change is required

Q7: No suggestions

---



I am writing this letter / complaint in regards to the proposal of discarding the Private Hire Knowledge test in the Borough of Dacorum.

As you are already aware the number of Taxi Drivers in Hemel Hempstead over the past decades has grown greatly. By implementing the Training Course in essence this will mean a driver will need very minimal / no local knowledge of the Borough to work as a Private hire driver. You point out that the awareness course will cover things such as road traffic law, customer service, safeguarding, personal safety etc. In my opinion this is ludicrous as to obtain a driving license, you already have to complete a Hazard awareness program as well as questions on the Highway code, so surely this is a repetitive exercise. A day of training will not necessary mean the driver will gain sufficient customer service or even absorb everything that you propose to cover in the awareness course

A question that I ask is, how will you be so sure that once the course is completed at the end of the day the driver has taken everything on board and most significantly engrossed everything in the short duration of time? There is no doubt that presently learning is required become a local borough driver.

In the view of fare paying customers, the most important objective to them when they get into a taxi is reaching their destination safely and securely, this is done by having knowledge of the local roads to use. This leads me onto saying that the local knowledge test guarantees that all drivers that have a license have knowledge and general understanding of the local area, this also ensure that drivers are not "ripping" off fare paying customers as they are using the shortest and most efficient route possible, as the use of the SatNav technology does not necessary guarantee the shortest route is being used, this also leads me onto mention safety, following a SatNav continuously can lead to distraction. The knowledge test also makes certain that the public and fare paying customers receive a professional service, customers such as the elderly, the vulnerable. This is also in public interest as well as public safety that we do not allow the knowledge test to be swept aside

Having worked as a Private Hire driver in the Borough for almost a year, I have on many occasions been highly praised on my knowledge of the local Borough. This is obviously down to the current studying that is required to undertake the Knowledge test and become a drive.

In summary to an extent I agree the licensing department should introduce firmer conditions such as a customer service course but this should be in addition to the Knowledge test. Let us not forget that all the current Hackney and Private hire drivers in the Borough that have had to study in order to become a driver. I hope you can take my points into consideration.

I am sending this email to protest against the policy change .I am strongly requesting you to keep the knowledge test. By cancelling the knowledge test there will be too many taxi drivers on the circuit. As there is a already a shortage of work and I am struggling to make a living this will make it even worse

Hi I'm not agree with consultation of allowing free private hire licence it's should be stay as it is.

And about medical.

I'm agree with your consultation that it should be DVLA standard and age of 45 -50-ext

Good thinking about licence plate changes it should be small sign on rear screen of the car like London private hire.

---

I am having to write to you today in regards to the abolition of a tried and tested method of taxi licensing; the knowledge test.

I have worked as a decorum taxi driver for 20+ years and like most other drivers I have come across in that time, I have showed the utmost professionalism, care and compassion towards those that travel around in our area.

Unfortunately, I have had to watch declining trade and standards over the years largely due to policies adopted by our local licensing authority.

Other drivers and I that are on the ground will be able to tell you about the impact lack of policing by enforcement officers which leads to cross-border working by a number of neighbouring licensing authorities that have a lower standards.

Our Licensing department wish to abolish the local knowledge test; I strongly believe that the impact of this will be underestimated until it is too late. Standards will drop significantly and anyone without demonstrating a commitment to their role in the public's safety will have that responsibility in their hands.

Please consider the elderly and vulnerable. It is in the interest of public safety that we do not allow this knowledge test to be swept aside. Additionally, it helps maintain a balance of numbers against available taxis and customer demand, at the moment the market place is oversaturated. There is just no more room for more taxis or private hires on decorum streets

I am hoping for your support my local councillor in maintaining our high standards and ensuring public safety.

I write in relation to the proposed changes in relation to taxi licensing for dacorum borough council.

Firstly in relation to point number 1, the knowledge test which has been working for a period of 25 years. I see no reason why the council cannot amalgamate the two tests, I do not feel that it would be a wise or suitable decision to remove the requirements of the test altogether. All current taxi drivers have passed this test and are competent within their roles. If the council feels that the next intake of taxi drivers need extra training, this should be in addition, not in replacement of the tests and training that all current drivers have gone through.

Though it may not be as important to have knowledge of the routes due to technology, every taxi driver should have a basic understanding. To try and argue that due to the availability of satellite navigation system drivers would not need knowledge of roads and routes is equivalent to saying that a doctor would not need a degree because self diagnosis is available on the internet, it is an absurd argument.

In relation to the point regarding companies subcontracting work after passing their test in other area, this is regulation which should be enhanced and made more stringent. The taxi drivers in the borough pay fees to be able to work and make a living, the council need to do more to ensure that those who pay their fees to the borough are earning a living, this ought to be the primary focus. The focus should not be in ensuring that the test is easy enough to pass so people don't go elsewhere.

In response to question 2, yes all drivers regardless of private and hackney ought to pass the a local knowledge test if they will be working in the borough.

In relation to current drivers, there is no reason to believe that they are unable or incompetent to carry out their jobs. If allegations have been made against individual drivers, the council ought to look at training individuals as opposed to wasting tax payers money on training those who do not need it.

My response to consultation question 3 is similar to the above. Unless there is a real reason to believe that an individual driver need to undertake a training and refresher course, it is a waste of resources to put everyone through such training when clearly there are other areas where this money could be put to use.

In relation to medical checks, you have yourselves pointed out that 'where a doctor recommends more frequent checks... we will require this.' It is unclear on what basis the council feel that more frequent checks would be necessary or the purpose of these more frequent checks. Clearly if there is an issue this will be raised by the GP, apart from the extra money which the council would make it is difficult to see any real benefit to this.

Consultation question 5, the GP's are paid to undertake these medical checks, the questions covered are essentially the same, apart from making the GP's life easier, there is no real benefit to changing the form unless it would be more cost effective for drivers by making this change.

Consultation question 6, there has been no complaints by current drivers or indication that we wish to change to a London system, we are happy with the way the current sign system is and there is no real advantage or changing apart from to fit a status quo which is essentially not needed because we are not a part of London.

The current system in relation to signs, changing of the system and issuance of new signs to such an extensive number of drivers is again a money wasting exercise. Essentially we work in the borough and our customers know how our signs work and those who use the taxis regularly know what they are looking for. Change is not only inconvenient for the drivers but may also cause confusion for our customers.

I request that you take the above into consideration when making any decision to the proposed changes.

---

**Request reference number: 506717**

**Record: 70**

Hi Dear Sir/Madam

First of all thank you for giving me opportunity to share my opinion.

about the knowledge test i would say that the current test is ok for new drivers. Because its very important that driver must know the area very well. Also customers expected from us that we know this area well.

We have not much work in dacorum as we have to cover all vehicle expenses and maintenance plus a huge amount of insurance cover for new drivers. I saw in other county's taxis are not in very good conditions and drivers are not as good as we are. In Dacorum we have comfortable vehicles / nearly new vehicles as people expecting a nice vehicle as a taxi. I think we should keep remain the current taxi licensing procedure.

I think for being a good taxi driver an applicant should pass the current knowledge test and he must be able to read and write and be able to understand english very well. because we have some dacorum drivers who have not good skills of customer service. And they pass the test with help of their friends because test was so simple and easy in the past. But current knowledge test is very good so only people with required skills of good customer service will come forward. Its looks more professional. And also remain the training and awareness course. Question no 2&3 i am happy.

About drivers medical i want to say that current medical procedure is ok for us. Because its important that a taxi driver must be fit and well to do work, its about people's life and safety

About signage i am happy with current taxi signs but if you want change i don't mind. But its important that i should display exterior signs or door signs cause it will help people to find their booked cab.

---

In Regards to your message about the new policy for private hire's.

my view on this is the knowledge test for new Private hire's drivers should not be removed as the drivers need the local knowledge to get around and it gives customers a good customer service to all communities including elderly, blind and disabled.

I also strongly believe we should not just rely on technology, e.g. If a customer wants to change his/her destination and the driver has to take out there map constantly this will not have a good impact on the driver and will be waste of time and journey, and it will create lots of problems between drivers and passengers over fares.

The knowledge test is extremely important for all new drivers. If this new policy goes ahead this will have a big impact on all old hackney drivers.

In regards to the signing external plates should be removed and I agree we should have internal plates like (pco).

Medicals should be as standard on every new application to keep up to date of all drivers health and public safety.

I have been asked to give my opinion in regards to the upcoming changes.

Q1 I don't think the current test should be replaced with the training and awareness course. Along with the current test I think an NVQ course should be completed by new drivers and those who have not done so.

Satellite navigation systems can be inaccurate at times and when a pre booked journey has a change of destination, a driver who has not completed the knowledge test may struggle to route plan last minute.

This can cause delay in the service. I have come across this situation many times and feel the knowledge has helped me avoid these.

Q2 Hackney carriage and dual drivers should still pass the current knowledge test and also be required to take an equivalent NVQ instead of the training and awareness course.

Q3 Drivers should undertake a shorter version of an NVQ course over a given period of time.

Q4 Medicals should continue with what's currently in place.

Q5 Form D4 is irrelevant for taxi and private hire drivers. I believe the current medical form used by doctors is sufficient.

Q6 Begin to issue alternative signage e.g. Stickers

Hi,

Here's are my suggestions below regarding the new changes in taxi licensing based on my six years of driving taxi experience in Dacorum borough council hope they will be helpful to take new decisions.

Regarding the first consulting question i think that knowledge test should be compulsory for hackney carriage and at the same time for private hire drivers aswel because its not just the knowledge test only it is test of your reading,writing and speaking test of English language aswel.yes i agree its difficult but its also helpful to mantain standard aswel which diffrenciate our taxi standards compare to the rest of areas which is much better.so i am not in favour of removing the test for private hire drivers.because same time knowledge test help the drivers to take passenger safely and more appropriate to their destination.

And regarding awareness course i think if its beneficial then its should be helpful for new drivers but i dont think this is necessary for old experience drivers.

And for private hire cars i think the way they are is good like plastic plates are more appropriate and visible compare to the stickers.

And new change in medical is good and i think it will be a very good decision.

Here is my opinion as best of my knowledge and experience.hop it will be helpful towards makin a decision.

---

**Request reference number: 506729**

**Record: 74**

Consultation answer 1. No, must pass knowledge test private hire driver.

Consultation answer 2. Yes, all new hackney carriage drivers and dual drivers should pass a knowledge test and awareness training course and also current taxi drivers should awareness training course.

Consultation answer 3. No

Consultation answer 4. No

Consultation answer 5. No

Consultation answer 6. Yes, along the lines of that used on vehicles licensed in London.

Consultation answer 7. No

---

**Request reference number: 506733**

**Record: 75**

CONSULTATION QUESTION 1  
YES

CONSULTATION QUESTION 2  
YES

CONSULTATION QUESTION 3  
NO for current drivers do not need refresher courses

Drivers Medicals Need to be unchanged

CONSULTATION QUESTION 4  
NO

CONSULTATION QUESTION 5  
ALL SIGNAGE TO REMAIN UNCHANGED

---

**Request reference number: 506734**

**Record: 76**

I am writing an email regarding about the Private Hire Knowledge Test.

As a Taxi Driver myself and the other taxi drivers in Hemel Hempstead we disagree to the fact that the Knowledge Test for the Private Hire Licence, would be easier for the newcomers to pass. Where as if there will be new drivers around in Hemel due to this test it would be really tough for us as there are drivers from outside such as Uber and Three Rivers as well coming into Hemel to do the job. Due to the those drivers, we only get roughly per job in a hour or so which would be around £4/£5 at cost.

I hope you will understand the situation of the current drivers in Hemel Hempstead.

Hi regarding your proposal changes to knowledge test and driver awareness, Driver Medicals & Signage on private hire vehicles.

Knowledge Test & Driver Awareness:

I strongly believe you should keep the knowledge test for new drivers. Its becoming very difficult to earn money with the drivers we already have. If you open the test you will flood Dacorum with so many drivers then no one will be able to earn a living. If you care then please KEEP the Knowledge test.

Driver Medicals:

Its an good idea to reduce the frequency of the medical test.

Signage:

I believe its a good idea to get rid of external plate and have a in-car signage. The external plate is in your face all the time for an example when i'm not at work and have gone to pick up a takeaway from town especially on week ends i get people trying to get into my car because they want a cab home even when thier taxis right their.

And please don't get any other external signage such as stickers or door signs which look really really horrible. As you know every company has its door sticker which make it clearly visible for customer to notice that its a cab.

Dear sirs with a heavy hertodat i email you i have been taxi driver just 8 years in dacorum have seen my trade eaten away by local polices adopted our council's licensing authority the lack of policing by enforcement officers in the brough has ended up with a free for all cross border working by numbers of neighbouring licensing authorities that have lowered the standards.To add insult to injuries our licensing department wish to abolish the knowledge tests for private hire which had high standards for taxis the local knowledge tests ensured customers tecivied good service in it is in the intrest of public saftey that we do not allow this knowledge tests to be abolished in name of technology it helps to maintain balance of numbers against available taxis and private hire,s and customer demand at the moment the market place is oversaturated the removal of knowledge tests will exacerbate this situation there is too many taxis and private hire in the brough I'm looking for your support as local councillor in maintaining the high standards already set out by the licensing your sincerely, it is a wrong decision to takeaway the knowledge test

=====

Dear whom it may concern

I have been working for dacorum borough council for the last 8 years, we have all noticed the taxi work is dramatically decreasing within the last few years, there is already a overload with private and Hackney taxi drivers. By making the changes you have planned it will massively affect our work in doing so it will also effect our income.

Please think of this as hundreds of of people's lively hoods being affected and the over load of taxis will effect our work even more, also adding to the issue by giving a taxi licence to a new driver without taking a test will mean that the new driver will not know the correct routes to take for the customer also they will not know the correct health and safety involved for the passenger.

Hi,

I just want to add my opinion for making changing in knowledge test.

1. I think it's not good idea to make any changing in knowledge test for new drivers because it will be problem for costumer and for old drivers so I thing you should leave knowledge test as it is.
- 2.i think it's not good idea to give training again to old drivers.
- 3.i think it's good idea to leave medical test for certain age.
- 4.i think it's not good idea to take off door stickers and back plat.

Hi. In my opinion we don't need any changes in taxi test. It is matter of our living. We are already too many and struggling already. Please don't finish it.

I write in relation to the proposed changes in relation to taxi licensing for dacorum borough council.

Firstly in relation to point number 1, the knowledge test which has been working for a period of 25 years. I see no reason why the council cannot amalgamate the two tests, I do not feel that it would be a wise or suitable decision to remove the requirements of the test altogether. All current taxi drivers have passed this test and are competent within their roles. If the council feels that the next intake of taxi drivers need extra training, this should be in addition, not in replacement of the tests and training that all current drivers have gone through.

Though it may not be as important to have knowledge of the routes due to technology, every taxi driver should have a basic understanding. To try and argue that due to the availability of satellite navigation system drivers would not need knowledge of roads and routes is equivalent to saying that a doctor would not need a degree because self diagnosis is available on the internet, it is an absurd argument.

In relation to the point regarding companies subcontracting work after passing their test in other area, this is regulation which should be enhanced and made more stringent. The taxi drivers in the borough pay fees to be able to work and make a living, the council need to do more to ensure that those who pay their fees to the borough are earning a living, this ought to be the primary focus. The focus should not be in ensuring that the test is easy enough to pass so people don't go elsewhere.

In response to question 2, yes all drivers regardless of private and hackney ought to pass the a local knowledge test if they will be working in the borough.

In relation to current drivers, there is no reason to believe that they are unable or incompetent to carry out their jobs. If allegations have been made against individual drivers, the council ought to look at training individuals as opposed to wasting tax payers money on training those who do not need it.

My response to consultation question 3 is similar to the above. Unless there is a real reason to believe that an individual driver need to undertake a training and refresher course, it is a waste of resources to put everyone though such training when clearly there are other areas where this money could be put to use.

In relation to medical checks, you have yourselves pointed out that 'where a doctor recommends more frequent checks... we will require this.' It is unclear on what basis the council feel that more frequent checks would be necessary or the purpose of these more frequent checks. Clearly if there is an issue this will be raised by the GP, apart from the extra money which the council would make it is difficult to see any real benefit to this.

Consultation question 5, the GP's are paid to undertake these medical checks, the questions covered are essentially the same, apart from making the GP's life easier, there is no real benefit to changing the form unless it would be more cost effective for drivers by making this change.

Consultation question 6, there has been no complaints by current drivers or indication that we wish to

change to a London system, we are happy with the way the current sign system is and there is no real advantage or changing apart from to fit a status quo which is essentially not needed because we are not a part of London.

The current system in relation too signs, changing of the system and issuance of new signs to such an extensive number of drivers is again a money wasting exercise. Essentially we work in the borough and our customers know how our signs work and those who use the taxis regularly know what they are looking for. Change is not only inconvenient for the drivers but may also cause confusion for out customers.

I request that you take the above into consideration when making any decision to the proposed changes.

---

**Request reference number: 506743**

**Record: 82**

It with a heavy heart today I email you I have been a taxi driver for almost 6years in Decorum have certainly seen my trade Ebbed a way by policies adopted by our local licensing authority the lack of policing by enforcement officer's in the Bough has ended up with a free for all cross-border working by a number of neighbouring licensing authorities that have a lower standards.

To add insult to injury our Licensing department wish to abolish the one thing that prevented a free for all maintained the very high standard's that the Dacorum taxi and private hire trade have The local knowledge tests It insures that all drivers have a good knowledge of the local area ensuring that all customers receive a good safe Service The elderly the vulnerable the disabled The blind it is in the interest of public safety that we do not allow this knowledge test to be swept aside in the name of technology it helps maintain a balance of numbers against available taxis and Private hire's and customer demand at the moment the market place is oversaturated the removal of the knowledge test will exacerbate this situation There is just not any more room for more taxes or private hires on decorum streets I'm looking for your support as my local councillor in maintaining the high standards already set out by the licensing Thanks you

=====

Regards to your message about the new policy for private hire's, my personal view on this is the knowledge test for new Private hire's drivers shouldn't be removed because this gives customers a good customer service to all communities including elderly, blind and disabled. I also strongly believe we should not just rely on technology, e.g. If a customer wants to change his/her destination and the driver has to take out there map constantly this will not have a good impact on the driver and will be waste of time and journey. The knowledge test is extremely important for all new drivers. If this new policy goes ahead this will have a big impact on all old hackney drivers.

---

**Request reference number: 506746**

**Record: 83**

I am writing to have your kind attention in terms of recent proposals being through in terms of licensing policies.

I have been a taxi driver in Dacorum for almost 10 years, and i still remember that i had to put a lot of effort in respect to have that license in the form of knowledge test and standards (by laws) set by my licensing authority, which i have not seen in neighbouring licensing authorities.

Hemel is a small town and there is already a large number of drivers working around, and as for i am concerned, the only thing i would like to mention that when i had my license the work situation was much better as there were less number of drivers with high standards. Now the number of drivers is gone very high and standard is going down with many drivers working from neighbouring boroughs provided with loop holes from our licensing authority and would have been worst with a free for all cross border working by a number of licensing authorities that have lower standards, despite of the fact that drivers from Dacorum can,t work anywhere else.

Therefore i have to put longer number of hours to earn bread and butter for my family.



With new licensing policy in which you are planning to abolish knowledge test , the number of drivers would be at huge with no standards and hard for everyone to survive. This is a matter of the survival of our profession. If these policies were implemented it would be very very hard for us to earn the living.

So i would like to request and have your kind attention, not to enforce new licensing policy, it will be really appreciated.

=====

I would like to be thankful and feel pleasure for myself to be a part of this consultation regarding to proposed changes for Taxi licencing. I would like to express my humble opinion on the areas proposed in the following ways as it was required.

Question 1.

I am a dual licence holder from Dacorum , and I can understand that you do need to pass a knowledge for Private hire as a part of your licence application including Hackney/Private hire laws, road traffic laws, Personal safety , customer service etc despite of the fact that equipments in the form of technology are helpful but not always accurate and sometimes absolutely failure. Dacorum has been one of the most organised and regulated licencing authority of neighbouring areas and always maintained high standards for licensing not like many others where there drivers have been entered into this profession without any fuss and efforts. I can still remember when I have to put very much hard work and effort to have my license 10 years ago.

Q2

Hackney carriage drivers along with the required knowledge test should also undertake short version of course in order to enhance their skills in terms of customer service , road laws , children safety and of course personal safety etc.

Q3

both Hackney and private hire drivers should have to complete a refresher training and awareness course at the time of making an application,

Q4

As for their health is concerned , medical should be conducted after every 3 years upto the age of 60 and then after every 1 or 2 years.

Q5

I think it's a good idea that medical reports for both Hackney and Private hire applications should be completed in a DVLA standard form so both your GP and DVLA can monitor it and one should not have to go through any other kind of complications.

Q6

As for the License plates are concerned , In my opinion they should be the same as London mini cab vehicles have because they are more secure and convenient.

Q7

Private hire vehicles within Dacorum should have a top roof sign display like Hackney but rather than taxi it must clearly says pre-bookings only and company details at the back who they will work for.

---

**Request reference number: 506748**

**Record: 84**

i am really thank full to council to give us right be for take the any further step., if council offer instant knowledge tes a awareness cours it will effect big time on my trade, and i would like to mation, as a taxi driver i am not making even bassic hours money,because we have alot of decorum taxi drivers in the area thats why the work get divided between the drivers.with my experiens i think the knowledge test is very important

for safty.there are alot of resone where we do need alot of area knowledge for example, on the weeken we pick 50% customar drunk, if the driver ask them more the one time , sir where are you going then they get agressive.if a driver dont know the area and some how if he follow set nav its not

handy because some time set nav take the driver throw long way and this way mostly customer dont pay the exate fare pluse customar also ask to get the discount because of there time.its also agains the safty. i did alot of hard work to learnd the knowledge test i am a experiens driver with my experiens i think it will be very bad for drivers if the change knowlege test in to training or awarenness cours because it will effect on work.i did read the other consultation question.i am agree with councle, watever changes the want to make to improve servisess and safty expecting 1 consultation question.im not agree if the change awarenness cours instant knowledge test.being a part of dacorum taxi driver i dont mind to do awarenness cours if its help to give batter sirvice to customar.

---

**Request reference number: 506749**

**Record: 85**

Regards to your message about the new policy for private hire's, my personal view on this is the knowledge test for new Private hire's drivers shouldn't be removed because this gives customers a good customer service to all communities including elderly, blind and disabled.

I also strongly believe we should not just rely on technology, e.g. If a customer wants to change his/her destination and the driver has to take out there map constantly this will not have a good impact on the driver and will be waste of time and journey. The knowledge test is extremely important for all new drivers. If this new policy goes ahead this will have a big impact on all old hackney drivers.

In regards to the external plates should be removed.

Medicals should be as they are already

---

**Request reference number: 506752**

**Record: 86**

Regarding the question raised in the consultation regardin changes to the private hire vehicle licence and the way they are issued.i would strongly disagree with the view put forward by the licencing department.Removing the test format and turning it into a free for all trade would have a severe impact on the drivers who rely on this trade to earn a livelihood as it would flood the town with too many mini cabs.Dacorum as a whole has a pretty decent taxi service , where there is never a complaint of not being able to get a taxi or a mini cab at anytime (even at the busiest times of the year like holiday season or new years) so why does the council wants to ruin the lives of people in the trade ?

On the issue of current drivers taking on aditional training ,i would like to support that as it will lift the service level ,which can only be a good thing.

I would like to skip the next two questions regarding the medical side of licencing as i feel it should not be up for consultation as it is a public safety issue an the licencing authority should be dealing with it in light of a medical professional.

On the issue of the way the mini cabs signage in dacorum i hope the council decision does keep in mind the thousands of elderly citizens using the mini cab service.taking away all the signage on the mini cabs would make it very difficuilt for the elderly especially when in a crowded enviornment as around the town center and supermarkets.therefore i believe the current requirements for signage as in door sticker on all mini cabs in dacorum must remain a compulsory thing.

There are already issues with work declining with companies like uber just killing the trade with there drivers working in hemel with tfl licenced vehicle.taking these steps to benefit them will be the worse thing that can be done by the licencing authority for all the local private hire and hackney licenced drivers.

I have been doing taxi in Dacorum Borough Council for more than 9 years.

I had a chance to have a look on your proposed draft for licensing enforcement policies. I am really shocked to see that you want to abolish the knowledge test. In my opinion the knowledge test is very important because it saves time and money for the customer. It's true that you can use tomtom to check the route but it is not 100% accurate and mostly gives you the longest route. Which means that the customer has to pay more for the journey.

Secondly, you would agree that hemel is a small town and the number of taxi's (Private hire/ Hackney) are already very high in the town. People not only from Hemel but also from other places are working in Hemel. We have to work very long hours to earn the living. If you visit a rank in the town you would know that how long does it take to get a job. you need to stand for hours to get one job. In this grim situation just imagine if you would abolish the knowledge test how hard it would be for us people to earn living.

Thirdly , If you remove the knowledge test it would be very easy for everyone to get a license. All people not only from hemel but from other places will rush to hemel to get a license, but if we need to get a license from any other council we have to pass a knowledge test of that council. which is discrimination. When I started doing taxi I had to pass a tough knowledge test.

I mean if someone from outside hemel wants to work in hemel he can get a license very easily and work but if someone from hemel wants to work for any other council he can't, which is not fair.

I hope you will take my points into consideration and will not abolish knowledge test.

=====

Consultation 1: I think you should not abolish knowledge test, instead You can add training and awareness course with the knowledge test. If you remove the knowledge test it will be easy for everyone to get a licence and would be very hard to earn lining for the drivers already working. Secondly, without the good knowledge of the area the drivers will take longer routes and will rip off the customers. Everyday there will be arguments between driver and customer.

Consultation 2: I think the knowledge test should be there for both private hire and hackney carriage

Consultation 3: I think there is no need for the current drivers to take part in any refresher course.

Consultation 4: I think this change will be good.

Consultation 5: Can do

Consultation 6: Yes

Consultation 7: No need to change the plastic plates.

---

I am grateful to you for providing me an opportunity to share my views regarding the Changing in Taxi Licence.

Knowledge Test: Knowledge Test for the Taxi Drivers which aimed at demonstrating that prospective drivers can find their way around the main towns and the surrounding areas; that they can prove that they have an up-to-date awareness of the Highway Code and that they fully understand the Council's Taxi Licensing Policy and any conditions that can be the essence of the driver's licence must stay as it is. To me, this knowledge is the core of taxi services in relation to increasing the levels of professional service offered to the public using a taxi. It will be a great disadvantage if Knowledge Test will be changed or stopped for taxi licensing, as it will put the existing taxi drivers out of the trade and bring non-professional drivers in the trade. It might be exemplified as to achieve medical doctor practicing license; criteria would be changed from MBBS to only three days' course. As I am aware, usually people interested in getting the private hire license, spends a lot of time in learning the area and customer dealing/services by working as pizza or take-away delivery men. I would like to request that the existing criteria of knowledge test must not be removed or changed for the private hire.

Refresher course: Giving a training course can be additional to the knowledge test which can also be given to the existing drivers as a refresher.

Drivers' Medical: I would say that drivers' medical is not a big issue which can affect to make changing in it.

Signage: I personally believe that for public safety and satisfaction, signage should stay as it is now.

Thank you very much for giving me chance to express my views. I hope my views would be considered while asserting the above-mentioned changes in Taxi Licencing.

It is with deep regret that I am contacting you once again about proposed changes to taxis/private hire vehicles in Dacorum.

The new proposals are reflecting a stance taken by the council of not really caring about the drivers or the trade and more interested in revenue.

#### 1. Knowledge Test.

Removal of this is a atrocious suggestion or proposal, and goes against the fundamental part of being a taxi driver, going against the fact the public should have trust in drivers having adequate knowledge of routes and places. Not only this, but this will damage the trade in its entirety as it would potentially allow many more drivers when there is no need.

This will flood a market/trade that is already operating at its optimum.

I feel very upset by this and feel the local authority instead of being stringent in cross border hiring is trying to legalise illegal trade in the borough by allowing those without a Dacorum taxi badge to acquire one without having to do any form of test or possess the relevant knowledge. This will Ed verse effect on public safety.

You stipulate the use of PDAs and Sat nav so you will expect drivers to do this every time on the job, this is dangerous unprofessional and hazardous. Most operators in Dacorum use PDAs but none have paid for the navigation feature.

By saying only Hackney drivers will require a test defeats the object as the Hackney trade will all but be killed off by the influx of private hire drivers.

Additionally, I would like to ask when was the last time a feasibility or meens test study was taken out. This would clearly show there are too many taxis operating within Dacorum. Why are other professions protected.

I strongly oppose this proposal.

## 2. Refresher course.

Having a training course in addition to a knowledge test is something the trade may consider. This can also be for existing drivers.

## 3. Driver Medical.

This is a proposal that I have no comment on bar for supporting it, but a question on renewal forms may need to be inserted in relation to health around the driver and notification of this to DBC if anything arises.

4. Signage. Public safety is key and why are we constantly trying to replicate what happens in London. The reasons why TFL don't allow exterior signage on private hires in London is because they don't want confusion. The London Hackney cars are prestigious and an iconic figure representing the UK globally as do yellow taxis in New York nothing should deter the naked eye otherwise. This is Dacorum, signs are needed on all vehicles especially private hire vehicles. This is because there is limited rank space in town or at the station so how will the public know it is their booked car. This will only increase and offer opportunities to those without licences to operate.

Finally, I don't understand the constant need to keep tampering with a system that has served Dacorum so well. The need is to stop any further testing and issuing of licences a waiting list should be implemented until such time arises where there is a genuine and honest need of further taxis. Dacorum could become a benchmark for the country with this position, reduce admin costs and be able to focus its efforts on regulation and enforcement. Drivers would be supportive and co operative and revenue could be generated by introducing stringent measures/ higher fees for drivers who are operating in a fair environment and not in the current oversubscribed local industry.

I am more than happy to assist the council in discussing this further.

---

**Request reference number: 506764**

**Record: 90**

I write in relation to the proposed changes in relation to taxi licensing for dacorum borough council.

Firstly in relation to point number 1, the knowledge test which has been working for a period of 25 years. I see no reason why the council cannot amalgamate the two tests, I do not feel that it would be a wise or suitable decision to remove the requirements of the test altogether. All current taxi drivers have passed this test and are competent within their roles. If the council feels that the next intake of taxi drivers need extra training, this should be in addition, not in replacement of the tests and training that all current drivers have gone through.

Though it may not be as important to have knowledge of the routes due to technology, every taxi driver should have a basic understanding. To try and argue that due to the availability of satellite navigation system drivers would not need knowledge of roads and routes is equivalent to saying that a doctor would not need a degree because self diagnosis is available on the internet, it is an absurd argument.

In relation to the point regarding companies subcontracting work after passing their test in other area, this is regulation which should be enhanced and made more stringent. The taxi drivers in the borough pay fees to be able to work and make a living, the council need to do more to ensure that those who pay their fees to the borough are earning a living, this ought to be the primary focus. The focus should not be in ensuring that the test is easy enough to pass so people don't go elsewhere.

In response to question 2, yes all drivers regardless of private and hackney ought to pass the a local knowledge test if they will be working in the borough.

In relation to current drivers, there is no reason to believe that they are unable or incompetent to carry out their jobs. If allegations have been made against individual drivers, the council ought to look at training individuals as opposed to wasting tax payers money on training those who do not need it.

My response to consultation question 3 is similar to the above. Unless there is a real reason to believe that an individual driver need to undertake a training and refresher course, it is a waste of resources to put everyone through such training when clearly there are other areas where this money could be put to use.

In relation to medical checks, you have yourselves pointed out that 'where a doctor recommends more frequent checks... we will require this.' It is unclear on what basis the council feel that more frequent checks would be necessary or the purpose of these more frequent checks. Clearly if there is an issue this will be raised by the GP, apart from the extra money which the council would make it is difficult to see any real benefit to this.

Consultation question 5, the GP's are paid to undertake these medical checks, the questions covered are essentially the same, apart from making the GP's life easier, there is no real benefit to changing the form unless it would be more cost effective for drivers by making this change.

Consultation question 6, there has been no complaints by current drivers or indication that we wish to change to a London system, we are happy with the way the current sign system is and there is no real advantage or changing apart from to fit a status quo which is essentially not needed because we are not a part of London.

The current system in relation to signs, changing of the system and issuance of new signs to such an extensive number of drivers is again a money wasting exercise. Essentially we work in the borough and our customers know how our signs work and those who use the taxis regularly know what they are looking for. Change is not only inconvenient for the drivers but may also cause confusion for our customers.

I request that you take the above into consideration when making any decision to the proposed changes.

---

**Request reference number: 506767**

**Record: 91**

Regards to your message about the new policy for private hire's, my personal view on this is the knowledge test for new Private hire's drivers shouldn't be removed because this gives customers a good customer service to all communities including elderly, blind and disabled.

I also strongly believe we should not just rely on technology, e.g. If a customer wants to change his/her destination and the driver has to take out their map constantly this will not have a good impact on the driver and will be a waste of time and journey. The knowledge test is extremely important for all new drivers. If this new policy goes ahead this will have a big impact on all old Hackney drivers.

In regards to the external plates should be removed.

Medicals should be as they are already

---

**Request reference number: 506769**

**Record: 92**

I have been a taxi driver for almost 20 years in Decorum have certainly seen my trade ebb away by policies adopted by you our local licensing authority. The lack of policing by enforcement officers in the Borough has ended up with a free for all. Cross-border working by a number of neighbouring licensing authorities that have a lower standards.

To add insult to injury you our Licensing department wish to abolish the one thing that prevented a free for all and maintained the very high standards.

The local knowledge tests ensure that all drivers have a good working knowledge of the local Area and that all customers receive a good safe service. The elderly, the vulnerable, the disabled, the blind, it is in the interest of public safety that we do not allow this knowledge test to be swept aside in the name of technology. It helps maintain a balance of numbers against customer demand.

the drivers that take this test make a huge investment in gaining the knowledge of the local area before they become a private Hire driver.

the market place is oversaturated with private hire cars. the removal of the knowledge test will exacerbate this situation by allowing big companies to flood the area with private hire cars There is just not any more room for more private hires on decorum streets I'm looking to our licensing department to ensure that you maintain the standards already set out by you The general feeling we get from the licensing department is that you seem to be against the local taxi and private hire trade for some reason.

it's like we've done something awful in the past and they seem to put up barriers preventing us from making a reasonable income.

they should be concentrating on Public Safety I do not feel these changes you wish to implement I'll be in the interest of public safety but more to promote corporations like Uber and Addison Lee

---

**Request reference number: 506770**

**Record: 93**

I write in relation to the proposed changes in relation to taxi licensing for dacorum borough council.

Firstly in relation to point number 1, the knowledge test which has been working for a period of 25 years. I see no reason why the council cannot amalgamate the two tests, I do not feel that it would be a wise or suitable decision to remove the requirements of the test altogether. All current taxi drivers have passed this test and are competent within their roles. If the council feels that the next intake of taxi drivers need extra training, this should be in addition, not in replacement of the tests and training that all current drivers have gone through.

Though it may not be as important to have knowledge of the routes due to technology, every taxi driver should have a basic understanding. To try and argue that due to the availability of satellite navigation system drivers would not need knowledge of roads and routes is equivalent to saying that a doctor would not need a degree because self diagnosis is available on the internet, it is an absurd argument.

In relation to the point regarding companies subcontracting work after passing their test in other area, this is regulation which should be enhanced and made more stringent. The taxi drivers in the borough pay fees to be able to work and make a living, the council need to do more to ensure that those who pay their fees to the borough are earning a living, this ought to be the primary focus. The focus should not be in ensuring that the test is easy enough to pass so people don't go elsewhere.

In response to question 2, yes all drivers regardless of private and hackney ought to pass the a local knowledge test if they will be working in the borough.

In relation to current drivers, there is no reason to believe that they are unable or incompetent to carry out their jobs. If allegations have been made against individual drivers, the council ought to look at training individuals as opposed to wasting tax payers money on training those who do not need it.

My response to consultation question 3 is similar to the above. Unless there is a real reason to believe that an individual driver need to undertake a training and refresher course, it is a waste of resources to put everyone through such training when clearly there are other areas where this money could be put to use.

In relation to medical checks, you have yourselves pointed out that 'where a doctor recommends more frequent checks... we will require this.' It is unclear on what basis the council feel that more frequent checks would be necessary or the purpose of these more frequent checks. Clearly if there is an issue this will be raised by the GP, apart from the extra money which the council would make it is difficult to see any real benefit to this.

Consultation question 5, the GP's are paid to undertake these medical checks, the questions covered are essentially the same, apart from making the GP's life easier, there is no real benefit to changing the form unless it would be more cost effective for drivers by making this change.

Consultation question 6, there has been no complaints by current drivers or indication that we wish to change to a London system, we are happy with the way the current sign system is and there is no real advantage or changing apart from to fit a status quo which is essentially not needed because we are not a part of London.

The current system in relation too signs, changing of the system and issuance of new signs to such an extensive number of drivers is again a money wasting exercise. Essentially we work in the borough and our customers know how our signs work and those who use the taxis regularly know what they are looking for. Change is not only inconvenient for the drivers but may also cause confusion for out customers.

I request that you take the above into consideration when making any decision to the proposed changes.

---

**Request reference number: 506773** **Record: 94**

I requesting you to stop private hire badge with out the knowledge test because with out knowledge test every body trying to get the pd badge and this will affect customer service & docrum council drivers will struggled in there trade I don't want to see Hemel Hempstead as a taxi service in Aylesbury.

---

**Request reference number: 506774** **Record: 95**

I completely disagree with the proposed consultation changes no 1, 2, 3 ,5 ,6 ,7 except consultaion no 4 . I think its not fair with the drivers currently working as taxi and private hires. we have put alot of hard work into getting our licences and people who wants to become taxi drivers should pass the tests as we did.

Our earning is shrinking day by day and more drivers will make it worse for our families.

I have been doing this for 5 years and my customers really like me and I know already how deal with different customers like disabled or vuneraable kids ets

I am 32 years old I think you should go ahead with consultaion no 4 because medical for young people is waste of money.

I hope you dont pass these proposed changes except consultaion no 4.

---

**Request reference number: 506778** **Record: 96**

Today I write to you in regards to the current change of policies which you have proposed to implement. I have been a taxi driver for just over a year now however been apart of the industry as a taxi controller for as long as 6 years. I have certainly seen my trade ebbed away by policies adopted by the local licensing authority and the lack of policing by enforcement officers.

The borough of dacorum is edging towards a free for all cross-border working borough with a number of neighbouring authorities whom have a lower standard than us.

To add insult to injury our licensing department propose to abolish the one factor which prevented a free for all type scenario, 'the knowledge test.' The local knowledge test ensures that all drivers that have a license have knowledge and understanding of the local area, this also makes certain that the general public and fare paying customers receive a proficient and safe service, customers such as the elderly, the vulnerable and the disable. This is also in public interest as well as public safety that we do not allow the knowledge test to be swept aside.

As far as the signage for private hire vehicles go, I strongly believe that the current structure in which the taxis is made visible and accessible to the customer is exceptional. For instance if the customer can only see the rear of the vehicle, they will mostly look for the exterior plate attached to the vehicle, the option of having stickers affixed to the rear windscreen may be beneficial to drivers as it will be



discreet however a disadvantage to customers who look out for the plate as a form of landmark.

To sum things up, there is just not any more room for more taxis/private hire vehicles on the streets of Dacorum. I hope you can take my issues and suggestions into consideration and hope you review the prospect of eliminating the knowledge test.

---

**Request reference number: 506780**

**Record: 97**

I am not happy to new changes because I have been studied for thee year to get the license if you open for everyone it's inequitable so i am not supporting for the changes .please consider my request.

---

**Request reference number: 506782**

**Record: 98**

I am writing this email to register my strongest protest against proposed changes to licencing requirements.

We have enough taxi drivers on the circuit as it is by stopping the knowledge test you will have drivers from outside the town and this will cause further problems especially for the elderly and voulerbles.

I request to you to keep the knowledge test as it is.

Thank you

## Annex A3 Consultation responses – others

**Request reference number: 498357** **Record: 1**

I am currently in the process of trying to obtain my private hire license and have received you're email about proposed changes to the policy.

I fully support the suggested changes to introduce a course instead of the written test paper.

I am due to sit my knowledge test for the third time in December.

I can see from you're email that the deadline for comments on these changes is the 13th November. If the changes were to go ahead what is the time frame of them to come into affect?

---

**Request reference number: 506540** **Record: 2**

Changes to knowledge test and medical requirements – Taxi and private hire drivers

Could Prevent awareness training be included with the Safeguarding children/CSE/vulnerable adults training?

Answers to questions: -

Q1 – yes

Q2 – would like to see knowledge test related to the areas identified for training and think a full days training is appropriate

Q3 - Yes, 3 yearly as is required for safeguarding training

Q4 – Yes

Q5 – yes

Q6 – continue with plastic plates as stickers in windows are not as recognisable. Plates can be seen from a distance and are useful to help identify vehicles if necessary on CCTV especially where drivers have been the victims of crime and they are also useful in the public identifying taxi's and legitimate vehicles from a distance. There has been an instance in Dacorum was posing as a taxi to get a female in to a vehicle and this was picked up by CCTV operators as there was nothing to identify the vehicle was a taxi. Police were called and a serious assault avoided and the perpetrator was found guilty of a number of crimes.

Q7 – if plates are removed there should be some other means of identifying vehicles quickly and from a distance

---

**Request reference number: 506579** **Record: 3**

Dont agree for the new applications for taxi licensing

---

**Request reference number: 506584** **Record: 4**

Today I write to you in regards to the current change of policies which you have proposed to implement. I have been a taxi driver for over 5 years I have certainly seen my trade ebbed away by policies adopted by the local licensing authority and the lack of policing by enforcement officers.

The borough of dacorum is edging towards a free for all cross-border working borough with a number of neighbouring authorities whom have a lower standard than us.

To add insult to injury our licensing department propose to abolish the one factor which prevented a free for all type scenario, 'the knowledge test.' The local knowledge test ensures that all drivers that have a license have knowledge and understanding of the local area, this also makes certain that the general public and fare paying customers receive a proficient and safe service, customers such as the elderly, the vulnerable and the disable. This is also in public interest as well as public safety that we do not allow the knowledge test to be swept aside.

As far as the signage for private hire vehicles go, I strongly believe that the current structure in which the taxis is made visible and accessible to the customer is exceptional. For instance if the customer

can only see the rear of the vehicle, they will mostly look for the exterior plate attached to the vehicle, the option of having stickers affixed to the rear windscreen may be beneficial to drivers as it will be discreet however a disadvantage to customers who look out for the plate as a form of landmark. To sum things up, there is just not any more room for more taxis/private hire vehicles on the streets of Dacorum. I hope you can take my issues and suggestions into consideration and hope you review the prospect of eliminating the knowledge test.

---

**Request reference number: 506593**

**Record: 5**

I write in relation to the proposed changes in relation to taxi licensing for dacorum borough council.

Firstly in relation to point number 1, the knowledge test which has been working for a period of 25 years. I see no reason why the council cannot amalgamate the two tests, I do not feel that it would be a wise or suitable decision to remove the requirements of the test altogether. All current taxi drivers have passed this test and are competent within their roles. If the council feels that the next intake of taxi drivers need extra training, this should be in addition, not in replacement of the tests and training that all current drivers have gone through.

Though it may not be as important to have knowledge of the routes due to technology, every taxi driver should have a basic understanding. To try and argue that due to the availability of satellite navigation system drivers would not need knowledge of roads and routes is equivalent to saying that a doctor would not need a degree because self diagnosis is available on the internet, it is an absurd argument.

In relation to the point regarding companies subcontracting work after passing their test in other area, this is regulation which should be enhanced and made more stringent. The taxi drivers in the borough pay fees to be able to work and make a living, the council need to do more to ensure that those who pay their fees to the borough are earning a living, this ought to be the primary focus. The focus should not be in ensuring that the test is easy enough to pass so people don't go elsewhere.

In response to question 2, yes all drivers regardless of private and hackney ought to pass the a local knowledge test if they will be working in the borough.

In relation to current drivers, there is no reason to believe that they are unable or incompetent to carry out their jobs. If allegations have been made against individual drivers, the council ought to look at training individuals as opposed to wasting tax payers money on training those who do not need it.

My response to consultation question 3 is similar to the above. Unless there is a real reason to believe that an individual driver need to undertake a training and refresher course, it is a waste of resources to put everyone through such training when clearly there are other areas where this money could be put to use.

In relation to medical checks, you have yourselves pointed out that 'where a doctor recommends more frequent checks... we will require this.' It is unclear on what basis the council feel that more frequent checks would be necessary or the purpose of these more frequent checks. Clearly if there is an issue this will be raised by the GP, apart from the extra money which the council would make it is difficult to see any real benefit to this.

Consultation question 5, the GP's are paid to undertake these medical checks, the questions covered are essentially the same, apart from making the GP's life easier, there is no real benefit to changing the form unless it would be more cost effective for drivers by making this change.

Consultation question 6, there has been no complaints by current drivers or indication that we wish to change to a London system, we are happy with the way the current sign system is and there is no real advantage or changing apart from to fit a status quo which is essentially not needed because we are not a part of London.

The current system in relation too signs, changing of the system and issuance of new signs to such an extensive number of drivers is again a money wasting exercise. Essentially we work in the borough and our customers know how our signs work and those who use the taxis regularly know

what they are looking for. Change is not only inconvenient for the drivers but may also cause confusion for out customers.

I request that you take the above into consideration when making any decision to the proposed changes.

---

**Request reference number: 506599** **Record: 6**

Keep the knowledge test

---

**Request reference number: 506600** **Record: 7**

I do not agree with you stopping the knowledge test as it will create situation where there will be more drivers than work available. Please reconsider this.

---

**Request reference number: 506642** **Record: 8**

Knowledge tests -

I prefer the knowledge test.

I think everyone should take the knowledge test.

A refresher course is a good idea.

Medicals -

Yes I think you should reduce the frequency of medical test.

Yes you could use the dvla d4 form.

Signage on vehicles -

Yes I prefer the plastic licence plates.

Stickers at the front and rear windows are good in-car signage.

---

**Request reference number: 506648** **Record: 9**

Plz make sure easy the Dacorum taxi test thank you

---

**Request reference number: 506649** **Record: 10**

Today I write to you in regards to the current change of policies which you have proposed to implement. I have been a taxi controller for over 4 years I have certainly seen my trade ebbed away by policies adopted by the local licensing authority and the lack of policing by enforcement officers.

The borough of dacorum is edging towards a free for all cross-border working borough with a number of neighbouring authorities whom have a lower standard than us.

To add insult to injury our licensing department propose to abolish the one factor which prevented a free for all type scenario, 'the knowledge test.' The local knowledge test ensures that all drivers that have a license have knowledge and understanding of the local area, this also makes certain that the general public and fare paying customers receive a proficient and safe service, customers such as the elderly, the vulnerable and the disable. This is also in public interest as well as public safety that we do not allow the knowledge test to be swept aside.

As far as the signage for private hire vehicles go, I strongly believe that the current structure in which the taxis is made visible and accessible to the customer is exceptional. For instance if the customer can only see the rear of the vehicle, they will mostly look for the exterior plate attached to the vehicle, the option of having stickers affixed to the rear windscreen may be beneficial to drivers as it will be discreet however a disadvantage to customers who look out for the plate as a form of landmark.

To sum things up, there is just not any more room for more taxis/private hire vehicles on the streets of Dacorum. I hope you can take my issues and suggestions into consideration and hope you review the prospect of eliminating the knowledge test.

I am writing in response to changes in private hire and Hackney carriage licensing. I have been working as a delivery driver in Berkhamsted for the last three years. I started this job with a view of passing taxi licence later, now I know surrounding Areas very well TRING POTTEN END, LITTLE HEATH, LITTLE GADDESSEN, GREAT GADDESSEN, BUCKLAND COMMON etc as we cover Nearly 13 miles radius. But I am still not confident to take a taxi test because it covers whole borough and I am not very much familiar with Hemel Hempstead Kings Langley side. The use of Satellite navigation for private hire drivers must be kept in view while making any changes to the area knowledge test if not removed completely. It will not only help new potential drivers to start their careers as a taxi drivers but also solve the problems of transportation for the general public

It has come to my attention that the Dacorum Borough Council Licensing Authority has come up with many proposed changes to the current standards around Taxi licensing. I would be grateful if you can address all of my concerns.

I am a resident of Hemel Hempstead and have lived here my whole life. I have been told of several new changes which the council is proposing regarding the current licensing process. I strongly disagree that the current private hire process should be replaced by a one day course.

The reasons why I strongly disagree are as follows.

1. It lowers the standard of knowledge required by taxi drivers within this Borough.
2. Hemel Hempstead is a conservative town and should adhere to high standards of health and safety and knowledge
3. The current private hire drivers who have gone through the long process to learn the 4000 roads/ schools / pubs / points of interest required within the borough, makes their efforts and their knowledge pointless.
4. The service given to customers within the borough will drop. You may argue that private hire drivers can check route before hand, but on a busy Friday night this isn't always possible. Without a shadow of doubt customers will not be happy while the driver has to wait while the driver has to fiddle around for ten minutes to search for a road in his sat nav.

On the other point of requiring refresher courses. I think that should be optional.

The reason for this is that it's not needed. When you look at Driving licence, you could argue elderly drivers over 85 should be required to take the test again. But even the DVLA doesn't enforce this rule because most elderly drivers can drive well.

I look forward to your reply.

Reference to suggest council for changes to taxi licencing, my opinion is as follows :

Q.1ans.: I strongly recommend that the test of new taxi drivers be made as simple as possible

Q.2ans.: Yes the existing drivers must be given an awareness and communication skills test as they took their relevant test quite a while ago .

Q.3ans. : I strongly believe that they should be given at least a refreshing course because most of the drivers are not educated . They hardly speak English and are not fully able to communicate with customers .

Q.4ans. : Medical should be taken yearly as no one knows what's going on in the body. While most people hide their health as feared of losing their badges.

Q.5ans.: NO .

Q.6ans.: Whatever costs less to or in benefit to the council .

Q.7ans.: If private hires are given a identification sign that will be good .

One more thing I would like to add up that there should be an age limit after which all drivers be retired. As for the safety of the customers.

I don't agree with this change

I think the decorum test should you be opened as it gives new drivers the opportunity. The advantages will bring new opportunity for everyone plus new business, The hackney drivers will still have a lot of work as they get jobs from the pda plus of the rank. The hackney drives take longer to go to jobs from the office as the pick up jobs of the ranks and make the office jobs late.They also take other drivers job of the town center.

I agree that there should be a general knowledge test which would be good to get the drivers knowledge of the areas.

Please find answers below

1. No
2. Yes
3. No
4. Fine as it is
5. No
6. Plastic license plate is fine.
7. N/A

Hi am against you new licensing law, because for as to be a taxi driver it's take over one years. Because if make it easy it will kill our taxi trade.

Thanks

At our Councillors Surgery in Bennetts End we had a number of taxi drivers turn up. I attach their details.

They all were mainly concerned on Q1 of the consultation, whether the Knowledge Test for Private Hire Drivers should be abolished and replaced with hr awareness training etc.

all the drivers were adamant that the test should be maintained as it currently is.

Some drivers did not want any display on the roof top of prinate hire taxis, as it has been a source and contention and confusion between hackney and private hire taxis.

Could you please add these 'consultees' on to the current consultation

Cllr Suqlain Mahmood

[DETAILS OF 16 INDIVIDUAL DRIVERS ATTACHED]

---

It's a hot issue among the taxi drivers of the Dacorum borough council these days that weather to simplify the taxi drivers license test or not.

Let's analyse it on the basis of benefits or losses to the council.

#### 1. BENEFITS.

a. If council decides to ease up the test, more n more drivers will take the test to join the existing team of drivers.

b. Council will be collecting more money in the form of test fees, taxi plates renewal fees, taxi badge etc. Which will be going to other councils otherwise.

c. Better and faster customers services as more drivers will be available.

#### 1. LOSSES.

a. As test is very difficult at the moment. For example making routes or learning famous places by heart which could easily be done these days with the help of SATNAV. but results in discouraging people to take on the test.

b. Council loosing huge amounts of money.

c. Some hackney drivers have the monopoly to charge more to the customers.

d. As drivers are short, customers services are very poor because people sometimes have to wait longer for a taxi and missing their schools, trains and appointments etc.

Council needs to look into the matter seriously and deeply as some of the drivers had made a group to exploit the matter so as to create problems for the new comers.

They misleading the council on simplifying the taxi driver test to achieve their goals. One of the biggest reasons that they are earning not less than £1100~£1300/ week. Showing very little in tax returns yearly , saving money, evading taxes, and getting child, housing, medical, low income benefits on the top, monthly from the council.

Therefore council is requested to ease the taxi drivers test as much as possible to help new comers and keep a check on these culprits.

I write in relation to the proposed changes in relation to taxi licensing for dacorum borough council.

Firstly in relation to point number 1, the knowledge test which has been working for a period of 25 years. I see no reason why the council cannot amalgamate the two tests, I do not feel that it would be a wise or suitable decision to remove the requirements of the test altogether. All current taxi drivers have passed this test and are competent within their roles. If the council feels that the next intake of taxi drivers need extra training, this should be in addition, not in replacement of the tests and training that all current drivers have gone through.

Though it may not be as important to have knowledge of the routes due to technology, every taxi driver should have a basic understanding. To try and argue that due to the availability of satellite navigation system drivers would not need knowledge of roads and routes is equivalent to saying that a doctor would not need a degree because self diagnosis is available on the internet, it is an absurd argument.

In relation to the point regarding companies subcontracting work after passing their test in other area, this is regulation which should be enhanced and made more stringent. The taxi drivers in the borough

pay fees to be able to work and make a living, the council need to do more to ensure that those who pay their fees to the borough are earning a living, this ought to be the primary focus. The focus should not be in ensuring that the test is easy enough to pass so people don't go elsewhere.

In response to question 2, yes all drivers regardless of private and hackney ought to pass the a local knowledge test if they will be working in the borough.

In relation to current drivers, there is no reason to believe that they are unable or incompetent to carry out their jobs. If allegations have been made against individual drivers, the council ought to look at training individuals as opposed to wasting tax payers money on training those who do not need it.

My response to consultation question 3 is similar to the above. Unless there is a real reason to believe that an individual driver need to undertake a training and refresher course, it is a waste of resources to put everyone through such training when clearly there are other areas where this money could be put to use.

In relation to medical checks, you have yourselves pointed out that 'where a doctor recommends more frequent checks... we will require this.' It is unclear on what basis the council feel that more frequent checks would be necessary or the purpose of these more frequent checks. Clearly if there is an issue this will be raised by the GP, apart from the extra money which the council would make it is difficult to see any real benefit to this.

Consultation question 5, the GP's are paid to undertake these medical checks, the questions covered are essentially the same, apart from making the GP's life easier, there is no real benefit to changing the form unless it would be more cost effective for drivers by making this change.

Consultation question 6, there has been no complaints by current drivers or indication that we wish to change to a London system, we are happy with the way the current sign system is and there is no real advantage or changing apart from to fit a status quo which is essentially not needed because we are not a part of London.

The current system in relation too signs, changing of the system and issuance of new signs to such an extensive number of drivers is again a money wasting exercise. Essentially we work in the borough and our customers know how our signs work and those who use the taxis regularly know what they are looking for. Change is not only inconvenient for the drivers but may also cause confusion for our customers.

I request that you take the above into consideration when making any decision to the proposed changes.



p 1/2



Dacorum  
Hackney & Private Hire  
Association

**Petition against changes to Licensing and reply to online consultation**

01<sup>st</sup> November 2016

Dacorum Borough Council  
Head of Taxi Licensing Department

Dear Sir/Madam,

We the Taxi trade (private and hackney drivers) have gathered a petition sanguinely hoping that persons at the helm will take cognizance of the below points raised and address them at the earliest opportunity whilst also taking into consideration the concerns of the drivers as on previous occasions there has not been much of an outcome.

The new proposals are reflecting a stance taken by the council of not really caring about the drivers or the trade and more interested in revenue.

1. Knowledge Test.

Removal of this is atrocious suggestion or proposal, and goes against the fundamental part of being a taxi driver, going against the fact the public should have trust in drivers having adequate knowledge of routes and places. Not only this, but this will damage the trade in its entirety as it would potentially allow many more drivers when there is no need. This will flood a market/trade that is already operating at its optimum.

We feel very upset by this and feel the local authority instead of being stringent in cross border hiring is trying to legalise illegal trade in the borough by allowing those without a Dacorum taxi badge to acquire one without having to do any form of test or possess the relevant knowledge. This will Ed verse effect on public safety.

You stipulate the use of PDAs and Sat nav so you will expect drivers to do this every time on the job, this is dangerous unprofessional and hazardous. Most operators in Dacorum use PDAs but none have paid for the navigation feature.

By saying only Hackney drivers will require a test defeats the object as the Hackney trade will all but be killed off by the influx of private hire drivers.

Additionally, I would like to ask when was the last time a feasibility or means test study was taken out. This would clearly show there are too many taxis operating within Dacorum. Why are other professions protected. There is approximately 460 Hackney and private hire drivers, the nightlife compared to other towns is dyer.

We strongly oppose this proposal.

8 2/2

2. Refresher course.

Having a training course in addition to a knowledge test is something the trade may consider. This can also be for existing drivers.

3. Driver Medical.

This is a proposal that we have no comment on bar for supporting it, but a question on renewal forms may need to be inserted in relation to health around the driver and notification of this to DBC if anything arises.

4. Signage. Public safety is key and why are we constantly trying to replicate what happens in London. The reasons why TFL don't allow exterior signage on private hires in London is because they don't want confusion. The London Hackney cars are prestigious and an iconic figure representing the UK globally as do yellow taxis in New York nothing should deter the naked eye otherwise. This is Dacorun, signs are needed on all vehicles especially private hire vehicles. This is because there is limited rank space in town or at the station so how will the public know it is their booked car. This will only increase and offer opportunities to those without licences to operate. We disagree with private hire vehicles having roof signage

Finally, we don't understand the constant need to keep tampering with a system that has served Dacorun so well. The need is to stop any further testing and issuing of licences a waiting list should be implemented until such time arises where there is a genuine and honest need of further taxis. Dacorun could become a benchmark for the country with this position, reduce admin costs and be able to focus its efforts on regulation and enforcement. Drivers would be supportive an co-operative and revenue could be generated by introducing stringent measures/ higher fees for drivers who are operating in a fair environment and not in the current oversubscribed local industry.

Please find attached a petition which was signed by 180 private hire and hackney carriage drivers

We are more than happy to assist the council in discussing this further.

Kind regards

Tabrez Khan

(Chairman of Taxi drivers Association)

Signature:



Terry Carrington

Association member

Signature:



N.B. 12 signature sheets attached, with 180 signatures specified.

**Annex B**  
**Draft driver medical form D4/DBC**  
*(see following document)*



Town Police Clauses Act 1847 &  
Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976

## Group 2 medical examination report for a Hackney Carriage / Private Hire / Dual Driver Licence

Dacorum Borough Council requires applicants for, and holders of, hackney carriage, private hire and dual driver licences to satisfy the DVLA's medical standards for Group 2 (vocational) drivers. A summary of these standards can be found at [www.gov.uk/dvla/fitnesstodrive](http://www.gov.uk/dvla/fitnesstodrive)

- Pages 1 and 8 must be completed by the applicant/licence-holder.
- Pages 2-7 must be completed by a doctor registered and licensed to practice in the United Kingdom or registered within the EU, who has viewed the driver's medical records covering at least the previous 5 years.
- Page 2 (vision assessment) may alternately be completed by a registered optician/optometrist, if the doctor is unable to fully and accurately complete the vision assessment.  
*N.B. Doctors must be able to measure visual acuity to the 6/7.5 line of a Snellen chart and confirm the strength of glasses (dioptries) from a prescription in order to complete the vision assessment.*

All black outlined boxes must be answered. If this form is not fully completed it will be returned to the driver. This may cause a delay to their application, or result in enforcement action against their licence.

### Driver's details (to be completed by applicant/licence-holder)

|                                       |     |  |              |
|---------------------------------------|-----|--|--------------|
| Full name:                            |     |  |              |
| Home address:<br>(including postcode) |     |  |              |
|                                       |     |  |              |
| Date of birth:                        | / / | Licence (badge) number:<br>(if an existing driver) | HD / PD / XD |

### Driver's doctor's details (GP where ordinarily registered)

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| Doctor/Surgery name:                    |  |  |  |
| Surgery address:<br>(or practice stamp) |  |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |

**The driver must sign and date the declaration on page 8  
when the doctor and/or optician has completed the report.**



# Medical examination report

## Vision assessment

To be filled in by a doctor or optician/optometrist

D4

If correction is needed to meet the eyesight standard for driving, ALL questions must be answered. If correction is NOT needed, questions 5 and 6 can be ignored.

1. Please confirm (✓) the scale you are using to express the driver's visual acuities.

Snellen  Snellen expressed as a decimal   
LogMAR

2. Please state the visual acuity of each eye.  
Snellen readings with a plus (+) or minus (-) are not acceptable. If 6/7.5, 6/60 standard is not met, the applicant may need further assessment by an optician.

Uncorrected

Corrected

(using prescription worn for driving)

3. Is the visual acuity at least 6/7.5 in the better eye and at least 6/60 in the other eye (corrective lenses may be worn to meet this standard)? **YES NO**

4. Were corrective lenses worn to meet this standard? **YES NO**  
   
If **YES**, glasses  contact lenses  both together

5. If **glasses** (not contact lenses) are worn for driving, is the corrective power greater than plus (+)8 dioptres in any meridian of either lens? **YES NO**

6. If correction is worn for driving, is it well tolerated? **YES NO**  
If **NO**, please give full details in the box provided

If you answer yes to any of the following give details in the box provided.

7. Is there a history of any medical condition that may affect the applicant's binocular field of vision (central and/or peripheral)? **YES NO**

If formal visual field testing is considered necessary, DVLA will commission this at a later date

8. Is there diplopia? **YES NO**  
   
(a) If **YES**, is it controlled?

If **YES**, please give full details in the box provided

9. Does the applicant on questioning, report symptoms of intolerance to glare and/or impaired contrast sensitivity and/or impaired twilight vision? **YES NO**

10. Does the applicant have any other ophthalmic condition? **YES NO**  
   
If **YES**, please give full details in the box provided

### Details/additional information

You must sign and date this section.

Name of examining doctor/optician (print)

Signature of examining doctor/optician

Date of signature

|   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D | D | M | M | Y | Y |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Please provide your GOC, HPC or GMC number

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Doctor/optometrist/optician's stamp

Applicant's full name

Date of birth

|   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D | D | M | M | Y | Y |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Please do not detach this page



# Medical examination report

## Medical assessment

**Must be filled in by a doctor**

**D4**

- Please check the applicant's identity before you proceed.
- Please ensure you fully examine the applicant as well as taking the applicant's history.

### 1 Nervous system

Please tick ✓ the appropriate box(es)

Is there a history of, or evidence of **any** neurological disorder? **YES** **NO**

If **NO**, go to section 2

If **YES**, please answer **ALL** questions below **YES** **NO**

1. Has the applicant had any form of seizure?
- (a) Has the applicant had more than one attack?
- (b) Please give date of first and last attack
- First attack
- Last attack
- (c) Is the applicant currently on anti-epileptic medication?
- If **YES**, please fill in current medication in **section 8, page 7**
- (d) If no longer treated, please give date when treatment ended
- (e) Has the applicant had a brain scan?
- If **YES**, please give details in **section 6, page 6**
- (f) Has the applicant had an EEG?
- If **YES** to any of above, please supply reports if available.

Is there **ANY** history of the following: **YES** **NO**

2. Stroke or TIA?
- If **YES**, please give date
- Has there been a **FULL** recovery?
- Has a carotid ultra sound been undertaken?
3. Sudden and disabling dizziness/vertigo within the last year with a liability to recur?
4. Subarachnoid haemorrhage?
5. Serious traumatic brain injury within the last 10 years?
6. Any form of brain tumour?
7. Other brain surgery or abnormality?
8. Chronic neurological disorders?
9. Parkinson's disease?
10. Is there a history of blackout or impaired consciousness within the last 5 years?
- If **YES**, please give date(s) and details in **section 6, page 6**
11. Does the applicant suffer from narcolepsy?
- If **YES**, please give date(s) and details in **section 6, page 6**

### 2 Diabetes mellitus

Does the applicant have diabetes mellitus? **YES** **NO**

If **NO**, go to section 3, page 4

If **YES**, please answer **ALL** the following questions.

1. Is the diabetes managed by: **YES** **NO**
- (a) Insulin?
- If **YES**, please give date started on insulin
- (b) If treated with insulin, are there at least 3 months of blood glucose readings stored on a memory meter(s)?
- If **NO**, please give details in **section 6, page 6**
- (c) Other injectable treatments?
- (d) A Sulphonylurea or a Glinide?
- (e) Oral hypoglycaemic agents and diet?
- If **YES** to any of a-e, please fill in current medication in **section 8, page 7**
- (f) Diet only?
2. (a) Does the applicant test blood glucose at least twice every day? **YES** **NO**
- (b) Does the applicant test at times relevant to driving?
- (c) Does the applicant keep fast acting carbohydrate within easy reach when driving?
- (d) Does the applicant have a clear understanding of diabetes and the necessary precautions for safe driving?
3. Is there any evidence of impaired awareness of hypoglycaemia? **YES** **NO**
4. Is there a history of hypoglycaemia in the last 12 months requiring the assistance of another person? **YES** **NO**
5. Is there evidence of: **YES** **NO**
- (a) Loss of visual field?
- (b) Severe peripheral neuropathy, sufficient to impair limb function for safe driving?
- If **YES** to any of 4-6 above, please give details in **section 6, page 6**
6. Has there been laser treatment or intra-vitreous treatment for retinopathy? **YES** **NO**
- If **YES**, please give date(s) of treatment.

### 3 Psychiatric illness

Is there a history of, or evidence of, psychiatric illness, drug/alcohol misuse within the last 3 years? **YES NO**

If **NO**, go to **section 4**

If **YES**, please answer ALL questions below

1. Significant psychiatric disorder within the past 6 months? **YES NO**

2. Psychosis or hypomania/mania within the past 12 months, including psychotic depression? **YES NO**

3. Dementia or cognitive impairment? **YES NO**

4. Persistent alcohol misuse in the past 12 months? **YES NO**

5. Alcohol dependence in the past 3 years? **YES NO**

6. Persistent drug misuse in the past 12 months? **YES NO**

7. Drug dependence in the past 3 years **YES NO**

If **'YES'** to any questions above, please provide full details in section 6, page 6, including dates, period of stability and where appropriate consumption and frequency of use.

### 4 Cardiac

#### a Coronary artery disease

Is there a history of, or evidence of, coronary artery disease? **YES NO**

If **NO**, go to **section 4b**

If **YES**, please answer ALL questions below and give details at **section 6** of the form and enclose relevant hospital notes.

1. Has the applicant suffered from angina? **YES NO**

If **YES**, please give the date of the last known attack

2. Acute coronary syndrome including myocardial infarction? **YES NO**

If **YES**, please give date

3. Coronary angioplasty (P.C.I.)? **YES NO**

If **YES**, please give date of most recent intervention

4. Coronary artery by-pass graft surgery? **YES NO**

If **YES**, please give date

### b Cardiac arrhythmia

Is there a history of, or evidence of, cardiac arrhythmia? **YES NO**

If **NO**, go to **section 4c**

If **YES**, please answer ALL questions below and give details in **section 6, page 6**.

1. Has there been a **significant** disturbance of cardiac rhythm? i.e. sinoatrial disease, significant atrio-ventricular conduction defect, atrial flutter/fibrillation, narrow or broad complex tachycardia in the last 5 years **YES NO**

2. Has the arrhythmia been controlled satisfactorily for at least 3 months? **YES NO**

3. Has an ICD or biventricular pacemaker (CRT-D type) been implanted? **YES NO**

4. Has a pacemaker been implanted? **YES NO**

If **YES**:

(a) Please supply date of implantation

(b) Is the applicant free of the symptoms that caused the device to be fitted?

(c) Does the applicant attend a pacemaker clinic regularly?

#### Peripheral arterial disease (excluding Buerger's disease) aortic aneurysm/dissection

Is there a history of, or evidence of, peripheral arterial disease (excluding Buerger's disease), aortic aneurysm/dissection? **YES NO**

If **NO**, go to **section 4d**

If **YES**, please answer ALL questions below and give details in **section 6 page 6**, enclosing relevant hospital notes.

1. Peripheral arterial disease (excluding Buerger's disease) **YES NO**

2. Does the applicant have claudication? **YES NO**  
If **YES**, how long in minutes can the applicant walk at a brisk pace before being symptom-limited?

Please give details

3. Aortic aneurysm? **YES NO**  
If **YES**:

(a) Site of Aneurysm: Thoracic  Abdominal

(b) Has it been repaired successfully?

(c) Is the transverse diameter **currently** > 5.5 cm?

If **NO**, please provide latest measurement and date obtained

4. Dissection of the aorta repaired successfully? **YES NO**  
If **YES**, please provide copies of all reports to include those dealing with any surgical treatment.

5. Is there a history of Marfan's disease? **YES NO**  
If **YES**, please provide relevant hospital notes

Applicant's full name

Date of birth

**d Valvular/congenital heart disease**

Is there a history of, or evidence of, valvular/congenital heart disease? YES NO

If NO, go to section 4e

If YES, please answer ALL questions below and give details in section 6 page 6. YES NO

- 1. Is there a history of congenital heart disease? YES NO
- 2. Is there a history of heart valve disease? YES NO
- 3. Is there a history of aortic stenosis? YES NO   If YES, please provide relevant reports
- 4. Is there any history of embolism? YES NO (not pulmonary embolism)
- 5. Does the applicant currently have significant symptoms? YES NO
- 6. Has there been any progression since the last licence application? (if relevant) YES NO

**e Cardiac other**

Is there a history of, or evidence of heart failure? YES NO

If NO, go to section 4f

If YES, please answer ALL questions below YES NO

- 1. Established cardiomyopathy? YES NO
- 2. Has a left ventricular assist device (LVAD) been implanted? YES NO
- 3. A heart or heart/lung transplant? YES NO
- 4. Untreated atrial myxoma? YES NO

**f Cardiac investigations**

Have any cardiac investigations been undertaken or planned? YES NO

If NO, go to section 4g

If YES, please answer ALL questions YES NO

- 1. Has a resting ECG been undertaken? YES NO   If YES, does it show:- (a) pathological Q waves?   (b) left bundle branch block?   (c) right bundle branch block?

If yes to a, b or c please provide a copy of the relevant ECG report or comment at section 6, page 6.

- 2. Has an exercise ECG been undertaken (or planned)? YES NO

If YES, please give date and give details in section 6, page 6 DD MM YY

Please provide relevant reports if available

- 3. Has an echocardiogram been undertaken (or planned)? YES NO

(a) If YES, please give date and give details in section 6, page 6. DD MM YY

- (b) If undertaken, is/was the left ejection fraction greater than or equal to 40%?

Please provide relevant reports if available

- 4. Has a coronary angiogram been undertaken (or planned)? YES NO

If YES, please give date and give details in section 6, page 6. DD MM YY

Please provide relevant reports if available

- 5. Has a 24 hour ECG tape been undertaken (or planned)? YES NO

If YES, please give date and give details in section 6, page 6. DD MM YY

Please provide relevant reports if available

- 6. Has a myocardial perfusion scan or stress echo study been undertaken (or planned)? YES NO

If YES, please give date and give details in section 6, page 6. DD MM YY

Please provide relevant reports if available

**g Blood pressure**

If blood pressure is 180/100mm Hg systolic or more and/or 100mm Hg diastolic or more, please take a further 2 readings at least 5 minutes apart and record the best of the 3 readings in the box provided.

- 1. Please record today's best blood pressure reading

- 2. Is the applicant on anti-hypertensive treatment? YES NO

If YES, please provide three previous readings with dates if available

DD MM YY DD MM YY DD MM YY



**5 General**

**All questions MUST be answered**

If **YES** to any, give full details in section 6,

1. Is there **currently** any functional impairment that is likely to affect control of the vehicle? **YES NO**

2. Is there a history of bronchogenic carcinoma or other malignant tumour with a significant liability to metastasise cerebrally? **YES NO**

3. Is there any illness that may cause significant fatigue or cachexia that affects safe driving? **YES NO**

4. Is the applicant profoundly deaf? **YES NO**  
   
If **YES**, is the applicant able to communicate in the event of an emergency by speech or by using a device, e.g. a textphone?

5. Does the applicant have a history of liver disease of any origin? **YES NO**  
   
If **YES**, please give details in **section 6**

6. Is there a history of renal failure? **YES NO**  
If **YES**, please give details in **section 6**

7. Is there a history of, or evidence of, obstructive sleep apnoea syndrome or any other medical condition causing excessive sleepiness? **YES NO**  
   
If **YES**, please give diagnosis

- a) If Obstructive Sleep Apnoea Syndrome, please indicate the severity
  - Mild (AHI <15)
  - Moderate (AHI 15 - 29)
  - Severe (AHI >29)
  - Not known

*If another measurement other than AHI is used, it must be one that is recognised in clinical practice as equivalent to AHI. DVLA does not prescribe different measurements as this is a clinical issue. Please give details in section 6.*

- b) Please answer questions i – vi for ALL sleep conditions
  - (i) Date of diagnosis       **YES NO**
  - (ii) Is it controlled successfully?

(iii) If **YES**, please state treatment

(iv) Is applicant compliant with treatment? **YES NO**

(v) Please state period of control

(vi) Date of last review

8. Does the applicant have severe symptomatic respiratory disease causing chronic hypoxia? **YES NO**

9. Does any medication currently taken cause the applicant side effects that could affect safe driving? **YES NO**

If **YES**, please provide details of medication and symptoms in **section 6**

10. Does the applicant have an ophthalmic condition? **YES NO**

If **YES**, please provide details in **section 6**

11. Does the applicant have any other medical condition that could affect safe driving? **YES NO**

If **YES**, please provide details in **section 6**

**6 Further details**

**Please forward copies of relevant hospital notes. PLEASE DO NOT send any notes not related to fitness to drive.**

## 7 Consultants' details

Details of type of specialist(s)/consultants, including address.

|               |
|---------------|
| Consultant in |
| Name          |
| Address       |
|               |
|               |

Date of last appointment 

|   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D | D | M | M | Y | Y |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

|               |
|---------------|
| Consultant in |
| Name          |
| Address       |
|               |
|               |

Date of last appointment 

|   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D | D | M | M | Y | Y |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

|               |
|---------------|
| Consultant in |
| Name          |
| Address       |
|               |
|               |

Date of last appointment 

|   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D | D | M | M | Y | Y |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

## 8 Medication

Please provide details of all current medication (continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

| Medication         | Dosage |
|--------------------|--------|
|                    |        |
| Reason for taking: |        |

| Medication         | Dosage |
|--------------------|--------|
|                    |        |
| Reason for taking: |        |

| Medication         | Dosage |
|--------------------|--------|
|                    |        |
| Reason for taking: |        |

| Medication         | Dosage |
|--------------------|--------|
|                    |        |
| Reason for taking: |        |

| Medication         | Dosage |
|--------------------|--------|
|                    |        |
| Reason for taking: |        |

## 9 Additional information

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Patient's weight (kg)                   |  |
| Height (cms)                            |  |
| Details of smoking habits, if any       |  |
| Number of alcohol units taken each week |  |

## 10 Examining doctor's details

To be completed by the doctor carrying out the examination. Please ensure all sections of the form have been completed. Failure to do so will result in the form being returned to you.

**Please print name and address in capital letters**

|         |
|---------|
| Name    |
| Address |
| Phone   |
| Fax     |
| Email   |

I confirm that this report was completed by me at examination and that I am currently GMC registered and licensed to practice in the UK or I am a doctor who is medically registered within the EU, if the report was completed outside of the UK.

**Signature of practitioner**

|  |
|--|
|  |
|--|

Date of signature 

|   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D | D | M | M | Y | Y |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**GMC registration number**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

**Doctors stamp**

|  |
|--|
|  |
|--|

Applicant's full name

|  |
|--|
|  |
|--|

Date of birth

|   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D | D | M | M | Y | Y |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**This page must be completed by the applicant / licence-holder.**

**Driver's consent and declaration**

You **MUST** fill in this section and must **NOT** alter it in any way.

Please read the following important information carefully then sign to confirm the statements below.

**Important information about consent**

As part of the investigation into your fitness to drive, Dacorum Borough Council may require you to have a medical examination or some form of practical assessment. If we do, the people involved will need your background medical details to carry out an appropriate assessment. These may include doctors, orthoptists at eye clinics, occupational health advisers, or similar professionals. We will only release information relevant to the assessment of your fitness to drive.

**Consent and declaration**

I authorise my doctor(s) and specialist(s) to release reports/medical information about my condition relevant to my fitness to drive, to Dacorum Borough Council.

I authorise Dacorum Borough Council to disclose such relevant medical information as may be necessary to the investigation of my fitness to drive, to doctors, medical staff, and DVLA.

I declare that I have checked the details I have given on the enclosed questionnaire and that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, they are correct.

I understand that it is a criminal offence if I make a false declaration to obtain a driving licence and can lead to prosecution.

Signature:  
(driver)

Print name:  
(driver)

Date:

I authorise Dacorum Borough Council to:

- Inform my doctors about the outcome of my licence application
- Release reports to my doctor(s)

**Guidance notes**

Further information on completing this medical report can be found in the DVLA leaflet, **INF4D**.

Any fees payable to a doctor, optician or optometrist are the responsibility of the applicant/licence-holder, and will not be reimbursed by the Council, even if your licence application is subsequently refused.

If you wear glasses or contact lenses, please ensure that you take a copy of your most recent prescription to your medical appointment.

Please return completed medical reports to:

**Licensing, Dacorum Borough Council, The Forum, Marlowes, Hemel Hempstead, HP1 1DN**

# Agenda Item 6



## AGENDA ITEM: 6

|                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| Report for:         | Licensing and Health & Safety Enforcement Committee |
| Date of meeting:    | 28 February 2017                                    |
| PART:               | I   |
| If Part II, reason: |   |

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| Title of report:      | <b>Public Spaces Protection Orders (PSPO's)</b>  |
| Contact:              | Ross Hill – Licensing Team Leader, Legal Governance  |
| Purpose of report:    | To initiate a review of the six current designated public place orders (DPPO's) in Dacorum, with a view to discharging these orders or replacing them with public spaces protection orders (PSPO's).   |
| Recommendations       | To initiate a call for evidence in the terms outlined in this report, the results of which will be reported to a future meeting of the Committee.  |
| Corporate objectives: | Safe and Clean Environment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain a clean and safe environment</li> </ul>   |
| Implications:         | <p><u>Financial</u><br/>There is no direct financial cost at this stage. If a PSPO is extended, it will be necessary to replace signage within the restricted area.</p> <p><u>Value for Money</u><br/>n/a</p> <p><u>Risk Implications</u><br/>n/a</p> <p><u>Community Impact</u><br/>Information to inform a subsequent Community Impact Assessment will be sought as part of the proposed call for evidence.</p> <p><u>Health And Safety Implications</u><br/>Some H&amp;S implications arise from the enforcement of orders, and will be reviewed if decisions are ultimately made to retain the current restrictions.</p> |
| Consultees:           | This report proposes issuing a call for evidence from selected bodies and the public. If the recommendation is approved, the results will be reported back to the Committee at a subsequent meeting.   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Background papers:  |   |
| Glossary of acronyms and any other abbreviations used in this report: | <p>DPPO – Designated public place order (<i>created under the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001 – also known as alcohol control zones, or similar</i>)</p> <p>PSPO – Public spaces protection order (<i>created under the Anti-Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014</i>)</p> |

## 1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1. Under the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001, local authorities were given powers to designate certain public places within their areas, within which the consumption of alcohol could be more rigorously controlled than would otherwise be the case. Orders created under this power were known as designated public place orders, or DPPO's, and could only be made following evidence that the consumption of alcohol in those locations was leading to nuisance or annoyance to the public, or disorder.
- 1.2. Within an area covered by a DPPO, any person who is believed to have consumed, is consuming, or intends to consume alcohol there, may be required by a police officer or an accredited person not to consume alcohol in that place, and to surrender any alcohol in their possession. It is an offence to fail to comply with a requirement made by a police officer or an accredited person in this regard.
- 1.3. The 2001 Act has now been repealed, and replaced by the Anti-Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014. This Act provided that DPPO's would remain in force and be treated as if they were PSPO's for a 3-year period, which expires on 20 October 2017. Authorities which have previously passed DPPO's must review them by this date and decide whether to retain the restrictions (by extending the PSPO) or discharging them if there is insufficient evidence to meet the statutory test for this. New or extended PSPO's will be valid for a period of 3 years.
- 1.4. Whereas DPPO's were limited only to alcohol consumption, PSPO's are a much wider-ranging power which can be used by authorities to control a variety of problematic behaviours which satisfy two statutory conditions<sup>1</sup>:
- “The first condition is that—*
- (a) activities carried on in a public place within the authority's area have had a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality, or*
- (b) it is likely that activities will be carried on in a public place within that area and that they will have such an effect.*
- The second condition is that the effect, or likely effect, of the activities—*
- (a) is, or is likely to be, of a persistent or continuing nature,*
- (b) is, or is likely to be, such as to make the activities unreasonable, and*
- (c) justifies the restrictions imposed by the notice.”*
- 1.5. When considering extending existing orders, authorities must also be satisfied<sup>2</sup> that an extension is *“necessary to prevent—*

<sup>1</sup> Section 59(2)-(3), Anti-Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014

<sup>2</sup> Section 60(4), Anti-Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014

*(a) occurrence or recurrence after that time of the activities identified in the order, or  
(b) an increase in the frequency or seriousness of those activities after that time.”*

- 1.6. The Act exempts parts of licensed premises, including beer gardens or terraces, from restrictions on the consumption of alcohol, with the expectation that the management of licensed premises will control the consumption of alcohol within the curtilage of their premises, under threat of a licence review if they failed to do so. Public land which is licensed for the sale of alcohol (e.g. parks licensed for events) is also exempted at times when alcohol is being lawfully sold there.

## **2. CURRENT ORDERS**

- 2.1. In a series of decisions through 2006 and 2007, the Licensing Committee exercised the above powers to create a total of six DPPO's, covering the following areas:

- Hemel Hempstead town centre, including Gadebridge Park  
(links to maps: [north](#) [south](#))
- Berkhamsted and Northchurch ([map](#))
- Bovingdon ([map](#))
- Boxmoor ([map](#))
- Durrants Hill, Apsley ([map](#))
- Evans Wharf, Apsley ([map](#))

- 2.2. These orders all remain in force at the present time, but in accordance with the above provisions must be reviewed and either extended or discharged, by October.

- 2.3. Anecdotally, it is believed that relatively little use has been made of the powers conveyed by these orders in recent years, either by Hertfordshire Constabulary or by other persons accredited by the police under the community safety accreditation scheme, and that few complaints have been received concerning street drinkers outside of Hemel Hempstead town centre. However, to properly inform a review of the current orders, accurate information will be required from a range of parties.

## **3. CALL FOR EVIDENCE**

- 3.1. In order to collect evidence needed to inform this review, it is proposed to issue a call for evidence on the use of the current orders in recent years – information will be requested for a 3-year period beginning January 2014. At this time it is intended to focus the review solely on whether to retain the existing orders – any other evidenced requests for new orders will be considered separately, outside the scope of this review.

- 3.2. Information will be sought from the following bodies on the frequency of use of the powers conveyed by the current orders, the number of complaints regarding relevant conduct received by those bodies, resources available for enforcement of the orders, and any other information considered to be relevant to the review by those bodies:

- Hertfordshire Constabulary
- Dacorum Borough Council (Residents Services; Clean Safe & Green; Regulatory Services; Strategic Planning & Regeneration; Strategic Housing)

- 3.3. Information will also be sought from the following bodies on the number of complaints regarding relevant conduct received by those bodies, and any other information considered to be relevant to the review by those bodies:
- Hertfordshire County Council (Community Safety; Public Health)
  - Town/parish councils for applicable areas
  - Dacorum Community Safety Partnership (members not already referenced)
- 3.4. Information will also be sought from the public about relevant conduct they have observed in their local areas. It is proposed that this part of the call for evidence will be conducted by way of an online questionnaire, hosted on the Council's consultation website channel. A link to this channel will also be sent to ward councillors. Although written responses from the public will not be encouraged, if received they will be considered as part of the review.
- 3.5. An 8-week window will be offered for receipt of evidence to inform the review, following which relevant information will be collated in a report. The final decision on whether to adopt, extend or discharge PSPO's must be made by Cabinet – the Licensing Committee will be asked to make appropriate recommendations.

#### **4. RECOMMENDATION**

- 4.1. To initiate a call for evidence in the terms outlined above, the results of which will be reported to a future meeting of the Committee.

# Agenda Item 7



**AGENDA ITEM: 7**

|                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| <b>Report for:</b>      | <b>Licensing and Health &amp; Safety Enforcement Committee</b> |
| <b>Date of meeting:</b> | <b>28 February 2017</b>  |
| <b>PART:</b>            | <b>I</b>   |
| If Part II, reason:     |  |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| <b>Title of report:</b>      | <b>Cosmetic body piercing and skin colouring</b>   |
| <b>Contact:</b>              | Ross Hill – Licensing Team Leader, Legal Governance  |
| <b>Purpose of report:</b>    | To begin the process of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. formally adopting statutory provisions for the regulation of cosmetic skin piercing, other than of the ears, and of semi-permanent skin colouring; and</li> <li>2. updating byelaws governing the conduct of all piercing, tattooing, acupuncture and electrolysis treatments.</li> </ol>   |
| <b>Recommendations</b>       | That the Committee recommend that Full Council resolve: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) To apply sections 14 to 17 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982, as amended by section 120 of the Local Government Act 2003, throughout the Borough of Dacorum, so as to require persons carrying on the practice of acupuncture; or the business of tattooing, semi-permanent skin colouring, cosmetic piercing or electrolysis to be registered with the authority; and</li> <li>b) To make byelaws under section 14(7) and 15(7) of the 1982 Act in connection with such registered persons and premises, to replace and update existing byelaws in respect of acupuncture; tattooing; and ear piercing and electrolysis.</li> </ol> |
| <b>Corporate objectives:</b> | Safe and Clean Environment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain a clean and safe environment</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Implications:</b>         | <u>Financial</u><br>Public notice of the application of these provisions must be given in a local newspaper in two consecutive weeks. Existing registered premises would also need to be notified of any change in byelaws affecting their operations. It is envisaged that these costs would be met from existing budget.   |



|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>Implications:<br/>(cont.)</p>   | <p><u>Value for Money</u><br/>Businesses and practitioners performing ear piercing and tattooing are already required to register with the Council, this proposal will simply extend the range of procedures they carry out which are regulated under byelaws.</p> <p><u>Risk Implications</u><br/>The procedures regulated under the provisions outlined in this report carry significant potential health risks, if operators do not have the required skill or expertise to carry out a treatment, or if the treatment is carried out in unhygienic conditions or with improper or non-sterile equipment. Appropriate regulation of these activities is seen as necessary to minimise such risks.</p> <p>Any byelaws made by the Council could potentially be refused approval by central Government. This risk is considered minimal, as the draft byelaws are consistent with a national model.</p> <p><u>Community Impact</u><br/>No impact anticipated.</p> <p><u>Health And Safety Implications</u><br/>Inspections of registered piercing/tattooing premises are already carried out, and a risk assessment has been undertaken for these activities. This document will remain under periodic review, although it is not envisaged that any further risks will arise from the additional categories of regulated premises.</p> |
| <p>Consultees:</p>   | <p>Public notice must be given of the adoption of revised requirements and/or new Byelaws.</p>   |
| <p>Background papers:</p>  | <p>None</p>  |
| <p>Glossary of acronyms and any other abbreviations used in this report:</p> |  |

## 1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1. Part VIII of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982 created an adoptive framework for the regulation of **ear piercing, tattooing, electrolysis and acupuncture** activities. In areas where the provisions have been adopted, both premises at which such activities are carried on and operators carrying out such treatments must have registered with the local Council, before any treatments may lawfully be carried out. The Council may also make byelaws governing the conduct of these activities, in respect of cleanliness and hygiene provisions.
- 1.2. Dacorum Borough Council adopted controls for these activities on 12 October 1983, and passed three sets of byelaws under the legislation, containing separate (albeit similar) measures for ensuring hygiene and prevention of infection for tattooing,

acupuncture, and ear piercing/electrolysis respectively. These byelaws are available to view on the [Council's website](#).

- 1.3. Section 120 of the Local Government Act 2003 amended the 1982 Act to provide additional controls for new piercing treatments which had become more prevalent since the original Act was passed – specifically, **cosmetic skin piercing** (of any part of the body other than the ears), and **semi-permanent skin colouring** (also known as micropigmentation, semi-permanent makeup or temporary tattooing). These additional controls require a further adoption decision to be made by Councils, and though this appears to have been considered by Dacorum in the 2000's, no formal adoption decision has been located.
- 1.4. Licensing officers are currently reviewing registration details, as it appears that a number of historic registrations were not transferred from paper records to computer databases in the 1990's/2000's. At present, 33 premises in Dacorum are registered for skin piercing activities and are still trading, of which:
  - 13 may carry out acupuncture
  - 12 may carry out ear piercing
  - 9 may carry out electrolysis
  - 12 may carry out tattooing

*N.B. Some premises are registered for multiple activities*

## 2. PROPOSALS

- 2.1. Body modifications such as tattoos and body piercings continue to increase in popularity, while emerging trends for semi-permanent make-up and skin tinting which currently fall outside the treatments which the Council regulates, are also seeing these treatments becoming increasingly common. As these all involve the piercing of the skin with needles, objects and dyes/colourings, these treatments are subject to similar public health concerns as the activities which are currently regulated, in respect of the hygiene and cleanliness of premises where procedures are carried out and the equipment and materials used, prevention of transmission of infectious diseases, and competency of persons carrying out such treatments.
- 2.2. It is therefore proposed to expand the list of piercing activities which the Council regulates to include those covered by the 2003 amendment. The mechanism for this would be a resolution made by Full Council, essentially readopting the full list of piercing activities.
- 2.3. Schedule 6 of the 2003 Act provides some transitional measures, essentially ensuring that existing registrations remain in force for the previously-regulated activities only. As some documents issued by the Council from 2007 onwards implied that the additional activities were already regulated, it is proposed to offer additional transitional provisions for existing registered premises, allowing them to amend their registrations to include the new activities, where they have already been safely and effectively carrying these out.
- 2.4. As the current byelaws are specific to the original list of regulated activities, it will be necessary to update these to include the new activities. At the same time, it is intended to consolidate the byelaws into a single set which apply to all activities. As there is significant common ground between the hygiene measures necessary

regardless of the treatment type undertaken, this is seen as a logical step to take, and will reduce the potential for confusion, particularly at premises approved to carry out multiple treatments. Draft new byelaws are attached at Annex A.

### **3. RECOMMENDATION**

3.1. That the Committee recommend that Full Council resolve:

- a) To apply sections 14 to 17 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982, as amended by section 120 of the Local Government Act 2003, throughout the Borough of Dacorum, so as to require persons carrying on the practice of acupuncture; or the business of tattooing, semi-permanent skin colouring, cosmetic piercing or electrolysis to be registered with the authority; and
- b) To make byelaws under section 14(7) and 15(7) of the 1982 Act in connection with such registered persons and premises, to replace and update existing byelaws in respect of acupuncture; tattooing; and ear piercing and electrolysis.

---

**Annex A**  
**Draft byelaws for piercing activities**  
*(see following document)*

***Dacorum Borough Council***

**BYELAWS FOR ACUPUNCTURE, TATTOOING,  
SEMI-PERMANENT SKIN-COLOURING,  
COSMETIC PIERCING AND ELECTROLYSIS**

Byelaws for the purposes of securing the cleanliness of premises registered under sections 14(2) or 15(2) or both of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982 and fittings in such premises and of persons registered under sections 14(1) or 15(1) or both of the Act and persons assisting them and of securing the cleansing and, so far as appropriate, sterilization of instruments, materials and equipment used in connection with the practice of acupuncture or the business of tattooing, semi-permanent skin-colouring, cosmetic piercing or electrolysis, or any two or more of such practice and businesses made by the Dacorum Borough Council in pursuance of sections 14(7) or 15(7) or both of the Act.

**Interpretation**

1.—(1) In these byelaws, unless the context otherwise requires—

“the Act” means the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982;

“client” means any person undergoing treatment;

“hygienic piercing instrument” means an instrument such that any part of the instrument that touches a client is made for use in respect of a single client, is sterile, disposable and is fitted with piercing jewellery supplied in packaging that indicates the part of the body for which it is intended, and that is designed to pierce either—

(a) the lobe or upper flat cartilage of the ear, or

(b) either side of the nose in the mid-crease area above the nostril;

“operator” means any person giving treatment, including a proprietor;

“premises” means any premises registered under sections 14(2) or 15(2) of the Act;

“proprietor” means any person registered under sections 14(1) or 15(1) of the Act;

“treatment” means any operation in effecting acupuncture, tattooing, semi-permanent skin-colouring, cosmetic piercing or electrolysis;

“the treatment area” means any part of premises where treatment is given to clients.

(2) The Interpretation Act 1978 shall apply for the interpretation of these byelaws as it applies for the interpretation of an Act of Parliament.

## Cleanliness and cleansing

2.—(1) For the purpose of securing the cleanliness of premises and fittings in such premises a proprietor shall ensure that—

(a) any internal wall, door, window, partition, floor, floor covering or ceiling is kept clean and in such good repair as to enable it to be cleaned effectively;

(b) any waste material, or other litter arising from treatment is handled and disposed of in accordance with relevant legislation and guidance as advised by the local authority;

(c) any needle used in treatment is single-use and disposable, as far as is practicable, or otherwise is sterilized for each treatment, is suitably stored after treatment and is disposed of in accordance with relevant legislation and guidance as advised by the local authority;

(d) any furniture or fitting in premises is kept clean and in such good repair as to enable it to be cleaned effectively;

(e) any table, couch or seat used by a client in the treatment area which may become contaminated with blood or other body fluids, and any surface on which a needle, instrument or equipment is placed immediately prior to treatment has a smooth impervious surface which is disinfected—

(i) immediately after use; and

(ii) at the end of each working day.

(f) any table, couch, or other item of furniture used in treatment is covered by a disposable paper sheet which is changed for each client;

(g) no eating, drinking, or smoking is permitted in the treatment area and a notice or notices reading “No Smoking”, and “No Eating or Drinking” is prominently displayed there.

(2)(a) Subject to sub-paragraph (b), where premises are registered under section 14(2) (acupuncture) or 15(2) (tattooing, semi-permanent skin-colouring, cosmetic piercing and electrolysis) of the 1982 Act, a proprietor shall ensure that treatment is given in a treatment area used solely for giving treatment;

(b) Sub-paragraph (a) shall not apply if the only treatment to be given in such premises is ear-piercing or nose-piercing using a hygienic piercing instrument.

(3)(a) Subject to sub-paragraph (b), where premises are registered under section 15(2) (tattooing, semi-permanent skin-colouring and cosmetic piercing) of the 1982 Act, a proprietor shall ensure that the floor of the treatment area is provided with a smooth impervious surface;

(b) Sub-paragraph (a) shall not apply if the only treatment to be given in such premises is ear-piercing or nose-piercing using a hygienic piercing instrument.

**3.** For the purpose of securing the cleansing and so far as is appropriate, the sterilization of needles, instruments, jewellery, materials and equipment used in connection with treatment—

(a) an operator shall ensure that—

(i) any gown, wrap or other protective clothing, paper or other covering, towel, cloth or other such article used in treatment—

(aa) is clean and in good repair and, so far as is appropriate, is sterile;

(bb) has not previously been used in connection with another client unless it consists of a material which can be and has been adequately cleansed and, so far as is appropriate, sterilized.

(ii) any needle, metal instrument, or other instrument or equipment used in treatment or for handling such needle, instrument or equipment and any part of a hygienic piercing instrument that touches a client is sterile;

(iii) any jewellery used for cosmetic piercing by means of a hygienic piercing instrument is sterile;

(iv) any dye used for tattooing or semi-permanent skin-colouring is sterile and inert;

(v) any container used to hold dye for tattooing or semi-permanent skin-colouring is either disposed of at the end of each treatment or is cleaned and sterilized before re-use.

(b) a proprietor shall provide—

(i) adequate facilities and equipment for—

(aa) cleansing; and

(bb) sterilization, unless only pre-sterilized items are used.

(ii) sufficient and safe gas points and electrical socket outlets;

(iii) an adequate and constant supply of clean hot and cold water on the premises;

(iv) clean and suitable storage which enables contamination of the articles, needles, instruments and equipment mentioned in paragraphs 3(1)(a)(i), (ii), (iii), (iv) and (v) to be avoided as far as possible.

**4.—(1)** For the purpose of securing the cleanliness of operators, a proprietor—

(a) shall ensure that an operator—

(i) keeps his hands and nails clean and his nails short;

(ii) keeps any open lesion on an exposed part of the body effectively covered by an impermeable dressing;

(iii) wears disposable examination gloves that have not previously been used with another client, unless giving acupuncture otherwise than in the circumstances described in paragraph 4(3);

(iv) wears a gown, wrap or protective clothing that is clean and washable, or alternatively a disposable covering that has not previously been used in connection with another client;

(v) does not smoke or consume food or drink in the treatment area; and

(b) shall provide—

(i) suitable and sufficient washing facilities appropriately located for the sole use of operators, including an adequate and constant supply of clean hot and cold water, soap or detergent; and

(ii) suitable and sufficient sanitary accommodation for operators.

(2) Where an operator carries out treatment using only a hygienic piercing instrument and a proprietor provides either a hand hygienic gel or liquid cleaner, the washing facilities that the proprietor provides need not be for the sole use of the operator.

(3) Where an operator gives acupuncture a proprietor shall ensure that the operator wears disposable examination gloves that have not previously been used with another client if—

(a) the client is bleeding or has an open lesion on an exposed part of his body; or

(b) the client is known to be infected with a blood-borne virus; or

(c) the operator has an open lesion on his hand; or

(d) the operator is handling items that may be contaminated with blood or other body fluids.

**5.** A person registered in accordance with sections 14 (acupuncture) or 15 (tattooing, semi-permanent skin-colouring, cosmetic piercing and electrolysis) of the Act who visits people at their request to give them treatment should observe the requirements relating to an operator in paragraphs 3(1)(a) and 4(1)(a).

## **Revocation**

**6.—**(1) The byelaws relating to Acupuncture that were made by the Dacorum Borough Council on the 24<sup>th</sup> day of November 1983 and were confirmed by the Secretary of State for Social Services on 19 March 1984 are revoked.

(2) The byelaws relating to Ear Piercing and Electrolysis that were made by the Dacorum Borough Council on the 24<sup>th</sup> day of November 1983 and were confirmed by the Secretary of State for Social Services on 19 March 1984 are revoked.

(3) The byelaws relating to Tattooing that were made by the Dacorum Borough Council on the 24<sup>th</sup> day of November 1983 and were confirmed by the Secretary of State for Social Services on 19 March 1984 are revoked.

THE COMMON SEAL of the DACORUM BOROUGH COUNCIL was hereunto affixed this Xxxx day of XXXXXXXXXXXX 20XX in the presence of:

XXXXXX XXXXXXXX

XXXXXX XXXXXXXX

The foregoing byelaws are hereby confirmed by the Secretary of State for Health on XX XXXXXX 20XX and shall come into operation on XX XXXXXX 20XX.

Member of the Senior Civil Service  
Department of Health



## **NOTE – THE FOLLOWING DOES NOT FORM PART OF THE BYELAWS**

Proprietors shall take all reasonable steps to ensure compliance with these byelaws by persons working on premises. Section 16(9) of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982 provides that a registered person shall cause to be prominently displayed on the premises a copy of these byelaws and a copy of any certificate of registration issued to him under Part VIII of the Act. A person who contravenes section 16(9) shall be guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding level 2 on the standard scale (see section 16(10)).

Section 16 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982 also provides that any person who contravenes these byelaws shall be guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding level 3 on the standard scale. If a person registered under Part VIII of the Act is found guilty of contravening these byelaws the Court may, instead of or in addition to imposing a fine, order the suspension or cancellation of the person's registration. A court which orders the suspension of or cancellation of a person's registration may also order the suspension or cancellation of the registration of the premises in which the offence was committed if such premises are occupied by the person found guilty of the offence. It shall be a defence for the person charged under the relevant sub-sections of section 16 to prove that he took all reasonable precautions and exercised all due diligence to avoid commission of the offence.

Nothing in these byelaws extends to the practice of acupuncture, or the business of tattooing, semi-permanent skin-colouring, cosmetic piercing or electrolysis by or under the supervision of a person who is registered as a medical practitioner, or to premises in which the practice of acupuncture, or business of tattooing, semi-permanent skin-colouring, cosmetic piercing or electrolysis is carried out by or under the supervision of such a person.

Nothing in these byelaws extends to the practice of acupuncture by or under the supervision of a person who is registered as a dentist, or to premises in which the practice of acupuncture is carried out by or under the supervision of such a person.

The legislative provisions relevant to acupuncture are those in section 14. The provisions relevant to treatment other than acupuncture are in section 15.

The key differences in the application of requirements in respect of the various treatments are as follows:

*The references in the introductory text to provisions of section 14 (acupuncture) of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982 **only apply to acupuncture.***

*The references in the introductory text to provisions of section 15 (tattooing, semi-permanent skin-colouring, cosmetic piercing and electrolysis) of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982 **do not apply to acupuncture.***

*The references in paragraph 1(1) in the definition of "premises" to provisions of section 14 (acupuncture) **only apply to acupuncture.***

*The references in paragraph 1(1) in the definition of "premises" to provisions of section 15 (tattooing, semi-permanent skin-colouring, cosmetic piercing and electrolysis) **do not apply to acupuncture.***

*The requirement in paragraph 2(2) that treatment is given in a treatment area used solely for giving treatment **applies to acupuncture, tattooing, semi-permanent skin-colouring,***

**cosmetic piercing and electrolysis but not to ear-piercing or nose-piercing using a hygienic piercing instrument.**

*The requirement in paragraph 2(3) that the floor of the treatment area be provided with a smooth impervious surface applies to tattooing, semi-permanent skin-colouring and cosmetic piercing but not to acupuncture or electrolysis or ear-piercing or nose-piercing using a hygienic piercing instrument.*

*The requirements relating to dye or a container used to hold dye used for treatment in paragraphs 3(1) (a) (iv) and (v) apply to tattooing and semi-permanent skin-colouring.*

*The requirement in paragraph 4(1)(a)(iii) that an operator wears disposable examination gloves that have not previously been used with another client does not apply to acupuncture otherwise than in the circumstances described in paragraph 4(3).*

*The provisions of paragraph 4(2) in relation to washing facilities apply to cosmetic piercing using only a hygienic piercing instrument.*

*The exception whereby the byelaws do not apply to treatment carried out by or under the supervision of a dentist applies only to acupuncture (see section 14(8) of the Act).*

## AGENDA ITEM: 8



|                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| Report for:         | Licensing and Health & Safety Enforcement Committee |
| Date of meeting:    | 28 February 2017                                    |
| PART:               | I   |
| If Part II, reason: |   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Title of report:  | <b>Licensing Legislative Update</b>  |
| Contact:  | Ross Hill – Licensing Team Leader, Legal Governance  |
| Purpose of report:  | This is a general information report on recent and upcoming legislative changes which will affect the exercise of the Council's licensing functions. |
| Recommendations   | That Members note the contents of this report.   |
| Corporate objectives:   | Dacorum Delivers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance excellence</li> </ul>  |
| Implications:   | No adverse implications are currently expected to arise from implementing these statutory changes.   |
| Consultees:   | n/a  |
| Background papers:  | n/a  |
| Glossary of acronyms and any other abbreviations used in this report: |  |

## 1. SCRAP METAL DEALERS ACT 2013

- 1.1. This Act, under which the Council regulates the conduct of scrap metal dealers, both at fixed sites and itinerant collectors, includes a 'sunset clause', whereby the Act will cease to have effect 5 years after commencement unless a positive decision is made by Parliament to retain it, following a review.
- 1.2. The Home Office have now begun the necessary review of the Act ahead of the expected schedule, and have issued a call for evidence and views on the efficacy of the Act to date. The deadline for responses was the 30<sup>th</sup> January 2017.
- 1.3. The Licensing Team Leader has responded to this review in an individual capacity, with details of the Council's experiences to date in administering and enforcing the Act. Generally, the response supported the retention of the Act and the regulatory structure, but observed that the current framework for itinerant collectors is not working effectively, having proved overly bureaucratic and difficult to enforce.

## 2. ANIMAL LICENSING

- 2.1. Committee were advised last year of a DEFRA consultation on proposed reform of animal licensing requirements, and approved a response for submission to that consultation on behalf of the authority. The proposals included repeal of legislation underpinning several current (separate) licensing schemes, and replacement with a new combined scheme, covering authorisation for:
  - Animal boarding establishments (kennels, catteries, home boarders, pet daycare)
  - Dog breeding establishments (commercial and hobbyist (5+ litters per year))
  - Pet shops
  - Horse-riding establishments
- 2.2. DEFRA have now announced the outcomes of the consultation, and how they propose to take the reforms forward. Details are available via the [DEFRA press release](#), but the key points to note are:
  - Current legislation for the above licence types will be repealed, to be replaced by a new combined licence (called an 'animal activity licence') issued under the Animal Welfare Act 2006. Each licence will specify which activities it authorises.
  - The specifics of this new scheme will be set out in Regulations.
  - Licences will last for up to 3 years – longer licences for lower-risk premises.
  - Licences will remain non-transferrable.
  - Inspections before grant of licences may have to be carried out by 'expert' trained licensing officers accredited by government, or vets.
  - New standardised national licence conditions contained within the legislation.
  - Sale of puppies for profit will be licensable, including pet and pedigree offspring. Non-commercial hobbyists breeding 3+ litters a year will also require licences.
  - The sale of puppies and kittens will be banned below 8 weeks of age. This will include sales from breeders to pet shops.
  - Licence numbers must be included in adverts placed by licensed dog breeders.

- 2.3. No timelines have been confirmed as of yet, but from informal discussions it is understood that implementation by April 2018 is being targeted. This will be confirmed when the Government makes Regulations, which are expected later this year.
- 2.4. DEFRA have also announced that performing animal registrations (currently dealt with by HCC) will also be repealed and replaced by a new but separate scheme, also under the AWA2006. This scheme will be expanded to include exhibited animals.

### **3. EQUALITIES ACT 2010 – WHEELCHAIRS IN TAXIS**

- 3.1. The Government have [announced](#) that provisions within the Equality Act 2010 relating to the carriage of passengers in wheelchairs by taxis will be commenced with effect from April 2017. These provisions, which were originally included in the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 but never enacted, would require drivers of ‘designated’ accessible taxis to carry passengers in wheelchairs for no additional charge and to render appropriate support and assistance in loading and unloading, and creates a specific criminal offence for failure to do so. Historically, any refusals to carry or assist such passengers have been dealt with under generic legislation.
- 3.2. Only licensed vehicles which have been specifically designated by the local authority will be subject to these duties and the offence, and the designation of vehicles is a discretionary function. If a designation list was not created, drivers would not commit the specific offence if they failed to comply with the new duties – however, they would still breach the general duty in the 2010 Act prohibiting discrimination against service users on the basis of an identifying characteristic, namely disability.
- 3.3. At the time of writing, 38 of the 225 hackney carriages licensed by the Council are wheelchair-accessible, and only wheelchair-accessible vehicles may be licensed as new hackney carriages (the 187 existing non-accessible vehicles may be replaced on a like-for-like basis, so long as the licences are maintained). The proportion of licensed hackney carriages in Dacorum which are wheelchair-accessible has fallen in recent years, from 22.7% in 2013 to 16.9% today.
- 3.4. As this announcement was only made shortly before this report was submitted and supporting government guidance is not available at the time of writing, it has not been possible to prepare a fuller report at this time for consideration by Committee. When the guidance is available later in the year, a full report will be prepared, to enable a decision on whether to enact the provisions and designate accessible taxis within Dacorum.

### **4. POLICING AND CRIME ACT 2017**

- 4.1. This Act received Royal Assent in January and makes various amendments to licensing legislation. Although commencement dates have not yet been confirmed, it is anticipated that the following measures will take effect from April 2017:
  - Sales of alcohol in non-liquid states (vapour, powder, etc) will be licensable
  - Prohibition of licensees making repeat challenges against interim steps on a summary review application

- Interim steps on summary review application continue in force until final review decision takes effect (e.g. during appeals process)
- Power for licensing authority to review personal licences following convictions / immigration penalty
- New relevant offences to be considered on application for a personal licence (sex offender orders, violent offences, firearms offences, terrorism offences)
- Parliament no longer required to approve statutory Government guidance on alcohol and entertainment licensing
- Provision for Government to issue new national guidance on taxi licensing, in respect of protecting children and vulnerable adults

4.2. It has been indicated that further measures within the Act will be held back pending the outcome of a House of Lords review of the Licensing Act 2003, which is expected to report in the Spring. These measures are:

- Placing cumulative impact policies for alcohol licensing on a statutory footing
- Reform of late night levy requirements, allowing levies to be targeted at particular areas, expanding their scope to include late night food outlets, and allowing police commissioners to request that licensing authorities introduce them in an area.

## **5. IMMIGRATION ACT 2016**

- 5.1. Licensing-related provisions of this Act, which impose a new duty on licensing authorities to carry out immigration status checks on applicants for certain licence types, went through the first phase of commencement in December 2016, when taxi-related provisions were enacted. Licensing authorities are now prohibited from granting a taxi driver or operator licence to any person who cannot demonstrate a lawful right to work in the UK, and where time limits apply to such entitlement the licence duration cannot exceed the immigration status.
- 5.2. The second phase of commencement is expected in April 2017, from which time any applicant for a personal (alcohol) licence or a premises licence, including transfers of existing licences, will be required to demonstrate their right to work in the UK. Again, licensing authorities will be prohibited from granting (or transferring) a relevant licence to a person who does not have the lawful right to work in the UK. These licences, which are generally of unlimited duration, will lapse if a holder loses the right to work in the UK. The Home Office, who oversee the Immigration Enforcement Unit, will also be added as a statutory consultee to these licence applications.