

# Appendix C

**Cook, Daniel P**

---

**Subject:** FW: 08/02 TAXI and not private hire vehicle

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 08 February 2017 14:53  
**To:** Cook, Danie  
**Cc:** Cllr Pete Foley  
**Subject:** 08/02 TAXI and not private hire vehicle

## The proposal

This proposal will primarily affect applicants for new hackney carriage licences; applicants will be expected to demonstrate a bona fide intention to ply for hire within the administrative area of Bridgend County Borough Council under the terms of the licence for which an application is being made.

There will be a presumption that applicants who do not intend to entirely or predominantly ply for hire within Bridgend County Borough will not be granted a hackney carriage licence authorising them to do so. Each application will be decided on its merits.

---

Further to my previous email 02/02 for which no reply has been provided to date, I must clarify this proposal listed on council website.

So it may be clear: if anyone applies for a taxi (Hackney Carriage) license it is done on the basis that they are only permitted to ply for hire in the Borough licensed in. Therefore it is already understood in law that a taxi cannot ply for hire in any other borough other than the borough it is licensed in. It is therefore illegal to ply for hire elsewhere and therefore a taxi can only predominately and entirely ply for hire in Bridgend Borough. Thus making the proposal not a bona fide proposal in essence or in wording as outlined above.

**Cook, Daniel P**

---

**Subject:** FW: Bridgend Taxi Forum

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 10 February 2017 16:49

**To:** Cook, Daniel

**Cc:** Cllr Pete Foley

**Subject:** RE: Bridgend Taxi Forum

Good afternoon Daniel Cook

Let the committee note:

Further to my last email.

I would like to say that it has taken me much time to familiarise myself and thus get a broad perspective on the intended use policy for Hackney Carriage. I use the the word I, as like many drivers who prodominetly work in Bridgend, I was not familiar with the policy adopted by many councils to date over the last 4 years. Bridgend in fact being much behind the times on this policy introduction.

From my research which has taken me some 4 weeks to get acquainted with this policy in order to get a balanced view; From what I see in reality it serves a purpose and makes enforcement easier for councils but does not get away from the fact that councils can talk to each other if they want to. One council being Carmarthenshire explained such a scenario today when asked about their intended use policy and experiences.

The good thing about a consultation generally is it gives the public and the trade time to understand and make comment on any proposals.

In this case of Bridgend borough, we were never afforded such practices and therefore alarm bells naturally go off when one discovers late in the day or the 11th hour without time to understand the proposal in full and the underlining reasons for it. For sure it is a national trend for this intended use policy/proposal. Times in the trade are changing and it is possible that in time this policy maybe redundant. But I cannot predict what is around the corner.

When I examine other areas including Manchester and Sheffield.as well as Greater London, it becomes clearer for the reasoning behind the intended use policy, as taxi drover flock to those areas. With further research I understand that trade members in other boroughs have been afforded good opportunity in consultation to examine and make comment on such a proposal.

As it stands the whole subject of deregulation has and still is very contraversial for many in the trade as well as MP's in some areas of the country. My research shows an active petition with some 11,000 signatures thus far falling short of the 100,000 needed by April this year.

The nature of the business is such that a taxi will drift into other territories and therefore an obvious concern if one does not want to fall foul of such a policy. As a result questions have been raised to clarify best practices for the driver or owner of the vehicle to ensure harmony going forward for all concerned including the borough of Bridgend.

I fail to understand why the council would wish to exclude the trade in consultation when other boroughs don't. In some cases the trade ask for a stay in the consultation process so they can better understand and gauge responses.

It has been my job to continue to seek proper conditions going forward based on The Department of transport best guidance for licensing. That in our opinion is a very good yard stick.

1. As 3 Partners we believe that it serves no purpose for the council to cheat the process because they can, and then report false occurrences relating to consultations. A practice that at the very least does not occur in England from what I understand.

2. We also feel that it is time for there to be a better working relationship with the trade/drivers so we are aware of what's new and how we can establish a level of communication that does not leave the trade in the dark as it has been at the very least this time around in at least two Boroughs.

3. It would have been easy to have contacted at least the 2 Partners in December or prior relating to this intended use policy proposal. I note you did not do that even though you did put your hand out by supplying your email address and making contact on other matters. Easy it would have been to let us know. In fact it would have been just as easy to send literature to all taxi drivers informing them of the same and then they could of planned to attend the meeting and then you would have had the opportunity to explain all and get the appropriate responses for your report and more.

4. At the moment we remain in limbo as to why we are left out so obviously. For which we still await a full explanation for the record to show. As per previous email contact recently.

5. Fares are still on the table without any progress on the subject. Why? We still remain 319th with a low minimum fare over 2 miles @ £4.90. Lower than the Vale and Cardiff which are both under your jurisdiction.

6. As stated previously it is important that communication and progress remain on the agenda until such time the channels are opened up for resolution and understanding going forward. It is only fair under the circumstances so there is no doubt in anyone's mind.

7. There is certainly a stain or foul taste left in our mouths as a result of the lack of progress on simple issues. From the outset this was forecasted in a survey carried out via members in the trade. One must say it is disappointing to confirm this fact to be still the case.

8. It would not be correct for licensing to realise we exist and then obviously ignore the trade and BIT or any individual/driver

9. It would therefore be more appropriate to include this email as part of the process when reporting to committee for the 7th of March meeting, rather than the email you mention written to you in January by BIT at the time, which really gave us no real time to compile accurately with no time to assess the situation based on facts and trends in the country overall.

10. At this time our work remains unfinished until the issues mentioned are discussed and resolved.

11. We still await explanation for being left out and ignored.

12. I read on the council website that the report was to be released on 06/02/17 but as yet I have not seen it.

13. I did read that "The Best practice for licensing" could be put into legislation. However my research at this time is incomplete as I seek further advice on the suggestion as well as feedback. I/we would certainly like an indication as to why the council would want to disregard key elements used in the guidance used by other cities/areas around the country to enable them to perform satisfactory and objectively.

14. In reality we are not asking for much overall based on guidance offered and practices already adopted by others in licensing.

15. We are not here to hinder but more to compliment the process or processes. But never the less should not be ignored or left out even when making simple requests.

16. Such was the lack of consultation that I was confused as to how many proposals were on the table. Turns out effectively there were 2.

We look forward to your response so a resolution can be sought on the matters contained in this email for a better understanding going forward, so we can all reach that level of communication much needed at this time for absolute clarification going forward.

Yours sincerely

D.Nelson

For and on behalf of the partnets for BIT and their data protected members of the taxi trade.

Cc: Madaline Moon MP

Cc: councillor Peter Foley

Cc: BIT Members