

Report Title:	Hackney Carriage Livery
Contains Confidential or Exempt Information	No - Part I
Cabinet Member:	Councillor Werner, Cabinet Member for Public Protection
Meeting and Date:	Licensing Panel 13 February 2024
Responsible Officer(s):	Andrew Durrant, Executive Director of Place Services & Amanda Gregory, Assistant Director of Housing & Public Protection
Wards affected:	All

## REPORT SUMMARY

The Licensing Panel of 16 October 2023 agreed that research should be conducted into the availability and cost of electric and hybrid hackney carriages and whether the models available complied with requirements for wheelchair accessibility.

The Panel also agreed that there should be a public consultation on possible changes to the livery that is currently required on RBWM licenced hackney carriages.

The research and consultation have been completed. This report sets out the results of the research for information. It also includes the results of the consultation and, based on those results, makes recommendations on the continued use of the livery on RBWM licenced hackney carriages

## 1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATIONS

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** That the Licensing Panel notes the report and:

- i) **Notes the information provided on the availability and costs of electric and hybrid hackney carriage vehicles**
- ii) **Agrees that the livery requirements for current RBWM licenced hackney carriages remain in place, and that an amended livery be agreed for hybrid and electric hackney carriages**

## 2. REASON(S) FOR RECOMMENDATION(S) AND OPTIONS CONSIDERED

### Options

**Table 1: Options arising from this report**

Option	Comments
The Licensing Panel agrees that the livery requirements for current RBWM licenced hackney carriages remain in place and that an amended livery be agreed for hybrid and electric hackney carriages	This would reflect the results of the public consultation that were carried out and the benefits that the livery brings
<b>This is the recommended option</b>	An amended livery will be agreed by the Cabinet Member and Assistant Director for electric and hybrid

Option	Comments
	hackney carriages to reduce the size and costs of the livery but maintain the overall look of a RBWM licenced hackney carriage vehicle
The Licensing Panel agrees that the livery is replaced with magnetic signage	<p>This is advocated by the drivers but is strongly opposed by officers because;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it would need to be policed, adding to already very heavy workloads</li> <li>• it would lead to complaints from the public, each requiring investigation and follow up</li> <li>• the scope for non-compliance, deliberate or accidental, would cause excessive demands on officer time and cause unnecessary friction between officers and drivers</li> <li>• enforcement action would be bureaucratic and time consuming, and lead to appeals which would further add to workloads and be a drain on officer resources</li> </ul>
The Licensing Panel agrees that the livery requirements are removed entirely	This is what the hackney drivers want but there is no evidence that the public think that this is what should be done

- 2.1 The information provided on the availability and costs of electric and hybrid hackney carriage vehicles is set out in Appendix B.
- 2.2 The Licensing Panel of 16 October 2023 agreed that consultation should be conducted with the public, hackney carriage drivers and all other interested parties as to possible changes to the livery on any licenced vehicles, and that the results of that the consultation and options for changes to the livery on licenced vehicles be brought to this Licensing Panel meeting.
- 2.3 The consultation has been completed and the full results are Appendix C to this report. There were 320 responses and a summary is set out in Table 2, below.

**Table 2: Consultation Summary**

Consultation Question	Responses
Q1 Are you a RBWM licenced hackney carriage or private hire driver?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes <b>73</b></li> <li>• No <b>247</b></li> </ul>
Q2 Were you aware that RBWM licenced hackney carriages (taxis) are required to be white with a purple bonnet and boot and a large RBWM coat of arms on the sides?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes <b>285 (89.1%)</b></li> <li>• No <b>35 (10.9%)</b></li> </ul>

Q3 What benefits, if any, do you think this livery provides?	See Appendix C
Q4 What detriments, if any, do you think this livery causes?	See Appendix C
Q5 Do you think that this livery; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be kept as it is</li> <li>• Could be reduced in some way</li> <li>• Could be removed entirely</li> </ul>	<b>206 (64.8%)</b> <b>61 (19.2%)</b> <b>51 (16.0%)</b>
Q6/Q7/Q8 Please give a reason for your answer	See Appendix C
Q9 As and when RBWM licenced hackney carriages move from being fossil fuelled to being hybrid or electric vehicles; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should the livery be kept as it is now</li> <li>• Could it be reduced in some way to demonstrate that the vehicle is hybrid or electric</li> <li>• Could the livery be removed entirely</li> </ul>	<b>179 (56.6%)</b> <b>93 (29.4%)</b> <b>44 (13.9%)</b>
Q10/Q11/Q12 Please give a reason for your answer	See Appendix C
Q13 Do you have any other comments on the use of the livery on RBWM licenced hackney carriage vehicles?	See Appendix C

- 2.4 These results show that there is a high level (89.1%) of recognition of the livery, and that a clear majority of respondents, 64.8%, think that the livery should remain as it is.
- 2.5 If you take just the respondents who are not a RBWM licenced hackney carriage or private hire driver, the percentage of respondents who think that the livery should remain as it is rises to 87%.
- 2.6 Even when licenced hackneys move from fossil fuel to electric or hybrid, there is still a majority of respondents, 56.6%, who think that the livery should remain as it is.
- 2.7 The benefits that respondents give for keeping the livery are very positive and highlight the ease of recognition of the vehicle as a licenced vehicle, and the extra safety and confidence that this brings. There are some neutral views and some that are negative. All of the comments are included in Appendix C.

- 2.8 The livery has been a requirement since 2012. Of the current RBWM licenced hackney drivers, 72% were licenced after the requirement of the livery was introduced so they would have been aware, when obtaining the licence, what their obligations would be in respect of the livery.
- 2.9 As well as the results of the consultation, a petition signed by 83 hackney carriage drivers has been received asking that the current RBWM hackney carriage livery is removed. This petition, which is Appendix D to this report, sets out the drivers' reasons for this and suggests an alternative livery in the form of magnetic signage.
- 2.10 If any changes to the livery were agreed the cost of removing the current livery, and changing the colour of a hackney carriage if that was also agreed, would have to be borne by the owner of the vehicle. The application of any new livery, or the purchasing of magnetic signage, would also have to be borne by the vehicle owner.
- 2.11 Members of the Licensing Panel are asked to agree the recommendation set out at the start of this report.

### **3. KEY IMPLICATIONS**

- 3.1 There are no key implications if the recommended option is agreed

### **4. FINANCIAL DETAILS / VALUE FOR MONEY**

- 4.1 None for RBWM at this time.

### **5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 A licensing authority may attach to the grant of a hackney carriage vehicle licence such conditions as they may consider reasonably necessary, and this would include the requirement for vehicles to have a certain appearance or livery (by virtue of section 47 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976).

### **6. RISK MANAGEMENT**

- 6.1 No risks have been identified at this time.

### **7. POTENTIAL IMPACTS**

- 7.1 Equalities. An Equality Impact Assessment is available as Appendix A.
- 7.2 Climate change/sustainability. This report will have no immediate effect in respect of climate change and sustainability.
- 7.3 Data Protection/GDPR. This report has no data protection / GDPR implications as there will be no changes to existing procedures in this respect.

## 8. CONSULTATION

8.1 A consultation has been completed and the results are set out in a report which is Appendix C to this report.

## 9. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

9.1 There will be no changes and therefore no implementation if the recommended option is agreed.

## 10. APPENDICES

10.1 This report is supported by four appendices:

- Appendix A – Equality Impact Assessment
- Appendix B – Information on Electric and Hybrid Hackney Carriages
- Appendix C – Taxi Consultation Survey Response Report (pages 2 to 109)
- Appendix D – Petition from RBWM Hackney Carriage Drivers

## 11. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

11.1 There are no background documents.

## 12. CONSULTATION

Name of consultee	Post held	Date sent	Date returned
<i>Mandatory:</i>			
<i>Statutory Officer (or deputy)</i>			
Elizabeth Griffiths	Executive Director of Resources & S151 Officer	22/01/2024	
Elaine Browne	Deputy Director of Law & Governance & Monitoring Officer	22/01/2024	29/01/2024
<i>Deputies:</i>			
Andrew Vallance	Deputy Director of Finance & Deputy S151 Officer	22/01/2024	05/02/2024
Jane Cryer	Principal Lawyer & Deputy Monitoring Officer	22/01/2024	
<i>Mandatory:</i>			
<i>Procurement Manager (or deputy) - if report requests approval to go to tender or award a contract</i>			
N/A			
<i>Mandatory:</i>			
<i>Data Protection Officer (or deputy) - if decision will result in processing of personal data; to advise on DPIA</i>			
Samantha Wootton	Data Protection Officer	22/01/2024	
<i>Mandatory:</i>			
<i>Equalities Officer – to advise on EQiA, or agree an EQiA is not required</i>			
Ellen McManus-Fry	Equalities & Engagement Officer	22/01/2024	23/01/2024

<i>Other consultees:</i>			
<i>Directors (where relevant)</i>			
Andrew Durrant	Executive Director of Place	19/01/2024	
<i>Assistant Directors (where relevant)</i>			
Amanda Gregory	Assistant Director of Housing and Public Protection	19/01/2024	01/02/224
<i>External (where relevant)</i>			
N/A			

Confirmation relevant Cabinet Member(s) consulted	Cabinet Member for Public Protection (Cllr Werner)	19/01/2024
---	--	------------

## REPORT HISTORY

<b>Decision type:</b>	<b>Urgency item?</b>	<b>To follow item?</b>
Licensing Panel decision	No	No

Report Author: Greg Nelson, Trading Standards & Licensing Manager 07970 446 526
--