

Appendix B – Summary of Consultation Responses

Consultation Question	Response Yes	Response No
<p>4.5 & 6.1 Enhanced DBS checks for drivers The DfT recommends that driver licence holders undergo enhanced DBS checks at more frequent intervals of every six months. This involves drivers to sign up to the DBS update service (already a policy requirement). Question – Do you agree with this requirement? Yes / No (delete as required).</p>	<p>11111111111111111111 111</p>	<p>11111111</p>
<p>4.12 Self-reporting The Department for Transport recommends that licence holders should notify Licensing Services within 48 hours of an arrest and release, charge or conviction for sexual, violent, dishonest or motoring offences. (This reduces the current 3-day limit) Question – Do you agree with this requirement? Yes / No (delete as required).</p>	<p>11111111111111111111 111111</p>	<p>1111</p>
<p>4.29 & 4.31 Complaints against license holders All complaints against drivers of both private hire and hackney carriages drivers and private hire operators should be referred to and recorded by the licensing authority. Ways of how to make a complaint to the licensing authority should be displayed in all vehicles not just hackney carriages as present Question – Do you agree with this requirement? Yes / No (delete as required).</p>	<p>11111111111111111111 111111</p>	<p>11111</p>
<p>7.8 - 7.13 CCTV and audio recordings The DfT expects that Licensing Authorities consult to identify if there are local circumstances which indicate that the installation of CCTV in vehicles would have either a positive or negative effect on the safety of taxi and private hire vehicle users, including children and vulnerable adults, and taking into account any privacy issues. Question A -Do you think that the installation of CCTV in licensed vehicles will have a positive or a negative effect on passengers? Yes / No (delete as required).</p>	<p>11111111111111111111</p>	<p>11111</p>
<p>Question B – The Councils policy currently permits CCTV in vehicles if requested by the driver. Do you think that it should be a mandatory requirement to have CCTV and audio recording in all licensed vehicles?</p>	<p>1111111111111111</p>	<p>111111111111 111</p>

Appendix B – Summary of Consultation Responses

Yes / No (delete as required).		
<p>8.16 – 8.17 Use of Passenger Carrying vehicles (PCV) licensed drivers The DfT expects that A Private Hire Operator who is also a Passenger Services Vehicle (PSV) operator must not use a PSV driver and PCV vehicle for a private hire booking without first gaining the agreement of the hirer, as the driver is not subject to the same level of DBS enhanced check.</p> <p>8.7 Booking and Despatch Staff – private hire operators Selby already require private hire operators to DBS check any staff who take bookings and are required to evidence this. As well as the DfT expect all private hire operators to maintain a register of all staff that will be taking bookings staff (by phone or in person).</p>	<p>11111111111111111111 11111</p>	<p>1111</p>
<p>Question – Do you agree with this requirement? Yes / No (delete as required).</p>	<p>11111111111111111111 111111</p>	<p>111</p>
<p>9.2 Joint authorisation of enforcement officers The DfT expects where need arises, jointly authorised officers from other licensing authorities so that compliance and enforcement action can be taken against licensees from outside the area.</p> <p>Do you agree that that authorisation should be given to officers, to ensure regulation of other drivers from other areas and vice versa?</p>	<p>11111111111111111111 1111111</p>	<p>1</p>

Additional comments

DBS checks

1. Yes, only if it doesn't cost any more than it is now as the cost is going put people off and get a licence elsewhere like many parts of the county are seeing plus you can't expect to pay out thousands to setup and expect them to pay out more in a short space of time.
2. The enhanced DBS service is ideal for peace of mind and security
3. Yearly is enough and what about the cost which will increase year upon year
4. Already carried out every year and drivers are required to inform of any changes straight away, so this will be an unnecessary cost to the driver

Self-Reporting

Appendix B – Summary of Consultation Responses

1. Yes and no as the police should inform licensing of any offences as some drivers will withhold informing so they can continue working until they get caught out with the more serious offences
2. Again it is ideal for security and peace of mind. if we are clear there is nothing to object to.
3. For any serious convictions yes, but for doing 42 mph in a 40 zone no

Complaints

1. No people generally know who to complain to
2. Nothing to worry about if you act properly
3. Only if the same applies for drivers to complain about passengers.

CCTV

1. Tightening up on checks and balances is fine if this does not lead to increases in costs to businesses and individuals. Anything that reduces competition and leads to higher fares for consumers must be avoided. Even with enhanced checks, CCTV, etc, crimes will still take place, so any extra measures must be proportional and not onerous to operators.
2. Negative effect breaching human rights people less likely to talk/confide plus expense of installation in current climate
3. This is a perfect example of why there needs to be a clear and defined differentiation between taxis (hackney carriages) and private hire and chauffeurs. At present all are viewed exactly the same which is wrong and short-sighted when licensing authority know there is a clear difference. Our clients are high wealth clients who require / demand discretion, privacy and at times anonymity so to make CCTV mandatory is ludicrous and discriminatory to chauffeur companies that should come under a subcategory.
4. Yes, I have a dash camera with a in facing camera and I feel safer knowing I have a backup if something happens to me or something on the road. Yes, but the cost of everything when first setting up needs looking into as it puts a lot of people off something could be staggered to give people a chance to get working
5. Yes and no depending on circumstance
6. [11:40] Michelle Dixon
7. This is not a yes or no question
8. A positive effect on law abiding passengers, a negative effect on non-law-abiding passengers
9. Yes, if the council or government pays for the installation of the CCTV. Another overhead we can do without.
10. Shouldn't be mandatory

10.5 & 6.1 Enhanced DBS checks for drivers

1. Fully agree as long as there is not a fee to pay every 6 months

Use of Passenger services vehicles

- 1.No all should have been DBS checked so deemed safe to carry passengers
2. Vehicles should be used for the purpose they are licensed for.
3. common sense says why isn't this already implemented

Appendix B – Summary of Consultation Responses

Booking Staff DBS

1. No why does a phone operator need a DBS when they don't come into contact to transport any customer. As long as jobs are registered why does it matter who took the booking as long as it's written down and who did it.
2. Yes, 100%
3. Again, common sense says this should already be a requirement.

Joint enforcement

1. As taxis from other authorities often cross boundaries.
2. Yes, all authorities should be able to check all vehicles especially now everybody can work where they want it's a safeguarding issue.
3. Absolutely as it should discourage abuse of regulations
4. Yes, this should happen as they may be picking up or dropping vulnerable people in the area, you should also know who is in your area and the condition of them and the vehicle
5. Yes, especially private hire taxis and UBER who have been doing this illegally for year.

Additional comments complaints

Additional comments

1. CCTV for example should not be mandatory but should be a choice for the operator, who can make this enhanced security a part of their marketing strategy. The customers can then decide for themselves if they wish to travel in a vehicle with CCTV or without. I would expect most are likely to choose the vehicle with the extra security. This consumer choice will lead to more operators installing CCTV as they fear missing out on business should they not have CCTV in their vehicles. Therefore, the technology is adopted voluntarily based on consumer demand rather than because the Council dictates it as an operator requirement.
2. More standard fares across the district. Not right that different taxis charge different fares to get to the same locations.
3. It is already passed 2020 and should be implemented immediately.
4. personally, all drivers should go back to how it used to be now it does not feel as safe to travel. you should have to work in your area otherwise it should be just one national plate DBS check, safeguarding instead of each council choosing which is causing drivers to look elsewhere to get a licence.
5. As a woman travelling alone, I would welcome the CCTV installation, but would be happy for this to be phased in, as it will be more difficult for some operators to comply quickly
6. ASAP as far as I am concerned
7. How long will CCTV be kept for and where is it stored?
8. What safeguards will be in place to prevent accidental or deliberate erasing of CCTV?
9. You should tighten up on everything and bring your drivers, operators, and vehicles in line with bigger local authorities. The fleet you license is old and a poor representation of the council
10. 2020 had passed so within a 30 day agreed period if not already completed
11. Some of these implementations should have been implemented back in the 70's as common sense tells you so.

Appendix B – Summary of Consultation Responses

Response types

Employee of licensing authority x2

Customer of PH and hackneys in Selby district x 5

Other x 2

PH Driver and Operator x 4

PH Driver x 4

HC Driver x 1

Town Council x 1