

# Public Document Pack



ASHTON-UNDER-LYNE · AUDENSHAW · DENTON · DROYLSDEN · DUKINFIELD · HYDE · LONGDENDALE · MOSSLEY · STALYBRIDGE

## SPEAKERS PANEL (LICENSING)

**Day:** Tuesday  
**Date:** 13 September 2022  
**Time:** 10.00 am  
**Place:** Tameside One, Market Square, Ashton-Under-Lyne, OL6 6BH

Item No.	AGENDA	Page No
1.	<b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> To receive any apologies for the meeting from Members of the Panel.	
2.	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b> To receive any declarations of interest from Members of the Panel.	
3.	<b>MINUTES</b> The Minutes of the proceedings of the meeting of the Speakers' Panel (Licensing) held on 19 July 2022 to be approved as a correct record.	1 - 6
4.	<b>APPLICATION FOR A VARIATION OF HACKNEY CARRIAGE FARES</b> To consider a report of the Assistant Director, Operations and Neighbourhoods.	7 - 18
5.	<b>EXEMPT ITEMS</b> That under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) the public be excluded for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 2 and 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act and in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information, because disclosure of the personal information contained in the reports would not be fair to the applicants / license holders and would therefore be in breach of Data Protection principles.	
6.	<b>REVIEW OF A PRIVATE HIRE DRIVER'S LICENCE - 3/2022</b> To consider a report of the Regulatory Services Manager (Licensing).	19 - 32
7.	<b>APPLICATION FOR A PRIVATE HIRE DRIVER'S LICENCE - 4/2022</b> To consider a report of the Regulatory Services Manager (Licensing).	33 - 48
8.	<b>APPLICATION FOR A HACKNEY CARRIAGE AND PRIVATE HIRE DRIVER'S LICENCE - 5/2022</b> To consider a report of the Regulatory Services Manager (Licensing).	49 - 66

---

From: Democratic Services Unit – any further information may be obtained from the reporting officer or from Charlotte Forrest, Senior Democratic Services Officer on 0161 342 2346 or [charlotte.forrest@tameside.gov.uk](mailto:charlotte.forrest@tameside.gov.uk), to whom any apologies for absence should be notified.

Item No.	AGENDA	Page No
----------	--------	---------

**9. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

To note that the date of the next Speakers Panel (Licensing) meeting is scheduled for 15 November 2022.

**10. URGENT ITEMS**

To consider any items which the Chair is of the opinion shall be considered as a matter of urgency

# Agenda Item 3.

## SPEAKERS PANEL (LICENSING)

19 July 2022

**Commenced:** 1.00 pm

**Terminated:** 4.00 pm

**Present:** Councillors S Homer (Chair), Chadwick (Deputy Chair), Alam (part) and Cartey

**In Attendance:**

Ashleigh Melia	Legal Representative
Mike Robinson	Regulatory Services Manager (Licensing)
Lauren O'Toole	Regulatory Compliance Officer (Licensing)
Mattise Artingstall	Regulatory Support Officer

**Apologies for Absence:** Councillors Jones, Quinn, Reid, T Sharif and T Smith

### 1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Name	Agenda Item	Personal / Prejudicial	Nature of Interest
Councillor Alam	Agenda Item 5	Personal	Licence holder is a constituent and neighbour

### 2. MINUTES

The minutes of the Speakers Panel (Licensing) meeting held on 15 March 2022 were agreed as a correct record.

### 3. EXEMPT ITEMS

#### RESOLVED

That under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) the public be excluded for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 2 and 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act and in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information, because disclosure of the personal information contained in the reports would not be fair to the applicant or licence holder and would therefore be in breach of Data Protection principles.

### 4. APPLICATION FOR A PRIVATE HIRE DRIVER'S LICENCE - 1/2022

The Assistant Director of Operations and Neighbourhoods submitted a report requesting that the Panel determine whether the applicant was a fit and proper person to hold the relevant licence in accordance with the provisions of Section 51(1)(a) and 59(1)(a) of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976.

The Panel considered the written information submitted and heard the Regulatory Services Manager's (Licensing) case. He advised the Panel that the applicant had applied for a Chauffeur Drivers Licence on 22 March 2022. The application form and statutory declaration form showed an offence for possession of a bladed article in a public place contrary to section 139(1) Criminal Justice Act 1988 on 28 December 2018. The applicant had been convicted of this offence at Crown Court in February 2019 and sentenced to a 12-month community order, rehabilitation, costs of £340 and a £85 victim surcharge.

The application form and statutory declaration form also showed an offence of pursuing a course of conduct, which amounted to harassment contrary to sections 2(1) and 2(2) of the Protection from Harassment Act 1997 on 26 May 2020. The applicant was convicted of this offence at the Magistrates Court in July 2020 and sentenced to a restraining order – protection from harassment in place until July 2022, a £100 fine, costs of £85 and a £33 victim surcharge.

Both of these offences were detailed in the DBS certificate. The applicant had attended the Licensing Office in April 2022 to discuss the convictions.

The Panel were made aware of the relevant sections of the Policy and Guidelines relating to the Application of the “Fit and Proper Person Test” to Licensed Drivers and Operators.

Having heard the Regulatory Services Manager’s (Licensing) case, the applicant and the Panel were provided with the opportunity to ask questions.

The applicant then addressed the Panel and gave a detailed account of the events around their arrest for possession of a bladed article in a public place on 28 December 2018. They explained that they had previously collected knives and had been given an ornamental knife in a sealed box as a Christmas gift from a friend. They had not wanted the gift and had placed it in the boot of their car, in its original unopened packaging, and forgot it was there until the Police discovered it three days later.

The applicant also gave a detailed explanation of the events leading up to their arrest for harassment on 26 May 2020. They had been going through a very difficult period in a nine-year relationship, which had eventually broken down. They were trying to maintain contact with their child but their ex-partner was making this increasingly difficult and regularly involved the Police with false accusations and testimonies. With regards to the harassment charge, the applicant stated that they had contacted their ex-partner on multiple occasions in order to get a change of clothes for their daughter who was in the care of the applicant at the time. They had not wanted to plead guilty to the offence but did so as they were in the midst of a family court hearing and wanted to focus on gaining custody to their daughter, which they were eventually successful with.

In response to questions from the Regulatory Services Manager and Panel Members, the applicant stated they were a hardworking, honest individual who wanted to provide for their daughter. They explained that they were currently in debt and wanted to clear this debt by working in a second job as a chauffeur.

**At this juncture the applicant, their partner, the Regulatory Services Manager (Licensing), the Regulatory Compliance Officer and the Regulatory Support Officer left the meeting whilst the Panel deliberated on the application. The Legal Representative and the Senior Democratic Services Officer remained in the meeting to give legal and procedural advice and took no part in the decision making process.**

In determining the application, the Panel considered all the information presented at the hearing in addition to the report and appendices. They further considered relevant statute and case law and the Council’s *Convictions Policy (Policy & Guidelines relating to the Application of the “Fit and Proper Test” to Licensed Drivers and Operators)*. Specifically section B relating to Violence and Offences against Other Persons, which stated that an application would normally be refused where an individual has a conviction for offences, including possession of an offensive weapon and harassment, if the date of conviction was less than 3 years prior to the date of application.

The Panel considered the first offence of being in possession of a bladed article in a public place. The Panel accepted the explanation of the incident and that the knife was still in its original packaging. The Panel accepted that people do collect knives and that the Police did not dispute that the knife was in its packaging.

The Panel then considered the second offence of pursuing a course of conduct, which amounted to harassment. The Panel listened to the explanation of this incident and the history between the applicant and their ex-partner and felt that they were credible in their explanation. The Panel noted that the family court would have heard all the evidence against them and that the family court deemed it appropriate for the applicant to see their daughter. The Panel also acknowledged that the applicant had taken steps to ensure that they do not communicate with their partner now unless it goes through a third party. The Panel were pleased that they had followed the family court's advice in pursuing an emotional management course and hoped that they continued to pursue this and benefitted from it.

The Panel noted that it had been more than 3 years since the applicant was convicted of being in possession of a bladed article however, it had been less than 3 years since they were convicted of harassment. On this occasion, having carefully considered all the evidence before it and the oral submissions made during the hearing, the Panel decided to depart from the Policy for the following reasons:-

1. The Panel determined that the applicant was credible when explaining the history between them and their ex-partner;
2. There were numerous allegations made against the applicant by their ex-partner that they were not charged with;
3. The applicant was visibly upset when they were talking about the photographs on their mobile phone that had been wiped and the Panel were sympathetic towards this;
4. The applicant had been through a long custody battle for their daughter and the family court, having considered the evidence and allegations that were made against them, ordered that they could see their daughter;
5. The applicant's ex-partner had informed the social worker during the family court proceedings that they had never put their hands on them and that was said to get at the applicant.

The Panel felt that the applicant was plausible and conducted themselves well during the hearing. The Panel strongly encouraged that they continued seeking support for emotional management and wished them and their daughter the best of luck in future and in their new career.

#### **RESOLVED**

**That the application for a Private Hire Driver's Licence 1/2022 be approved.**

***At this juncture Councillor Alam declared an interest and left the meeting.***

#### **5. REVIEW OF A HACKNEY CARRIAGE AND PRIVATE HIRE DRIVER'S LICENCE - 2/2022**

The Assistant Director of Operations and Neighbourhoods submitted a report requesting that the Panel determine whether the licence holder was a fit and proper person to hold the relevant licence in accordance with the provisions of Section 61 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976.

The Panel considered the written information submitted and heard the Regulatory Services Manager's (Licensing) case. He advised the Panel that the licence holder had held a Hackney Carriage and Private Hire driver's licence since April 2010. There were two existing complaints on file from June 2017 and July 2021. The first related to being abusive towards another road user and driving erratically and the second related to speaking inappropriately towards the complainant and driving without due care and attention. The licence holder received written warnings for both of these incidents and the cases were closed.

It was reported that on Monday 6 June 2022, the Licensing department received a complaint regarding a road traffic accident involving a hackney carriage vehicle and the conduct of the driver following the accident. The vehicle belonged to the licence holder and they were driving it at the

time of the accident. The driver presented their vehicle at Tame Street depot for inspection on the same day following a request from Licensing. Photographic evidence was taken that showed a slight mark on the front bumper. The driver had explained that this was a historic mark, which was accepted by Licensing and members of the Panel.

On 7 June 2022, Licensing contacted the complainant and a witness statement was taken. On 9 June 2022, the complainant submitted photographic evidence to the Licensing department taken at the time of the accident. On 15 June 2022, Licensing contacted the licence holder to obtain a witness statement. On 6 July 2022, the licence holder supplied photographic evidence to the Licensing department that they had taken on the day of the accident.

The Panel were made aware of the relevant sections of the Policy and Guidelines relating to the Application of the "Fit and Proper Person Test" to Licensed Drivers and Operators.

Having heard the Regulatory Services Manager's (Licensing) case, the licence holder, their two representatives and the Panel were provided with the opportunity to ask questions.

The licence holder then addressed the Panel and told them that they had been on a journey from Stalybridge to Hyde and their cab had touched the back of the complainant's car while they had been stationary at traffic lights. The driver explained that they had itched their leg and then their foot meaning they released their foot from the brake pedal and the cab had rolled into the back of the complainant's car. During the Panel's questioning, the licence holder said that they had mistakenly not applied the handbrake on this occasion.

The licence holder stated that the complainant got out of the car and had been furious and was very abusive towards them. During the altercation, the licence holder was trying to calm the complainant down and explain that there was limited damage to either vehicle. The complainant claimed that the licence holder had hit their car with force and they had hurt their back, which the licence holder disputed as the damage to both vehicles was extremely minor. The complainant had also accused them of grabbing their arm, which was strongly denied by the licence holder. The complainant's partner was travelling in the opposite direction shortly after the accident had taken place and became involved in the altercation. They said that the licence holder needed to apologise to the children who they claimed were both injured in the back of the car. The licence holder apologised to the children and in doing so touched the back of one of the children, which they were heavily criticised for.

The licence holder explained that during the altercation, the complainant was filming them and taking many photographs but the complainant's partner denied the licence holder the opportunity to take photographs. The licence holder managed to take one photograph of the back of the car but were unsure of the quality. They said that they had provided their insurance details to the complainant and both had continued with their separate journeys in the same direction as the licence holder was travelling to the taxi rank in Hyde. The licence holder explained that they were concerned that they needed further photographic evidence so, as the complainant was signalling to turn right, they took another photograph of the back of the complainant's car and then continued straight on the road towards Hyde.

The representatives of the licence holder questioned the relevance of including the two previous complaints made against the licence holder stating that they felt this was unfair as there had been no evidence. They also queried the complainant's statements as they differed and their failure to submit the video that had been taken at the time of the accident. They assumed the main reason the licence holder was before Panel was due to them placing their hand on one of the children's backs shortly after the accident had taken place. They claimed that this showed compassion and that the licence holder was trying to comfort the child, which they believed demonstrated that they were a fit and proper person.

The Regulatory Services Manager (Licensing) and Panel Members, were provided with the opportunity to ask questions.

**At this juncture the licence holder, their representatives, the Regulatory Services Manager (Licensing), the Regulatory Compliance Officer (Licensing) and the Regulatory Support Officer left the meeting whilst the Panel deliberated on the review. The Legal Representative and the Senior Democratic Services Officer remained in the meeting to give legal and procedural advice and took no part in the decision making process.**

In determining the review, the Panel considered all the information presented at the hearing in addition to the report and appendices. They further considered relevant statute and case law and the Council's *Convictions Policy (Policy & Guidelines relating to the Application of the "Fit and Proper Test" to Licensed Drivers and Operators)*.

The Panel listened to the licence holder's explanation of the incident on 6 June 2022 and determined that, on the balance of probabilities, the driver had rolled into the back of the complainant's car and that they did not hit it with force as alleged.

For the avoidance of doubt, the Panel did not consider the fact that the accident happened nor the extent of the accident when they were determining whether the licence holder was a fit and proper person to hold a licence. The concern of the Panel was the conduct following the accident, which they felt fell short of what they expected of its licenced drivers. The Panel did note though that whilst being interviewed about the incident at Tame Street, the licence holder stated that they were "sorting out change" when their car rolled into the back of the complainant's car. However, during oral submissions at the hearing, the licence holder stated that they had rolled into the back of the vehicle because they were "scratching their leg". The Panel expected its licenced drivers to drive and operate their vehicles to a certain standard and the licence holder was informed that in future, as a professional driver, they should use a handbrake when they were at traffic lights.

The Panel noted that the complainant alleged that the licence holder put a hand on their arm and that the complainant provided photographic evidence of a bruise on their arm. The Panel acknowledged that the licence holder disputed that they touched the complainant's arm and there was no further evidence as to whether or not this injury was caused by the licence holder nor could they ascertain when the photograph may have been taken.

The Panel were significantly concerned that the licence holder went to the rear of the complainant's vehicle and touched their child. The driver accepted that they had done this and whilst they stated that they had done this to see if the child was okay, the photographic evidence provided clearly shows the child looking distressed, uncomfortable and trying to move away from the licence holder's hand. Regardless of why the licence holder touched the child, the Panel felt that it was completely inappropriate and unacceptable behaviour.

Following the accident, the Panel were confident that the licence holder had followed the complainant for approximately 1 mile to the junction of Ashton Road and Bennett Street and this could be considered as intimidating behaviour. Initially during oral submissions, the licence holder stated that they were going straight on towards Hyde, however, they later stated that they were behind the complainant who was turning right. When asked about this, the licence holder stated that they could not remember which direction they went in. The Panel were of the view that the licence holder must have been in the right hand lane behind the complainant in order to take the photograph of the back of the car and were aware that it was a right hand only lane at this junction. The Panel were concerned that the licence holder had followed the complainant up to this point and felt that following the accident and subsequent altercation the correct course of action was for them to take an alternative route, of which there were many, to the end destination.

In addition to this, the Panel were concerned that the licence holder must have used a mobile phone to take this photograph whilst their vehicle was in motion and their cab was positioned extremely close to the complainant's car, which they also considered to be intimidating behaviour.

The Panel noted that there were two previous complaints against the licence holder in addition to this incident and they were concerned that there may be a pattern of behaviour. The Panel's primary concern was the safety of the public. Therefore, the Panel felt it necessary to give weight to

these two complaints, albeit no further action was taken on those occasions, and had to take a course of action against the licence holder.

The Panel considered all available options. However on balance, having carefully considered all the evidence, the Panel decided that the licence be suspended for a period of 3 months. The suspension would take effect after the 21-day appeal period had expired.

The Panel was of the view that the sanction imposed was appropriate and proportionate having regard to all the circumstances of this matter and having regard to the Council's adopted policy.

**RESOLVED**

**That the licence holder's licence be suspended for a period of 3 months following the expiration of the 21-day appeal period.**

**6. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

**RESOLVED**

**That the date of the next meeting of Speakers Panel (Licensing) scheduled for 13 September 2022 be noted.**



**7. URGENT ITEMS**

There were no urgent items.

**CHAIR**



# Agenda Item 4.

<b>Report to:</b>	<b>SPEAKERS PANEL (LICENSING)</b>
<b>Date:</b>	13 September 2022
<b>Reporting Officer:</b>	Emma Varnam – Assistant Director, Operations and Neighbourhoods
<b>Subject:</b>	<b>APPLICATION FOR A VARIATION OF HACKNEY CARRIAGE FARES</b>
<b>Report Summary:</b>	The report details an application received from Tameside Owners and Drivers Association to increase the maximum fares for Hackney Carriages.
<b>Recommendations:</b>	Members are requested to note the proposal to consult on the application for a variation of Hackney Carriage fares.
<b>Corporate Plan:</b>	Living Well – Improve satisfaction with local community.
<b>Policy Implications:</b>	There are no policy implications from this report.
<b>Financial Implications: (Authorised by the statutory Section 151 Officer &amp; Chief Finance Officer)</b>	There are no direct financial implications for the Authority.
<b>Legal Implications: (Authorised by the Borough Solicitor)</b>	<p>The Council has statutory powers to fix Hackney Carriage Fares under Section 65 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976. This can only be done once the statutory process for consultation has taken place under s.65 and any objections are properly considered.</p> <p>Proposals to vary the tables of fares need to be advertised and any objections brought back to this panel for consideration.</p>
<b>Risk Management:</b>	Enforcement activities ensure that the maximum permissible tariff is not exceeded.
<b>Access to Information:</b>	The author of the report is Mike Robinson – Regulatory Services Manager
<b>Background Information:</b>	<p>The background papers relating to this report can be inspected by contacting Mike Robinson</p> <p> Telephone - 0161 342 4122</p> <p> E-mail – <a href="mailto:mike.robinson@tameside.gov.uk">mike.robinson@tameside.gov.uk</a></p>

## 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Section 65 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 allows a district Council to fix the rates or fares within the local authority for Hackney Carriage Vehicles by the production of a table of fares following a prescribed period of statutory consultation.
- 1.2 The Act requires the Council to advertise a notice in at least one local newspaper for a period of 14 days, any proposal to change Hackney Carriage fares together with a table of fares or the variation thereof to allow any objections to be made.
- 1.3 The consultation procedure following a request for a fare increase is as follows:-
- Write to all Hackney Carriage owners seeking their views – completed 2 September 2022.
  - Report to Speakers Panel with owners comments – 13 September 2022.
  - Report to Executive Member for Executive Decision regarding permission to commence statutory consultation.
  - Advertise the fare increase in the local press in accordance with Legislation.
  - Allow 14 days for representations.
  - Representations taken into consideration and decision made by Executive Member (*If no representations received then the fare review is automatically approved*).
  - Meter agents to program new fares.

## 2. REPORT

- 2.1 The current fares were last increased on 10 March 2022. A copy of the current table of fares is attached at **Appendix 1**.
- 2.2 On 16 August 2022, a request was received from the Tameside Owners & Drivers Association (TODA) for a further variation to the fare structure. Details of the request are attached at **Appendix 2**.
- 2.3 There are currently 148 Hackney Carriages licensed by the Council. Between 18 August 2022 and 2 September 2022, an informal consultation was carried out with all licensed Hackney Carriage vehicle proprietors, seeking their views on the proposal. 45 replies were received by Licensing all supporting the variation. A summary of the comments is attached at **Appendix 3**.
- 2.4 A comparison of the current and proposed tariffs is also attached at **Appendix 4**, which shows the impact of the proposed changes.

## 3. CONCLUSION

- 3.1 The Panel are requested to consider the application.

## 4. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1 As set out at the front of the report.

Tameside MBC  
Maximum Hackney Carriage Fares  
Operative March 2022



<b>Tariff 1 - Day Rate</b>	<b>Daily, 6am to 11pm</b>
<b>For first 153 yards</b>	<b>£2.00</b>
<b>then for every 153 yards or part thereof</b> (Approximately £2.30 per mile)	<b>20p</b>
<b>Waiting time every 45 seconds</b> (Approximately £16.00 per hour)	<b>20p</b>

<b>Tariff 2 - Night Rate</b>	<b>Daily, 11pm to 6am</b>
<b>For first 118.5 yards</b>	<b>£2.70</b>
<b>then for every 118.5 yards or part thereof</b> (Approximately £3 per mile)	<b>20p</b>
<b>Waiting time every 36 seconds</b> (Approximately £20.00 per hour)	<b>20p</b>

<b>Tariff 3 - Holiday Rate</b>	<b>2pm 24 December to 6am 27 December 2pm 31 December to 6am 2 January Public Holidays 24hr (midnight to midnight)</b>
<b>For first 100 yards</b>	<b>£2.70</b>
<b>then for every 100 yards or part thereof</b> (Approximately £3.50 per mile)	<b>20p</b>
<b>Waiting time every 30 seconds</b> (Approximately £24.00 per hour)	<b>20p</b>

<b>Extra Charges</b>	
<b>Each additional passenger or animals</b>	<b>20p</b>
<b>Soiling charge</b> (must be paid if inside of cab needs cleaning)	<b>£30.00</b>
<b>No extra charges for wheelchairs, prams, guide/hearing dogs or children under 12 years.</b>	
Extras to be limited to a maximum of 60p for four-seater Hackney Vehicles, 80p for five-seater Hackney Vehicles, £1.00 for six-seater Hackney Vehicles, £1.20 for seven-seater Hackney Vehicles and £1.40 for eight-seater Hackney Vehicles.	

<b>Authorised Fares and charges when operating within the Borough of Tameside</b>
When a hackney carriage is standing or plying for hire the fare for any hiring shall be calculated in accordance with the fare table for all journeys within the Metropolitan Borough of Tameside unless the hirer expresses his / her desire to engage a hackney carriage by time, when the rate of fare shall be calculated by time. Such rate of fare shall be agreed in advance prior to the commencement of the journey.

The rate of fares fixed by the Council shall include rates or fares for any journey commencing within Tameside and ending at any point within Greater Manchester, but outside Tameside, less than four miles from the nearest Tameside boundary.



**Date**

16<sup>th</sup> August 2022

**Subject**

**APPLICATION FOR VARIATION OF HACKNEY CARRIAGE FARE TABLE**

**Strategy**

The hackney carriage trade provides public transport to all sectors of the community including vulnerable persons. They are on occasions the only accessible form of transport available. T.O.D.A. believes in regular reviews of fares to consider the constantly shifting costs and passenger trends associated with the taxi trade, in providing a quality taxi service through better job security and higher vehicle standards. Regular fare reviews should maintain the income of taxi drivers and owners. In turn, maintaining a professional aspect to taxi driving and seeking to encourage taxi drivers to commit to further education such as NVQ’s and other safeguarding/customers service courses. It would also encourage owners to invest in newer and more advanced vehicles, which will encourage members of the public to use taxis when shopping or socialising in Tameside; adding further to the local economy.

**Introduction**

Section 65 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 gives the Council the power to fix the rates or fares within the district for time and distance, and all other charges in connection with the hire of a vehicle or with the arrangements for the hire of a vehicle, to be paid in respect of the hire of hackney carriages by means of a table of fares. When setting hackney carriage fares there is no requirement in the Act to consider external factors, and there is no limit on the amount of increase or variation.

**Background Information**

History shows that hackney carriage fare variations have been irregular over the years in Tameside, with changes in 2004, 2008, 2011, 2012, 2018 and the last application being made in October 2021.

The application submitted in October 2021 for a variation in hackney carriage fares was originally submitted in March 2020, but due to the uncertainties of the Covid 19 lockdown the application was withdrawn. This application provided the most up to date information and figures available at the time., however, due to the lengthy statutory legal process involved in any hackney carriage fare variation, the new fares only actually came into effect in March 2022.

Unfortunately, in that time between October 2021 and March 2022, the UK experienced an fuel/energy “crisis”, further exasperated by the war in Ukraine, resulting in average diesel cost rising by 28.3% from 139.78p per litre in October 2021 to 179.30p per litre in March 2022, with UK inflation accelerating to, at the time, a 30 year high of 6.2%; making the figures used in the application somewhat immaterial.

Since then, the unprecedented rises in the cost of living have seen prices soar and production costs skyrocket, thus having a huge knock-on effect on the costs associated with running and purchasing a compliant hackney carriage vehicle, with UK average diesel price alone reaching a record high of 199.05p in July 2022 and EV charging prices rising by an average of 29% since the beginning of the year.

TaxiPoint – UKTaxi News found that diesel black cab drivers are on average spending £2500 a year on fuel based on prices just 12 months ago.

The price of a new Cab Direct Mercedes-Benz Vito Taxi, currently the most popular vehicle in the Tameside hackney carriage fleet, increased from £34,995 in August 2021 to a list price of £46,995 for new models from September 2022

JULY 2021

JULY 2022

Mercedes-Benz Vito Taxi Now from only **£34,995** OTR Offer available while stocks last!

**TAXI NEWS**  
**FOLLOW** TaxiPoint  
**COSTING THOUSANDS**  
Diesel TX4 taxi drivers spending over **£2,500** a year MORE on fuel based on prices just 12-months ago

Mercedes-Benz Vito Taxi Now from only **£42,500** OTR **SAVE £4,000**

## Proposal

The proposal is to;

- Increase the running mile price by 10% across all tariffs.
- Increases in the flag fall price for the first time since 2008.
- Increase waiting time prices for the first time since 2012, by 12.5%
- Increase the soiling charge from £30 to £40 if the inside of the cab needs cleaning.
- Add Manchester Airport barrier charges to the fare table

### Tariff 1 - Day Rate – 6am - 11pm

Flag fall to increase by 50p from £2.00 to £2.50

Price per mile to increase by 10% from £2.30 to £2.53, by reducing the yardage from 153 to 139 yards.

Waiting time to increase by 12.5% from £16.00 per hour to £18.00, by reducing the amount of time for 20p from 45 to 40 seconds.

	CURRENT	PROPOSED
FLAG FALL COST	£2.00	£2.50
FLAG FALL YARDAGE	153yds	139yds
SUBSEQUENT YARDAGE	153yds	139yds
PRICE PER UNIT	20p	20p
WAITING TIME PER HOUR	£16.00	£18.00
RUNNING MILE	£2.30	£2.53

### Tariff 2 - Night Rate – 11pm – 6am

Flag fall to increase by 30p from £2.70 to £3.00

Price per mile to increase by 10% from £2.97 to £3.26, by reducing the yardage from 118.5 to 108 yards.

Waiting time to increase by 12.5% from £20.00 per hour to £22.50, by reducing the amount of time for 20p from 36 to 32 seconds.

	CURRENT	PROPOSED
FLAG FALL COST	£2.70	£3.00
FLAG FALL YARDAGE	118.5yds	108yds
SUBSEQUENT YARDAGE	118.5yds	108yds
PRICE PER UNIT	20p	20p
WAITING TIME PER HOUR	£20.00	£22.50
RUNNING MILE	£2.97	£3.26

### Tariff 3 - Holiday Rate – Operates from midnight to midnight (00.00 to 23.59) on all public holidays, and from 2pm on 24<sup>th</sup> December to 6am on 27<sup>th</sup> December and 2pm on 31<sup>st</sup> December to 6am on 2<sup>nd</sup> January.

Flag fall to increase by 30p from £2.70 to £3.00

Price per mile to increase by 10% from £3.52 to £3.87, by reducing the yardage from 100 to 91 yards.

Waiting time to increase by 12.5% from £24.00 per hour to £27.00, by reducing the amount of time for 20p from 30 to 26.7 seconds.

	CURRENT	PROPOSED
FLAG FALL COST	£2.70	£3.00
FLAG FALL YARDAGE	100yds	91yds
SUBSEQUENT YARDAGE	100yds	91yds
PRICE PER UNIT	20p	20p
WAITING TIME PER HOUR	£24.00	£27.00
RUNNING MILE	£3.52	£3.87

## Summary

	FLAG FALL	1 MILE	2 MILE	3 MILE	4 MILE	5 MILE	6 MILE	7 MILE	8 MILE	9 MILE	10 MILE	PER MILE
CURRENT TARIFF 1	2.00	4.20	6.60	8.80	11.00	13.40	15.60	18.00	20.20	22.60	24.80	2.30
PROPOSED TARIFF 1	2.50	4.90	7.50	9.90	12.50	15.10	17.50	20.10	22.70	25.10	27.70	2.53
CURRENT TARIFF 2	2.70	5.50	8.50	11.50	14.50	17.50	20.50	23.30	26.30	29.30	32.30	2.97
PROPOSED TARIFF 2	3.00	6.20	9.40	12.60	16.00	19.20	22.40	25.80	29.00	32.20	35.40	3.26
CURRENT TARIFF 3	2.70	6.10	9.70	13.10	16.70	20.10	23.70	27.30	30.70	34.30	37.70	3.52
PROPOSED TARIFF 3	3.00	6.80	10.60	14.60	18.40	22.20	26.20	30.00	33.80	37.80	41.60	3.87

Tameside MBC  
Maximum Hackney Carriage Fares  
Operative xxx



<b>Tariff 1 - Day Rate</b>	<b>Daily, 6am to 11pm</b>
For first <b>139</b> yards	<b>£2.50</b>
then for every <b>139</b> yards or part thereof	20p
Waiting time every <b>40</b> seconds	20p

<b>Tariff 2 - Night Rate</b>	<b>Daily, 11pm to 6am</b>
For first <b>108</b> yards	<b>£3.00</b>
then for every <b>108</b> yards or part thereof	20p
Waiting time every <b>32</b> seconds	20p

<b>Tariff 3 - Holiday Rate</b>	<b>2pm 24 December to 6am 27 December 2pm 31 December to 6am 2 January Public Holidays 24hr (midnight to midnight)</b>
For first <b>91</b> yards	<b>£3.00</b>
then for every <b>91</b> yards or part thereof	20p
Waiting time every <b>27</b> seconds	20p

<b>Extra Charges</b>	
Each additional passenger or animals	20p
Soiling charge (must be paid if inside of cab needs cleaning)	<b>£40.00</b>
<b>All Manchester Airport barrier charges (drop-off &amp; pick-up) must be paid by the hirer.</b>	
<b>No extra charges for wheelchairs, prams, guide/hearing dogs or children under 12 years.</b>	
Extras to be limited to a maximum of 60p for four-seater Hackney Vehicles, 80p for five-seater Hackney Vehicles, £1.00 for six-seater Hackney Vehicles, £1.20 for seven-seater Hackney Vehicles and £1.40 for eight-seater Hackney Vehicles.	

<b>Authorised Fares and charges when operating within the Borough of Tameside</b>	
When a hackney carriage is standing or plying for hire the fare for any hiring shall be calculated in accordance with the fare table for all journeys within the Metropolitan Borough of Tameside unless the hirer expresses his / her desire to engage a hackney carriage by time, when the rate of fare shall be calculated by time. Such rate of fare shall be agreed in advance prior to the commencement of the journey.	
The rate of fares fixed by the Council shall include rates or fares for any journey commencing within Tameside and ending at any point within Greater Manchester, but outside Tameside, less than four miles from the nearest Tameside boundary.	

This page is intentionally left blank



## APPENDIX 3

### Representations following informal enquiries

AGREE	ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
Y	I do agree with the proposed Hackney fare increase
Y	I can confirm I agree with the proposed Hackney fare increase.
Y	This should have happened earlier. This should be done on a regular basis rather than every 10 years, so the customers don't get a big hit.
Y	Yes I agree with rise
Y	I am in the favour of fare increase I am agree that hackney fare should go up like proposed by toda .. bcz its fuel etc everything so expensive we struggling .. so need help kind
Y	I do agree with the proposed Hackney fare increase.
Y	Thanks for submitting this proposal on behalf of Hackney trade in a speedy manner. I do agree with the proposed hackney fare increase.
Y	I agree with the proposed fair increase
Y	
Y	I do agree with the proposed hackney fare increase
Y	I do agree with the proposed Hackney fare increase
Y	I do agree with the proposed Hackney fare increase
Y	I am happy with the fare increase, that's why the fuel price go up and the cost of living goes up as well.
Y	Cost of living has gone up along with the fuel prices, parts prices etc.
Y	I do agree with the proposed Hackney fare increase
Y	I agree that with the rising living costs along with inflation, the cost of fuel rising by almost 50ppl over the last few months has made running a hv very difficult not to mention the high rise in spare parts the last increase was prior to all the above rises.
Y	Yes I agree with the proposal for the fare rise!!
Y	I agree with the with the proposed Hackney fare increase.
Y	I DO AGREE with the proposed Hackney fare increase.
Y	cost of living and fuel and parts prices have gone up. our last rise was before this
Y	I agree with the proposal
Y	Good morning just emailing regarding the fare increase I agree with the proposal for the fares to increase.
Y	I agree with the increase in order to maintain a good quality of life and help keep up with the increased energy bills, fuel prices and increased costs of car parts.
Y	I do agree with the proposed hackney fare increase
Y	Yes I agree with the Hackney fare increase.
Y	I do agree with the proposed hackney fare increase
Y	I do agree with the proposed hackney fare increase
Y	Yes i agree with the proposal for hackney fare increase
Y	
Y	
Y	I do agree with the proposed hackney fare increase.
Y	I agree with fare increase because of cost of living, cost of maintenance and cost of fuel energy thing gone up the roof
Y	I do agree with the proposed Hackney fare increase Hackney plate number
Y	
Y	Cost of living has gone up as well as fuel prices, parts prices etc

Y	Hey, I'm writing to say I agree with the proposal of the fare increase
Y	I agree to the proposal
Y	I think a rise is needed due to cost of living increases.
Y	Yes, I agree with the proposed hackney fare increase as everything is increasing specifically fuel prices, cab maintenance as well as livelihood costs. Thank you.
Y	I do agree with the proposed Hackney Fare increase.
Y	I do agree with the proposed Hackney Fare increase.
Y	Cost of living has gone up along with fuel prices and parts prices etc
Y	I do agree with the proposed Hackney Fare increase.
Y	I do agree with the proposed Hackney fare increase Hackney plate. Reason for increase is inflation, high fuel prices and all over increase in everything which effects everyone.
Y	HIGH INFLATION HIGH FUEL PRICES AND ALL OTHER COMOBITY PRICE ARE HIGH ASWELL, THANKS

# APPENDIX 4

Summary

	FLAG FALL	1 MILE	2 MILE	3 MILE	4 MILE	5 MILE	6 MILE	7 MILE	8 MILE	9 MILE	10 MILE	PER MILE
CURRENT TARIFF 1	2.00	4.20	6.60	8.80	11.00	13.40	15.60	18.00	20.20	22.60	24.80	2.30
PROPOSED TARIFF 1	2.50	4.90	7.50	9.90	12.50	15.10	17.50	20.10	22.70	25.10	27.70	2.53
CURRENT TARIFF 2	2.70	5.50	8.50	11.50	14.50	17.50	20.50	23.30	26.30	29.30	32.30	2.97
PROPOSED TARIFF 2	3.00	6.20	9.40	12.60	16.00	19.20	22.40	25.80	29.00	32.20	35.40	3.26
CURRENT TARIFF 3	2.70	6.10	9.70	13.10	16.70	20.10	23.70	27.30	30.70	34.30	37.70	3.52
PROPOSED TARIFF 3	3.00	6.80	10.60	14.60	18.40	22.20	26.20	30.00	33.80	37.80	41.60	3.87

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 2, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 2, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



By virtue of paragraph(s) 2, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 2, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 2, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 2, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



By virtue of paragraph(s) 2, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 2, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 2, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 2, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



By virtue of paragraph(s) 2, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 2, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 2, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 2, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



By virtue of paragraph(s) 2, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 2, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank