HACKNEY CARRIAGE FARES REVIEW STAGE 2

Public Consultation Summary

TYPE	RESPONSE	OFFICER COMMENTS
SEBC Driver	I STRONGLY OBJECT TO THESE PROPOSALS.	The options for charging for additional passengers were
(email)	Tariff 4,5 & 6 were previously removed from the fares due to overcharging as the driver could set whatever tariff he liked.	considered as part of this review,
(email)	Reintroducing these tariffs will again allow this to happen, tariff 6 was very popular after midnight with some driver's.	following claims that the current system was not transparent enough for customers. This option was
	Tariff 2. Starting fare should be £5.10 (33% extra) the distance should be the same as tariff 1 not a mile.	considered a compromise, still allowing drivers to charge extra proportional to the journey distance/time, while making it clear
	Tariff 2 previously came in at 00.00hrs at 50 %. Then was changed to 2300 hrs at 33 %.now proposed to be 00.00hrs at 33 % why change again? .	to the customer the charge right from the start.
	Forest Heath made concessions to st eds regarding fares and distance but kept tariff 2 at 2300 hrs due to being in keeping with national guidelines. Why go back on this because a few "wheelchair operators " who used the free plate route as a way of creating their own private hire businesses object.	This change is in response to claims by St Edmundsbury drivers that the reduction to 33% was unfair. It is hoped this balances out any loss of income from moving the 23.00hrs back to 00.00hrs.
	The people who will benefit from the changes will be the overchargers who have no concern or respect for the future of the rank.	Councillors decided to push the timing of tariff 2 back to 00.00hrs to ensure the public are not priced out of getting taxis back from events that finish around 23.00hrs, e.g. theatre, concerts etc., particularly given there are limited public transport options at this time in our predominantly rural
		area.

SEBC Driver (email)	Having just received the new proposal of fares. I have noticed that Tariff 1 is to high this will scare off the customers during the day who are mainly the elderly and people on a very low income Tariff 2 is only 131% of tariff 1. Not the 150% which was agreed at the meeting as part of the change from 11pm to midnight Tariff 4 is also only 131% of tariff 1 which make a massive jump from tariff 4 to tariff 5 Also the words "up to a maximum of " has been left in. This leaves us with a safety issues when customers refuse to pay more than £10 leaving us out of pocket by anything from £50 to £300 depending to the time the incident happens and how serious the mess is	Overcharging is an enforcement issue. These fares represent the maximum drivers can charge. However, we recognise that many drivers will charge this price. This is the first overall increase for St Edmundsbury drivers since 2015 and for Forest Heath drivers since 2014 and reflects increasing cost of living and fuel over this period. The West Suffolk fares remain in the middle when compared with fare cards across the region and nationally. Tariff 2 has been updated according to these concerns
Member of the public (email)	I read your article in the Bury Mercury, December 19th & thought to myself, why did the taxi driver whom I took a cab with last Friday tell me there had already been a merger and that is why it cost me £13.80 at 11.15pm, to get from the centre of town (Bury St Edmunds) to my home in Rushbrooke, a near 3 miles away. I took a taxi as I had been at my work's Christmas dinner party, at that price no wonder people drink & drive! I find this an extortionate cost for a 5 minute 3 mile max ride. Next time I'll walk!	In response to your objection and comments from drivers, the proposal has been updated: the threshold for the higher tariff has been pushed back to after midnight, in order to increase affordability for people returning from evening events.
Member of the public	I am assuming that you are not pensioners or disabled who has no other means of transport except by a taxi.	One of our aims for the fare review was to keep the affordability for customers and we would not want the

(letter)	It is going to cost me £10 each way to go into a town to shop, visit the doctors, dentist, opticians etc; you can keep ramping prices up but you will probably reduce the number of taxis available to get people like me out to do any of the above. Perhaps you should try travelling by taxi for a month, but then with your inflated salaries it would make little difference for you. I served in the Royal Air Force helping to defend my home country, now I am 77 years old and disabled the people who are supposed to help are doing the opposite. So before making a decision on this matter "THINK ON"	fares to negatively impact both the public and then the trade in this way. For SEBC, the fares have pretty well gone back to 2015 prices and format. There is an increase for FHDC, particularly the starting prices. However, they have not had an increase for some years
FHDC Driver (Darren Daines)	I am a licensed driver and operator and have been doing this work for over 30yrs in the local area. The tariff proposal is completely inappropriate for the trade and current economic situation, in mine and the other driver's opinion, thus we do object to the recommended tariff. There are a number of points which cause us concern. 1- What's the use of having calendar controlled meters, when those who operate wheelchair accessible vehicles (WAV) and have drivers that are so inclined have the option to select the 5-8 passenger tariff, as its has no built in control on it. [The West Suffolk Licensing Team] said she knows this has been carried out by drivers, although unable to prove it!! Calendar control only works if you have single tariffs depending on time of day across the trade, not different tariffs for different sized Vehicles and number of passengers carried. If you are going to allow separate WAV tariffs may we suggest you only allow them in WAV hackney carriages if they have seat occupant sensors linked to the meters, which will enable lockout of the higher	The 3 additional tariffs were proposed to replace the set additional 'extra' charges (added through an 'extras' button) which was not transparent enough for customers, so the trade reported that some refused to pay. It is felt that the additional tariffs is simpler and fairer, as it is set at the start of a journey so the customer knows the fare isn't being artificially inflated at the end of the journey. Alternatives were considered such as no extra charges or a one-off charge but it was suggested that this would not be fair on the trade. The proposed fares have been updated – night fares are to commence at midnight and conclude at 6am

tariff unless they sense more than 4 seats are occupied, this system is available, although is an extra cost for installation.

- 2 The WAV tariffs are too as it doesn't cost 50% more to run WAV taxi's, yes set the tariffs higher but nearer 20% figure as this is nearer the true difference in operating cost of a WAV and Saloon or estate car and as now all new licensed taxis will have to be a WAV, the extra charges just encourages even more of the WAV taxis to be purchased and licensed, if you reduce the difference then it would reduce the number of new WAV taxis coming to be licensed. Even [the West Suffolk Licensing Team] has said that the WAV tariffs are very expensive when compared to 4 seater taxi's and current St Edmunds Area is getting overrun with WAV style taxis during some meetings when discussing the merged tariff options.
- 3 Forest Heath have had for years the 23.00hrs 06.00hrs tariff 2 timings, as to avoid penalizing night shift workers, especially NHS staff and emergency services who finish as 06.00hrs and need taxis to get home after a hard nights work, the proposed timing would be a major cost to such workers. This timing should be on all tariffs.
- 4 You have removed the extras for the carriage of luggage and bags, when collecting passengers from supermarkets or picking up people with cases, it can take an amount of time to load and unload these bags and or luggage, plus we are not being paid for this as should not put meter on until the journey starts even though we have actually started the hire when the first bag is put in the boot. You can get a supermarket pickup and they have 8 or 10 bags after doing a weekly shop and then have to drop them home and help them carry the bags to their doorway, as you can't just dump the bags on the side of the road, you are talking as 10 mins of hire time that we are not being paid for, as most passengers pay before getting out of the taxi and this before unloading bags. The small 20p charge for each bag did cover the

The fares will be reviewed annually and the effect on the trade monitored. If there is a reduction in walk-on work fares this will be reflected in the findings of an independent supply and demand survey which is planned for 2019. This can then be used to support future decisions on hackney carriage fares.

The baggage charge has been put back on the tariffs as an optional extra for drivers.

The wording has been updated on the tariff sheet.

time and 90% of passengers were happy to pay this cost, when we explained what it was for.

5 – The wording for the WAV tariffs (4-6) needs to be changed as at the moment it is open to interpretation in that, the WAV's can charge the higher tariff even if carrying less than 5 passengers, we would suggest it reads "The Following Tariffs Apply to Vehicles When Carrying More than 4 Passengers"

Finally a general view of overall proposal and merger

The St Edmunds tariffs were a much higher start/flag than Forest Heath when the merger started and they were complaining of walk-on (rank work) passenger losses, I'm not surprised, Forest Heath had kept start/flag cost down to reasonable amount and this kept a reasonable trade in the Walk-on (Rank Work). With the current 1st Stage alignment Forest Heath area is also seeing a reduction of walk-on passengers (Rank Work) due to the drastic increase in Start/Flag I would expect this to continue as things stand.