	normal .																		
A THE THE TOUR THAT	company	an proper		1178/2008	10000					Material Property									
1 mm har tradering	content of the last of the las	15 September 1	1000	10.70.70.00	NAME OF TAXABLE PARTY.														
W. Marchaeller	company	10,00000		10,000,000	110000	17.6 Install Many Strap Street						transpopus		Analytic form the important behavior in a protection of the parties with report or with region construct parties.	According refere				World alon
				10,780,70100	2000							Nather agree or magner.	T000 400		Tropic spin				Words stepne better seen on francis
T DE SANSON	company company	14,000		10/80/0000	2000	TO MANUFACTURE WHICH THE				Water of Taylor		transpopus	Transporter						Windowskie on States
					100 to														
				10/20/2020															
at the top television	company	ALTONO I	a men	0.00000	FEE 100			Married Specialist											
0 No. 249 200	company	10,000 m	1000	10/20/2002 10/20/2002	100.00					Material Property		Selfur graces thegas	Nather governor strages				No. The second business in contract		mostly with
0 00 04 000 0 00 04 000 0	congress of					8.00						Manage opening	Transport of the State of the S		Writing ages Seeling was not disserted				Transporter
		10,000	1000	10/00/0000	1177														7100 Figure
A SECTION OF	100,000			10,000	1000	THE WANTED WINDS							April 1999			and a	No. Recorded Section Street Co.	Note that I gain all and improved by the Material State of the second of	TOTAL COMPANY
												Manage opening the state of			Strategies Section and the Strategies				
The transfer of	rangener	0000		0.00,000	100.00	THE SHARTNESS WINDOWS			NAME AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY.								To Descript Survey Street and	Total of Control and Add Add Add Add Add Add Add Add Add A	Train them
at the highways	content of the last of the las	9000	2000	0.00,000	Part of	14 monthern simplifie											To the standard because the standard		
						ET wasternamen													
2 20 14 1000	content of the last of the las	9000		10/10/2018 (0/10/2018	200	A PER TERMINANT AND A PERSON NAMED AND ADDRESS OF THE PERSON N						Nation against trapped			National Section 11 August 1				
W. Bell Sup Bellevill	company	ACCUSE.	a men	1000,000	10000	ALC: Y				Water of Taylor		Strange, Bougha			Natherapie no Angre		No. Recorded Section Street Man	Section with the board model of many processing of the state of many control and the section of	Accept aceban
N MATERIAL STREET	company company	80.00		1000,0000 1000,0000	1000	n n				THE COURSE	Mark Base 1	Manager Angeles Manager Angeles			National Control of States		No. Recorded Service Street Co.	Street and the street street of the street o	Words States
	CONTRACTOR OF THE PERSON AND THE PER			Mark Contract	100.00														Accely along Accely and on
to the top troubles	company	ACCUSE.		1000,000	10000	440						transportuges.	Nather ages our droughts		World States				mode andon
N. Military Strategic Co.	company company	80.00	1000	1000,0000 1000,0000	1000	AN INDUSTRIAL STREET							Transporter		April Service on Assets		No. Recorded Service Standard	Name and the control of the control	Total Dates
W. Str. Str. Str. Str.	congress of	90.00	1000	000,000	1000	III) wastern waste		Married Spender				Trape Trape	Transporter		Natherapie no Angra Visido Diserso		No. Recorded Section Street Section 1		Words Statem
				10/10/1000 10/10/1000											Service again our droughest				
						FRE SOMETHING WINDS TO													
M. Marting Strategies	company company	80.00		1000,0000 1000,0000	1000	A ST. CONSTITUTE STREET, STREE						Station agree on Houghes			Program	Macrodic effects. Nating your last court if yours, it should be the united travalled business.	No. President Service Street Man		Program
M. Mar has broken	congress of	90.00	1000	000,000	NAME OF TAXABLE PARTY.	THE WARREST WINDOWS			NAME AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY.			npar apar	Ages Methor ages no rivages		Native upon no dougrap		No. Department becomes inscribed		April 1988
	rangene			1000,0000 1000,0000	MARINE MARINE														
of the bay before	company company	0000		000,000	1000	THE WHATEHOUSE STREET	Marie Administration								Natherape on Angre		No. Recorded Service Standard	Note that The state of the TWO	Winds States
												Trape .	Topic .		mostly makes				

Eye Reproduction and adjust to the control of the c	hope specificage with propositivity and P.		Representation with the proposal configuration.		Name and Address of the Property of the Land		to progress degree the elithers desert better.
			Manage agree				
					110.25		
					Troop was		
	month down		transferações		Tropings		
			Manage ages				
					Troop was		Nongraphic Control of the Control of
					Trough ages		
A wide from the plant of the product							
of wild the should be up to the years will	Nather agree on Houghes				Tricingly refere		
					Tropings		
					Trough ages		
		The second property of the property of the second property of the se	Married States	Margarita Maria, Malatana a Falagarita dan Manada Margarita Manada Margarita Manada Manada Margarita Manada	Total States		
		May also if the construction (against and the pictures in construct.) The second actions in a first and the first and the construction of the cons		Millipers M. pr., sala citi a. 4. to qui fi subset. Estimatible improprietti in manchini colori improprietti in manchini colori improprietti in manchini colori improprietti in manchini colori in manchini			
		The state of the s	March Andre	Margini of the Control of the State of the Control	Top her		
			Strongs, Bodger				
					Total des		Tropings Tropings
							Nather opening Hopes
	Nather agree or Hospital						
		The section of the control of the section of the se	Manage age of the Control of the Con	We will record the special field appropriate the second participate of the second seco	Troop spec		
The above and day of the bad with proceeding the control processing the control							
	month dow		transpopulari				
The particular territorial for the control agent to perchant recovered a control, the control agent to the control						Noville survivo describerational describations	



ID For	mat (Q1a (Q1b (Q1c O	1d Q	1e (Q1f Q	10th	TAXI	Q2	Q3 Q3D	s Q4	Q4I	Dis Q5	Q5Yes	Qe	Q6Dis	Q7	Q7Dis	Q8 (Q8Dis	Q9	Q9Dis	Q10	Q10Dis (211	Q11Dis	Q12	2 Q12Dis	Q	13 C)14 (Q15 (216
48	1					5			2	4	2	2	3	2 :	1 1		5 1	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	L	5	1	1	2	2	2
50	1					5			2			2	3	2 :				5		5	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	L	5	1	1	1	2	2
51	1						6	2	1	5		2	3	2 :					1		1	5	1	5	1	5	1			1	1	1	3	2
45	1	1							1	4		2	3	2 :	1 1		5 1	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	L	5	1	1	2	3	2
8	1			3	4				1	. 3	1	2	3	2	2 2	. !	5 1	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	5	1	L	5	1	1	1	3	2
28	2					5			2	. 3	3	2	3	2	2 2		5 1	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	3	2
58	2	1							1	. 5	5	2	5	2	1 2		5 2	5	2	1	2	5	2	5	2	5	2	2	5	2	2	1	3	2
63	2	1			4				1	. 2	3	2 -99	9	2	1 2	. !	5 1	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	4	1	L	5	1	1	1	4	2
19	2	1	2	3	4				1	. 2	2	2	2	2	2 2		1 2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	4	2
64	3	1	2	3	4	5			1	. 4	2	2	3	2	1 1	. !	5 1	5	1	5	1	5	1	2	2	1	1	L	5	1	1	1	4	2
69	1	1							1	. 2	2	2	2	2	1 2	. !	5 1	2	2	2	2	4	1	2	1	2	2	2	4	1	1	2	4	2
20	1			3					1	. 2	2	2	2	2	2 2	: :	2 2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	5	1	L	2	2	1	1	4	2
23	1					5			2	. 3	3	2	3	2 -99	9 2	:	1 2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	4	1
57	2	1		3	4				1	. 4	1	2	3	2	1 1	. !	5 1	3	2	5	1	5	1	1	1	5	1	L	3	1	1	1	4	1
46	2	1							1	. 3	2	2	3	2	2 2		2 2	4	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4	1	L	5	1	2	1	4	2
59	2	1							1	. 2	2	2	3	2 -99	9 2	:	2 2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4	1	2	1	4	2
11	2	1							1	. 3	1	2	1	2	2 2	. !	5 1	2	2	2	2	5	1	2	1	2	2	2	5	1	2	1	4	2
66	3									-99	-99	2 -9	9	2 -99	9 2	. !	5 1	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	2	2	2	2	4	1	2	1	4	2
18	1	1	2		4				1	. 2	2	2	2	2	1 2	. !	5 1	1	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	4	2
32	2	1	2		4				1			2	4	2		. !		3		1		1	2			1				2	2	1	4	2
42	1	1	2		4				1			2		2		. !		1		1		1	2			1				2	2	1	4	2
2	2	1	2	3					1			2		2				1		5	2		2		2	1				2	2	1	4	2
4	2					5			2			2		2				1		1		1	2			1				2	2	2	4	1
15	2					5			2				3			:		1		1		1	2			1				2	2	2	4	1
56	2	1							1				2	2				4		2	2		2			4				2	2	1	4	2
55	2		_						-99	_			5	2 :		. !		5		5		3	2			3				2	2	2	4	2
47	2		2			_			1				2	2 :		. !		2		2		4	1			2				1	1	1	5	2
5	2					5	_		2				2					2		1		1	2			1	_			2	1	2	5	2
49	1						6	1	1				3	2 :		. !		5		5		5	1		1	5				1	1	2	5	2
53	1	4				_	6	3	1				3	2 :		. !		5		5		5	1		1	5				1	1	2	5	2
44	1	1				5			1				3	2 :		. !		5		5	1		1		1	5				1	1	2	5	2
43	1	1 1							1			2		2 :		. !		5		5	1		1			5				1	1	1	5 5	2
41	2	_							1	_			2	2 :		. !		3		2	2		1			2			-	1	2	1	5 5	1
24	1 1	1 1							1 1			2 :	2	2 2		. !		2 5	2	2 5	2	4 5	1		1 1	5				1 1	2	1 1	5 5	2 2
67 65	2	1			4				1			2 :		2 :						1	1			_	1	2					2		5 5	2
65 13	2	1			4							2		2 :				1		1		4 1	1 2			3				1 2	2	1 1	5 5	2
26	1	1							1	2		2		2 :		. !		4		2	2		1			2				2 2	2	1	5 5	2
26 37	1	1							1				4 3	2 :				3		1		1	2			3				2	2	1	5 5	2
3	2	1				5				99	-99	2						2		1		1	2			3 1				2	2	2	5 5	1
5 54	2					5 5			2			1 4		2 2				2		1		1	2			1				2	2	1	5 5	2
9	2		2			J			1			2						1		1		1	2			1				2	2	1	5 5	2
		1	_						_																								•	
60	2	1							1	. 5	5	2	5	2	2 2	. !	5 2	5	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	5	1

27	1	1					1	1	1	2	4	1	. 1	1	5		1	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4	1	1	1	6	2
31	2	_						4	2	2	4		-99	2			2	5		2	2		1	5	1	5	1	5	1	1	2	6	2
62	2	_							2	2	3		2		2		2	2		2		2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	6	2
	2	1	_	2										2	2		2	2	_	_	2	2			_	_		4	1	1	1	0	2
17	1	1	2	3	4			2	1	2	2	2		2	3	•	2	3	2		2	2	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	1	1	6	1
29		1						4	2	2	3		1	1	5	:	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	1	1	6	2
1	2		2				1	3	3	1	4	1	. 2	2	5	:	1	2	2	1	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	5	1	2	1	6	2
61	2	1					1	3	2	2	4	1	. 1	2	4	:	1	5	1	2	2	4	1	4	1	2	2	5	1	2	1	6	2
68	2		2				1	4	4	2	5	2	1	1	5	:	1	1	2	1	2	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	1	6	2
6	2	1					1	2	2	2	4	1	. 1	1	3	:	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	1	6	2
7	2					5	2	2	2	2	4	1	. 2	2	2	:	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	6	2
38	1	1					1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2		2	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	6	2
39	1	1					1	1	1	2	1	2	2	2	1	:	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	6	2
40	1	1					1	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	:	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	1	6	2
14	3					5	2	2	4	1	4	1	. 2	2	1	:	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	4	1	1	2	7	2
10	1	1					1	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	1	:	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	7	2
21	3					5	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	1	:	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	7	1
30	1	1					1	5	5	2	5	2	-99	1	5	:	2	5	2	3	2	5	1	-99	2	4	1	5	1	1	1	7	1
25	1			3			1	4	3	2	5	1	. 1	1	5	:	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	4	1	1	1	7	1
22	3					5	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	:	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	2	-99	7	1
36	1	1					1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	:	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	1	7	1
52	1					5	2	5	2	2	3	2	1	1	5	:	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	1	1	8	2
16	1					5	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	:	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	8	2

CodeB

CodeC

ID TA	AXI Q3	Q3Dis	CodeA
54	2 Strongly disagree	Enhanced DBS checks	
14	2 Disagree	If a person has been suspended for an attack on vulnerable children what measures are in place if the driver returns back Provided there is close cooperation between local police and licensing authority with regard to very recent/ongoing	
10	1 Agree	convictions/cautions.	
	G		
		The locality test is not fit for purpose. If you were to revise certain routes you will pass the test but probably can't explain any	
1	1 Neither agree nor disagree	other locations people use technology now and they will ask if they are in doubt. It is a good way to collect revinue though.	
49	1 Agree		
51	1 Agree		
53	1 Agree		
64	1 Agree		
44	1 Agree		
3	2		
4	2 Agree		
5	2 Agree		
7	2 Agree		
15	2 Neither agree nor disagree		
28	2 Neither agree nor disagree		
21	2 Neither agree nor disagree		
22	2 Strongly agree		
16	2 Strongly agree		
23	2 Neither agree nor disagree		
48	2 Agree		
50	2 Agree		
52	2 Agree		
19	1 Agree		
17	1 Strongly agree		
57	1 Strongly agree		
8	1 Strongly agree		
32	1 Agree		
18	1 Agree		
42	1 Agree		
63	1 Neither agree nor disagree		
65	1 Neither agree nor disagree		
2	1 Strongly agree		
20	1 Agree		
25	1 Neither agree nor disagree		
9	1 Strongly agree		

1 Disagree

- 1 Disagree
- 6 1 Agree

68

- 1 Strongly agree 11
- 1 Strongly agree 13
- 1 Agree 31
- 1 Agree 41
- 46 1 Agree
- 56 1 Strongly agree
- 58 1 Strongly disagree
- 59 1 Agree
- 60 1 Strongly disagree
- 1 Agree 61
- 1 Agree 62
- 24 1 Agree
- 26 1 Agree
- 27 1 Strongly agree
- 29 1 Agree
- 1 Strongly disagree 30
- 1 Strongly agree 36
- 37 1 Agree
- 38 1 Agree
- 39 1 Strongly agree
- 40 1 Agree
- 1 Agree 43
- 45 1 Agree
- 67 1 Agree
- 69 1 Agree
- 55 -99 Neither agree nor disagree

66

CodeB

CodeC

CodeA

ID TAXI Q4 Q4Dis 7 2 Disagree All taxis should take contactless payment 25 1 Strongly disagree CROSS BORDER HIRING RULES 1 Disagree Locality test should just cover hospitals and maybe main accident and emergency departments but not where farms ect are. Common sense. 1 1 Disagree Minor traffic offences. You keep your licence until 12 points. It should be the same for licensed taxi drivers. 61 1 Disagree More protection and support for drivers who are vulnerable every time we pick up a passenger 6 27 1 Disagree see below 2 Disagree There should be more emphasis on and incentives to switch away from petrol and diesel to fully electric vehicles 3 2 Disagree When taxi drivers have had heart or other medical conditions needing daily medication yearly face to face checks with a GP should take place 14 49 1 Neither agree nor disagree 1 Neither agree nor disagree 51 53 1 Neither agree nor disagree 1 Neither agree nor disagree 64 44 1 Neither agree nor disagree 4 2 Agree 5 2 Agree 15 2 Neither agree nor disagree 28 2 Neither agree nor disagree 54 2 Disagree 21 2 Agree 22 2 Strongly agree 16 2 Agree 23 2 Neither agree nor disagree 48 2 Neither agree nor disagree 50 2 Neither agree nor disagree 52 2 Neither agree nor disagree 19 1 Agree 17 1 Agree 1 Neither agree nor disagree 57 1 Neither agree nor disagree 8 32 1 Disagree 1 Agree 18 1 Neither agree nor disagree 42 63 1 1 Neither agree nor disagree 65 2 1 Strongly agree 20 1 Agree 9 1 Strongly agree 47 1 Agree 1 Strongly disagree 68 11 1 Strongly agree 13 1 Strongly agree 31 1 Disagree 41 1 Agree 1 Neither agree nor disagree 46 56 1 Agree 58 1 Strongly disagree

59

60

1 Neither agree nor disagree

1 Strongly disagree

- 62 1 Neither agree nor disagree
- 10 1 Strongly agree
- 24 1 Agree
- 26 1 Disagree
- 29 1 Neither agree nor disagree
- 30 1 Strongly disagree
- 36 1 Agree
- 37 1 Neither agree nor disagree
- 38 1 Agree
- 39 1 Strongly agree
- 40 1 Agree
- 43 1 Neither agree nor disagree
- 45 1 Neither agree nor disagree
- 67 1 Neither agree nor disagree
- 69 1 Agree
- 55 -99 Strongly disagree

66

CodeC

D	TAXI	Q5	Q5Yes	CodeA	CodeB
32	1	Yes	8 years old/ to 10 years old, and euro 5 NOT EURO 6		
			Age limit. Some 8 year old cars are in better condition and less miles than some 3 year old. It will also put drivers in		
47	1	Yes	permanent debt		
30	1		AGE LIMITS WHAT PLANET ARE YOU ON TAXIS ARE JUST SURVIVING DEATH KNELL FOR MOST OPERATORS		
6	1	Yes	Age limits. As long as the vehicle meets Euro 6 and is correctly maintained age should not be an issue.		
			${\sf AGE\ OF\ VEHICLES.\ SOME\ OLDER\ VEHICLES\ ARE\ IN\ BETTER\ CONDITION\ THAN\ SOME\ OF\ THE\ NEWER\ ONES.\ IF\ THE\ VEHICLE\ CANDITION\ THAN\ SOME\ OF\ THE\ NEWER\ ONES.\ IF\ THE\ VEHICLE\ CANDITION\ THAN\ SOME\ OF\ THE\ NEWER\ ONES.\ IF\ THE\ VEHICLE\ CANDITION\ THAN\ SOME\ OF\ THE\ NEWER\ ONES.\ IF\ THE\ VEHICLE\ CANDITION\ THAN\ SOME\ OF\ THE\ NEWER\ ONES.\ IF\ THE\ VEHICLE\ CANDITION\ THAN\ SOME\ OF\ THE\ NEWER\ ONES.\ IF\ THE\ VEHICLE\ CANDITION\ THAN\ SOME\ OF\ THE\ NEWER\ ONES.\ IF\ THE\ VEHICLE\ CANDITION\ THAN\ SOME\ OF\ THE\ NEWER\ ONES.\ IF\ THE\ VEHICLE\ CANDITION\ THAN\ SOME\ OF\ THE\ NEWER\ ONES.\ IF\ THE\ VEHICLE\ CANDITION\ THAN\ SOME\ OF\ THAN\ SOME\ SOME\ OF\ THAN\ SOME\ OF\ THAN\ SOME\ SOME\ OF\ THAN\ SOME\ SOME\ OF\ $		
25	1	Yes	PASS A COUNCIL MOT THEY SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO STAY ON THE ROAD		
49	1	Yes	Common sense needs to be used instead of making drivers pay for TWO DBSs when not needed.		
51	1	Yes	Common sense needs to be used instead of making drivers pay for TWO DBSs when not needed.		
53	1	Yes	Common sense needs to be used instead of making drivers pay for TWO DBSs when not needed.		
44	1	Yes	Common sense needs to be used instead of making drivers pay for TWO DBSs when not needed.		
48	2	Yes	Common sense needs to be used instead of making drivers pay for TWO DBSs when not needed.		
50	2	Yes	Common sense needs to be used instead of making drivers pay for TWO DBSs when not needed.		
52	2	Yes	Common sense needs to be used instead of making drivers pay for TWO DBSs when not needed.		
29	1	Yes	Common sense needs to be used instead of making drivers pay for TWO DBSs when not needed.		
43	1	Yes	Common sense needs to be used instead of making drivers pay for TWO DBSs when not needed.		
45	1	Yes	Common sense needs to be used instead of making drivers pay for TWO DBSs when not needed.		
64	1	Yes	Common sense needs to be used, instead of making drivers pay for TWO DBS 's when not needed.		
65	1	Yes	Concentrate on unlicensed out of town ph drivers before chastising hack vehicle age		
67	1	Yes	Drivers shouldn't be asked to pay for 2 DBS's		
68	1	Yes	On at 4 years off at 8 also allowing cross border hiring.		
42	1	Yes	see response to next question		
			Some cars over 8 years old could be potentially be in better condition than newer vehicles. As long as they pass the		
26	1	Yes	compliance test, they should be allowed to be licenced		
			The new standards are currently being challenged on various fronts, producing a new policy now and including them could		
			mean the policy becomes void in the near future. It would make more sense to hold the new policy for 12 months while this is		
57	1	Yes	ironed out.		
27	1	Yes	wehicle age see below		
3	2	No			
4	2	No			
5	2	No			
7	2	No			
15	2	Nο			

- 2 No 28
- 54 2 No
- 2 No 14
- 2 No 21
- 22 2 Yes
- 16 2 No
- 23 2
- 19 1 No
- 17 1 No
- 8 1 No
- 18 1 Yes
- 63 1 Yes
- 2 1 Yes
- 20 1 No
- 1 1 No
- 9 1 No
- 11 1 No
- 13 1 No
- 1 31
- 41 1 Yes
- 46 1 No
- 56 1 Yes
- 58 1 Yes
- 59 1
- 60 1 No
- 1 Yes 61
- 62 1 No
- 10 1 No
- 24 1 No
- 36 1 No
- 37 1 Yes
- 38 1 No
- 39 1 No
- 40 1 No

69 1 Yes

55 -99 No

66

ın -	ΓΑΧΙ Q6	Q6Dis	CodoA	CodeB	CodoC
61	1 Disagree	10 year old limit on cars, new cars 6 years old, more sensible and affordable	CoueA	Coueb	Couec
01	I Disagree	Age of new Vehicle should not be 4 years old a first license. Also the vehicle age to replace them at 8 years old is too short. I			
41	1 Strongly disagree	think 13 years old then vehicle should be replaced.			
68	1 Strongly disagree	Age standards			
47	1 Strongly disagree	Age. Will keep drivers in permanent debt and an 8 year old vehicle cam be as good as a 3 year old one.			
		. 6			
		All of them, in the current climate its hard enough to make a living now, and aslong as its road worthy and well looked after, i			
32	1 Strongly disagree	really cant see what the problem is, coach companies don't have this issue, and they are serving the public			
37	1 Disagree	all vehicles should be up to 10 years old			
26	1 Strongly disagree	As long as a vehicle passes emissions, compliance test & is in good condition, it should be able to be licenced			
		As long as vehicles meet the current 3 test per year (on older vehicles) and meet any enviromental standards then vehicles			
		should be allowed to continue to be plated. The policy would only be based on vanity (we only want new cars) and not			
67	1 Strongly disagree	roadworthy standards			
		As well as the taxi industry already being decimated by covid, we now have to contend with the cost of buying 3 year old			
		vehicles ,its like the council are trying to finish us off. A better solution would be Euro 6 up to 5or 6 year old and vehicles			
27	1 Strongly disagree	removed at 10 years rather than 8.			
28	2 Strongly disagree	Electric vehicles should not be exempt from the age restriction policy.			
		Existing vehicles that meet and continue to meet standards that have been registered bedore the adoption of the policy			
		should be granted grandfather rights to continue as Hack/PH until such time as they mechanically unsound. To impliment a 4			
		year maximum age on new vehicles is to price out the majority of the owner drivers, whos margins of operating margins are			
62	1 Ctrongly disagree	tight already. Given the loss of almost a years trading profits in 2020 this policy should be amended and deffered until the			
63	1 Strongly disagree	true impact of Covid can be assessed on tge trade.			
		I agree that vehicles should have an agreed age limit, however I do not agree that a vehicle first being licensed should be a			
		maximum of four years old. In the last 18 months I have licenced 3 vehicles which are over that age and each time the tester			
		has commented on how clean and well maintained they are. If this rule is enforced it will mean that as a trade we will be			
		forced to purchase vehicles with higher mileage or vehicles which are or have previously been damaged rather than quality			
		low mileage vehicles. For example a six passenger seat vehicle such as a Ford Galaxy on a 66 plate with more than 100,000			
		miles on would currently cost £10,000 to buy whereas a 64 plate with 40,000 miles on would cost you the same. If we are			
		forced to purchase newer vehicles with more miles on the cost of repairs will be significant as we will be inheriting problems.			
		Alternatively we could purchase lower mileage 66 plates for £14,000 but then the cost will have to be passed onto the			
		customer. Our home to school transport prices will increase significantly and our meter prices will have to increase which will			
		cost the general public more, I am located in the most deprived area of the country, formally the district of Easington Colliery.			

really think that putting these measures in place when we are in a recession is a good idea?

This may also mean that there is a need for cheaper transport which may lead to more unlicensed taxis operating. Do we

11	1 Strongly disagree	I disagree with an age being put on licensed vehicles. Licensing vehicles less than four years old. And then only allowing vehicles to be licensed until they are 8 years old. Alternatively emission standards might be better. But without a age limit.
1	1 Strongly disagree	If a vehicle is miticulacley maintained why replace it as it costs more to the environment by manufacturing a new one
66	Strongly disagree	If this change in policy is brought in it will decimate the taxi trade in County Durham. Having to buy a 4 year old (or newer) vehicle every 4 years (or more if buying a newer vehicle) will be so expensive that a lot of drivers will not be able to afford to buy another vehicle. Or if they can afford to buy one it may already be very high mileage. For example a 2016 Skoda octavia with 36000 miles on is £12000, £266 a month meaning you will pay back roughly £13500 (unless you have poor credit then you could be paying back £24-25000). But as the car is 4 years old when it is first licensed the owner only has 4 years to use that vehicle meaning they will be in a constant cycle of needing finance. Further more, why when a vehicle becomes 4 years and 1 day old does it become any less suitable as a taxi. Or why when it becomes 8 years and 1 day is it any less suitable as a taxi? I agree with new cars coming onto the fleet after 1st April 2024 being euro 6, we all should be working towards making the environment cleaner, but discarding a perfectly usable vehicle simply because of its age is wrong. Along with what I have previously said I think the council need to look at the current circumstances and take this into account. It is going to take many years for the economy to recover and forcing people into getting debt to carry out their job is immoral.
13	1 Neither agree nor disagree	Not a lot of the drivers can afford to buy new vehicles every 8 years and I agree if the vehicle is near enough no longer road worthy than that's great but if a vehicle is kept well maintained and is still road worthy I think it should be kept on as a taxi due to the council MOT tests which we get every 6 months been a high profile test should be able to detect whether a vehicle is road worthy or not and a longer life span than the 8 year timeline
		regarding public transport i.e. bus and coach companies who transport passengers including children are not required to meet these standards and as such their vehicles are much older so i feel the trade are being singled out. Agree with euro 6 emission standard however, not the new vehicle proposal or age policy of the vehicle whereby you would have to take it off after 8 years. I have vehicles which are maintained to a good standard and they get serviced twice a year as well as its council test. oil filters changed evey 9000 miles. it doesn't matter what age the vehicle is as long as it is maintained and serviced to a
42	1 Strongly disagree	good standard. I generally know when my vehicle is at the end of life and at that point i would replace it. The 4 year Age should be increased from first licence. The vehicle age of 8 years should be increased considerably. Making the transition from petrol & diesel straight to electric is unfair on the trade due to costs. There should be encouragement to
69	1 Strongly disagree	Hybrid.
24	1 Strongly disagree	The 8 year rule is to strict. Vehicles over 8 years should be licenced.
2	1 Strongly disagree	The age of the car as long as it's passed it's hack tests there should be no reason why cars after 8 year old should not be re licenced this is a discrace and will put allot of drivers in financial difficulty having to buy new cars constantly

The proposed new age limits on vehicles will unfairly affect operators who carry out a large proportion of school contracts as the timeframe to need to replace vehicles frequently will mean an increase in tendered prices to as depreciation will need to be recouped over a shorter time which means more cost for the Local Authority and ultimately the tax payers of the local area. The benefits gained of a low emission vehicle operating for less than 2 hours per day would be negligible. In this instance a 'schools only' plating category may be appropriate.

These vehicles are not always affordable and unfairly limit existing drivers from protecting their careers.

This policy stinks of favouring the large corporate companies at the expense of the traditional local independent drivers. Again a policy to favour large companies and make almost impossible the survival of the small individual drivers that have been a tradition especially in County Durham. Normal purchase agreements are usually over FIVE years so buying a Four year old vehicle to go at EIGHT years means you are still paying for a vehicle you can't use. No individual can sustain this cost. Large companies won't be affected as they can dump the vehicle to a licensing authority that doesn't have this standard, then bring it back to Durham and use it as a private hire. The aim of all Euro 6 vehicles is a good one, but, new vehicles should be SIX years old this will by the time the policy is adopted mean all new vehicles will be Euro 6. An end of use at ELEVEN years will at least allow individuals the ability to exit finance agreements before having to purchase a new vehicle. WAV vehicles should last TWO EXTRA years and new ones should be SIX years. While this may keep the current level of WAV vehicles in the county, it won't help increase the woefully inadequate numbers in the county. But the only reason for removing old vehicles is vanity as long as they are sound and meeting environmental standards they should be able to work with the current THREE test regime.

This policy stinks of favouring the large corporate companies at the expense of the traditional local independent drivers. Again a policy to favour large companies and make almost impossible the survival of the small individual drivers that have been a tradition especially in County Durham. Normal purchase agreements are usually over FIVE years so buying a Four year old vehicle to go at EIGHT years means you are still paying for a vehicle you can't use. No individual can sustain this cost. Large companies won't be affected as they can dump the vehicle to a licensing authority that doesn't have this standard, then bring it back to Durham and use it as a private hire. The aim of all Euro 6 vehicles is a good one, but, new vehicles should be SIX years old this will by the time the policy is adopted mean all new vehicles will be Euro 6. An end of use at ELEVEN years will at least allow individuals the ability to exit finance agreements before having to purchase a new vehicle. WAV vehicles should last TWO EXTRA years and new ones should be SIX years. While this may keep the current level of WAV vehicles in the county, it won't help increase the woefully inadequate numbers in the county. But the only reason for removing old vehicles is vanity as long as they are sound and meeting environmental standards they should be able to work with the current THREE test regime.

8 1 Strongly disagree 1 Strongly disagree 65

1 Strongly disagree 49

1 Strongly disagree

This policy stinks of favouring the large corporate companies at the expense of the traditional local independent drivers. Again a policy to favour large companies and make almost impossible the survival of the small individual drivers that have been a tradition especially in County Durham. Normal purchase agreements are usually over FIVE years so buying a Four year old vehicle to go at EIGHT years means you are still paying for a vehicle you can't use. No individual can sustain this cost. Large companies won't be affected as they can dump the vehicle to a licensing authority that doesn't have this standard, then bring it back to Durham and use it as a private hire. The aim of all Euro 6 vehicles is a good one, but, new vehicles should be SIX years old this will by the time the policy is adopted mean all new vehicles will be Euro 6. An end of use at ELEVEN years will at least allow individuals the ability to exit finance agreements before having to purchase a new vehicle. WAV vehicles should last TWO EXTRA years and new ones should be SIX years. While this may keep the current level of WAV vehicles in the county, it won't help increase the woefully inadequate numbers in the county. But the only reason for removing old vehicles is vanity as long as they are sound and meeting environmental standards they should be able to work with the current THREE test regime.

1 Strongly disagree

53

This policy stinks of favouring the large corporate companies at the expense of the traditional local independent drivers. Again a policy to favour large companies and make almost impossible the survival of the small individual drivers that have been a tradition especially in County Durham. Normal purchase agreements are usually over FIVE years so buying a Four year old vehicle to go at EIGHT years means you are still paying for a vehicle you can't use. No individual can sustain this cost. Large companies won't be affected as they can dump the vehicle to a licensing authority that doesn't have this standard, then bring it back to Durham and use it as a private hire. The aim of all Euro 6 vehicles is a good one, but, new vehicles should be SIX years old this will by the time the policy is adopted mean all new vehicles will be Euro 6. An end of use at ELEVEN years will at least allow individuals the ability to exit finance agreements before having to purchase a new vehicle. WAV vehicles should last TWO EXTRA years and new ones should be SIX years. While this may keep the current level of WAV vehicles in the county, it won't help increase the woefully inadequate numbers in the county. But the only reason for removing old vehicles is vanity as long as they are sound and meeting environmental standards they should be able to work with the current THREE test regime.

44 1 Strongly disagree

This policy stinks of favouring the large corporate companies at the expense of the traditional local independent drivers. Again a policy to favour large companies and make almost impossible the survival of the small individual drivers that have been a tradition especially in County Durham. Normal purchase agreements are usually over FIVE years so buying a Four year old vehicle to go at EIGHT years means you are still paying for a vehicle you can't use. No individual can sustain this cost. Large companies won't be affected as they can dump the vehicle to a licensing authority that doesn't have this standard, then bring it back to Durham and use it as a private hire. The aim of all Euro 6 vehicles is a good one, but, new vehicles should be SIX years old this will by the time the policy is adopted mean all new vehicles will be Euro 6. An end of use at ELEVEN years will at least allow individuals the ability to exit finance agreements before having to purchase a new vehicle. WAV vehicles should last TWO EXTRA years and new ones should be SIX years. While this may keep the current level of WAV vehicles in the county, it won't help increase the woefully inadequate numbers in the county. But the only reason for removing old vehicles is vanity as long as they are sound and meeting environmental standards they should be able to work with the current THREE test regime.

This policy stinks of favouring the large corporate companies at the expense of the traditional local independent drivers. Again a policy to favour large companies and make almost impossible the survival of the small individual drivers that have been a tradition especially in County Durham. Normal purchase agreements are usually over FIVE years so buying a Four year old vehicle to go at EIGHT years means you are still paying for a vehicle you can't use. No individual can sustain this cost. Large companies won't be affected as they can dump the vehicle to a licensing authority that doesn't have this standard, then bring it back to Durham and use it as a private hire. The aim of all Euro 6 vehicles is a good one, but, new vehicles should be SIX years old this will by the time the policy is adopted mean all new vehicles will be Euro 6. An end of use at ELEVEN years will at least allow individuals the ability to exit finance agreements before having to purchase a new vehicle. WAV vehicles should last TWO EXTRA years and new ones should be SIX years. While this may keep the current level of WAV vehicles in the county, it won't help increase the woefully inadequate numbers in the county. But the only reason for removing old vehicles is vanity as long as they are sound and meeting environmental standards they should be able to work with the current THREE test regime.

2 Strongly disagree

50

This policy stinks of favouring the large corporate companies at the expense of the traditional local independent drivers. Again a policy to favour large companies and make almost impossible the survival of the small individual drivers that have been a tradition especially in County Durham. Normal purchase agreements are usually over FIVE years so buying a Four year old vehicle to go at EIGHT years means you are still paying for a vehicle you can't use. No individual can sustain this cost. Large companies won't be affected as they can dump the vehicle to a licensing authority that doesn't have this standard, then bring it back to Durham and use it as a private hire. The aim of all Euro 6 vehicles is a good one, but, new vehicles should be SIX years old this will by the time the policy is adopted mean all new vehicles will be Euro 6. An end of use at ELEVEN years will at least allow individuals the ability to exit finance agreements before having to purchase a new vehicle. WAV vehicles should last TWO EXTRA years and new ones should be SIX years. While this may keep the current level of WAV vehicles in the county, it won't help increase the woefully inadequate numbers in the county. But the only reason for removing old vehicles is vanity as long as they are sound and meeting environmental standards they should be able to work with the current THREE test regime.

52 2 Strongly disagree

> This policy stinks of favouring the large corporate companies at the expense of the traditional local independent drivers. Again a policy to favour large companies and make almost impossible the survival of the small individual drivers that have been a tradition especially in County Durham. Normal purchase agreements are usually over FIVE years so buying a Four year old vehicle to go at EIGHT years means you are still paying for a vehicle you can't use. No individual can sustain this cost. Large companies won't be affected as they can dump the vehicle to a licensing authority that doesn't have this standard, then bring it back to Durham and use it as a private hire. The aim of all Euro 6 vehicles is a good one, but, new vehicles should be FIVE years old this will by the time the policy is adopted mean all new vehicles will be Euro 6. An end of use at TEN years will at least allow individuals the ability to exit finance agreements before having to purchase a new vehicle. WAV vehicles should last till TWELVE years and new ones should be SIX years. While this may keep the current level of WAV vehicles in the county, it won't help increase the woefully inadequate numbers in the county. But the only reason for removing old vehicles is vanity as long as they are sound and meeting environmental standards they should be able to work with the current THREE test regime.

This policy stinks of favouring the large corporate companies at the expense of the traditional local independent drivers. Again a policy to favour large companies and make almost impossible the survival of the small individual drivers that have been a tradition especially in County Durham. Normal purchase agreements are usually over FIVE years so buying a Four year old vehicle to go at EIGHT years means you are still paying for a vehicle you can't use. No individual can sustain this cost. Large companies won't be affected as they can dump the vehicle to a licensing authority that doesn't have this standard, then bring it back to Durham and use it as a private hire. The aim of all Euro 6 vehicles is a good one, but, new vehicles should be SIX years old this will by the time the policy is adopted mean all new vehicles will be Euro 6. An end of use at ELEVEN years will at least allow individuals the ability to exit finance agreements before having to purchase a new vehicle. WAV vehicles should last TWO EXTRA years and new ones should be SIX years. While this may keep the current level of WAV vehicles in the county, it won't help increase the woefully inadequate numbers in the county. But the only reason for removing old vehicles is vanity as long as they are sound and meeting environmental standards they should be able to work with the current THREE test regime.

1 Strongly disagree

43

This policy stinks of favouring the large corporate companies at the expense of the traditional local independent drivers. Again a policy to favour large companies and make almost impossible the survival of the small individual drivers that have been a tradition especially in County Durham. Normal purchase agreements are usually over FIVE years so buying a Four year old vehicle to go at EIGHT years means you are still paying for a vehicle you can't use. No individual can sustain this cost. Large companies won't be affected as they can dump the vehicle to a licensing authority that doesn't have this standard, then bring it back to Durham and use it as a private hire. The aim of all Euro 6 vehicles is a good one, but, new vehicles should be SIX years old this will by the time the policy is adopted mean all new vehicles will be Euro 6. An end of use at ELEVEN years will at least allow individuals the ability to exit finance agreements before having to purchase a new vehicle. WAV vehicles should last TWO EXTRA years and new ones should be SIX years. While this may keep the current level of WAV vehicles in the county, it won't help increase the woefully inadequate numbers in the county. But the only reason for removing old vehicles is vanity as long as they are sound and meeting environmental standards they should be able to work with the current THREE test regime.

45 1 Strongly disagree

Usually purchase agreements are over 5 years, so if you buy a 4 year old vehicle over a five year agreement, the said vehicle will have to be taken off as a taxi / phv with 1 year of the agreement to be paid. Meaning we're stuck with a vehicle which still has to be paid for but unable to use as a taxi. WHATS THE POINT!! No small company or individual can afford this. Why not make it upto 6 year old to be licensed and renewed at 11 year old, with the exception to WAV which I agree should have a 2 year extension owing to the additional cost of purchase and adaption. This would still ensure all new vehicles being licensed fall into EURO 6 on the emissions. Also would a zero emission vehicle, not still deteriorate at the same rate as a diesel or petrol car. I.E. the seats will have the same wear and tear, the suspension still travels on poor roads and on and on and on.

64 1 Strongly disagree

Utter rot that a 3 year old Euro 6 vehicle can be licensed but a 5 year old Euro 6 vehicle can't be licensed as a new vehicle. If the vehicle meets Euro 6 engine specifications and passes the emissions test its Euro 6 and passed the test. How does the age of the vehicle impact emissions? If I purchase a brand new Euro 6 vehicle and run at 75,000 miles a year, when the vehicle it's 4 years old it's done 300k. If a driver buys a second hand Euro 6 vehicle at 5 years old with 40,000 miles on the clock how is that worse for the environment than a vehicle of the same age and engine as one with 300k+ miles? A stupid rule not thought out at all. If you want to make engine emissions future proof, all you need to do is say "only vehicles which meet Euro 6 will be licensed as new applications and all pre Euro 5 vehicles won't be renewed after April 2024. Add a line that says something like Euro 6 vehicles may be used until 8 years after the Euro 6 engine specification is superseded, and from 3 years after the new standard is realised all new vehicles must meet that standard.

WE DISAGREE WITH THE AGE OF VEHICLE HOWEVER AGREE WITH EMISSIONS

- 57 1 Strongly disagree
- 25 1 Strongly disagree
- 3 2 Strongly agree
- 4 2 Agree
- 5 2 Agree
- 7 2 Agree
- 15 2 Strongly agree
- 54 2 Strongly agree
- 14 2 Strongly agree
- 21 2 Strongly agree
- 22 2 Strongly agree
- 16 2 Strongly agree
- 23 2 Strongly agree
- 19 1 Strongly agree
- 17 1 Neither agree nor disagree
- 20 1 Agree
- 9 1 Strongly agree
- 6 1 Neither agree nor disagree
- 31 1 Disagree
- 46 1 Agree
- 56 1 Disagree
- 58 1 Strongly disagree
- 59 1 Agree
- 60 1 Strongly disagree
- 62 1 Agree
- 10 1 Strongly agree
- 30 1 Strongly disagree
- 36 1 Agree
- 38 1 Agree
- 39 1 Strongly agree

- 40 1 Agree
- 55 -99 Strongly disagree

ID TA	AXI Q7	Q7Dis	CodeA	CodeB	CodeC
61	1 Strongly disagree	Absurd that 2 minor speeding offences e.g SP30 should endanger your licence			
		providing there is close cooperation between licensing authority and local police regarding recent/ongoing cautions and			
10	1 Agree	prosecutions.			
		Why would the council licence people with drug or sex convictions? Drivers are now reticent to act in self defence, never			
<i>C</i> 1	1 Ctrongly disagras	mind interceding in any incident on North Road. This clause would put the public in more danger as drivers would just not get			
64 67	1 Strongly disagree	involved. We have already seen one such case this week. Why would the council licensing people with drugs or a sex convictions?			
67	1 Strongly disagree	Why would the council licensing people with drugs or a sex convictions? Drivers are now reticent to act in self defence,			
		never mind interceding in any incident on North Road. This clause would put the public in more danger as drivers would just			
49	1 Strongly disagree	not get involved. We have already seen one such case this week.			
	z ot. og., aloug.co	Why would the council licensing people with drugs or a sex convictions? Drivers are now reticent to act in self defence,			
		never mind interceding in any incident on North Road. This clause would put the public in more danger as drivers would just			
51	1 Strongly disagree	not get involved. We have already seen one such case this week.			
		Why would the council licensing people with drugs or a sex convictions? Drivers are now reticent to act in self defence,			
		never mind interceding in any incident on North Road. This clause would put the public in more danger as drivers would just			
53	1 Strongly disagree	not get involved. We have already seen one such case this week.			
		Why would the council licensing people with drugs or a sex convictions? Drivers are now reticent to act in self defence,			
		never mind interceding in any incident on North Road. This clause would put the public in more danger as drivers would just			
44	1 Strongly disagree	not get involved. We have already seen one such case this week			
		Why would the council licensing people with drugs or a sex convictions? Drivers are now reticent to act in self defence,			
40	2 Strongly disagree	never mind interceding in any incident on North Road. This clause would put the public in more danger as drivers would just			
48	2 Strongly disagree	not get involved. We have already seen one such case this week. Why would the council licensing people with drugs or a sex convictions? Drivers are now reticent to act in self defence,			
		never mind interceding in any incident on North Road. This clause would put the public in more danger as drivers would just			
50	2 Strongly disagree	not get involved. We have already seen one such case this week.			
	_ ct. ct.g., aloug.cc	Why would the council licensing people with drugs or a sex convictions? Drivers are now reticent to act in self defence,			
		never mind interceding in any incident on North Road. This clause would put the public in more danger as drivers would just			
52	2 Strongly disagree	not get involved. We have already seen one such case this week.			
		Why would the council licensing people with drugs or a sex convictions? Drivers are now reticent to act in self defence,			
		never mind interceding in any incident on North Road. This clause would put the public in more danger as drivers would just			
29	1 Strongly disagree	not get involved. We have already seen one such case this week.			
		Why would the council licensing people with drugs or a sex convictions? Drivers are now reticent to act in self defence,			
		never mind interceding in any incident on North Road. This clause would put the public in more danger as drivers would just			
43	1 Strongly disagree	not get involved. We have already seen one such case this week.			
		Why would the council licensing people with drugs or a sex convictions? Drivers are now reticent to act in self defence,			
1 E	1 Strongly disagree	never mind interceding in any incident on North Road. This clause would put the public in more danger as drivers would just			
45 26	1 Strongly disagree1 Disagree	not get involved. We have already seen one such case this week You have no control over cross border hiring drivers			
3	2 Agree	Tou have no control over cross border filling drivers			
3	_ / 18100				

2 Strongly agree

- 5 2 Agree
- 7 2 Agree
- 15 2 Strongly agree
- 28 2 Agree
- 54 2 Agree
- 14 2 Strongly agree
- 21 2 Strongly agree
- 22 2 Strongly agree
- 16 2 Strongly agree
- 23 2 Strongly agree
- 19 1 Agree
- 17 1 Neither agree nor disagree
- 1 Neither agree nor disagree
- 8 1 Strongly agree
- 32 1 Neither agree nor disagree
- 18 1 Strongly agree
- 42 1 Strongly agree
- 63 1 Strongly agree
- 65 1 Strongly agree
- 2 1 Strongly agree
- 20 1 Agree
- 25 1 Strongly agree
- 1 1 Agree
- 9 1 Strongly agree
- 47 1 Agree
- 68 1 Strongly agree
- 6 1 Agree
- 11 1 Agree
- 13 1 Strongly agree
- 31 1 Strongly disagree
- 41 1 Neither agree nor disagree
- 46 1 Disagree
- 56 1 Disagree
- 58 1 Strongly disagree
- 59 1 Agree
- 60 1 Strongly disagree
- 1 Neither agree nor disagree
- 24 1 Agree
- 27 1 Neither agree nor disagree
- 30 1 Strongly disagree
- 36 1 Agree

- 1 Neither agree nor disagree
- 38 1 Agree
- 39 1 Strongly agree
- 40 1 Agree
- 69 1 Agree
- 55 -99 Strongly disagree
- 66 Strongly agree

ID TA	AXI Q8	Q8Dis Agree completely with intelligence led checks. Random checks are very much open to abuse by officers of the council. What's to stop an officer 'randomly' selecting the same individual over and over again? Who pays for these tests? If I were randomly selected and expected to pay for my random test that I passed, I'd be seeking legal advice on the basis you carried out a test at my expense that wasn't required. Will the council officers and drivers of council owned vehicles be subjected to the same	CodeA	CodeB	CodeC
57	1 Strongly disagree	random during and alcohol tests as the trade?			
63	1 Strongly agree	Any and all testing shall be at the expense of the licencing authority.			
67	1 Strongly disagree	I would agree if it applied to all council employee's as well			
49	1 Strongly disagree	Intelligence led yes, random no as it is open to abuse. It should also be applied to councillors and all council employees.			
51	1 Strongly disagree	Intelligence led yes, random no as it is open to abuse. It should also be applied to councillors and all council employees.			
53	1 Strongly disagree	Intelligence led yes, random no as it is open to abuse. It should also be applied to councillors and all council employees.			
44	1 Ctrongly disagree	Intelligence led yes, random no as it is open to abuse. It should also be applied to councillors and all council employees.			
44	1 Strongly disagree	intelligence led yes, random no as it is open to abuse. It should also be applied to councillors and all council employees.			
48	2 Strongly disagree	Intelligence led yes, random no as it is open to abuse. It should also be applied to councillors and all council employees.			
40	2 Strongly disagree	intelligence real yes, random no as tels open to abase. It should also be applied to councillors and all council employees.			
50	2 Strongly disagree	Intelligence led yes, random no as it is open to abuse. It should also be applied to councillors and all council employees.			
	3, 13, 13	υ 0			
52	2 Strongly disagree	Intelligence led yes, random no as it is open to abuse. It should also be applied to councillors and all council employees.			
43	1 Strongly disagree	Intelligence led yes, random no as it is open to abuse. It should also be applied to councillors and all council employees.			
45	1 Strongly disagree	Intelligence led yes, random no as it is open to abuse. It should also be applied to councillors and all council employees.			
		Intelligence led, by all means, random so long as it's at the councils expense unless a positive result is returned. Also should			
64	1 Strongly disagree	apply to all council officers, officials and employees.			
29	1 Strongly disagree	It should also be applied to councillors and all council employees			
65	1 Strongly agree	Test all of us. Many are high as kites			
3	2 Strongly agree				
4	2 Strongly agree				
5	2 Strongly agree				
7	2 Agree				
15	2 Strongly agree				
28	2 Strongly agree				
54	2 Strongly agree				
14	2 Strongly agree				
21	2 Strongly agree				
22					

2 Strongly agree

2 Strongly agree

22 16

- 19 1 Agree
- 17 1 Strongly agree
- 8 1 Agree
- 32 1 Strongly agree
- 18 1 Strongly agree
- 42 1 Strongly agree
- 2 1 Strongly disagree
- 20 1 Agree
- 25 1 Strongly agree
- 1 1 Strongly agree
- 9 1 Strongly agree
- 47 1 Agree
- 68 1 Strongly agree
- 6 1 Strongly agree
- 11 1 Agree
- 13 1 Strongly agree
- 31 1 Agree
- 41 1 Agree
- 46 1 Agree
- 56 1 Agree
- 58 1 Strongly agree
- 59 1 Agree
- 60 1 Strongly agree
- 61 1 Agree
- 62 1 Agree
- 10 1 Strongly agree
- 24 1 Agree
- 26 1 Agree
- 27 1 Agree
- 30 1 Neither agree nor disagree
- 36 1 Strongly agree
- 37 1 Strongly agree
- 38 1 Strongly agree
- 39 1 Strongly agree
- 40 1 Strongly agree
- 69 1 Agree
- 55 -99 Strongly disagree
- 66 Strongly agree

ID T	AXI Q9	Q9Dis Cartes and the cartes are also as a second cartes and the cartes are a second ca	CodeA	CodeB	CodeC
31	1 Strongly disagree	Common sense			
		Course was waste of time. Common sense is needed we are not the police. At course police were asked about unlicensed			
		vehicles picking vulnerable people up they said they couldn't do anything about it. That in my opinion is a bigger problem than	ı		
47	1 Disagree	drivers reporting it.			
61	1 Disagree	CRB checks are enough			
41	1 Disagree	Drivers once sat course don't loose knowledge.			
11	1 Strongly disagree	I disagree with refresher courses every 3 years. A refresher course every 5 to 6 years would be better.			
		I strongly agree. Also I think that all drivers whether they wish to be engaged on home to school contracts or not should			
		complete the same CSE course which is held by County Hall. In my opinion it is ludicrous that as a new driver you potentially			
18	1 Agree	have to sit two as licencing wont issue your badge until you have completed their course.			
26	1 Disagree	If a driver has had training, it's a matter of common sense implanting ity			
24	1 Disagree	if driver has already done the course there no reason to refresh after 3 years.			
67	1 Strongly disagree	Just reiterates the same thing, if anything new then it should be made available online to all drivers			
65	1 Disagree	Not our responsibility to spot or accuse public of this social services and polices job			
69	1 Disagree	Once the course is done there should be no need for refresher.			
		So long as the training is required because things have changed fair enough, but to expect people to pay to sit and watch a			
		power point presentation in county hall which is identical to the power point presentation they watched 3 years ago is both a			
		waste of time and an insult to the intelligence of the people attending. As mentioned, if it's a new course, fair enough to			
57	1 Strongly disagree	expect retraining. It should read "retraining as required as legislation changes"			
		The quality of the councils training this year was far below the standards of the previous training. It should be online and free			
		so as to be able to be completed at a convenient time instead of being dragged to a central location. Agree with trading at			
64	1 Strongly disagree	first licence granting but then only if there is new information to be trained on, not the same time after time.			
		The quality of the councils training this year was far below the standards of the previous training. It should be online and free			
		so as to be able to be completed at a convenient time instead of dragging people into a central location to sit and listen to			
		inferior training. Better to listen in your own home or on the rank. Training at first licencing yes, but there has been no new			
49	1 Strongly disagree	information to make the training relevant again and again.			
		The quality of the councils training this year was far below the standards of the previous training. It should be online and free			
		so as to be able to be completed at a convenient time instead of dragging people into a central location to sit and listen to			
		inferior training. Better to listen in your own home or on the rank. Training at first licencing yes, but there has been no new			
51	1 Strongly disagree	information to make the training relevant again and again.			
		The quality of the councils training this year was far below the standards of the previous training. It should be online and free			
		so as to be able to be completed at a convenient time instead of dragging people into a central location to sit and listen to			
		inferior training. Better to listen in your own home or on the rank. Training at first licencing yes, but there has been no new			
53	1 Strongly disagree	information to make the training relevant again and again.			

44	1 Strongly disagree
48	2 Strongly disagree
50	2 Strongly disagree
52	2 Strongly disagree
29	1 Strongly disagree
43	1 Strongly disagree
45 30 3 4 5	 Strongly disagree Strongly disagree Strongly agree Strongly agree Strongly agree
7	2 Agree
15 28	2 Strongly agree2 Agree
54	2 Strongly agree
14	2 Strongly agree
21	2 Strongly agree
22	2 Strongly agree
16	2 Strongly agree
23	2 Strongly agree
19	1 Agree

The quality of the councils training this year was far below the standards of the previous training. It should be online and free so as to be able to be completed at a convenient time instead of dragging people into a central location to sit and listen to inferior training. Better to listen in your own home or on the rank. Training at first licencing yes, but there has been no new information to make the training relevant again and again.

The quality of the councils training this year was far below the standards of the previous training. It should be online and free so as to be able to be completed at a convenient time instead of dragging people into a central location to sit and listen to inferior training. Better to listen in your own home or on the rank. Training at first licencing yes, but there has been no new information to make the training relevant again and again.

The quality of the councils training this year was far below the standards of the previous training. It should be online and free so as to be able to be completed at a convenient time instead of dragging people into a central location to sit and listen to inferior training. Better to listen in your own home or on the rank. Training at first licencing yes, but there has been no new information to make the training relevant again and again.

The quality of the councils training this year was far below the standards of the previous training. It should be online and free so as to be able to be completed at a convenient time instead of dragging people into a central location to sit and listen to inferior training. Better to listen in your own home or on the rank. Training at first licencing yes, but there has been no new information to make the training relevant again and again.

The quality of the councils training this year was far below the standards of the previous training. It should be online and free so as to be able to be completed at a convenient time instead of dragging people into a central location to sit and listen to inferior training. Better to listen in your own home or on the rank.

The quality of the councils training this year was far below the standards of the previous training. It should be online and free so as to be able to be completed at a convenient time instead of dragging people into a central location to sit and listen to inferior training. Better to listen in your own home or on the rank. Training at first licencing yes, but there has been no new information to make the training relevant again and again.

The quality of the councils training this year was far below the standards of the previous training. It should be online and free so as to be able to be completed at a convenient time instead of dragging people into a central location to sit and listen to inferior training. Better to listen in your own home or on the rank. Training at first licencing yes, but there has been no new information to make the training relevant again and again.

WHO WOULD YOU REPORT ANYTHING TO WHO WOULD TAKE ANY NOTICE MORE TIMEWASTING

- 17 1 Agree
- 8 1 Strongly agree
- 32 1 Strongly agree
- 42 1 Strongly agree
- 63 1 Strongly agree
- 2 1 Strongly disagree
- 20 1 Agree
- 25 1 Strongly agree
- 1 1 Neither agree nor disagree
- 9 1 Strongly agree
- 68 1 Agree
- 6 1 Strongly agree
- 13 1 Strongly agree
- 46 1 Neither agree nor disagree
- 56 1 Disagree
- 58 1 Strongly disagree
- 59 1 Agree
- 60 1 Strongly agree
- 62 1 Agree
- 10 1 Strongly agree
- 27 1 Agree
- 36 1 Agree
- 37 1 Strongly agree
- 38 1 Strongly agree
- 39 1 Strongly agree
- 40 1 Strongly agree
- 55 -99 Neither agree nor disagree
- 66 Strongly agree

CodeB

CodeC

ID T	AXI Q10	Q10Dis	CodeA
24	1 Agree	Agree as long as there is not a refresher course after 3 years.	
69	1 Agree	As long as we are not required to do refresher courses.	
		Drivers working on the ranks are meeting disabled people all the time, so yes it makes perfect sense to train drivers on disability awareness. The training needs to cover a much wider range of disabilities though other than wheelchair users and people with guide dogs. Attention needs to be paid to people with learning disabilities, mental health awareness, autisim, elderly people, and other hidden disabilities. I'd also suggest conflict managment training could be a valuable tool for drivers to participate in. Maybe consider an NVQ for drivers which covers all the areas you wish to train including first aid, health and safety, CSE awareness, disability awareness. Make it a formal course with an approved provider rather than the council nor a private company not affiliated to any education board being able to cobble something together as currently happens with	
57	1 Strongly agree	disabled access training provided by the education transport teams.	
11	1 Agree	I agree only as one course without any requirement to do a refresher course every 3 years.	
65	1 Disagree	I dont work with disabled and never have	
		It should be online and free so as to be able to be completed at a convenient time instead of dragging people into a central	
49	1 Strongly disagree	location to sit and listen somebody rabbit on . Better to listen in your own home or on the rank.	
		It should be online and free so as to be able to be completed at a convenient time instead of dragging people into a central	
51	1 Strongly disagree	location to sit and listen somebody rabbit on . Better to listen in your own home or on the rank.	
		It should be online and free so as to be able to be completed at a convenient time instead of dragging people into a central	
53	1 Strongly disagree	location to sit and listen somebody rabbit on . Better to listen in your own home or on the rank.	
		It should be online and free so as to be able to be completed at a convenient time instead of dragging people into a central	
44	1 Strongly disagree	location to sit and listen somebody rabbit on . Better to listen in your own home or on the rank.	
		It should be online and free so as to be able to be completed at a convenient time instead of dragging people into a central	
48	2 Strongly disagree	location to sit and listen somebody rabbit on . Better to listen in your own home or on the rank.	
		It should be online and free so as to be able to be completed at a convenient time instead of dragging people into a central	
50	2 Strongly disagree	location to sit and listen somebody rabbit on . Better to listen in your own home or on the rank.	
		It should be online and free so as to be able to be completed at a convenient time instead of dragging people into a central	
52	2 Strongly disagree	location to sit and listen somebody rabbit on . Better to listen in your own home or on the rank.	
		It should be online and free so as to be able to be completed at a convenient time instead of dragging people into a central	
29	1 Strongly disagree	location to sit and listen somebody rabbit on . Better to listen in your own home or on the rank.	
		It should be online and free so as to be able to be completed at a convenient time instead of dragging people into a central	
43	1 Strongly disagree	location to sit and listen somebody rabbit on . Better to listen in your own home or on the rank.	
		It should be online and free so as to be able to be completed at a convenient time instead of dragging people into a central	
45	1 Strongly disagree	location to sit and listen somebody rabbit on . Better to listen in your own home or on the rank.	
		It should be up to the drivers if they want to be trained not forced by the policy Upto the company or the individual whether	
31	1 Strongly disagree	they insure there vehicles or licence there vehicles to carry disabled passengers.	
67	1 Strongly disagree	only if online and free	
61	1 Disagree	Only those with disability vehicles. Otherwise all drivers should employ common sense and courtesy	
64	1 Agree		
3	2 Strongly agree		
4	2, 0		

2 Strongly agree

- 7 2 Agree
- 15 2 Strongly agree
- 28 2 Agree
- 54 2 Strongly agree
- 14 2 Strongly agree
- 21 2 Strongly agree
- 22 2 Strongly agree
- 16 2 Strongly agree
- 23 2 Strongly agree
- 19 1 Strongly agree
- 17 1 Neither agree nor disagree
- 8 1 Agree
- 32 1 Strongly agree
- 18 1 Strongly agree
- 42 1 Agree
- 63 1 Agree
- 2 1 Strongly disagree
- 20 1 Agree
- 25 1 Agree
- 1 1 Neither agree nor disagree
- 9 1 Strongly agree
- 47 1 Neither agree nor disagree
- 1 Neither agree nor disagree
- 6 1 Agree
- 13 1 Strongly agree
- 41 1 Agree
- 46 1 Agree
- 1 Neither agree nor disagree
- 58 1 Strongly disagree
- 59 1 Agree
- 60 1 Strongly agree
- 62 1 Agree
- 10 1 Strongly agree
- 26 1 Agree
- 27 1 Neither agree nor disagree
- 30 1
- 36 1 Agree
- 37 1 Agree
- 38 1 Agree
- 39 1 Agree

- 40 1 Agree
- 55 -99 Strongly agree
- 66 Neither agree nor disagree

ID TAXI Q11		Q11Dis	CodeA	CodeB	CodeC
31	1 Strongly disagree	Again it's down to the descretion of the company or individual if this is a requirement they need to have. More unnecessary expenses again.			
47	1 Agree	As long as govt pay for it			
64	1 Strongly agree	But not at great expense to the operator. Also who would be the data controller ???			
04	1 Strongly agree	But not at great expense to the operator. Also who would be the data controller !!!			
		CCTV should not be compulsory in vehicles, there's privacy issues for drivers and customers. Who would hold the ico licenses?	1		
		Individual vehicle owners or the council? If it's the council they should pay fo the systems to be fitted, and then at the end of			
		the taxis life would need to pay to have the vehicle returned to standard spec. Some companies operate contracts on behalf			
57	1 Strongly disagree	of the prison service where CCTV is prohibited in vehicles operating on their behalf.			
		I agree for the safety of yourself and the safety of passenger but again on financial background not a lot of drivers can afford			
		these costs yes I have CCTV in my vehicle but not every driver is the same also, on the other side of the respect towards			
		safeguarding of drivers on passenger patents or family member should be notified on a consent from by the driver or the			
		council that cctv is fitted on the vehicle and that is is only used for the protection and safeguarding of any present in the			
		vehicle and within vehicle range therefore a consent form should be sent out to every applicable family members to whether			
13	1 Neither agree nor disagree	they agree and are ok and also a consent from should be in a vehicle along with info stickers			
63	1 Disagree	In principal it is a good idea , but it should always fall to the operator owner to have final say.			
		,			
		Installation of CCV is an additional cost and burden for drivers at a challenging time for the trade. It is unclear who would be			
		the data controller. If drivers are to be put in a position to act as data controllers they would have significant additional			
		burdens around processing of personal data, responsibility for storage and disclosure, and notification to the ICO. If drivers			
20	1 Strongly disagree	have full access to the CCTV system and data it offers limited protection for riders.			
67	1 Strongly disagree	Only if not controlled by the council			
46	1 Disagree	Personal choice			
30	1 Disagree	SHOULD BE PERSONAL CHOICE SOMETIMES IT WOULD BE ILLEGAL			
		Vehicles that solely carry out school contracts this would not be appropriate, again a case could be made for a schools only			
8	1 Strongly disagree	plating category			
		While I believe any driver who doesn't have cameras is an idiot. I would never be in favour of compulsory local authority			
		controlled cameras in any licensed vehicle, unless all council vehicles and offices have cameras linked to the web so we can			
49	1 Strongly disagree	make sure we are getting our moneys worth.			
		While I believe any driver who doesn't have cameras is an idiot. I would never be in favour of compulsory local authority			
		controlled cameras in any licensed vehicle, unless all council vehicles and offices have cameras linked to the web so we can			
51	1 Strongly disagree	make sure we are getting our moneys worth.			
		While I believe any driver who doesn't have cameras is an idiot. I would never be in favour of compulsory local authority			
		controlled cameras in any licensed vehicle, unless all council vehicles and offices have cameras linked to the web so we can			
53	1 Strongly disagree	make sure we are getting our moneys worth.			
		While I believe any driver who doesn't have cameras is an idiot. I would never be in favour of compulsory local authority			
		controlled cameras in any licensed vehicle, unless all council vehicles and offices have cameras linked to the web so we can			
44	1 Strongly disagree	make sure we are getting our moneys worth.			
	- · · · -				

48	2 Strongly disagree
50	2 Strongly disagree
52	2 Strongly disagree
29	1 Strongly disagree
43	1 Strongly disagree
45	1 Strongly disagree
3	2 Strongly agree
4	2 Strongly agree
5	2 Strongly agree
7	2 Agree
15	2 Strongly agree
28	2 Strongly agree
54	2 Strongly agree
14	2 Strongly agree
21	2 Strongly agree
22	2 Strongly agree
16	2 Strongly agree
23	2 Strongly agree
19	1 Agree
17	1 Neither agree nor disagree
32	1 Strongly agree
18	1 Agree
42	1 Strongly agree
65	1 Agree
2	1 Strongly agree
25	1 Agree
1	1 Neither agree nor disagree
9	1 Strongly agree
60	1 Noither agree per disagree

1 Neither agree nor disagree

68

While I believe any driver who doesn't have cameras is an idiot. I would never be in favour of compulsory local authority controlled cameras in any licensed vehicle, unless all council vehicles and offices have cameras linked to the web so we can make sure we are getting our moneys worth.

While I believe any driver who doesn't have cameras is an idiot. I would never be in favour of compulsory local authority controlled cameras in any licensed vehicle, unless all council vehicles and offices have cameras linked to the web so we can make sure we are getting our moneys worth.

While I believe any driver who doesn't have cameras is an idiot. I would never be in favour of compulsory local authority controlled cameras in any licensed vehicle, unless all council vehicles and offices have cameras linked to the web so we can make sure we are getting our moneys worth.

While I believe any driver who doesn't have cameras is an idiot. I would never be in favour of compulsory local authority controlled cameras in any licensed vehicle, unless all council vehicles and offices have cameras linked to the web so we can make sure we are getting our moneys worth.

While I believe any driver who doesn't have cameras is an idiot. I would never be in favour of compulsory local authority controlled cameras in any licensed vehicle, unless all council vehicles and offices have cameras linked to the web so we can make sure we are getting our moneys worth.

While I believe any driver who doesn't have cameras is an idiot. I would never be in favour of compulsory local authority controlled cameras in any licensed vehicle, unless all council vehicles and offices have cameras linked to the web so we can make sure we are getting our moneys worth.

- 6 1 Neither agree nor disagree
- 11 1 Agree
- 41 1 Agree
- 56 1 Disagree
- 58 1 Strongly disagree
- 59 1 Agree
- 60 1 Strongly agree
- 61 1 Agree
- 62 1 Agree
- 10 1 Strongly agree
- 24 1 Agree
- 26 1 Agree
- 27 1 Agree
- 36 1 Agree
- 1 Neither agree nor disagree
- 38 1 Agree
- 39 1 Agree
- 40 1 Neither agree nor disagree
- 69 1 Agree
- 55 -99 Neither agree nor disagree
- 66 Agree

ID TA	XI Q12	Q12Dis	CodeA	CodeB	CodeC
1	1 Strongly disagree	6 points on a licence can be achieved very easily, however depending on the speeds involved.			
46	1 Strongly disagree	Absolutely no need for it. 12 points is a ban not 6.			
62	1 Disagree	Depends what the points are for, the current system works fine for consideration of individual cases			
25	1 Disagree	DRIVERS HAVE ENOUGH TO PAY OUT FOR LICENSES			
30	1 Strongly disagree	EVEN MORE FARES GOING TO WEB CARS AND PIZZA DRIVERS			
8	1 Strongly disagree	I cant see the benefit of this at all			
59	1 Disagree	I disagree the dvla deem to you fit to drive how can parish councillors play god with a taxi drivers livelihood			
41	1 Disagree	I don't think there's any need for minor offences			
11	1 Strongly disagree	If it's only minor offences then there should be no requirement to do a driver improvement course.			
24	1 Disagree	if its only a minor offence then there shouldn't be a requirement to sit a driver improvement course.			
		If the law of the land say 12 points then that's what it should be. If yes then ALL council workers including councilors should			
67	1 Strongly disagree	be held to the same standard			
66	Disagree	It should depend on the offences. Getting an sp30 for doing 33 in a 30 is vastly different to 79 in a 50.			
27	1 Disagree	ive heard of drivers getting prosecuted for doing 31-32 mph which is a bit harsh			
		Points can be issued by Police and are subject to discrestion, as such there is no level / standard to say what is minor or if and			
63	1 Strongly disagree	when they are given to a driver.			
65	1 Disagree	Points may not be associated with bad driving			
14	2 Disagree	Should be band from driving with no test			
		The idea that minor traffic offences warrant denying any human being their ability to earn a living by any council is a disgrace.			
49	1 Strongly disagree	Again these rules should apply to councillors and officers as well as the general council workforce if adopted for the trade.			
	0, 0				
		The idea that minor traffic offences warrant denying any human being their ability to earn a living by any council is a disgrace.			
51	1 Strongly disagree	Again these rules should apply to councillors and officers as well as the general council workforce if adopted for the trade.			
		The idea that minor traffic offences warrant denying any human being their ability to earn a living by any council is a disgrace.			
53	1 Strongly disagree	Again these rules should apply to councillors and officers as well as the general council workforce if adopted for the trade.			
		The idea that minor traffic offences warrant denying any human being their ability to earn a living by any council is a disgrace.			
44	1 Strongly disagree	Again these rules should apply to councillors and officers as well as the general council workforce if adopted for the trade.			
		The idea that minor traffic offences warrant denying any human being their ability to earn a living by any council is a disgrace.			
48	2 Strongly disagree	Again these rules should apply to councillors and officers as well as the general council workforce if adopted for the trade.			
		The idea that minor traffic offences warrant denying any human being their ability to earn a living by any council is a disgrace.			
50	2 Strongly disagree	Again these rules should apply to councillors and officers as well as the general council workforce if adopted for the trade.			
		The idea that minor traffic offences warrant denying any human being their ability to earn a living by any council is a disgrace.			
52	2 Strongly disagree	Again these rules should apply to councillors and officers as well as the general council workforce if adopted for the trade.			

29	1 Strongly disagree	The idea that minor traffic offences warrant denying any human being their ability to earn a living by any council is a disgrace. Again these rules should apply to councillors and officers as well as the general council workforce if adopted for the trade.
		6
43	1 Strongly disagree	The idea that minor traffic offences warrant denying any human being their ability to earn a living by any council is a disgrace. Again these rules should apply to councillors and officers as well as the general council workforce if adopted for the trade.
45	1 Strongly disagree	The idea that minor traffic offences warrant denying any human being their ability to earn a living by any council is a disgrace. Again these rules should apply to councillors and officers as well as the general council workforce if adopted for the trade.
		The idea that minor traffic offences warrant denying any human being their ability to earn a living by any council is a disgrace.
64	1 Strongly disagree	Again these rules should apply to councillors and officers aswell as all the general council workforce if adopted by our trade.
47	1 Strongly disagree	The job is in enough financial ruin and current rules are enough
7,	1 Strongly disagree	The job is in chough munding duri the rules are chough
		This depends on the circumstances, it is possible to get 6 points for a single offence, and in the same respect it's possible to
57	1 Neither agree nor disagree	get points for parking badly. To force drivers to go on training courses for some things would be silly.
		Totally disagree. Taxi drivers drive a lot of miles. I do 30,000 per annum, in often stressful circumstances. I do not need driver
61	1 Strongly disagree	training or lessons.
69	1 Disagree	Why get driver to do a course for minor offences.
		You are discriminating the driver as incompetent. If the driver amhas a licence to drive then no further action should be taken
31	1 Strongly disagree	
3	2 Strongly agree	
4	2 Strongly agree	
5	2 Strongly agree	
7	2 Strongly agree	
15	2 Strongly agree	
28	2 Agree	
54	2 Strongly agree	
21	2 Strongly agree	
22	2 Strongly agree	
16	2 Strongly agree	
23	2 Strongly agree	
19	1 Agree	
17	1 Neither agree nor disagree	
32	1 Agree	
18	1 Agree	
42	1 Agree	
2	1 Strongly disagree	
20	1 Agree	
9	1 Strongly agree	
68	1 Agree	

- 6 1 Agree
- 13 1 Strongly agree
- 56 1 Disagree
- 58 1 Strongly disagree
- 60 1 Strongly agree
- 10 1 Strongly agree
- 26 1 Neither agree nor disagree
- 1 Neither agree nor disagree
- 37 1 Strongly disagree
- 38 1 Agree
- 39 1 Agree
- 40 1 Agree
- 55 -99 Strongly disagree

ID TAXI Q13 CodeA CodeB CodeC

An increase in licencing enforcement in Durham city to combat the rise in PH ride sharing drivers parking illigally and touting

1 for work with little or no oversight.

Another more serious matter concerns me and that although it is a serious offence and extremely dangerous, getting prosecuted for "using" a mobile phone brings with it a FIVE YEAR TAXI LICENCE BAN... This is rather draconian, for example does placing a fallen mobile back in its cradle constitute a serious offence and worthy of a 5 year ban???? Also does using a cradled phone for navigation or voice commands constitute an offence? is it any different from using an in built manufacturers touch screen navigation system???? The law is very blurry in these areas and requires clarification if such

27 1 SERIOUS penalties are to be imposed

As stated in previous answer, I would like to propose an issue about health problems in older taxi drivers that have serious 2 medical conditions or heart problems more supervision of these drivers should be adhered to for the safty of passenger's.

Enforcement need to work nights and weekends to try and catch the growing amount of drivers overcharging and refusing short fares. Private hire vehicles should be able to use bus lanes, the likes of Uber are growing More and more so why should taxis which are declining in use be allowed to use bus lanes and private hires not? Whilst the bridge in Durham is closed there needs to be a designated private hire pick up point as currently on a weekend taxis block up whole area around market place so where are the hundreds now using Uber meant to get safely collected from? Anything agreed by licensing in Durham needs to be agreed in Sunderland and Newcastle or else drivers can just register elsewhere and still legally operate, but eith very

- 19 1 little chance of ever getting monitored as out of area
- 1 Everything is against the driver. At this rate there won't be many drivers left i have received concerns from a number of passengers about some drivers' poor command of the English language which 1 results in communucation breakdown. i feel this needs to be addressed.
- I honestly believe this new policy should have been put on hold for 12 months owing to the current economic situation. COVID-19 has a lot to answer for and I believe in running with this is taking precious time away from dealing with more pressing
- 64 1 matters.

14

I suggest all drivers are encouraged to complete an advanced driving assessment, by RoSPA, RODAR, or any similar

5 2 organisation

I think the council should stop make the job of a Taxi driver unbearable. The pressure on drivers are ridiculous. I think the council should listen to drivers rather than them getting to get her on a committee and thinking what's the next thing we can

- 1 add to the list to get to taxi drivers and the companies involved.
- 1 I'm a few hours late on submitting my views on this consultation please accept them.

More street presence of enforcement, on the 2 or 3 occasions that enforcement officers have been out in Durham City on a Friday or Saturday night during my 4 years as a hackney driver, more than half of the usual cars are working, once word gets around many drivers get out of town, speaks volumes. Also enforcement checks on private hire cars from out of the area who

- 1 form their own taxi ranks would help
- 20 1 N/A

57

PH Vehicles should not be allowed to park in shopping car parks/car parks/ or on side streets waiting for there

- 1 operator/telephone bookings they should be made to return to there base.

 Regarding Driver Knowledge and Locality Tests, I have taken quite a few taxis around Durham and the knowledge of the local area seems extremely poor in some cases. I am not sure whether drivers are retested or how thorough the existing tests are but the results do not seem very good. The standard was much higher before the extension of licencing to allow many more
- 23 2 drivers/firms to pick up in the city.

Some of the policy directly breaches the equality act. You can not demand anyone provides proof of conditions such as dyslexia. You can not refuse to issue a drover with a taxi badge because they didn't learn to read or write. There's even an argument that an oral English test could be construed as disability discrimination. If an individual has a speech problem would you refuse to license them? Or is it just targeted at people who don't speak English at all? Their is no requirement for a driver to be able to fluently communicate with passengers, so long as they can understand where a passenger wants to go to it's not their job to hold a full conversation or act as a tour guide. Drivers should not really be actively talking with passengers or 1 acting as a tour guide this is just as dangerous as talking on a mobile phone.

Stop copy and pasting from people who sit on their backside dreaming up how to make people unemployed. This should have been put to trade reps by email for comment before publishing, using Covid 19 to avoid working in partnership with the following agencies, groups and individuals to promote the licensing objectives: a) Local Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Trade b) County Wide Taxi Working Group again. All councillors should do at least one week every year working normal shifts for a taxi driver. Licensing councillors and licensing and enforcement should do four weeks every year. What is made could be split between the taxi owner and a charity chosen by the trade reps. Before any attempt to adopt this policy meetings should take place this year between licensing and the trade by any means possible, otherwise we will take it you failed under section

49 1 7 of your current policy on page 8

Stop copy and pasting from people who sit on their backside dreaming up how to make people unemployed. This should have been put to trade reps by email for comment before publishing, using Covid 19 to avoid working in partnership with the following agencies, groups and individuals to promote the licensing objectives: a) Local Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Trade b) County Wide Taxi Working Group again. All councillors should do at least one week every year working normal shifts for a taxi driver. Licensing councillors and licensing and enforcement should do four weeks every year. What is made could be split between the taxi owner and a charity chosen by the trade reps. Before any attempt to adopt this policy meetings should take place this year between licensing and the trade by any means possible, otherwise we will take it you failed under section

1 7 of your current policy on page 8

Stop copy and pasting from people who sit on their backside dreaming up how to make people unemployed. This should have been put to trade reps by email for comment before publishing, using Covid 19 to avoid working in partnership with the following agencies, groups and individuals to promote the licensing objectives: a) Local Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Trade b) County Wide Taxi Working Group again. All councillors should do at least one week every year working normal shifts for a taxi driver. Licensing councillors and licensing and enforcement should do four weeks every year. What is made could be split between the taxi owner and a charity chosen by the trade reps. Before any attempt to adopt this policy meetings should take place this year between licensing and the trade by any means possible, otherwise we will take it you failed under section

1 7 of your current policy on page 8

53

44

Stop copy and pasting from people who sit on their backside dreaming up how to make people unemployed. This should have been put to trade reps by email for comment before publishing, using Covid 19 to avoid working in partnership with the following agencies, groups and individuals to promote the licensing objectives: a) Local Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Trade b) County Wide Taxi Working Group again. All councillors should do at least one week every year working normal shifts for a taxi driver. Licensing councillors and licensing and enforcement should do four weeks every year. What is made could be split between the taxi owner and a charity chosen by the trade reps. Before any attempt to adopt this policy meetings should take place this year between licensing and the trade by any means possible, otherwise we will take it you failed under section

1 7 of your current policy on page 8

Stop copy and pasting from people who sit on their backside dreaming up how to make people unemployed. This should have been put to trade reps by email for comment before publishing, using Covid 19 to avoid working in partnership with the following agencies, groups and individuals to promote the licensing objectives: a) Local Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Trade b) County Wide Taxi Working Group again. All councillors should do at least one week every year working normal shifts for a taxi driver. Licensing councillors and licensing and enforcement should do four weeks every year. What is made could be split between the taxi owner and a charity chosen by the trade reps. Before any attempt to adopt this policy meetings should take place this year between licensing and the trade by any means possible, otherwise we will take it you failed under section

2 7 of your current policy on page 8

48

50

52

Stop copy and pasting from people who sit on their backside dreaming up how to make people unemployed. This should have been put to trade reps by email for comment before publishing, using Covid 19 to avoid working in partnership with the following agencies, groups and individuals to promote the licensing objectives: a) Local Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Trade b) County Wide Taxi Working Group again. All councillors should do at least one week every year working normal shifts for a taxi driver. Licensing councillors and licensing and enforcement should do four weeks every year. What is made could be split between the taxi owner and a charity chosen by the trade reps. Before any attempt to adopt this policy meetings should take place this year between licensing and the trade by any means possible, otherwise we will take it you failed under section 2 7 of your current policy on page 8

Stop copy and pasting from people who sit on their backside dreaming up how to make people unemployed. This should have been put to trade reps by email for comment before publishing, using Covid 19 to avoid working in partnership with the following agencies, groups and individuals to promote the licensing objectives: a) Local Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Trade b) County Wide Taxi Working Group again. All councillors should do at least one week every year working normal shifts for a taxi driver. Licensing councillors and licensing and enforcement should do four weeks every year. What is made could be split between the taxi owner and a charity chosen by the trade reps. Before any attempt to adopt this policy meetings should take place this year between licensing and the trade by any means possible, otherwise we will take it you failed under section

2 7 of your current policy on page 8

Stop copy and pasting from people who sit on their backside dreaming up how to make people unemployed. This should have been put to trade reps by email for comment before publishing, using Covid 19 to avoid working in partnership with the following agencies, groups and individuals to promote the licensing objectives: a) Local Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Trade b) County Wide Taxi Working Group again. All councillors should do at least one week every year working normal shifts for a taxi driver. Licensing councillors and licensing and enforcement should do four weeks every year. What is made could be split between the taxi owner and a charity chosen by the trade reps. Before any attempt to adopt this policy meetings should take place this year between licensing and the trade by any means possible, otherwise we will take it you failed under section

1 7 of your current policy on page 8

43

45

29

Stop copy and pasting from people who sit on their backside dreaming up how to make people unemployed. This should have been put to trade reps by email for comment before publishing, using Covid 19 to avoid working in partnership with the following agencies, groups and individuals to promote the licensing objectives: a) Local Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Trade b) County Wide Taxi Working Group again. All councillors should do at least one week every year working normal shifts for a taxi driver. Licensing councillors and licensing and enforcement should do four weeks every year. What is made could be split between the taxi owner and a charity chosen by the trade reps. Before any attempt to adopt this policy meetings should take place this year between licensing and the trade by any means possible, otherwise we will take it you failed under section 1 7 of your current policy on page 8

Stop copy and pasting from people who sit on their backside dreaming up how to make people unemployed. This should have been put to trade reps by email for comment before publishing, using covid to avoid working in partnership with the following agencies, groups and individuals to promote the licensing objectives: a) Local Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Trade b) Countywide Taxi Working Group again. All councillors should do at least one week every year working normal shifts for a taxi driver. Licensing councillors and licensing and enforcement should do four weeks every year. What is made could be split between the taxi owner and a charity chosen by the trade reps. Before any attempt to adopt this policy meetings should take place this year between licensing and the trade by any means possible, otherwise we will take it you failed under section 7 of

1 your current policy on page 8.

The changes to the licensing policy regarding the age of vehicles will have a detrimental effect on many small business's. Whilst I can agree with the 4 year age limit for new vehicles the 8 year age limit will limit service life of perfectly good vehicles, as a rule a vehicle carrying out a school contract will give us 8 to 10 years service. I also think this will have a detrimental

- 8 1 impact on many owner drivers who will not be able to justify the cost of replacing a vehicle so often.
- 21 2 Vehicle insurance must be for full year not monthly and confirmation from insures when insurance stops

1 VERY POOR TIME TO BE DOING THIS ARE YOU PLANNING LICENSING STAFF REDUNDANCIES YOU WILL NEED LESS STAFF

WE NEED BETTER CLEARANCE ON CROSS BORDER HIRING AS THE AMOUNT OF VEHICLES FROM OUT OF TOWN THAT DONT HAVE TO ABIDE BY THE COUNCIL POLICY IS RIDICULOUS. I FEEL LIKE I WOULD BENEFIT FROM LICENSING ALL OF MY VEHICLES

- 1 WITH A DIFFERENT COUNCIL AS IT WOULD BE CHEAPER WITH LESS RESTRICTIONS AND REQUIREMENTS

```
36 1
37 1
38 1
39 1
40 1
67 1
55 -99
```