## PROPOSED VARIATION TO THE SCHEME OF HACKNEY CARRIAGE FARES

## SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report recommends proposals to vary the scheme of hackney carriage fares (last uplifted 29.11.13) by a $4 \%$ uplift as applied to the pull-off and running mile yardage to the current scheme of fares.

Cabinet is requested to consider the proposals and approve the uplift for public consultation as may be appropriate.

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This report puts forward proposed variations to the extant scheme of hackney carriage fares. For reference, the current scheme was last uplifted on 29th November 2013 and is given at appendix A.
1.2 Under the Local Authorities (Functions \& Responsibilities) (England) Regulations, the determination of hackney carriage fares is an executive function. Accordingly, while not obliged to approve a revised scheme of fares, Cabinet is asked to consider and approve the proposals outlined in section 3.0 below for public consultation.
1.3 Significantly, any revision to the scheme of fares must be subject to public consultation. Where there are any objections to the proposals, they should be brought back to Cabinet for consideration, otherwise the proposed scheme takes effect on expiry of any date specified in the consultation notice. For this reason, and the fact that any variation to the scheme of fares will likely have a Borough wide effect, any determination, even at this stage, should be considered a key decision.

### 2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1. Section 65 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 (LGMPA76) gives the Council the power - not a duty (i.e. a discretionary ability), to fix the rates or fares in connection with the hire of a hackney carriage vehicle within its district by means of a scheme of fares. Historically, the Council has always established and set a scheme of fares
and this has been subject to annual review in accordance with its taxi licensing policy.
2.2. As an executive function, Cabinet previously approved the democratic procedure and methodology as follows.

### 2.3. Approved procedure

2.4. The procedure involves the calculation of an initial percentage uplift figure (known as the 'notional uplift') using a formula based on various indices and measures of inflation, weighted to reflect factors relevant to the trade e.g. the cost of fuel. This formula was first used in the 2002 settlement and was developed in consultation with the Taxi Trade Board.
2.5. Using the notional uplift as a guide, a revised fare scheme is prepared and subject to public consultation. Given its role and responsibilities in other areas of taxi licensing work, the views of the Licensing \& General Purposes Committee are also sought during the consultation period.
2.6. On completion of the consultation process, those making representations are invited to present their comments before any decision is made. The decision on what scale of fares should be implemented is then made by the Cabinet Member for Safety \& Regulation in consultation with the Chairman of the Licensing \& General Purposes Committee and the Council's Licensing Manager. The approved timetable aims to give effect to any variation to the scheme of fares in October or November each year (subject to Committee cycles etc).
2.7. Perceived problems, associated activities and issues
2.8. Despite the above, Cabinet also perceived the process of setting hackney carriage fares as complex, time-consuming and costly. Members have also expressed concern as to whether the setting of fares best serves the public interest and/or supports wider transportation policies; particularly as other service charges in the private and/or self-employed sector are not similarly regulated.
2.9. Against this backdrop, Cabinet has also requested that officers look at the efficacy of and options for the (de)regulation of setting hackney carriage fares in consultation with the Chairman of the Licensing \& General Purposes Committee and the Member for Safety \& Regulation.
2.10. In consequence of this, it was considered appropriate to develop and consult on a more simplified scheme of fares in the first instance. This resulted in two separate variation proposals that did not find favour with the taxi trade and were subsequently withdrawn in 2014 and 2015 respectively.
2.11. Following the later of these, Cabinet resolved that a cross-party task and finish group be established to make recommendations to Cabinet on all future changes to the scheme. However, whilst attempting to work collaboratively with the taxi trade over the past 24 months, the Member

Group has not been able to reach agreement with the taxi trade on a simplified fare structure.
2.12. It is now 3-4 years since the fare scheme was last uplifted and any increase applied. As there is little prospect of an agreement on a future fare structure at present, it may now be unreasonable to delay any further uplift; particularly as the degree, significance and impact of any fare uplift will likely increase over time and through any further prolongation of review.

### 3.0 DETAILS OF THE PROPOSAL

3.1. Accordingly, so as to reduce the significance and impact of any fare increase following a prolonged review and minimise the potential for challenge, it is proposed that an interim increase of $4 \%$ be applied at this time; deferring any remaining uplift amount to, and pending the next fare review and/or reworking of the scheme.
3.2. As a notional and interim uplift, it is proposed that this be applied as an adjustment to the pull-off rate yardage (i.e. the initial distance to be travelled for the initial engagement charge on the meter) and running mile unit rate (i.e. the distance travelled for each meter tick over charge after the initial pull-off distance). This accords with historical methods of uplift application and results in the proposed fare scheme given at appendix B. As an interim measure pending future review of the scheme, Cabinet is asked to approve this variation for public consultation.

### 4.0 CONSULTATION

4.1. By virtue of Section 65(2) LGMPA76 any revision to the scheme of fares must be published in a local newspaper and in a notice at the Council offices by way of public consultation on the proposals. Representations regarding proposed changes may then be made within a stated period of not less than 14 days.
4.2. In accordance with the approved procedure, the views of the Licensing \& General Purposes Committee will also be sought during any consultation period and fed back to Cabinet as may be appropriate.
4.3. Sections 65(3) and 65(4) LGMP76 provide that where, following consultation, there are any objections to the proposals, these must be brought back to Cabinet for consideration. Otherwise, the proposed scheme takes effect on expiry of the date specified in the consultation notice*.
*NB(1): Due to the purdah period for the general election on $8^{\text {th }}$ June, the Council will only be able to effect consultation from the $9^{\text {th }}$ June onwards. Allowing for newspaper publication dates and subsequent Cabinet / Committee cycles, any report back to Cabinet will likely fall to its meeting of $25^{\text {th }}$ July.
$\mathbf{N B ( 2 ) : ~ F u r t h e r ~ t o ~ t h e ~ a b o v e , ~ a n y ~ c h a n g e ~ t o ~ t h e ~ s c h e m e ~ o f ~ f a r e s ~ r e s u l t s ~ i n ~}$ the need to recalibrate the taximeters in all taxis licensed by the Council. A modern taximeter needs technical / specialist recalibration and, given the
number involved, requires some co-ordination to take effect at the same time. For this reason, it is proposed that any revised scheme of fares should take effect from $1^{\text {st }}$ September.

### 5.0 IMPLICATIONS OF PROPOSALS

5.1. The taxi fare implications inherent to the proposals can mainly be seen by comparing them against the current scheme of fares. The tables given at appendix C provide for a fare cost comparison of journeys at each mile mark (up to 15 miles) whilst, the tables given at appendix $\mathbf{D}$ provide for a cost comparison of a number of local journey examples.
5.2. Whilst subject to variation on account of running mile and meter tick over points, collectively, these show an approximate $4 \%$ uplift to current taxi rates across the board.

### 6.0 OTHER RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS

### 6.1. Legal Implications

6.2. Whist the Council is not obliged to set a scheme of fares, the Council's taxi licensing policy (approved October 2012) specifies that the Council will seek to undertake an annual review of taxi fares. It further aims to give effect to any variation to the scheme of fares in October or November each year (subject to Committee cycles etc).
6.3. Notably, the Council may be subject to challenge where the expectation(s) arising from its stated policy intentions are not being met.

### 6.4. Financial and Resource Implications

6.5. There are no direct financial implications associated with this report other than those attributable to the costs of public consultation. However, these are factored into and can be borne by existing budgets.

### 6.6. Equalities Impact Implications

6.7. By virtue of section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, the Council must have 'due regard' to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation as well as to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. Due regard must be had at the time decisions are taken and may involve removing or minimising any disadvantage suffered by those who share a relevant protected characteristic, taking steps to meet the needs of such people; and encouraging them to participate in public life, or in any other activity where their participation is disproportionately low. The 'protected characteristics' and groups are: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, gender, religion or belief, sexual orientation and marriage / civil partnership status.
6.8. Whilst there is no directly available and attributable data to consider or apply in respect of taxi services or their use, it is likely that taxis are well used by local disabled and elderly residents. It is also likely that these 'protected' groups would be affected by any proposed fare increase.
6.9. Notably, Rushmoor has a $100 \%$ wheelchair accessible hackney carriage vehicle policy and fleet. Rushmoor also has a lower number and lower percentage of state pensioners, but has a higher percentage of residents that are in bad or very bad health (used as a potential indicator of disability), when compared to surrounding local authority areas.
6.10. Accordingly, the Council could freeze or lower taxi fares to mitigate against the potential impact of the fare increase upon these groups, however, this would impact upon the ability of drivers to recover their costs and make a living from the trade. Moreover, given the wide variation and definition of disability, this would likely create practical difficulties for the taxi trade to implement and/or for the Council to enforce in cases of dispute.
6.11. That said, there is, at this time, no attributable data to suggest that the interim uplift proposals will adversely impact the groups protected by the Equality Act to any greater extent than other group(s).
6.12. Indeed, once established, a scheme of fares must be applied to journey's undertaken within the Borough. A scheme of fares as regulated by taximeter therefore provides for a consistent method of calculating a fare for any journey between point A to B regardless of the user group. However, whilst the scheme may also be, and is often applied voluntarily for journeys going outside the borough, out of borough journey's may be negotiated with the fare paying customer in advance. This may be for a sum greater or lesser than that calculated by the scheme / taximeter.
6.13. Further to the above, while subject to minor ancillary income streams (e.g. vehicle advertisements), taxi fares are the main means by which drivers can recoup the costs of providing a taxi service and effecting an income / living. Conversely, fares must be reasonable and affordable for those that use and/or rely on such services. In essence then, there is a balance to be struck with reference to what is reasonable to expect people to pay but also with reference to the need to give taxi drivers sufficient incentive to provide a taxi service; particularly when it is needed as well as by those needing it (including at times involving anti-social hours). These and other relevant considerations are outlined at appendix E.
6.14. A range of potentially relevant local socio-economic data and similar indicators is provided at appendix $\mathbf{F}$ by way of helping to contextualise both the current and proposed levels of taxi fares against local circumstances. Whilst there is no directly attributed data to consider or apply in respect of taxi services or their use, this data also serves to indicate relative depravation / affluence and the local ability to pay for and use taxi services.

### 6.15. Useful Guidance

6.16. While there is limited guidance available to Council's in setting taxi fares, an excerpt of the Department for Transport (DfT) best practice guidelines to licensing authorities is given at appendix G.
6.17. While the DfT best practice guidelines have no legal standing, the following points may be relevant; namely -
(a) It is good practice to review fare scales at regular intervals.
(b) Fare scales should be designed with a view to practicality.
(c) Authorities may wish to consider adopting a simple formula for deciding on fare revisions as this will increase understanding and improve the transparency of the process.
(d) In reviewing taxi fares authorities should pay particular regard to the needs of the travelling public, with reference both to what it is reasonable to expect people to pay but also to the need to give taxi drivers sufficient incentive to provide a service when it is needed.
(e) There may be a case for higher fares at times of higher demand.
(f) Taxi fares are a maximum, and in principle are open to downward negotiation between passenger and driver.

### 7.0 CONCLUSIONS

7.1. The Council's taxi licensing policy specifies that the Council will undertake an annual review of taxi fares. Significantly, following work to review the (de)regulation of hackney carriage fares, the existing scheme of fares has not been uplifted since November 2013. In these circumstances, it may be unreasonable to delay application of a notional uplift to the existing scheme.
7.2. To minimise any potential for challenge and any significant increase thereon, it is proposed that an interim increase of $4 \%$ be applied to the scheme of fares at this time. This will require a deferral of any remaining notional uplift amount to, and pending the next fare review and/or reworking of the scheme. Work to this effect will commence later in the year.
7.3. Any proposal for variation must be subject to public consultation and, by virtue of approved processes will include Member consideration by virtue of the Licensing \& General Purposes Committee. Where appropriate, all representations / comments will be brought back to Cabinet for consideration before determination. Any advertised proposal will automatically take effect in the event that it does not attract any representations / comments.

## BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS: None

## CONTACT DETAILS:

Portfolio Holder | - Ken Muschamp, Business, Safety \& Regulation Portfolio |
| :---: |
| Holder |
| ken@laulind.co.uk, 07801430352 |

Head of Service -| Qamer Yasin, Head of Environmental Health \& Housing |
| :--- |
| gamer.yasin@rushmoor.gov.uk, 01252398640 |

Report Author | -John McNab, Environmental Health Manager |
| :--- |
| john.mcnab@rushmoor.gov.uk, 01252398886 |

## APPENDICES:

```
Appendix 
```

Appendix A - Current scheme of fares (effective from 29.11.13)

Appendix B - Proposed scheme of fares (as based on 4\% uplift)
Appendix C - Comparison tables of charges at each mile mark (up to 15 miles) for current \& proposed fare schemes
Appendix D - Local journey examples / costs arising from the current \& proposed
Appendix E - Relevant considerations in setting taxi fares
Appendix F - Potentially relevant socio-economic data \& associated indicators
Appendix G - Excerpt of DfT Best Practice Guidelines (March 2010)
-oOo-

## APPENDIX A

## CURRENT SCHEME OF FARES (EFFECTIVE FROM 29th NOVEMBER 2013)

## HACKNEY CARRIAGE FARES effective from 29th November 2013

Below is a table of fares made by Rushmoor Borough Council under S65 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976. Subject to the notes below, these fares and charges are the MAXIMUM fares that may be charged.

## METER RATE 1 - Day time

Any hiring on a weekday between 07:00 and 17:59 (unless Rate 4 or 5 applies instead).

| First 1132 yards or uncompleted part | £2.70 |
| :--- | :--- |
| For each subsequent (or part) 155.7 yards up to 8 miles | $£ 0.20$ |
| Thereafter, for each subsequent (or part) 130.3 yards | $£ 0.20$ |
| Waiting time (per 40 second period) | $\mathbf{£ 0 . 2 0}$ |

## METER RATE 2 - Evenings and weekends

Any hiring on any day between 18:00 and 22:59
(unless Rate 4 or 5 applies instead); or
Any hiring on a Saturday or Sunday, between 07:00 and 17:59 (unless Rate 5 applies instead).

First 1132 yards or uncompleted part
For each subsequent (or part) 155.7 yards up to 8 miles
Thereafter, for each subsequent (or part) 130.3 yards
Waiting time (per 40 second period)

## METER RATE 3 - Night time

Any hiring on any day between 23:00 and 06:59 (unless Rate 5 applies instead).
First 1132 yards or uncompleted part
For each subsequent (or part) 155.7 yards up to 8 miles
Thereafter, for each subsequent (or part) 130.3 yards
Waiting time (per 40 second period)

## METER RATE 4 - Bank holidays

Any hiring on a bank or public holiday or New Year's Day (1st Jan) between 07:00 and 22:59 (unless Rate 5 applies instead).

| First 1132 yards or uncompleted part | $£ 3.35$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| For each subsequent (or part) 155.7 yards | $£ 0.25$ |
| Waiting time (per 40 second period) | $£ 0.25$ |

£0.25

## METER RATE 5 - Christmas/New Year

Any hiring on Christmas Day (25 December) or Boxing Day (26 December); or
Any hiring on Christmas Eve (24 December) or
New Year's Eve (31 December) between 21:00 and 23:59; or
Any hiring on New Year's Day (1 January)
between 00:00 and 06:59

| First 1132 yards or uncompleted part | $£ 4.40$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| For each subsequent (or part) 155.7 yards | $£ 0.40$ |
| Waiting time (per 40 second period) | $£ 0.40$ |

## EXTRA CHARGES

For each additional passenger in excess of five passengers
At rate 1 or 2 (per person) £0.70

At rate 3, 4 or 5 (per person) £1.00
Any hiring booked by telephone or radio
At rate 1 or 2
At rate 3,4 or 5 £1.00

Any hiring if the journey starts or finishes outside the
Rushmoor boundary
At rate 1 or 2 £0.70
At rate 3,4 or 5 £1.00

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { NB: Passengers may be charged a maximum of four extras, so: } \\
\text { At rate } 1 \text { or } 2 \text {, the total of extras shall at no time exceed } & £ 2.80 \\
\text { At rate } 3,4 \text { or } 5 \text {, the total of extras shall at no time exceed } & £ 4.00
\end{array}
$$

## DEBIT AND CREDIT CARD PAYMENTS

Some taxis accept credit or debit cards. A surcharge may be made for this method of payment which, for non-business customers will not exceed the amount permitted by law, and for business customers shall be limited to a maximum of $£ 1$ or $12.5 \%$ of the metered fare (whichever is greater).

## FOULING CHARGE

Any fouling to the interior of the cab making it unfit for further hiring (at the discretion of the driver). Up to £100

## IMPORTANT NOTES

Fare rates are based on a combination of time and distance and are automatically calculated by and must be displayed on the taximeter at all times. If the journey takes the taxi outside the Rushmoor Borough, the fare charged must still be in accordance with this table of fares unless a fare was otherwise agreed with the hirer before the journey started.

[^0]
## APPENDIX B

## PROPOSED SCHEME OF FARES (AS BASED ON 4\% UPLIFT)

## HACKNEY CARRIAGE FARES <br> Proposal

Below is a table of fares made by Rushmoor Borough Council under S65 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976. Subject to the notes below, these fares and charges are the MAXIMUM fares that may be charged.

## meter rate 1 - Day time

Any hiring on a weekday between 07:00 and 17:59 (unless Rate 4 or 5 applies instead).
First 1088 yards or uncompleted part
For each subsequent (or part) 149.5 yards up to 8 miles
Thereafter, for each subsequent (or part) 125.2 yards
Waiting time (per 40 second period)

## METER RATE 2 - Evenings and weekends

Any hiring on any day between 18:00 and 22:59 (unless Rate 4 or 5 applies instead); or
Any hiring on a Saturday or Sunday, between 07:00 and 17:59 (unless Rate 5 applies instead).
First 1088 yards or uncompleted part
For each subsequent (or part) 149.5 yards up to 8 miles Thereafter, for each subsequent (or part) 125.2 yards
Waiting time (per 40 second period)
METER RATE 3 - Night time
Any hiring on any day between 23:00 and 06:59 (unless Rate 5 applies instead).
First 1088 yards or uncompleted part £4.00
For each subsequent (or part) 149.5 yards up to 8 miles
Thereafter, for each subsequent (or part) 125.2 yards
£0.30
Waiting time (per 40 second period)
£0.30

## METER RATE 4 - Bank holidays

Any hiring on a bank or public holiday or New Year's Day (1st Jan) between 07:00 and 22:59 (unless Rate 5 applies instead).
First 1088 yards or uncompleted part
For each subsequent (or part) 149.5 yards
£0.25
Waiting time (per 40 second period)

## IMPORTANT NOTES

Fare rates are based on a combination of time and distance and are automatically calculated by and must be displayed on the taximeter at all times. If the journey takes the taxi outside the Rushmoor Borough, the fare charged must still be in accordance with this table of fares unless a fare was otherwise agreed with the hirer before the journey started.

COMPLAINTS AND COMMENTS - Where possible please quote the Cab / Driver Number
Please contact the Head of Environmental Health \& Housing at Rushmoor Borough Council, Council Offices, Farnborough Road, Farnborough, Hampshire, GU14 7JU. Tel: 01252398399 • Fax: 01252524017 • Email: licensing@rushmoor.gov.uk

APPENDIX C

## COMPARISON TABLES OF CHARGES AT EACH MILE MARK (UP TO 15 MILES) FOR CURRENT \& PROPOSED FARE SCHEMES

| EXISTING v PROPOSED SCHEME OF FARES COMPARISON TABLE METER RATE 1 (07:00 TO 17:59) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DISTANCE | CURRENT COSTS <br> 29.11.13 (£) | PROPOSED SCHEME <br> (£) | \%AGE INCREASE |
| PULL-OFF | 2.70 | 2.70 | 4.04\% |
| 1 MILE | 3.70 | 3.70 | 0.00\% |
| 2 MILES | 5.90 | 6.10 | 3.39\% |
| 3 MILES | 8.10 | 8.50 | 4.94\% |
| 4 MILES | 10.30 | 10.70 | 3.88\% |
| 5 MILES | 12.70 | 13.10 | 3.15\% |
| 6 MILES | 14.90 | 15.50 | 4.03\% |
| 7 MILES | 17.10 | 17.90 | 4.68\% |
| 8 MILES | 19.50 | 20.10 | 3.08\% |
| 9 MILES | 22.10 | 23.10 | 4.52\% |
| 10 MILES | 24.90 | 25.90 | 4.02\% |
| 11 MILES | 27.50 | 28.70 | 4.36\% |
| 12 MILES | 30.30 | 31.50 | 3.96\% |
| 13 MILES | 32.90 | 34.30 | 4.26\% |
| 14 MILES | 35.70 | 37.10 | 3.92\% |
| 15 MILES | 38.30 | 39.90 | 4.18\% |
| Meter Rate 1 Notes: |  |  |  |
| Pull-off charge (£) |  | Current | Proposed |
|  |  | 2.70 | 2.70 |
| Pull-off distance (yards) |  | 1132 | 1088 |
| Subsequent running mile charge (£) |  | 0.20 | 0.20 |
| Distance per running mile charge up to 8 miles (yards) |  | 155.7 | 149.5 |
| Distance per yardage rate charge after 8 miles (yards) |  | 130.3 | 125.2 |
| NB: All journeys shown above are for basic hire. Costs shown do not include any extras. |  |  |  |






## LOCAL JOURNEY EXAMPLES / COSTS ARISING FROM THE CURRENT AND PROPOSED FARE SCHEMES

| Rate |  | Weekday 07:00-17:59 Meter Rate 1 |  |  | Any Day 18:00-22:59 Meter Rate 2 |  |  | Any Day 23:00-06:59 Meter Rate 3 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Journey Details | Distance (miles) | Current Cost (£) | Proposed Cost (£) | Increase | Current Cost (£) | Proposed Cost (£) | Increase | Current Cost (£) | Proposed Cost (£) | Increase |
| Council Offices to Guildford Station | 13.5 | 34.30 | 35.70 | 4.08\% | 34.95 | 36.35 | 4.01\% | 51.40 | 53.50 | 4.09\% |
| Council Offices to Aldershot Station | 4.1 | 10.70 | 10.90 | 1.87\% | 11.35 | 11.55 | 1.76\% | 16.00 | 16.30 | 1.88\% |
| Council Offices to Frimley Park Hospital | 2.7 | 7.50 | 7.70 | 2.67\% | 8.15 | 8.35 | 2.45\% | 11.20 | 11.50 | 2.68\% |
| Council Offices to Gatwick Airport (M/Way)* | 43.7 | 115.90 | 120.50 | 3.97\% | 116.55 | 121.15 | 3.95\% | 173.80 | 180.70 | 3.97\% |
| Council Offices to Gatwick Airport (Non M/Way)* | 47.1 | 125.10 | 130.10 | 4.00\% | 125.75 | 130.75 | 3.98\% | 187.60 | 195.10 | 4.00\% |
| Whitchurch Close to Frimley Park Hospital | 7.2 | 17.70 | 18.30 | 3.39\% | 18.35 | 18.95 | 3.27\% | 26.50 | 27.40 | 3.40\% |
| Weyborne Road to Frimley Park Hospital | 7.4 | 18.10 | 18.70 | 3.31\% | 18.75 | 19.35 | 3.20\% | 27.10 | 28.00 | 3.32\% |
| Whitchurch Close to Fernhill Lane | 7.8 | 18.90 | 19.70 | 4.23\% | 19.55 | 20.35 | 4.09\% | 28.30 | 29.50 | 4.24\% |
| Whitchurch Close to Juniper Road | 9.4 | 23.30 | 24.10 | 3.43\% | 23.95 | 24.75 | 3.34\% | 34.90 | 36.10 | 3.44\% |
| Waiting Time |  | 30p per minute | 30p per minute |  | 30p per minute | 30p per minute |  | 45p per minute | 45p per minute |  |
| Pull-off Fee |  | 2.70 | 2.70 |  | 3.35 | 3.35 |  | 4.00 | 4.00 |  |
| Notes: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1) All journeys shown above are for basic hire. Costs sh <br> 2) All mileage taken from AA Route Planner. <br> 3) All figures subject to rounding. <br> 4) Costs given are calculated for comparison purposes | o not includ <br> practice, j | y extras e.g <br> eys marked | aiting time, ad <br> are subject to | onal passeng ply and dema | or telephone and separate | okings. <br> otes - typ | wer than th | given. |  |  |



WHAT MATTERS TO THE CUSTOMER / PUBLIC (in no particular order)
> Simple and easy to understand
$>$ Fare is reasonable and affordable ( $£$ )
$>$ Clear / Clarity of fares to be paid (in advance of journey)
$>$ Ease of calculation (both in advance and during journey)
$\Rightarrow$ Ease of calculation by taximeter
> Practicality of applicability
> Transparently and independently established
$>$ Easy to enforce / police
$>$ Offers sufficient incentive for trade to provide taxi services when needed

## WHAT MATTERS TO THE TAXI TRADE (in no particular order)

$>$ Fare reasonably covers the costs of service and provides reasonable driver income ( $£$ )
$\rightarrow$ Fares commensurate with level of anti-social hours worked / risk (e.g. working at night / during night time economy) (i.e. incentive to provide a service when needed)
$>$ Ease of calculation by taximeter
> Practicality of applicability
$>$ Practicality of payment method

## APPENDIX F

## POTENTIALLY RELEVANT SOCIO-ECONOMIC DATA \& INDICATORS

## RELATIVE AFFLUENCE OF AREA

## Types of housing in Rushmoor

A higher percentage of housing in Rushmoor is at the lower end of the property market. In 2016, $86.4 \%$ of properties were in Band D or below. This is a much higher percentage than Rushmoor's geographic neighbours.

| March 2016 | Rushmoor | Guildford | Waverley | Surrey <br> Heath | Hart |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Band A | $3.6 \%$ | $1.9 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ |
| Band B | $21.4 \%$ | $5.9 \%$ | $6.2 \%$ | $5.8 \%$ | $5.1 \%$ |
| Band C | $39.6 \%$ | $20.4 \%$ | $18.4 \%$ | $16.2 \%$ | $23.0 \%$ |
| Band D | $21.9 \%$ | $27.6 \%$ | $23.5 \%$ | $26.8 \%$ | $22.6 \%$ |
| Band E | $9.7 \%$ | $17.2 \%$ | $17.7 \%$ | $18.5 \%$ | $19.9 \%$ |
| Band F | $3.0 \%$ | $11.2 \%$ | $12.9 \%$ | $15.8 \%$ | $17.4 \%$ |
| Band G | $0.8 \%$ | $12.8 \%$ | $15.6 \%$ | $13.9 \%$ | $9.6 \%$ |
| Band H | $0.1 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ | $3.9 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ |
| \% band D or <br> below | $\mathbf{8 6 . 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 . 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 . 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 . 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 2 . 5 \%}$ |

(Source: Valuation Office Agency)

## NUMBER OF PEOPLE ON BENEFITS / CLAIMANT COUNT

Rushmoor has a higher percentage of residents claiming benefit principally for the reason of being unemployed and claiming main out-of-work benefits than residents in its geographical neighbours.

Claimant Count - Claimant Count is the number of people claiming benefit principally for the reason of being unemployed.

| March 2017 | Rushmoor | Guildford | Waverley | Surrey <br> Heath | Hart |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% of those <br> aged 16-64 <br> in area | $1.0 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ |

(Source: NOMIS - Office for National Statistics)
Working-age client group - Main out-of-work benefits - benefits includes the groups: job seekers, ESA and incapacity benefits, lone parents and others on income related benefits.

| August <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | Rushmoor | Guildford | Waverley | Surrey <br> Heath | Hart |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% of those <br> aged 16-64 <br> in area | $6.0 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ | $4.3 \%$ | $3.9 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ |

(Source: NOMIS - Office for National Statistics)

## (UN)EMPLOYMENT RATES

Rushmoor has the second highest percentage of residents who are unemployed.

| Jan 2016 - Dec <br> 2016 | Rushmoor | Guildford | Waverley | Surrey <br> Heath | Hart |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Economically active <br> (\% of those ages 16-64 <br> in area) | $85.0 \%$ | $77.7 \%$ | $84.3 \%$ | $84.2 \%$ | $85.2 \%$ |
| In employment <br> \% of those ages 16-64 <br> in area) | $81.8 \%$ | $72.8 \%$ | $82.4 \%$ | $80.6 \%$ | $83.3 \%$ |
| Unemployed <br> (\% of those economically <br> active) | $3.2 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ |

(Source: NOMIS - Office for National Statistics)

## \% POPULATION IN RELATIVE DEPRIVATION

Rushmoor has higher deprivation score (as defined by the national Indices of Multiple Deprivation), and a higher percentage of children living in low income families than in the areas around Rushmoor. Also, Rushmoor has a much lower percentage of households not deprived in any dimension from the 2011 Census, compared to its geographical neighbours.

## Indices of Multiple Deprivation

| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | Rushmoor | Guildford | Waverley | Surrey <br> Heath | Hart |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Deprivation score <br> (IMD 2015) | 15.1 | 9.4 | 7.1 | 7.7 | 5.0 |

(Source: Public Health England - 2016 Area Health Profile)
Child poverty

| 2013 | Rushmoor | Guildford | Waverley | Surrey <br> Heath | Hart |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% children (under <br> 16) in low income <br> families | $11.8 \%$ | $9.9 \%$ | $7.2 \%$ | $8.3 \%$ | $6.1 \%$ |

(Source: Public Health England - 2016 Area Health Profile)

## Deprivation dimensions data from the 2011 Census

The 2011 Census has calculated the number of households in a given area with selected household characteristics that are related to deprivation, these are called dimensions. The deprivation dimensions used by the Census are -

- Employment - if any member of a household, not a full-time student, is either unemployed or long-term sick.
- Education - if no person in the household has at least level 2 education ( $5+$ GCSE or equivalent), and no person aged $16-18$ is a full-time student.
- Health and disability - if any person in the household has general health categorised as 'bad or very bad' or has a long term health problem.
- Housing - if the household's accommodation is either overcrowded, with an occupancy rating -1 or less (this means one less room than needed based on a standard formula), or is in a shared dwelling, or has no central heating.

|  | Rushmoor <br> $\%$ | Guildford <br> $\%$ | Waverley <br> $\%$ | Surrey <br> Heath \% | Hart \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Household is not deprived <br> in any dimension | 47.5 | 54.9 | 56.6 | 56.2 | 58.7 |
| Household is deprived <br> in 1 dimension | 32.7 | 30.0 | 29.2 | 29.8 | 29.0 |
| Household is deprived <br> in 2 dimensions | 15.5 | 12.4 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 10.7 |
| Household is deprived <br> in 3 dimensions | 3.9 | 2.5 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 1.5 |
| Household is deprived <br> in 4 dimensions | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 |

(Source: Office for National Statistics)

## INCOME / DISPOSABLE INCOME LEVELS

Rushmoor residents earn over $£ 100$ less a week than residents in its geographical neighbours. Those who work in Rushmoor also earn less than if they worked in Guildford, Waverley and Hart.

Gross weekly pay of those who live in Rushmoor and those who work in Rushmoor

| 2016 all full time workers | Rushmoor | Guildford | Waverley | Surrey Heath | Hart |  | South East | Great Britain |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Earnings by residence | $£ 548.60$ | $£ 662.60$ | $£ 775.60$ | £671.10 | £655.60 | £277.50 | £582.00 | $£ 541.00$ |
| Earnings by workplace | £559.20 | £643.90 | £574.30 | £538.10 | £617.80 | £277.50 | £566.00 | £540.20 |

(Source: NOMIS - Office for National Statistics)
Average annual income levels

| 2016 all full time workers | Rushmoor | Guildford | Waverley | Surrey <br> Heath | Hart |  | South East | Great Britain |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Earnings by residence | £28,527 | £34,455 | £40,331 | £34,897 | £34,091 | £14,430 | £30,264 | £28,132 |

(Source: NOMIS - Office for National Statistics)

## MODE OF TRAVEL CHOICE

In 2011, Rushmoor residents mainly travelled to work by car or van (47.6\%). In total 166 people ( $0.2 \%$ ) travelled to work by taxi, this was the highest number and percentage of the population aged 16-74, compared to Rushmoor's geographical neighbours.

Method of Travel to Work - Resident Population, 2011

| \% of population aged 16-74 | Rushmoor | Guildford | Waverley | Surrey <br> Heath | Hart |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Work mainly at or from home | $2.8 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ | $7.0 \%$ | $5.5 \%$ | $6.0 \%$ |
| Underground, metro, light rail, tram | $0.1 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ |
| Train | $5.0 \%$ | $7.8 \%$ | $7.8 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ | $5.2 \%$ |
| Bus, minibus or coach | $3.0 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ |
| Taxi (people) | $0.2 \%(166)$ | $0.1 \%(152)$ | $0.1 \%(88)$ | $0.1 \%(71)$ | $0.1 \%(84)$ |
| Motorcycle, scooter or moped | $0.6 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ |
| Driving a car or van | $47.6 \%$ | $39.3 \%$ | $41.8 \%$ | $50.1 \%$ | $50.2 \%$ |
| Passenger in a car or van | $3.9 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ | $2.6 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ |
| Bicycle | $2.1 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ |
| On foot | $7.4 \%$ | $8.2 \%$ | $6.4 \%$ | $5.2 \%$ | $5.4 \%$ |
| Other method of travel to work | $0.6 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ |
| Not in employment | $26.7 \%$ | $31.4 \%$ | $30.9 \%$ | $28.1 \%$ | $27.3 \%$ |

(Source: Office for National Statistics)

## \% CAR OWNERSHIP

In 2011, Rushmoor residents had the lowest level of car ownership, compared to our geographical neighbours.

2011 Car ownership

| $\%$ of households | Rushmoor | Guildford | Waverley | Surrey <br> Heath | Hart |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No car or van | $16.6 \%$ | $13.9 \%$ | $11.9 \%$ | $10.0 \%$ | $8.0 \%$ |
| 1 car or van | $43.0 \%$ | $40.0 \%$ | $38.1 \%$ | $34.5 \%$ | $34.7 \%$ |
| 2 cars or vans | $31.2 \%$ | $33.9 \%$ | $36.3 \%$ | $39.9 \%$ | $42.1 \%$ |
| 3 cars or vans | $6.8 \%$ | $8.6 \%$ | $9.7 \%$ | $11.0 \%$ | $10.7 \%$ |
| 4 or more cars or vans | $2.4 \%$ | $3.6 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ | $4.6 \%$ | $4.5 \%$ |

(Source: Office for National Statistics)

## NET INWARD / OUTWARD MIGRATION

The following table demonstrates that in 2011 more people commuted out of Rushmoor than commuted into Rushmoor. More Rushmoor residents commuted into Surrey Heath than to anywhere else.

|  | Where people LIVING IN Rushmoor go to work | Where people WORKING IN Rushmoor live |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rushmoor | 16,367 people living and working in the Borough |  |
|  | 4,565 home workers |  |
|  | 4,131 workers with no fixed workplace |  |
| Hart | 3,238 | 4,675 |
| Surrey Health | 4,693 | 2,806 |
| Guildford | 3,579 | 2,656 |
| Waverley | 2,703 | 2,174 |
| Bracknell Forest | 1,158 | 1,072 |
| Woking | 1,013 | 625 |
| Basingstoke and Deane | 931 | 1,213 |
| East Hampshire | 636 | 1,236 |
|  | Total commuting OUT of Rushmoor - 26,208 | Total commuting $\mathbf{I N}$ to Rushmoor - 25,058 |

(Source: 2011 Census http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/HTMLDocs/dvc193/)
OLDER POPULATION
Rushmoor has a lower number and lower percentage of state pensioners than in the surrounding areas.

| State Pension caseload <br> - August 2016 | Rushmoor | Guildford | Waverley | Surrey <br> Heath | Hart |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | 13247 | 24283 | 26771 | 16849 | 18277 |
| Percentage of population | $13.9 \%$ | $16.6 \%$ | $21.7 \%$ | $19.1 \%$ | $19.5 \%$ |

(Source: DWP Stat-Xplore)

## ILL HEALTH

The 2011 census indicated that a higher percentage of Rushmoor residents indicated that they were in bad or very bad health, compared to the residents in the surrounding local authorities.

| General Health <br> 2011 census | Rushmoor | Guildford | Waverley | Surrey <br> Heath | Hart |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% of the population <br> indicating that they are in <br> bad health <br> or very bad health | $3.6 \%$ | $3.2 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $3.2 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ |

(Source: Office for National Statistics)

## APPENDIX G

## EXCERPT FROM DFT TAXI AND PRIVATE HIRE VEHICLE LICENSING BEST PRACTICE GUIDANCE TO LICENSING AUTHORITIES (March 2010)

## TAXI FARES

52. Local licensing authorities have the power to set taxi fares for journeys within their area, and most do so. (There is no power to set PHV fares.) Fare scales should be designed with a view to practicality. The Department sees it as good practice to review the fare scales at regular intervals, including any graduation of the fare scale by time of day or day of the week. Authorities may wish to consider adopting a simple formula for deciding on fare revisions as this will increase understanding and improve the transparency of the process. The Department also suggests that in reviewing fares authorities should pay particular regard to the needs of the travelling public, with reference both to what it is reasonable to expect people to pay but also to the need to give taxi drivers sufficient incentive to provide a service when it is needed. There may well be a case for higher fares at times of higher demand.
53. Taxi fares are a maximum, and in principle are open to downward negotiation between passenger and driver. It is not good practice to encourage such negotiations at ranks, or for on-street hailings; there would be risks of confusion and security problems. But local licensing authorities can usefully make it clear that published fares are a maximum, especially in the context of telephone bookings, where the customer benefits from competition. There is more likely to be a choice of taxi operators for telephone bookings, and there is scope for differentiation of services to the customer's advantage (for example, lower fares off-peak or for pensioners).
54. There is a case for allowing any taxi operators who wish to do so to make it clear - perhaps by advertising on the vehicle - that they charge less than the maximum fare; publicity such as ' $5 \%$ below the metered fare' might be an example.

[^0]:    COMPLAINTS AND COMMENTS - Where possible please quote the Cab / Driver Number
    Please contact the Head of Environmental Health \& Housing at Rushmoor Borough Council, Council Offices, Farnborough Road, Farnborough, Hampshire, GU14 7JU. Tel: 01252398399 • Fax: 01252524017 ■ Email: licensing@rushmoor.gov.uk

