

# Licensing Committee

Grand Jury Room, Town Hall  
30 January 2013 at 6.00pm

The Licensing Committee deals with policy issues relating to licensing matters and applications and appeals concerning hackney carriage and private hire vehicles and drivers and other appeals.

# Information for Members of the Public

## Access to information and meetings

You have the right to attend all meetings of the Council, its Committees and Cabinet. You also have the right to see the agenda, which is usually published 5 working days before the meeting, and minutes once they are published. Dates of the meetings are available at [www.colchester.gov.uk](http://www.colchester.gov.uk) or from Democratic Services.

## Have Your Say!

The Council values contributions from members of the public. Under the Council's Have Your Say! policy you can ask questions or express a view to meetings, with the exception of Standards Committee meetings. If you wish to speak at a meeting or wish to find out more, please pick up the leaflet called "Have Your Say" at Council offices and at [www.colchester.gov.uk](http://www.colchester.gov.uk)

## Private Sessions

Occasionally meetings will need to discuss issues in private. This can only happen on a limited range of issues, which are set by law. When a committee does so, you will be asked to leave the meeting.

## Mobile phones, pagers, cameras, audio recorders

Please ensure that all mobile phones and pagers are turned off before the meeting begins and note that photography or audio recording is not permitted.

## Access

There is wheelchair access to the Town Hall from St Runwald Street. There is an induction loop in all the meeting rooms. If you need help with reading or understanding this document please take it to Angel Court Council offices, High Street, Colchester or telephone (01206) 282222 or textphone 18001 followed by the full number that you wish to call and we will try to provide a reading service, translation or other formats you may need.

## Facilities

Toilets with lift access, if required, are located on each floor of the Town Hall. A vending machine selling hot and cold drinks is located on the first floor and ground floor.

## Evacuation Procedures

Evacuate the building using the nearest available exit. Make your way to the assembly area in the car park in St Runwald Street behind the Town Hall. Do not re-enter the building until the Town Hall staff advise you that it is safe to do so.

Colchester Borough Council, Angel Court, High Street, Colchester  
telephone (01206) 282222 or textphone 18001 followed by the full number you wish  
to call

e-mail: [democratic.services@colchester.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@colchester.gov.uk)

[www.colchester.gov.uk](http://www.colchester.gov.uk)

**COLCHESTER BOROUGH COUNCIL  
LICENSING COMMITTEE  
30 January 2013 at 6:00pm**

**Members**

Chairman : Councillor Nick Cope.  
Deputy Chairman : Councillor Julia Havis.  
Councillors Mary Blandon, Margaret Fairley-Crowe,  
Dave Harris, Pauline Hazell, Mike Hogg, Brian Jarvis,  
Margaret Kimberley, Michael Lilley and Colin Mudie.

**Substitute Members** :

**Agenda - Part A**  
(open to the public including the media)

Members of the public may wish to note that Agenda items 1 to 5 are normally brief.

**Pages**

**1. Welcome and Announcements**

(a) The Chairman to welcome members of the public and Councillors and to remind all speakers of the requirement for microphones to be used at all times.

(b) At the Chairman's discretion, to announce information on:

- action in the event of an emergency;
- mobile phones switched off or to silent;
- location of toilets;
- introduction of members of the meeting.

**2. Substitutions**

Members may arrange for a substitute councillor to attend a meeting on their behalf, subject to prior notice being given. The attendance of substitute councillors must be recorded.

**3. Urgent Items**

To announce any items not on the agenda which the Chairman has agreed to consider because they are urgent and to give reasons for the urgency.

**4. Have Your Say!**

(a) The Chairman to invite members of the public to indicate if they wish to speak or present a petition at this meeting – either on an item

on the agenda or on a general matter not on this agenda. You should indicate your wish to speak at this point if your name has not been noted by Council staff.

(b) The Chairman to invite contributions from members of the public who wish to Have Your Say! on a general matter not on this agenda.

## **5. Declarations of Interest**

The Chairman to invite Councillors to declare individually any interests they may have in the items on the agenda. Councillors should consult Meetings General Procedure Rule 7 for full guidance on the registration and declaration of interests. However Councillors may wish to note the following:-

- Where a Councillor has a disclosable pecuniary interest, other pecuniary interest or a non-pecuniary interest in any business of the authority and he/she is present at a meeting of the authority at which the business is considered, the Councillor must disclose to that meeting the existence and nature of that interest, whether or not such interest is registered on his/her register of Interests or if he/she has made a pending notification.
- If a Councillor has a disclosable pecuniary interest in a matter being considered at a meeting, he/she must not participate in any discussion or vote on the matter at the meeting. The Councillor must withdraw from the room where the meeting is being held unless he/she has received a dispensation from the Monitoring Officer.
- Where a Councillor has another pecuniary interest in a matter being considered at a meeting and where the interest is one which a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would reasonably regard as so significant that it is likely to prejudice the Councillor's judgment of the public interest, the Councillor must disclose the existence and nature of the interest and withdraw from the room where the meeting is being held unless he/she has received a dispensation from the Monitoring Officer.
- Failure to comply with the arrangements regarding disclosable pecuniary interests without reasonable excuse is a criminal offence, with a penalty of up to £5,000 and disqualification from office for up to 5 years.

## **6. Minutes**

**1 - 2**

To confirm as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 27 November 2012.

## **7. Hackney Carriage // Survey of Unmet Demand**

**3 - 74**

See report by the Head of Environmental & Protective Services.

## **8. Exclusion of the public**

In accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 and in accordance with The Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2000 (as amended) to exclude the public, including the press, from the meeting so that any items containing exempt information (for example confidential personal, financial or legal advice), in Part B of this agenda (printed on yellow paper) can be decided. (Exempt information is defined in Section 100I and Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972).



# LICENSING COMMITTEE

## 27 NOVEMBER 2012

*Present:* - Councillors Nick Cope, Mary Blandon, Dave Harris, Julia Havis, Pauline Hazell, Margaret Kimberley, Michael Lilley and Colin Mudie

### **13. Minutes**

The minutes of the meetings held on 8 August and 24 September 2012 were confirmed as a correct record.

### **14. Scheme of Delegation // Hypnotism**

The Committee considered a report on an amendment to the Scheme of Delegation to Officers from the Licensing Committee to the Head of Environmental and Protective Services to bring into effect the obligations placed upon the Council under the Hypnotism Act 1952.

The Hypnotism Act 1952 empowered Licensing Authorities, for public entertainments under the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982, to attach conditions to a public entertainment licence regulating or prohibiting the giving of an exhibition, demonstration or performance of hypnotism on any person at the place for which the public entertainment licence had been granted. Following the introduction of the Licensing Act 2003 it was no longer possible for the Licensing Authority to impose blanket conditions to regulate the performance of hypnotism. The Home Office issued guidance concerning this which stated that no exhibition, demonstration or performance of hypnotism shall be given on any person at the licensed premises or under the provisions of a temporary event notice except the written consent of the licensing authority and in accordance with any conditions attached to the consent.

The report outlined the application process and the conditions that would be applied to the grant of any licence. If no objections were received in respect of an application the licence would be granted but if objections were received the matter would be referred to the Licensing Committee for determination. This practice was in line with other licensing processes.

RESOLVED that the scheme of delegation from the Licensing Committee to the Head of Environmental and Protective Services be amended to include the granting of authorisation for the exhibition, demonstration or performance of hypnotism where no objections are received. In the event that objections are received the matter to be brought before the Committee for determination.

### **15. Statement of Gambling Policy // Review**

The Head of Environmental and Protective Services presented a report on the re-publication of the Statement of Gambling Policy. The Licensing Authority was required under the terms of the Gambling Act 2005 to republish its Statement of Gambling Policy every three years, the next publication being due by 31 January 2013. It was intended

to fully review the Policy in the near future and therefore only minor changes had been made to the introduction of the policy to update the statistics. A full review of the Policy and full consultation on any proposed changes would be carried out towards the middle of 2013 when the outcome of changes being considered by the Government would be known.

RESOLVED that the minor changes to the Gambling Policy be approved and the Statement of Gambling Policy be re-advertised by 31 January 2013.

## **16. Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licence Policy and Conditions**

The Committee considered a report by the Head of Environmental and Protective Services on a proposed new policy and revised conditions and scheme of penalty points for Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Vehicles, Operators and Drivers. The current conditions had been in place for some time and needed to be updated to bring them into line with developments in legislation, case law and technology.

It was acknowledged that the government was looking at a major overhaul of Hackney Carriage and Private Hire licensing but this was likely to be at least two years away and it was considered necessary to proceed with the changes set out in the appendix to the report. Many of the changes were likely to be consistent with the Government proposals and other changes were necessary to ensure that the Council's licensing regime did not contravene legislation such as the convention on the rights of the individual.

Mr McAuley, Chairman of the Hackney Carriage Association attended the meeting and in response to a question from the Chairman commented that he was broadly happy with the proposals albeit this was based on limited information as conveyed at the meeting and not on a full reading of the policy.

RESOLVED that the Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licence Policy and Conditions be approved for consultation purposes and that the outcome of the consultation exercise be reported to the Committee in January 2013.





## Licensing Committee

Item  
**7**

30 January 2013

Report of	Head of Environmental & Protective Services	Author	Gary O'Shea ☎ 282213
Title	Hackney Carriage – Survey of Unmet Demand		
Wards affected	Not applicable		

**The purpose of this report is to deliver the findings of the recently undertaken Survey of unmet demand with regard to the provision of Hackney Carriage Services in the Borough and to seek resolution to implement the findings therein**

### 1. Decision Required

- 1.1 Members are asked to note the results of the Unmet Demand Survey Report undertaken by CTS Traffic and Transportation and to determine whether or not to continue to restrict in line with the recommendations of that report.
- 1.2 The options available are:
  - a) Resolve to implement recommendation 2 put forward by CTS Traffic and Transport as highlighted in paragraph 5.4 of this report
  - b) Resolve to adopt (with reasons) one of the other three options as highlighted in the report put forward by CTS

### 2. Reasons for recommendation

- 2.1 Colchester currently restricts the number of Hackney Carriage vehicles that are permitted to be licensed within the Borough. The current limit is set at 131.
- 2.2 Where the Borough Council continues to restrict Hackney carriage numbers, the Council must undertake a survey of unmet demand every three years in order to provide justification for continued restriction of numbers. This report delivers the results of the latest survey and seeks members' approval to resolve under option a) (above).

### 3. Highlighted Risks

- 3.1 Failure to conduct the three yearly survey of unmet demand whilst numbers remain limited could leave the policy on continuing to limit numbers open to challenge by means of Judicial Review.

### 4. Supporting and Background Information

- 4.1 Section 37 Town Police Clauses Act 1847, as amended by section 16 Transport Act 1985 enables Councils to License Hackney Carriage vehicles and to restrict the number of vehicles it licenses provided they are satisfied that there is no significant unmet demand for these services.

4.2 Following a successful tendering process, CTS Traffic and Transportation were selected on 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2012 as the consultants to conduct the survey on behalf of Colchester Borough Council. The consultants report and recommendations are attached to this report at appendix A.

## **5. Survey of Unmet Demand**

5.1 The Survey was carried out from 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2012 until 16 January 2013, with the main survey work being undertaken in November 2012.

5.2 Generally the survey report states that there is no evidence of significant unmet demand for the services of Hackney Carriages in Colchester Borough area. The retention of the current levels would maintain the balance to the benefit of the travelling public.

5.3 The available options considered by CTS as a result of the survey undertaken were:

- 1) to affirm the current policy on limitation of Hackney Carriage numbers and make no other changes
- 2) to retain the current policy on limitation of Hackney carriage numbers and to take other actions to ensure that passenger demand continues to be met effectively
- 3) to remove the limit on Hackney Carriage numbers and make no other changes
- 4) to remove the limit on Hackney Carriage numbers and attempt to restrict the negative impacts of this change by requiring all new vehicles to be wheelchair accessible

5.4 The preferred option of CTS and therefore the recommendation of this report is option 2. In choosing option b, CTS states:

*“This would encourage public benefit from the retention of the current limited vehicle policy which might not occur with option 1. The focus would need to be on maintaining the current M&S rank, signing Head Street more effectively and encouraging its use and ensuring a third rank to replace the lost (and used) bus station facility was identified and encouraged into use.”*

5.5 The Licensing authority assuming adoption of option 2 will work with the trade and relevant authorities to achieve the continued effectiveness in meeting passenger demand and safety

## **6. Consultation**

6.1 Consultation was widely conducted and is outlined in the report submitted by CTS.

## **7. Equality, Diversity and Human Rights Implications**

7.1 There are no specific implications that have not been fully considered as part of the unmet demand survey.

## **8. Community Safety Implications**

8.1 The survey is aimed at protection of the travelling public by means of ensuring that there are sufficient numbers of licensed vehicles.

8.2 More widely the limitation on numbers in conjunction with perceived demand and the availability of rank space will ensure that the balance is maintained and that there are no safety implications from congestion caused by queuing for ranks for example.

## **9. Conclusion**

9.1 The survey as attached and presented by Ian Millership from CTS has been full and thorough and having considered all relevant aspects in relation to demand, members are respectfully requested to implement its findings



**cts**

TRAFFIC + TRANSPORTATION

THE DATA COLLECTION SPECIALISTS

Colchester Borough  
Council

Hackney Carriage Unmet  
Demand Survey 2012

January 2013





# Contents

<b>Executive summary .....</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Background to taxi licensing in Colchester .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3. Results from rank surveys .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>4. Public Consultation results .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>5. Stakeholder Consultation.....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>6. Licensed Vehicle Trade Consultation.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>7. Responses to DfT Best Practice Guidance 2010 .....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>8. The Equality Act 2010 .....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>9. Summary and conclusions .....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>10. Recommendations .....</b>	<b>47</b>

CTS Traffic & Transportation Ltd.  
Unit 14 Aqueduct Mill, Aqueduct Street, Preston, PR1 7JN  
Tel: (01772) 251 400 Fax: (01772) 252 900  
E-mail: [enquiries@ctstraffic.co.uk](mailto:enquiries@ctstraffic.co.uk) Web-site: [www.ctstraffic.co.uk](http://www.ctstraffic.co.uk)



## **Data Quality Assurance:**

Report by: Ian Millership

Date: 16/01/13

Checked by: Joe Maclaren

Date: 16/01/13





## **Executive summary**

CTS Traffic & Transportation were appointed by the Colchester Borough Council to undertake an unmet demand survey during 2012. The study included:

- Public and stakeholder consultation between November 2012 and January 2013
- Rank surveys in November 2012
- Trade consultation in December 2012

At present, no person can obtain a hackney carriage vehicle license to operate in the Colchester area. At the time of starting the study, there were 131 hackney carriages in the fleet. This fleet is supplemented by 468 private hire vehicles, meaning 22% of the licensed vehicle fleet in the area are hackney carriage. Current provision compared to population is 3.4 licensed vehicles per thousand of population, with the hackney carriage ratio at 0.7, a fair level, although below average for those authorities to which we have compared values (although overall licensed vehicle is much higher than the average of the comparison).

At the time of the survey, 25% of the hackney carriage fleet was wheelchair accessible (DfT formal statistics, 2011), a very reasonable proportion.

There are two main ranks in the area. The main Council operated rank is in High Street and sees around 36% of demand, operating all days and hours and serving shopping and night life demand. The busiest rank is the private rank at Colchester North station which sees some 60% of passenger demand. This rank is subject to payment of a further fee, and just 90 of the fleet are able to serve this location with a limit on the number of permits.

The bus station rank saw some use until it was closed just after our survey. Head Street rank may be developing slowly, but Queen Street night rank is not used to any significant extent. Demand appears to have increased since the last survey although overall usage of licensed vehicles by the public tends to be low.

Discussion with members of the public identified just 34% had used a licensed vehicle in Colchester in the last three months. Some 0.6 licensed vehicle trips were made per month by those we talked to. 72% obtained their licensed vehicle by phone, with few other methods (smart or free phones) used. Rank usage was 23% and hail quite high at 3%.

Few either needed or were aware of people needing adapted vehicles, although those that did say they needed them strongly preferred wheel chair accessible styles.

Latent demand was 1.07 and there was acknowledgment of some longer waits for vehicles at specific times, but none were significant in context.

Our stakeholder consultation found that supermarkets and hotels mainly used the services of private hire companies. The hospital was also served well by a free-phone arrangement. Clubs were generally well provided for by nearby ranks (albeit one club encouraged people to book to avoid closing time queues). There is no issue with over-ranking.

Little response was forthcoming from the disability sector, with just one comment regarding an awkward issue from two years ago.

Hackney carriage consultees told us:

- they feel the impact of the 16 extra plates are still being felt
- there is no need for more vehicles at this time
- they do not want any reduction in the size of the High Street rank
- they are concerned about the visibility of other ranks to the public.

Key conclusions are:

- no evidence of any significant unmet demand
- a need to keep the High Street rank at its current size
- need to encourage more use of the Head Street rank by signing

Four options are technically available to the Colchester Borough councillors

- Option 1 – reaffirm current policies and make no other changes
- Option 2 – retain the current limit and take other actions to develop the hackney carriage trade
- Option 3 – remove the limit on hackney carriage numbers and make no other change
- Option 4 – remove the limit but attempt to restrict the negative impacts of this change by requiring new vehicles to be wheel chair accessible and with other quality improvements

The technical recommendation is for Option 2 to be taken forward.

Other actions are listed in the detail in the recommendations chapter.

# 1. Introduction

Colchester Borough Council is responsible for the licensing of hackney carriage and private hire vehicles operating within the Council area. The licensing authority has a limit on the number of hackney carriage vehicle licences since at least 1989 (according to the detailed 2005 DfT survey information). Regular reviews of policy have occurred since that time, with previous surveys undertaken in 2008 and 2005.

## **Study timetable**

Colchester appointed CTS Traffic and Transportation on 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2012 to undertake this "hackney carriage unmet demand survey" in line with our quotation dated July 2012.

The review was carried out between 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2012 and 16<sup>th</sup> January 2013, with survey work undertaken in November 2012. A licensed vehicle driver consultation was held in December 2012, with other stakeholder consultation during December 2012 and January 2013. A draft final report was submitted and this was reviewed on 15<sup>th</sup> January 2013 to identify any factual or missing issues. The Final Report will be presented to the Licensing Committee on 30<sup>th</sup> January 2013.

## **National background and definitions**

At the present time, hackney carriage and private hire licensing is carried out under the Town Police Clauses Act 1847 (as amended by various further legislation including the Transport Act 1985, especially Section 16) in regard to hackney carriages and the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 with reference to private hire vehicles. A number of modifications have been made within more recent legislation and through case law.

The issue of limits on hackney carriage vehicle licences (and other potentially restrictive practices) were considered by the Office of Fair Trading (OfT) (and latterly the House of Commons Select Committee on Transport). The Department for Transport most recently published Best Practise Guidance in April 2010 to cover a number of more recent issues and take on board both the recommendations of the OfT and House of Commons Select Committee (HoC SC). More recently a further HoC SC has led to the Law Commission (LC) taking on a wide ranging review of vehicle licensing law to be completed over the next few years. The consultation is now complete and results are expected from the LC towards the end of 2013.

At the present time, each licensing authority in England supervises the operation of two different kinds of licensed vehicle. Firstly, all vehicles able to carry nine or more passengers are dealt with under public service vehicle licensing and licensing authorities only have jurisdiction over those carrying eight or less passengers. These vehicles are further subdivided into:

- Hackney carriage vehicles (sometimes referred to as 'taxis' in legislation), which alone are able to wait at ranks and pick up people in the street (ply for hire). To operate such a vehicle also requires a driver to be licensed to drive within the area the vehicle is licensed to operate
- Private hire vehicles, which can only be booked through an operating centre and who otherwise are not insured for their passengers (often also known as 'taxis' by the public). To operate such a vehicle requires a vehicle and driver licence, and there must also be an affiliation to an operator. Such vehicles can only transport passengers who have made bookings via this operator.

For the sake of clarity, this report will refer to 'licensed vehicles' when meaning hackney carriage and private hire collectively, and to the specific type when referencing either specific type of vehicle. The term 'taxi' will be avoided as far as possible, although it has to be used in its colloquial form when dealing with the public, few of whom are aware of the detailed differences.

### **Review aims and objectives**

Colchester is seeking a review of their current policy towards hackney carriage quantity control in line with current Department for Transport (DfT) Best Practice guidance as published in April 2010. Further background information about previous policy is contained in Chapter 2 to set the context of the current situation.

The "Best Practice Guidance" paragraph 47 states: "Most licensing authorities do not impose quantity restrictions, the Department regards that as best practice. Where restrictions are imposed, the Department would urge that the matter should be regularly reconsidered..." Recent information suggests that some 75% of licensing authorities in England and Wales either have never limited numbers, or have removed their limit since the OfT published its results. Around 90 authorities currently retain a limit – although a small number have over recent years returned the limit on vehicle licences (notably including Sheffield and Birmingham, but also including Slough, Derbyshire Dales, Wirral, Watford and Chesterfield).

Colchester requires this review to make recommendations on what policy the Council should retain or adopt, considering the whole range of policy options open to the Council. This review report must contain reasoned, recommended policy options for the Committee to consider.

## **Report structure**

This Report provides the following further chapters:

- Chapter 2 – current background to taxi licensing statistics and policy
- Chapter 3 – results from the rank surveys
- Chapter 4 – results from the surveys undertaken with the public
- Chapter 5 – up to date stakeholder consultation
- Chapter 6 – results from consultation with the taxi licensing trade
- Chapter 7 – consideration of the responses to BPG paragraph 47 and Annex A questions
- Chapter 8 – a review of options relating to the Equality Act
- Chapter 9 – summary and conclusions of this review
- Chapter 10 – recommendations for policy arising from this review.



## **2. Background to taxi licensing in Colchester**

### **The Colchester Borough Council area**

Colchester is one of twelve district councils within the county of Essex. Taking the 2011 census result and factoring it to 2012 using the 2008 SNPP estimates, the 2012 population for Colchester is currently estimated at 176,000. Amongst the districts, Colchester is the largest in population terms together with Basildon.

The Borough area includes a small section of Thames estuary and quite a section of rural area, although there is no other large settlement within its boundaries.

### **Background Borough and County Council policy**

Colchester Borough Council has several background policies underpinning the various strategies for the Borough. The Core Strategy was adopted in December 2008 and is now being taken forward through the Colchester Local Development Framework and its Annual Monitoring Report. The Colchester Local Development Scheme 2011-2015 is constantly updated with progress. Policies include focuses on cycling and walking, travel planning, promotion of rail use and access to the stations in the Borough, reducing congestion and air pollution and development of the new bus station. The central area is covered by the Better Town Centre SPD.

Licensed vehicles are supported in these strategies as they are considered to form an essential element of the public transport system for the area.

The Colchester Station Travel Plan is also a key action item which includes ensuring adequate access for hackney carriage and private hire to take and bring people to and from Colchester's main line station.

### **Policy of restricting hackney carriage vehicle licences**

Colchester Borough Council has a power to restrict the number of hackney carriage vehicle licences it grants when it is satisfied there is no unmet demand for the services of hackney carriages which is deemed to be significant. This power has been in this format since the introduction of the 1985 Transport Act, Section 16 (before which the power to limit was unfettered).

The Department for Transport statistics (updated with 2012 information from the Borough and from National Private Hire Association sources) suggests that Colchester's limitation policy began in around 1989, following the introduction of the 1985 Transport Act. Since that time, surveys have been undertaken most recently in 2007/08 and reported in July 2008.



The rank observations, undertaken at three ranks, covered 123 hours and identified 4,434 passengers using 3,085 different hackney carriages. 53% of passenger departures were from the North railway station (private) rank and 44% from the High Street rank. The remaining surveys and passengers were observed at the bus station rank. During the surveys, 19 wheel chair users were observed.

No weekday daytime unmet demand was observed, which resulted in the ISUD index value for the study being set to zero.

40% of those interviewed had used a licensed vehicle in the last month. Of those, 72% had made a journey by private hire vehicle and the remaining 28% by hackney carriage. Cost of fares and car availability were the top two reasons people did not use licensed vehicles, or use them more.

These results are compared to the 2012 survey below.

### Background statistics

Information was obtained to demonstrate the current make-up of the licensed vehicle fleet in the Colchester Borough Council area, including current vehicle trends. The table below shows the historic level of vehicle numbers in this area.

	Hackney carriage vehicles	Private hire vehicles	Total licensed vehicle fleet	Driver numbers			Comment
				Hcd	phd	Dual	
DfT data states limit began in 1989							
<b>1994</b>	106	unknown	n/k	415			
<b>1997</b>	115	265	380	130	320		
<b>1999</b>	115	314	429				
<b>2001</b>	114	375	489				
<b>2004</b>	113	347	460				
<b>2005</b>	113	347	460	0	0	760	
<b>2007</b>	121	506	627	0	0	764	57 op
<b>2009</b>	130	506	636	0	0	764	57 op
<b>2010</b>	130	518	648				
<b>2011</b>	131 (24% WAV)	566 (4% WAV)	697	0	0	746	62 op
<b>2012</b>	131 (25% WAV)	468	599	0	0	800	90 op

*Note: DfT statistics suggested used from 1994 to 2007 and 2011.*

*National Private Hire Association survey for 2010, Council statistics at start of study for 2012 "op" means number of private hire operators reported by DfT*

The above figures show hackney carriages have grown by 14% since 1997 (24% since 1994). Main increase in plate numbers occurred between 2005 and 2009 when 16 more plates were issued. All these could not be sold on except in exceptional circumstances – and we understand a few have been (the five year period is due to expire shortly for several of these vehicles).

Private hire vehicles have increased by 75% during the 1997 to 2012 period, although they are currently marginally lower than the highest level of 697 reported for DfT in 2011. This means that the proportion of the fleet that is hackney carriage has fallen from 30% in 1997 to 22% now.

During the same period, driver numbers have almost doubled from around 450 to 800. In the same period the move was made to make all driver licences dual, ie any driver can driver either hackney carriage or private hire and there is no way of knowing easily which driver belongs to which part of the licensed vehicle fleet.

### **Comparative information**

The Table below compares recent licensed vehicle numbers for other Essex authorities plus Babergh and Ipswich (as requested by Colchester), using a mixture of DfT and information from Councils where studies have recently been undertaken. The table is listed with the lowest provision of hackney carriages (hcv) per thousand of population at the top of the table.

<b>Area</b>	<b>Popn (2008 est of 2012, 000)</b>	<b>No of HCV (% WAV)</b>	<b>HCV per 1000 popn</b>	<b>No of PHV (% WAV)</b>	<b>PHV per 1000 popn</b>	<b>Total veh</b>	<b>Total veh per 1000 popn</b>
<b>Babergh</b>	88	26 (23)	0.3	116 (14)	1.3	142	1.6
<b>Braintree (L)</b>	149	84 (17)	0.6	250 (13)	1.7	334	2.2
<b>Uttlesford</b>	80	54 (0)	0.7	755 (84)	9.4	809	10.1
<b>Colchester (L)</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>131 (25)</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>468 (?)</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>599</b>	<b>3.4</b>
<b>Harlow</b>	82	66 (100)	0.8	201 (0)	2.5	267	3.3
<b>Chelmsford</b>	170	174 (53)	1.0	119 (0)	0.7	293	1.7
<b>Maldon</b>	62	73 (0)	1.2	17 (0)	0.3	90	1.5
<b>Basildon</b>	176	221 (63)	1.3	316 (1)	1.8	537	3.1
<b>Ipswich</b>	135	170 (36)	1.3	316 (2)	2.3	486	3.6
<b>Castle Point</b>	88	131 (8)	1.5	75 (16)	0.9	206	2.3
<b>Tendring</b>	140	289 (6)	2.1	24 (4)	0.2	313	2.2
<b>Rochford</b>	84	215 (14)	2.6	43 (0)	0.5	258	3.1
<b>Epping Forest (L)</b>	125	378 (0)	3.0	25 (0)	0.2	403	3.2
<b>Brentwood</b>	74	232 (4)	3.1	34 (0)	0.5	266	3.6
<b>Average</b>		160	1.4	202	1.8		3.2

*Note: Population values are 2012 estimates from 2008 based projections, in thousands Hackney carriage vehicle (HCV) and private hire vehicle (PHV) numbers are from NPHA 2012 survey, apart from Colchester which was number at inception meeting. WAV = wheelchair accessible vehicle*

In 2012, Colchester, Braintree and Epping Forest restrict hackney carriage vehicle numbers within Essex according to sources. Levels of hackney carriages are 0.7 per thousand of population, locating Colchester fourth from lowest, and below the average for the areas compared. This proportion is shared by Uttlesford and is just slightly less than that for Harlow. Chelmsford has 1 hackney per thousand population and Ipswich 1.3

In terms of private hire vehicles and overall licensed vehicle fleet, Colchester is above the average of 3.2, and fourth from top in the list compared. Excluding Uttlesford, whose fleet is vastly expanded by operations at Stansted Airport, Colchester compares favourably to both Brentwood and Ipswich, both with 3.6 licensed vehicles per thousand of population.

### ***Vehicle Accessibility***

At present, the hackney carriage fleet is 25% wheel chair accessible. While this is lower than many other of the authorities compared, there are many authorities with much lower, or even zero values, and having a quarter of the fleet is reasonable. This level was helped in the recent past by the 16 additional plates having to be wheel chair accessible.

This could be an issue were Section 161 of the Equality Act to be implemented and Colchester retained a limit on hackney carriage vehicle numbers. This is considered further in Chapter 8.

### ***Driver ratios***

With 800 drivers and 599 vehicles in the licensed vehicle fleet, there is some suggestion of some potential for double shifting (1.33 drivers per vehicle), although the dual driver situation makes it hard to test on the separate fleets with any confidence.

### ***Fares***

Using the latest Private Hire and Taxi Monthly (January 2013), Colchester fares (currently £6-80 for a 2 mile tariff 1 fare) rank 6<sup>th</sup> equal highest of the 361 fares authorities in England, Scotland and Wales. Two other authorities share this fare level, Carrick and Caradon.

In terms of national fares, the highest fare at January 2013 was £7-30 and the lowest £2-80 for the 2 mile tariff 1. The national average fare is £5-50, some 24% lower than the current Colchester fare. Compared to the Essex average (plus Ipswich and Babergh), Colchester's fare level is 15% higher – being the most expensive fare in Essex for this measure. The average Essex (plus Ipswich and Babergh) fare is £5-92. Chelmsford, at £6-20, has the next nearest fare to Colchester. This fare level appears high.

### 3. Results from rank surveys

The Table below shows the result of our review of the ranks available in Colchester. At the time of the last survey, there were just two formal Council ranks plus the private rank at North railway station.

The Trade provided us with some background history to current rank provision. They told us that:

- The current High Street rank was increased in size by sacrificing two other High Street ranks at St Nicholas House and Barclays Bank to focus on the one location
- Ranks in Vineyard Street, Crouch Street and St John's Street (when Tesco had a store there), but all were given up as they were not used.

At the time of this survey, the three ranks above were still in place, although the bus station rank was about to close just after our survey work was undertaken. There are plans to reduce the 21-space High Street rank in size. A new rank was introduced in Head Street, but sees little use although there is some thought that people expect to find hackney carriages here. A night only rank exists in Queens Street which operates from 1800 to 0600 and is otherwise a loading facility. A new rank had been introduced on the refurbished south side of the North Station, but was little used.

Other than the locations listed below, we are not aware of any other ranks within the Colchester council area. There are no ranks at any of the other railway stations within the Council and licensing administrative area.

<b>Rank / operating hours</b>	<b>Spaces</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>24-hour ranks</b>		
High Street	21	Main central area rank, on one-way system
Head Street	3	New rank
Bus Station	2	Rank about to be removed for rebuilding of bus station area
<b>Night rank</b>		
Queen Street	2	1800 to 0600 only, otherwise loading bay
<b>Colchester station (private rank)</b>		
North Rail station	22	Private, administered by Greater Anglia

Surveys were proposed during the tender stage of the project (as informed by the previous survey and discussion with the licensing officer), and were modified at the inception meeting to take account of current expectation of times of use of ranks and informal rank locations. The net impact of the revision was to increase the included survey hours from a total of 110 to an increased total of 130 hours, but with a spread felt to more accurately record active locations. Some equipment issues occurred and the final hours observed totalled 128 hours.

The Table below shows the actual hours observed, using video methods with the recordings observed by trained staff, and analysed to provide details of the usage and waiting times for both passengers and vehicles. Passenger waiting time was kept to that which was true unmet demand, ie when passengers were waiting but no hackney carriage vehicle was there.

Location	Day / date (all 2012)	Time observed	Total hours observed
<b>24 hour ranks</b>			
High Street	Thursday 8 <sup>th</sup> November	1500-0400	14
	Friday 9 <sup>th</sup> November	0400-0700 next day	26
Head Street	Thursday 8 <sup>th</sup> November	1500-0400	14
	Friday 9 <sup>th</sup> November	0400-0600 next day	25
Bus Station	Friday 9 <sup>th</sup> November	0800-2200	14
<b>Night rank</b>			
Queen Street	Thursday 8 <sup>th</sup> November	2200-0600	8
	Friday 9 <sup>th</sup> November	2200-0400	6
<b>Private rank</b>			
Colchester North station	Friday 9 <sup>th</sup> November	0800-0500	21
<b>TOTAL HOURS</b>			<b>128</b>

Full details of the observed volumes of passenger and vehicle traffic are included in **Appendix 1**. The survey comprised some 128 hours of observation. There are no feeder ranks in the licensing area which were not observable directly from the cameras being used to watch the head of the rank.

The Table below summarises the time periods observed at each locations as well as providing overall operational statistics for each location during each period of observation. A detailed description of the observations follows below.

Rank	Period (2012)	Average passenger arrivals per hour that rank is active	Passengers per hackney carriage	Average wait time for passengers (sec)	Average vehicle arrivals per hour	No. of wheel chair passengers observed	% of hackney carriages leaving empty
High Street	Thursday 8 <sup>th</sup> November 1500-0400	16	1.7	0	11	0	17
	Friday 9 <sup>th</sup> November 0400-0700 next day	37	1.7	0	23	0	7
Head Street	Thursday 8 <sup>th</sup> November 1500-0400	3	1.5	0	3	0	33
	Friday 9 <sup>th</sup> November 0400-0600 next day	3	1.5	0	3	0	50
Bus Station	Friday 9 <sup>th</sup> November 0800-2200	2	1.3	0	5	0	70
Queen Street	Thursday 8 <sup>th</sup> November 2200-0600	1	1.5	0	1	0	n/a
	Friday 9 <sup>th</sup> November 2200-0400	3	3	0	3	0	n/a
North Station (private rank)	Friday 9 <sup>th</sup> November 0800-0500	37	1.2	15	31	0	4

### High Street rank

The High Street rank is the main Council hackney carriage rank facility in Colchester. It is located on the one-way High Street, just beyond the Council offices and outside Marks and Spencer. The rank is a double-banked site and is obvious within the High Street.

The rank was observed on Thursday 8<sup>th</sup> November from 15:00 to 04:00 and on Friday 9<sup>th</sup> from 04:00 continuing on to Saturday 10<sup>th</sup> November 2012 at 06:00. Some information was lost due to equipment issues in the first two hours, but the remaining data is robust and complete.

#### *Thursday operation*

During the Thursday, the rank saw around 16 passengers per hour with occupancy of loaded taxis being 1.7 persons. Just 17% of vehicles arriving at this location left without passengers. During the course of the day, no passengers ever had to wait for a hackney carriage to arrive. No wheel chair passengers were observed.

During the Thursday a total of 190 passengers were served at this location. Some 23% of these passengers were served in the hour from 02:00 to 03:00. The largest daytime passenger count was 15 in the 17:00 hour although observations did not begin fully until 17:00.

During the quieter periods, average vehicle waiting times for passengers were up to an hour, with a maximum wait of a hackney carriage for a passenger of over 104 minutes.

#### *Friday operation*

Whilst the rank was active on Friday, there was an average of 37 passengers per hour, over twice as busy as Thursday. Each taxi on average took 1.7 passengers (the same as Thursday). Very few, just 7% of vehicles left the location without a passenger. On average 23 vehicles per hour served this location. Friday saw no passengers wait for a hackney carriage to arrive.

During the Friday a total of 711 passengers used this rank. 16% used the rank in the 01:00 hour alone. The rank saw little use till around 11:00 after which flows remained similar until an evening dip between 19:00 and 22:00. After this, the rank became much busier, until becoming quiet after 04:00.

Vehicle waits for passengers were quite high for most of the day, worst in the quiet periods, with typical maximum waits being just over an hour in most hours. After 22:00 vehicles tended to wait less with maximum waits observed after 22:00 being 16 to 20 minutes with the higher demand.

Over both days, service observed at this location was **very good**.

#### **Head Street rank**

This rank is a recent introduction on the two-way route through the central area. Though some shops are nearby, it is more towards the edge of the main shopping area, though on the correct side of the road for pedestrian traffic

The rank was observed between 15:00 and 04:00 on Thursday 8<sup>th</sup> November 2012 and then from 0400 on Friday 9<sup>th</sup> November through to 06:00 the next day. Over the two day period, just 21 passengers were observed, in six different hours. On both days average occupancy was 1.5 persons per vehicle.

No passengers were observed to wait for vehicles to arrive, although very few vehicles sat waiting here for customers. The most consistently busy period for the rank was from 22:00 to 02:00 on the late Friday night, when 11 vehicles waited and ended up taking some 8 passengers away during the period. Daytime passengers were few and far between.

On the Thursday a third of vehicles waiting left empty whilst on the Friday this rose to 50% of vehicles.

Demand at this location overall is very low, although the rank is performing a useful function and may well develop further. Service here is **fair**

### **Bus station rank**

The bus station rank was due to close for the building of the new bus station from mid-November. At the time of our survey, the rank was still used and buses were still operating from the old bus station.

This rank was observed on Friday 9<sup>th</sup> November 2012 from 08:00 until 22:00. During the hours the rank was used, it saw on average just two passengers per hour, with an occupancy of 1.3 passengers per loaded departure. No passengers were observed to arrive when vehicles were not available. 70% of vehicles left the location without passengers, and the supply of vehicles to the location was on average 5 per hour.

Just nine passengers used this location during the hours observed, with the busiest hours being 14:00 and 16:00. Despite the low demand, maximum waits of vehicles for a fare did not exceed half an hour.

Overall, service to this location is **good**

### **Queen Street night rank**

This rank is a delivery bay during the day time, and is located on the one way route not far from the old bus station. It only operates as a rank from 18:00 to 06:00. Observations were undertaken on both Thursday 8<sup>th</sup> November and Friday 9<sup>th</sup> November, in both cases starting at 22:00. On the Thursday, four of the five vehicles using this location were identified as private hire vehicles. On the Friday, five of the six were private hire vehicles. Some passengers were seen at this location waiting for vehicles to arrive, suggesting this was the agreed point where those booking private hire had been asked to wait.

This rank is effectively unused.

### **Colchester North station rank**

The rank at Colchester station is operated by Greater Anglia. A supplementary fee is payable to use this location (£62,000 last year). There are 22 spaces marked on the 'down' (away from London) side, near what used to be the main station entrance and car park. The rank is designed with the feeder spaces adjacent. More recently, with the development of the station travel plan, the 'up' side entrance, nearer to the town centre, has been improved and a small rank exists there, although this is not yet seeing significant use. We were told by the trade that this rank is restricted to 90 permits, all members of the hackney carriage association with whom the permit fee is agreed.

Observations at this location were undertaken on Friday 9<sup>th</sup> November 2012, between 08:00 and 05:00 on the Saturday morning. The rank was then active for some 19 hours during which average passenger flows were 37 per hour – the same as High Street rank on the same day. Occupancy here, however was lower at just 1.2 passengers per vehicle.



Around 31 vehicles arrived to service this location per hour. Over the day, just 4% left empty. During the full day some 696 passengers used this rank.

Vehicles began to arrive towards the end of the 07:00 hour, with 08:00 seeing some 20 passengers depart. There was a peak of 47 passengers in the 09:00 hour after which flows were steady between 13 and 23 per hour. From 16:00 onwards, flows increased, with a peak of 73 in the 19:00 hour. Flows then dropped again with no passengers observed after 02:20.

Maximum vehicle waits for passengers were up to 70 minutes in some periods, although falling to under 20 minutes at peak times. Average waiting times tended to be between between 30 and 45 minutes for most hours.

At the end of the days' operation there was a mismatch of supply which meant that 26 people waited for hackney carriage to arrive at the end of the period observed. When averaged over the day, the delay to passengers was 15 seconds, although for those waiting the average wait was just under seven minutes. Although this is clearly unmet demand, it is not significant since the longest wait was 11 minutes, it occurred at the end of the day, and was at a private rank where a further limit on vehicle numbers applies that is not under the jurisdiction of the Council to influence. It is also likely that the issue was caused by the arrival of the last train.

Overall service at this location is **good**

An automatic traffic counter was used near the rank to identify the pattern of demand over a longer period. Whilst the tube was not able to correctly record all movements (due to the slow speed vehicles pass over), it did provide some idea on variation through the day and week. On average during the ATC observations the busiest hour was 0100 (16%), followed by midnight (14%), 2000 (9%), 2100 and 2300 (8% each) (in each case hours beginning). The rank survey found 1900 busiest (13%) followed by 2000 (11%) and midnight (10%). These figures are relatively similar.

In terms of busiest days, the ATC average suggests Thursday is busiest (21% of flow), Friday next (20%), then Wednesday and Saturday each with 14%. All other days are about equal with around 10% of flow on each day.

The data also suggests that average flows tended to increase through December, with the first week of ATC (after our video observation) appearing to be quieter than the following weeks, which we would expect given the run up to Christmas. This suggests our observations in November were average.

### Comparison of overall supply and demand

The Table below provides a slightly different summary of supply and demand, comparing average vehicle arrivals per hour with average loaded departures per hour, ie seeing how supply and demand match on average.

Rank	Period	No of hours rank operated	Average vehicle arrivals per hour	Average loaded departures per hour	Overall judgment of service provided
High Street	Thursday 8 <sup>th</sup> November 1500-0400	11	11	9	Very good
	Friday 9 <sup>th</sup> November 0400-0700 next day	19	23	22	
Head Street	Thursday 8 <sup>th</sup> November 1500-0400	1	3	2	Fair
	Friday 9 <sup>th</sup> November 0400-0600 next day	6	3	2	
Bus station	Friday 9 <sup>th</sup> November 0800-2200	5	2	1	Good
Queen Street	Thursday 8 <sup>th</sup> November 2200-0600	Unused			
	Friday 9 <sup>th</sup> November 2200-0400				
North Station private rank	Friday 9 <sup>th</sup> November 0800-0500	19	31	30	Good

Our observations demonstrate there is a relatively even split between demand at the High Street and at Colchester North station in terms of passengers per hour, although overall the latter location tends to have higher demand in overall terms. There are always more vehicles available than leave empty, although this is true more of High Street than the station when proportions leaving empty are taken into account.

## Comparison of total demand with previous survey

The table below calculates a typical week from the observations undertaken in 2012.

Rank	Period	No of passengers	Passengers per week	2008 survey
High Street	Weekday	172	2798 (38%)	1960 (44%)
	Weekend	711		
Head Street	Weekday	3	60 (1%)	n/a
	Weekend	18		
Bus station	Day	9	54 (1%)	135 (3%)
North Station	Friday	696	4524 (60%)	2339 (53%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>Full Week</b>		<b>7436</b>	<b>4434</b>

Note – surveys only compared where possible due to changes in ranks surveyed. Total includes all observations at relevant points.

The table suggests that North Station takes around 60% of the average weekly trade for hackney carriages in Colchester. High Street sees 38% of demand, with the two other active ranks each seeing just less than one percent. Effectively, the town still operates on just two ranks, one of which is a private operation and subject to a supplementary fee and further restriction on the number of vehicles in the fleet that can serve it.

Compared to the previous survey, the station appears to have become more dominant, and the lesser ranks less used (though the bus station has been in decline for some years in terms of awaiting its redevelopment). It also appears that overall demand has increased.

### High Street rank size

In terms of capacity, the High Street rank can currently take 21 vehicles in two banks. Given that the station rank is private, and Queen Street is night only (and not used), adding Head Street provides 24 rank spaces for 131 vehicles. This is 5 vehicles per space available. Even if it is assumed all 90 station registered vehicles only work the station, the ratio of spaces and vehicles only drops to 1.7.

It is understood that the outer lane tends to be vehicles which are on radio circuits and who may need to leave to take up radio calls. Our survey identified 17% of vehicles leaving this rank without passengers, supporting this suggestion. The design is currently therefore very practical, and capacity is such that it enable the High Street to operate without the effects of over-ranking that many other similar locations experience.

Demand at this location sees a maximum of 34 people leaving in 24 vehicles during daytime hours. Flows increase at night such that there are over 49 people leaving the rank every hour from 2200 to 0300 on the Friday, with a maximum hourly throughput of some 117 between 0100 and 0200 the early hours of Saturday 10<sup>th</sup> November 2012, who used 58 vehicles to leave the rank. An accumulation through the day suggests there are regularly 11 vehicles waiting in the queue at this site, with the potential there could be peaks of much more both at quieter periods when vehicles are waiting longer for fares, and at busier times when more vehicles are out awaiting the more significant peak flows. Design should allow for twice the space to cover such peaks.

We would therefore conclude that the current 21 space rank is about adequate for the potential vehicle demands placed upon it. Any reduction would potentially lead to blockage of the High Street route as there is very little extra space available for vehicles to wait in this area.

### **Level of hackney carriage vehicle activity**

The plate numbers of hackney carriages were recorded during the inception visit, whilst the rank surveys were being undertaken (on a sample basis), and during the course of the consultation day visit.

Of the 131 hackney carriage vehicles, during the course of the study a total of 47 different plates were observed (36% of vehicles). Given the sampling approach taken, this seems a reasonable level of observation.

### **Licensed vehicles in Colchester**

Information was provided regarding the number of operators in the Colchester area. A list of operators was provided, which contained some 107 companies. Of these, 40 were individual vehicles set up as operators, and 33 had just two vehicles. The largest three companies had 60 vehicles each. Six had 50 vehicles, one had 45, three others 30 and one 28 vehicles. All other operators had between 3 and 16 vehicles. This is a very highly fragmented company profile, although the guidance that anyone wishing to take their own bookings has influenced the high number of small operators in the area. There does not appear to be any dominant operator.



## 4. Public Consultation results

A fourteen question survey was undertaken with 250 persons in the Colchester Borough Council area. Surveys were undertaken within the main town centre area including near the railway station. Responses were mainly from those available during the day time, following standard practise for these interviews. The Table below summarises the overall responses for the Borough.

Question	Response	Av	Centre	Stn (am)	Stn (pm)
Have you used a taxi in the last three months in the Colchester area?	Yes	34	30	47	57
How often do you use a licensed vehicle in Colchester?	Almost daily	2	2	6	0
	Once a week	15	19	12	0
	A few times a month	19	15	18	50
	Once a month	17	17	12	25
	Less than once a month	46	47	53	25
How do you normally obtain a taxi in Colchester?	At a taxi rank	23	26	17	11
	Hail in the street	3	3	6	0
	Telephone a company	72	70	78	78
	Use a Freephone	1	1	0	0
	Use my mobile or smart phone	0	0	0	0
	Other	1	0	0	11
If you book a taxi by phone, please tell us the three private hire or mini cab companies you phone most?	See description below				
And when booking by phone, the three taxi companies you phone most?	See description below				
Questions relating to hackney carriages only:					
Please tell me the ranks you are aware of in Colchester, and for each if you use them	See description below				
Is there any location in Colchester where you would like to see a rank, and if it was there and vehicles were available, would you use it?	See description below				

Have you had any problem with the local hackney carriage service? (indicate as many as apply)	Design of vehicle	0	0	0	0
	Driver issues	37	17	100	0
	Position of ranks	0	0	0	0
	Delay in getting a taxi	37	49	0	0
	Cleanliness	13	17	0	0
	Other problems (please state)	13	17	0	0
	No. of problems recorded	8	6	2	0
	No problem (% of total interviews)	24	24	25	29
What would encourage you to use hackney carriages or use them more often (indicate top two reasons)	Better vehicles	9	10	0	0
	More hackney carriages I could phone for	2	2	0	0
	Better drivers	5	6	0	0
	More hackney carriages I could hail or get at a rank	0	0	0	0
	Cheaper ranks	0	6	0	0
	Cheaper	69	67	100	60
	Other	10	8	0	40
	No. of reasons	58	48	5	5
	Nothing (% of total interviews)	19	6	0	0
Do you consider you, or anyone you know, to have a disability that means you need an adapted vehicle?	No	77	80	76	63
	Yes - I need a wheelchair accessible vehicle	23	20	24	38
	Yes – someone I know needs a wheelchair accessible vehicle	0	0	0	0
	Yes– I need an adapted vehicle but not a wheelchair accessible	0	0	0	0
	Yes – someone I knows needs an adapted vehicle but not wheelchair accessible	0	0	0	0
	Other	0	0	0	

	% responding	34	30	47	57
Have you ever given up waiting for a hackney carriage at a rank in Colchester?	No	48	71	41	38
Do you have regular access to a car?	Yes	52	49	59	63
Thinking about the large rank near Marks and Spencer in the High Street, which statements do you agree with?	It's a great place to have a rank	79	98	52	50
	It's obvious where I can get a hackney carriage from in the central area	21	2	48	50
	The rank obstructs my walking past	0	0	0	0
	The rank is visually obtrusive and should be made smaller	0	0	0	0
Do you live in the area?	Yes	76	82	50	64
Gender (value in bracket from census, 2008 est of 2012)	Male	45 (49)	44	44	57
Age (value in brackets from census, 2008 est of 2012)	Under 30 (15-29)	26 (29)	28	22	7
	31-55 (30-54)	47 (40)	46	47	64
	Over 55	27 (31)	26	31	29

Some 34% of those interviewed had used a licensed vehicle in the Colchester Borough Council area in the last three months, quite a low level of recent usage. Town centre values were 30% whilst at the station the percentages were 47% for those in the morning and 57% in the evening. These values compare to 40% using a licensed vehicle in the previous month in the 2008 survey, a significant fall, although still consistent in being low.

67% of people gave us reasons why they did not use licensed vehicles. The highest response at 39% was having their own car. 16% preferred buses, 14% preferred to walk and 11% claimed because they were not local. Expense was quoted by 7% of people. All other non-use reasons were 5% or less.

34% of respondents told us how often they used a licensed vehicle. We have assumed the remaining 66% do not use licensed vehicles and calculated the average level of licensed vehicle trips per month per person below for the average, for the central area and for the station interviews.



On average, there are 0.6 person trips by licensed vehicle per month based on these assumptions, a fairly low level (0.6 for central area, 1.1 for station (morning) and 0.8 for station (evening)).

Interestingly, the station seems to have higher licensed vehicle usage.

All interviews			
Frequency	% of people	Assumed Trips per month	Total
Daily	2	20	40
One per week	15	4	60
A few per month	19	2	38
One per month	17	1	17
Less than one per month	47	0.5	23.5
			178.5
Trips per person per month			1.8
Allow for 66% not using at all			0.6
Central area			
Frequency	% of people	Assumed Trips per month	Total
Daily	2	20	40
One per week	19	4	76
A few per month	15	2	30
One per month	17	1	17
Less than one per month	47	0.5	23.5
			186.5
Trips per person per month			1.9
Allow for 70% not using at all			0.6

Station – morning interviews			
Frequency	% of people	Assumed Trips per month	Total
Daily	6	20	120
One per week	12	4	48
A few per month	18	2	36
One per month	12	1	12
Less than one per month	52	0.5	26
			242
Trips per person per month			2.4
Allow for 53% not using at all			1.1

Station – evening interviews			
Frequency	% of people	Assumed Trips per month	Total
Daily	0	20	0
One per week	0	4	0
A few per month	50	2	100
One per month	25	1	25
Less than one per month	25	0.5	12.5
			137.5
Trips per person per month			1.4
Allow for 43% not using at all			0.8

40% of people told us how they obtained licensed vehicles in the Colchester Borough Council area. Overall, 72% obtained them by phone. None used smart phones and just 1% free-phones. 23% obtained them by using a rank whilst 3% hailed, suggesting a very low usage of hackney carriages in Colchester, albeit that the hailing value is relatively high. For the central area interviews, 70% phoned, 26% used ranks, 3% hailed and just 1% used a free phone. This value is very similar to the result from the 2008 survey of 72% private hire and 28% hackney carriage, although overall usage (see above) seems to have fallen in terms of recent usage. The hailing percentage is high (more typical is less than 1%).

Some 54 different answers were given to the identification of the companies used in the central area, and eighteen further answers at the station. One company had the highest number of responses. Three companies dominated the railway station listing. In the central area the two different questions trying to obtain hackney carriage companies compared to private hire did not get any different answer, although those answering this question at the station did generally name different companies between the two questions.

A set of questions were then asked relating specifically to use of hackney carriages.

The first question asked people to name all the rank locations they were aware of in the Colchester Borough Council area and if they used the locations they named or not. 52 different responses were provided in the central area, and 19 at the station. The High Street / M&S rank was named most (63 times), followed by the station (43 times). The bus station was also mentioned a few times. Other locations mentioned as having ranks included Gala Bingo (5 reports, many of whom used it), Osbourne Street, Business Park, hospital, arena and Tesco. There was one mention of Queen Street (not used) and two of Head Street, one of whom said they used it. The two main ranks are therefore well-known, but the lesser ranks are not.

When asked if there was somewhere ranks should be, there were 19 responses and thirteen different locations. Most popular, with three people saying they would use it was Tesco's (where a one person already thought there was a rank). Two said they would use a rank at the bus station, two said at the university and three said either High Street or more in the central area. One said 'other side of the station'. None of these replies are particularly significant.

Of those interviewed in the central area, just six people responded they had problems with the local hackney carriage service. Just two had issues of those interviewed at the station. None of the responses are therefore significant. The highest response was delay in getting a taxi, with driver issues, cleanliness and other (not specified) taking the remaining responses. 24% of those interviewed overall took time to say they had no problem.

A total of 58 responses were provided about matters that might encourage more use of hackney carriages. As in most areas, a key response was that reduced price would encourage their use (69%). The next most important response was 'better vehicles' (9%), other various reasons (10%) and 'cheaper ranks' (5%) (assumed to mean cheaper hackney carriages). No-one said more hackney carriages at ranks would increase their use, and just 2% said more hackney carriages they could phone for. 19% of all interviews said nothing would make them use hackney carriages, or use them more.

Four statements were put to people regarding the main rank near M&S. 28% of those interviewed gave a response. All responded to the positive quotes – 79% agreed it was a great place to have a rank and 21% said it was obvious where they could get a hackney carriage from. None agreed with the statements that it obstructed them walking or that it should be made smaller.

People were asked if they or anyone they knew had a disability needing either a wheel chair accessible licensed vehicle, or a vehicle adapted in some other way. 34% responded to this question, with 79% of them saying they did not need any adaptation, or know anyone who did. Those needing adapted vehicles all suggested the need was for wheel chair adapted vehicles.

30% of people in the central area responded to the question seeking if they had ever given up waiting for a vehicle in Colchester – and 71% of these had not. Values at the station were 24% and zero, with overall 24% of people responding. This suggests there is some latent demand for hackney carriages in the Colchester area. The latent demand factor would be 1.07 based on these responses.

People provided further detail to these responses. In the central area sample, 12 people gave detail. One gave up after 20 minutes 'recently' but did not specify where. Three others gave up 'recently' though one said after waiting 20 minutes at home, suggesting a private hire experience, not a hackney carriage one. Two quoted waits a month ago, one 1-2 months ago, another 3 months ago and two a year ago. For these twelve, the average waiting time before giving up was 45 minutes. Just four had given up at the station, two at the station after 15 minutes both two months ago, one in the High Street two months ago after a 20 minute wait, and one in High Street six months ago (these interviews were in January so these experiences would have been around November). In context, these numbers are not significant although there are clearly some issues when supply does not meet demand.

52% of people had regular access to a car, and 76% lived in the Colchester Borough Council area.

Our gender sample saw under-representation of men (45% compared to 49%), whilst our age sample caught less people in the older age group but more in the middle age group.

### **Summary**

Overall, the public attitude questions suggest relatively low usage of licensed vehicles, mainly arising from use of private transport, buses and walking in the area. This tied in with car ownership of 52% for those interviewed. Overall trips per month were just 0.6 per person. Recent usage compared to 2008 seemed lower in terms of frequencies.

The split between private hire and hackney carriage was about the same as in 2008, with 72% phoning and 23% using ranks. However, use of smart phones was zero, and use of free phones very low. On the contrary, hailing was high at some 3%.

People used a wide range of private hire companies but were not able to distinguish between hackney carriage and private hire operators. The two main ranks were well-known, but the smaller ranks were not very well known at all. There was little demand for more ranks.

Increased use of hackney carriages was dominated by them being cheaper – other reasons not being more than 9% (better vehicles).

People were appreciative of the main M&S rank and none felt it was either an obstruction or visually intrusive.

Just over a third responded to the question about disability, of which 79% did not need any adaptation or know anyone who did. Those needing adapted vehicles all favoured wheel chair accessible ones.

The latent demand factor is 1.07, and although people were willing to give examples which were themselves significant, the overall view is that there are some waits but mainly related to occasional issues that are more than likely to arise at most ranks.

The overall sample was fairly representative of the area, although the local element was 76%. Men were slightly under-represented in the sample, as were the older age group.

## 5. Stakeholder Consultation

The following key stakeholders were contacted in line with the DfT Best Practise Guidance 2010:

- Supermarkets
- Hotels
- Hospital
- Pubwatch / night clubs
- Disability representatives
- Police
- Tourism

Specific comments have been aggregated below to provide an overall appreciation of the current situation, although in some cases comments are specific to the needs of a particular stakeholder. It should be noted that the comments contained in this Chapter are the view of those consulted, and not that of the authors of this Report. **Appendix 2** provides further details of those consulted.

The licensed vehicle trade consultation is the subject of the following chapter.

### ***Supermarkets***

Five supermarkets were contacted, of which four provided response during the time available for this consultation. Two said that customers tended to phone their preferred company from their personal mobile phones and then proceed to a pick-up point. Three had phones direct to specific companies. One said there was a nearby sign to a rank, but there was also a lay-by where private hires met passengers who had phoned for them.

None had any issue with the service provided, and none had received any complaint.

### ***Hotels***

Two hotels were contacted. One would phone companies for their customers whilst the other had an agreement with a company (jointly with another branch of their store). Both said their arrangements worked well and customers enjoyed a good service. However, this was almost exclusively undertaken by private hire vehicles.

### ***Hospital***

A representative from Colchester General Hospital told us that a private hire company phone number is advertised in the hospital entrance. Other people ask for information at the front desk. Effectively the link is to private hire companies, and no complaints have been received.

## ***Pubwatch / Night clubs***

There are no private agreements between night clubs and any part of the licensed vehicle trade. Some provide public phones, and it is appreciated that other people do phone their preferred private hire company on their own mobile phone.

Contact was sought with a number of late bars and night clubs. In the timescale for this report, two responded. One confirmed people were able to get licensed vehicles to get home, usually by going to the rank or phoning companies on their own mobile phones. Their customers tend to head to the High Street rank. The other club said people could get away at the end of the evening if they pre-booked vehicles, otherwise they might have to wait 30-60 minutes. The club was opposite the night only rank although many walked up to High Street. Though they had two companies they would give out the phone number for, there was no specific agreement with either, and no dedicated phone line or booking system.

## ***Disability Representative***

The representative from CCVS who sent out a request for comment for the last survey offered to repeat this for the current survey. Just one response was received.

A social inclusion co-ordinator told us of an incident two years ago where someone who is now part of CCVS was attending a disability training event in Colchester. When their booked private hire vehicle arrived and noted the person was in a wheel chair, they refused to take the booking not making it clear if they were refusing to take the person or their wheelchair. This caused significant offence and remains in the minds of those within CCVS. The person suggested drivers needed training on equality and disability awareness.

No other responses were received during the time this report was written.

## ***Police***

The local police representative considers current night time provision works very well. Hackney carriages are managed effectively and they see no evidence for any change in policy, particularly in regard to limitation of vehicle numbers.

## ***Tourism***

A representative from Colchester tourism section was consulted. They advised us that their customers often find a shortage of licensed vehicles at school times. Examples were quoted of people coming in and booking accommodation between 1445 and 1545 and then finding they had to wait till after the school time has passed before they can obtain a vehicle. This is a significant issue as there are three new hotels expected in the area in the near future and this issue could cause them some difficulty.

Another issue raised was that some drivers expressed their poor views of Colchester to people getting into their vehicles. The tourist office had examples where business people had used licensed vehicles when coming to the area seeking to invest and have been put off by such discussions – with those wishing to persuade them to invest being put on the back foot by such a poor introduction. The tourist section would like a mystery shopper exercise to prove the veracity of these claims and for action to be based on more robust evidence.

The tourist section is keen that hackney carriage drivers are seen as ambassadors for Colchester and is willing to work with the relevant association to achieve this.

### **Rail Operators**

The local rail operator is currently Greater Anglia. Representatives were contacted to arrange permission for filming of the rank at the station. They also provided comment about the service provided which they felt was good. Matters would also be discussed if necessary

National statistics are publicly available showing the total number of entries and exits at each rail station in the United Kingdom. These numbers are calculated using ticket barrier and ticket issue information from ticket sales.

The Table below shows information for Colchester Borough stations from 2002/2003 to date. The information confirms that Colchester is the main station, with ten times the entries and exits of the next busiest, Marks Tey. Whilst there has been growth overall since the start of these statistics, there has also been wide fluctuation over the years.

The figures also confirm that the likelihood of ranks being worthwhile at other than Colchester is low, particularly at Hythe. There is also some evidence of the recent recession effects, although all stations clearly have seen significant increase since 2002/3.

Rail year (ends March in last year noted)	Entries / exits	Growth / decline
<b>Colchester</b>		
2002 / 2003	4,005,869	n/a
2004 / 2005	4,305,315	+7%
2005 / 2006	4,287,601	-1%
2006 / 2007	4,337,926	+1%
2007 /2008	4,516,616	+4%
2008 / 2009	4,502,739	-1%
2009 / 2010	4,218,622	-6%
2010 / 2011	4,362,914	+3%(+9% overall)



Colchester Town		
2002 / 2003	145,101	n/a
2004 / 2005	163,488	+13%
2005 / 2006	181,215	+11%
2006 / 2007	457,276	n/a (change)
2007 /2008	451,769	-1%
2008 / 2009	448,381	-1%
2009 / 2010	394,882	-12%
2010 / 2011	381,232	-3%
Mark's Tey		
2002 / 2003	364,979	n/a
2004 / 2005	384,337	+5%
2005 / 2006	400,155	+4%
2006 / 2007	432,073	+8%
2007 /2008	459,980	+6%
2008 / 2009	443,724	-4%
2009 / 2010	428,804	-4%
2010 / 2011	428,816	+0% (+17% overall)
Hythe		
2002 / 2003	32,145	n/a
2004 / 2005	45,214	+41%
2005 / 2006	52,716	+17%
2006 / 2007	52,729	+0%
2007 /2008	51,836	-2%
2008 / 2009	60,188	+16%
2009 / 2010	69,124	+15%
2010 / 2011	90,822	+31%(+182% overall)
Wivenhoe		
2002 / 2003	293,581	n/a
2004 / 2005	318,540	+9%
2005 / 2006	320,984	+1%
2006 / 2007	330,794	+3%
2007 /2008	335,294	+1%
2008 / 2009	328,872	-2%
2009 / 2010	309,076	-6%
2010 / 2011	330,030	+7%(+12% overall)
Chappel andWakes Colne		
2002 / 2003	26,625	n/a
2004 / 2005	25,526	-4%
2005 / 2006	26,292	+3%
2006 / 2007	28,579	+9%
2007 /2008	29,903	+5%
2008 / 2009	30,940	+3%
2009 / 2010	31,674	+2%
2010 / 2011	32,756	+3% (+23% overall)

Colchester has the most frequent services overall, with direct links to Norwich, Ipswich and London as well as the branch services to Colchester Town and onwards. Colchester also sees significant transfers between the

Town branch trains when through trains are not running, as well as passengers swopping between fast and more local services to intermediate stations.

The train taxi guide was interrogated to identify licensed vehicle links from each station. The reference for Colchester is correct, saying it is a major station with an active rank. Three operators are, however, given in case vehicles are not there. These three operators are the same as those given for both Hythe and Colchester Town, both of which correctly are noted as not having any rank and needing licensed vehicle users to make bookings for such vehicles for onward travel from these two stations.

Last London trains tend to arrive just before 02:00 with a gap then until the next morning.

Wivenhoe is listed as having a rank or booking office, with three phone numbers also made available. Marks Tey and Chappel and Wakes Colne are listed as having no rank or office and again needing phone bookings. Chappel is given two companies to phone whilst Marks Tey has just one or suggestion to use Colchester instead.



## 6. Licensed Vehicle Trade Consultation

### ***Trade consultation***

A letter was prepared with a questionnaire for issue to all licensed Colchester drivers, with another letter for private hire operators to pass to drivers. Unfortunately, this letter was not issued. It was agreed between the client and trade that this omission was not significant particularly given the trade representatives had been involved with the study throughout.

Hackney carriage trade representatives were present at the inception meeting for the project and provided their input on behalf of their members. Whilst providing information incorporated in other parts of the report they also told us:

- The impact of the sixteen extra plates issues a few years ago was significant on the present trade, estimated at reducing income per driver by £171 per week
- They feel there are more than enough hackney carriage vehicles at the present time
- They are concerned about the proposed changes to the High Street rank as it remains the principal rank available to all 131 vehicles which actually sees passengers
- They are concerned about the visibility of ranks to the public



## 7. Responses to DfT Best Practice Guidance 2010

Annex A of the Best Practice Guidance (BPG) provides a list of useful questions to help assess the issue of quantity controls of hackney carriage licences.

This chapter takes the form of a response to each question based on the evidence identified earlier in this report. BPG questions are shown in ***bold italic*** with responses following in normal type.

***Have you considered the Government's view that quantity control should be removed unless a specific case that such controls benefit the consumer can be made?***

Yes, this report is the independent input to this consideration on behalf of Colchester Borough Council.

***Questions relating to the policy of controlling numbers:  
Have you recently reviewed the need for your policy of quantity controls?***

Yes, this report forms a review of the need for the policy of quantity control of hackney carriages at this point in time in the Colchester Borough Council area. Full unmet demand studies were undertaken in 2004 and 2007/8 and this latest review in 2012 follows the government guidance on need for regular review.

***What form did the review of your policy of quantity controls take?***

This current review follows the DfT Best Practise Guidance April 2010 in undertaking a full review of the current situation in regard to the policy towards hackney carriage vehicle limits. It includes:

- A review of the background policies of the Council
- A rank survey program to identify current demand and supply
- Public consultation with people in the streets of Colchester
- Stakeholder consultation with all groups recommended by the DfT Best Practise Guidance as far as people were available
- trade consultation with representatives of the trade
- Consideration of the relevant section of the Equality Act

***Who was involved in the review?***

This review was undertaken by an independent consultant and included direct discussion with the following respondents:

- Local supermarkets
- Hotels in the area
- The local hospital
- A local Disability representative
- Rail representatives

***What decision was reached about retaining or removing quantity controls?***

The decision regarding quantity controls is the subject of the final chapter, but is also a matter for decision by the committee appointed to make such decisions on behalf of the Council.

***Are you satisfied that your policy justifies restricting entry to the trade?***

Please see the summary and conclusions section for guidance on conclusions from our review – ultimately this decision is for the local council to make.

***Are you satisfied that quantity controls do not:***

- ***Reduce the availability of taxis***
- ***Increase waiting times for consumers***
- ***Reduce choice and safety for consumers***

At the present time, there is a good availability of hackney carriages in the Borough, with 131 vehicles available to service demand in the main central area and at the railway station. A further 16 plates were added within the last five years at a time when general demand has been affected more recently by the recession.

There are also a large number of private hire companies who also compete for work in the area. The police are satisfied that the night life of the area is well-served by both hackney carriage and private hire vehicles.

***What special circumstances justify retention of quantity controls?***

This issue is ultimately for the Councillors to conclude. The present operation seems to be in reasonable balance and adequately meets the needs of those requiring their service in the area.

***How does your policy benefit consumers, particularly in remote rural areas?***

Colchester Borough Council has significant proportions of rural area, but none have sufficient trade to encourage ranks, and all tend to be served by private hire operations. This partly accounts for the high number of private hire operators in the area.

***How does your policy benefit the trade?***

Retention of a limit would retain some added value of having a hackney carriage vehicle licence which would allow some investment in the trade that would not be as likely with the introduction of further vehicles, although it would be strongly advisable that any removal of the limit must require new vehicles to be wheel chair accessible and of a high overall standard.

***If you have a local accessibility policy, how does this fit with restricting taxi licences?***

We are not aware of any local accessibility policy, and current evidence suggests the demand for wheel chair accessible vehicles is very low in the area, with many disabled providing their own vehicles. There is more likelihood that further wheel chair accessible vehicles might be added were the limit to be retained and drivers encourage to invest in such vehicles, than either by a policy of new hackney carriages having to be wheel chair accessible, or by removal of the limit. Neither of these latter options could guarantee any extra wheel chair accessible vehicles at all, whilst the option of encouragement via the retention of the limit might produce some increase.

***Questions relating to setting the number of taxi licences:***

***When did you last assess unmet demand?***

Unmet demand has been regularly reviewed, with this study preceded by earlier ones in 2007/8 and 2004, which with the dates of survey work effectively provide an almost three yearly review in accordance with the Best Practise Guidance.



***How is your taxi limit assessed?***

In all previous studies the limit has been assessed using industry standard techniques.

***Have you considered latent demand, ie potential customers who would use taxis if more were available, but currently do not?***

Yes, latent demand was considered by several methods, with the key method being through interviews with members of the public. There is evidence of some latent demand, but not at a significant level.

***Are you satisfied that your limit is set at the correct level?***

This is a matter for decision by the Council committee based on evidence following in our summary.

***How does the need for adequate taxi ranks affect your policy of quantity controls?***

The Council has sought to add extra ranks to the mix, although the main High Street rank with high capacity is the result of amalgamation of several ranks. This has been to the benefit of the customer. The bus station rank has now closed with the closure of the old bus station. Two other town centre ranks exist, one night time only (effectively unused) and another all-day which sees some use, but needs more development, particularly signing to see more significant use. The North station rank is a private rank under the auspices of the railway company, although they are also introducing a further rank on the side of the station towards the central area as part of their Travel Plan development.

***Questions relating to consultation and other public transport service provision:***

***When consulting, have you included all those working in the market, consumer and passenger (including disabled groups), groups which represent those passengers with special needs, local interest groups, eg hospitals or visitor attractions, the police, a wide range of transport stakeholders, eg rail/bus/coach providers and traffic managers?***

See above, yes, all appropriate consultees have been taken into account.

***Do you receive representations about taxi availability?***

No

***What is the level of service currently available to consumers including other public transport modes?***

At the present time, bus services in the area are generally very good particularly in the main urban parts of the Council area.

## 8. The Equality Act 2010

Whilst several sections of the Equality Act (EA) affect licensed vehicle operations, the key provision relevant to this report is the requirement under section 161 that any authority with a limit on the number of hackney carriage vehicle licences should issue licences to wheel chair accessible vehicles (WAV) until an agreed percentage of the fleet were such WAV style. The last guidance in regard to timescales for introduction of this regulation saw consultation occurring around this point in time – although nothing has yet been issued by the Department for Transport. Colchester Borough Council currently has a limit and this section of the Act would apply if ever enacted.

The Equality Act is national legislation which cannot be amended by the council or its officers. Current thought suggests that the required proportion of WAV style vehicles expected for the Council area might be of the order of 35%. The Table below sets out the possible options for the Council based on the current level of 33 WAV and a proportion of 35%.

Option	Total number of vehicles	Number of wheel chair accessible vehicles (WAV)	Percentage of fleet that are WAV
Current	131	33	25%
EA requirement	131	46	35%
Meet EA by removing limit but no WAV stipulation	131 upwards	33 upwards	25% or more
Meet EA by removing limit but with all new vehicles having to be WAV	131 upwards	33 upwards with each new vehicles adding to number	At least 25%- an extra 0.8% for each new vehicle added
Meet EA by retaining limit and 13 current vehicles converting	131	46	35%
Meet EA by granting plate to any WAV, with none of present converting under limited scenario.	151 (+15%)	53	35%

## ***Potential responses to the Equality Act***

The EA requirement is a compound requirement which means that the percentage of vehicles must be of the current total after any new plates are added. This compound growth means that, if no current vehicles convert, and the limit is retained, 20 extra WAV style hackney carriages would be needed, taking the limit to 151 hackney carriage vehicles.

Were the trade to agree to convert sufficient vehicles to WAV style to ensure that the EA requirements were met this would require 13 vehicles to convert, but would retain the current number of vehicles at 131.

However, it is also true that retaining the limit by applying the quality standard that all new hackney carriages had to be wheel chair accessible would not guarantee any further vehicles would be added but would meet the stipulation of the EA. In the current context, we do not consider that many if any new vehicles would be added at this standard.

## 9. Summary and conclusions

### ***Policy Background***

Colchester Borough Council has kept a regular review of its policies towards hackney carriage and private hire vehicles, including the issue of if a limit on hackney carriage vehicle numbers is appropriate. A limit was reported as introduced in 1989 in DfT statistics. The limit has been reviewed in 2004 and 2007/08 by formal demand surveys as far as our records permit.

The Colchester Local Development Scheme 2011-5 is constantly updated as progress is made on its aims. Transport policies focus on sustainable travel, including development of a Travel Plan for Colchester North station which links in with cycling, walking and other improved access to the station – including more use of the exit nearer to the central area (which involves the new taxi rank on that side of the station which is currently being developed in conjunction with the Trade). There is also the Better Town Centre SPD. Licensed vehicles are supported as part of the public transport offer of the area.

In 2012, Colchester, Braintree and Epping Forest are understood to retain limits on hackney carriage vehicle numbers within Essex authorities. Many other authorities including Basildon, Harlow and Chelmsford removed their limits many years ago. The level of hackney carriages in Colchester is 0.7 per thousand of population, placing the area fourth from lowest, and below average for the areas compared. Chelmsford has 1 hackney per thousand and Ipswich 1.3.

For the overall fleet of licensed vehicles, Colchester is above the average for Essex, and has a similar level of overall provision to both Brentwood and Ipswich.

At the present time, the hackney carriage fleet is 25% wheel chair accessible. This was helped by the extra sixteen plates which had to be wheel chair accessible. This puts Colchester closer to the potential 35% limit expected in Section 161 of the Equality Act.

Fares place Colchester 6<sup>th</sup> equal in the January 2013 national league table of fares.

Present dual driver status makes it hard to understand if there remains any double shifting in the fleet at present – the driver ratio of 1.33 suggests some possibility.

### ***Rank Survey results***

Rank surveys were undertaken covering some 128 hours of rank operation. Observations covered all the currently marked ranks at times when they were expected to see hackney carriage vehicles and passengers. The focus of observations was on a Thursday and Friday in November.

Rank observations suggest average hourly passenger flows are about the same at High Street and North station, although the overall statistics show the longer hours of operation at the station leading to 38% of demand being at High Street and 60% at North Station. Other ranks appear to have fallen in relative usage, although the closure of the bus station rank appears to have not helped this change. Head Street rank may be developing slowly.

Compared to the 2008 survey, observable hackney carriage demand appears to have increased (which seems at odds with the public attitude survey suggested overall demand has fallen), and demand at the station has become more dominant. The bus station rank was the only other active rank in 2008, but saw 3% of demand, this proportion of 'other rank' demand has fallen, but is now shared with Head Street. This has to be held in the context that the bus station rank and old bus station is now closed.

In terms of activity of the hackney carriage fleet at ranks, and in the area in general, during the course of the study just 36% of the fleet were observed. This may be related to the sample nature of this estimate.

The rank observations have to be seen in context of the high number of private hire companies in the Colchester area. Whilst some of this relates to the encouragement to those taking bookings to be an operator (hence there are 73 of the 107 companies with two or less vehicles), there remain nine companies with 28 or more vehicles, quite a high number.

### ***Public Consultation***

A total of 250 persons were interviewed in the streets of Colchester town centre during November 2012. Surveys were undertaken in the main town centre area and included respondents near to the railway station (the latter in January 2013).

There was a low usage of licensed vehicles in the last three months – just 34%, mainly due to high car usage and use of public transport and walking. From responses, it is estimated that on average there are 0.6 licensed vehicle trips per person per month, very low.

72% of respondents obtained licensed vehicles by phone and 23% use ranks. Hailing is conversely, at 3%, relatively high. People use a wide range of private hire and hackney companies but are not able to distinguish when they phone if they are calling a private hire or hackney carriage.

The main item that would increase hackney carriage vehicle usage would be lower fares. People appreciated the M&S rank and did not believe it was an obstruction in any way. People mainly knew this rank and the North station rank but did not know the lesser ranks well at all. There was little call for new ranks.

Most of those responding to the question about need for adapted vehicles did not need, or know anyone who needed, adapted vehicles. For those needing adapted vehicles, the need for wheel chair accessible style was paramount.

The latent demand factor was 1.07, with people willing to tell us how long they waited before giving up, and when. These results were not significant in context.

52% of people had regular access to a car and 76% of those interviewed lived in the area (both quite low). The sample was under-represented by men and those in the older age group.

### ***Stakeholder Consultation***

Supermarkets had free-phones to specific companies. Two said customers tended to phone companies on their own mobiles and then go to an agreed pick-up point. One mentioned signing to a rank, but also said passengers had a private hire pick-up point they regularly used.

Hotels were served by either phoning private hire companies or having a free phone. All said service was good.

The hospital also had a free-phone and felt the provision of service from it was good.

Two clubs responded regarding licensed vehicle provision in the area. Both recommended use of the ranks and private hire companies. Neither saw a particular shortage of vehicles, although one did advise people to book or experience waits of 30-60 minutes at the rank at closing time.

Despite a widely made request for information, only one comment was made regarding disability issues. This related to an awkward incident two years ago involving poor treatment and refusal to carry a person in a wheel chair, although that person now obtained good service.

Comments were made by the tourist office about shortages around school times and a wish to develop drivers as ambassadors.

In terms of rail services, publicly available information generally points rail passengers at pre-booking, although it does correctly reference the rank at Colchester station, which is the subject of an additional fee from Greater Anglia, including a limited number of vehicle licences. Demand at the other stations is never likely to be sufficient for a rank although one station, Wivenhoe is stated as having a rank or booking office.

## ***Trade Consultation***

Hackney carriage trade representatives told us:

- They are still keenly aware of the impact of the extra 16 plates
- They feel there are more than enough hackney carriages at this time
- They do not wish to see the M&S rank reduced in size
- Are concerned about visibility of ranks to the public.

## ***Equality Act***

The Equality Act is already on the statute books. There is a requirement that any authority with a limit on its number of hackney carriages should ensure no new entrant is refused entry if they are offering a wheel chair accessible vehicle if a given proportion of vehicles has not been achieved. At the present time, the level of WAV required in a fixed fleet has not been determined, and there is still no confirmed date for the consultation required to allow this to move forward. The recent Law Commission Review may reduce any desire by Government to spend time resolving this Act. There is no way set out in legislation that any Council can require a particular level of WAV within the private hire fleet.

At the present time, there is no way that any authority without a limit on hackney carriage vehicle numbers can encourage an increase in the number of WAV style hackney carriages, apart perhaps from the introduction of a mandatory order requiring all vehicles to be wheel chair accessible (which would most likely be opposed by those seeking the spirit of the EA since current thinking is a mixed fleet is generally better for those with a range of disabilities).

If a limit on vehicle licence numbers is retained and section 161 is enacted, and the proportion is 35%, Colchester would either need to apply for an exemption, encourage 13 of the present fleet to convert, or issue wheel chair accessible licences to 20 extra vehicles.

## ***Best Practice Guidance***

A review of the questions posed in the BGP was undertaken and is presented in an earlier Chapter

## ***Conclusion***

At the present time, there is no evidence of significant unmet demand for the services of hackney carriages in the Colchester Borough Council area. On this basis, a limit on the number of hackney carriage vehicles can be retained. There is no given number of plates that need to be issued.

There is need, however, to consider better signing at least to the rank in Head Street which has the potential to be used, and to ensure there is a replacement for the bus station rank which was used. It will also be important to retain the M&S rank as it currently is since it provides a key point where people can obtain hackney carriages, which is obvious and has sufficient waiting capacity to ensure passenger need is met efficiently and without potential for over-ranking.

It also appears that usage of licensed vehicles may be reduced by the high level of fares in the area. The strength of the comment about what would make people use hackney carriages more, together with Colchester being 6<sup>th</sup> from the top of the league table suggests price may be a key factor in the low levels of demand observed.

There is good evidence to support the need to ensure the High Street rank remains at 21 spaces at all times to cover potential demand and ensure that the High Street remains functional and does not get blocked by the over-ranking that might otherwise occur at key traffic times.





## 10. Recommendations

### ***Limits on the number of hackney carriage vehicles***

At the present time in the Colchester Borough Council area the Licensing Committee has a number of options:

- (1) It could re-affirm the current policies and make no other changes
- (2) It could retain the current limit on vehicle numbers and take other actions to ensure passenger demand continues to be met effectively
- (3) It could remove the limit on hackney carriage vehicles and make no other change
- (4) It could remove the limit and attempt to restrict the negative impacts of this change by requiring all new vehicles to be wheel chair accessible

Our technical recommendation at this time for Colchester would be option 2. This would encourage public benefit from the retention of the current limited vehicle policy which might not occur with Option 1. The focus would need to be on maintaining the current M&S rank, signing Head Street more effectively and encouraging its use and ensuring a third rank to replace the lost (and used) bus station facility was identified and encouraged into use. Encouraging use of two extra town centre ranks would take some while to achieve, and even with signing and encouragement, it may be at least a year before they could become active locations.

Were option 3 to be chosen, there would be significant effects on the historic core of the central area, since further vehicles would all seek to use the current M&S rank as their only guaranteed source of regular work. Demand for space at this point would increase further as the current demand was spread between further vehicles who would each have to wait longer for fares. The extra ranks and better advertising would be more essential, although it would also be easier to encourage current drivers to use these more in the stability of a limited environment than the instability of one where new vehicles were appearing regularly.

Option 4 could reduce the level of transfer of private hire vehicles to hackney carriage, with no significant demand for wheel chair accessible vehicles from the stakeholders and public consulted during the study this effect could be quite a restraint on any new entrants. This would, however, introduce the need to consider grandfather rights and changes to current vehicle requirements otherwise a further market of plates would be introduced that might cause issues within the trade in terms of fairness of conditions.

## ***Other Elements of the Action Plan***

**Colchester Borough Council** (licensing) should ensure that rank details and contact numbers for hackney carriage and private hire are up to date and readily available to the public from the Council internet site.

The licensing section needs to work with Essex County Council regarding maintenance of the current M&S rank as it is. Further, signing to Head Street needs to be improved and a replacement site for the bus station rank found, signed and encouraged into use.

**Essex County Council** must be encouraged by the Borough Council transport and licensing representatives to ensure rank provision and signing is adequate for the central area.

**Hackney carriage trade** representatives and all drivers need to ensure they work with all appropriate parties to take full advantage of any business opportunities that present themselves. This includes working with the licensing section and Essex county highways to ensure that new ranks are practical and attractive for drivers to use, as well as obvious to the public.

The current excellent hackney carriage relationship to the Council must be encouraged and continued, as it is providing key benefits to passengers. There may be opportunities for improving driver knowledge of the area through input from the tourist office.

The public are not able to differentiate between phoning for a private hire vehicle and phoning a hackney carriage company. If this is an important distinction to the hackney carriage trade, they need to find a way to emphasise this. The fact that hailing is high suggests people understand the difference between hackney carriage and private hire in general, but not when phoning for a vehicle.

The hackney carriage trade needs to prepare its response to the Equality Act to ensure that sufficient vehicles would transfer to wheel chair accessible were the section of this Act applied requiring such levels of hackney carriage vehicles. If the limit on vehicle numbers is retained, the only reasonable response from the trade must be transfer of sufficient vehicles to meet the nationally imposed legal requirement – the Council is very unlikely to be able to have any influence on this, if enacted, although it may be worth considering an exemption based on the information contained in this Report.

**Private hire trade** members and representatives need to work with appropriate Council representatives to enable them to develop their businesses further.





## Colchester, High Street Rank, Thursday 8<sup>th</sup> November 2012, 1500 – 0400

Hour	No of vehicle arrivals	Total passenger departures	Total loaded vehicle departures	Empty vehicle departures	Total Vehicle departures	Average vehicle waiting times (hh:mm:ss)	Average vehicle waiting times (for a fare, hh:mm:ss)	Maximum vehicle waiting time for a fare (hh:mmins)	Average passenger waiting time in an hour (m:ss)	Average passenger waiting time, those waiting only (mins)	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time (mins)
15	16	11	7	2	9	0:33:41	0:35:51	0:54:00						
16	0	7	7	0	7	0	0	0						
17	20	15	11	1	12	0:30:09	0:30:25	0:42:00						
18	10	14	11	1	12	0:39:30	0:44:15	1:22:00						
19	9	7	4	3	7	0:54:40	1:16:45	1:44:00						
20	6	5	5	3	8	0:42:50	0:42:50	0:54:00						
21	4	11	6	0	6	0:58:00	0:58:00	1:04:00						
22	13	9	7	1	8	0:31:09	0:33:27	0:58:00						No passenger waits
23	9	25	16	2	18	0:28:53	0:29:07	0:46:00						
00	17	10	5	2	7	1:01:32	1:00:15	1:35:00						
01	9	17	10	2	12	0:53:47	0:57:38	1:16:00						
02	13	44	17	6	23	0:29:28	0:33:27	0:40:00						
03	11	15	8	1	9	0:12:16	0:12:36	0:20:00						
04	1	0	0	1	1	0:01:00	0	0						
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>						

Note – issue with equipment during first two hours.

**Colchester, High Street Rank, Friday 9<sup>th</sup> November 2012, 0400 – 0600**

Hour	No of vehicle arrivals	Total passenger departures	Total loaded vehicle departures	Empty vehicle departures	Total Vehicle departures	Average vehicle waiting times	Average vehicle waiting times	Average vehicle waiting times	Average passenger waiting time	Average passenger waiting time,	Number of people waiting 1-5	Number of people waiting 6-10	Maximum passenger wait time
04	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
06	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
07	3	0	0	1	1	0:49:40	0:57:30	1:00:00					
08	4	2	2	0	2	0:48:45	0:48:45	1:02:00					
09	13	8	8	0	8	0:42:05	0:42:05	1:05:00					
10	10	8	8	0	8	1:04:24	1:06:20	1:38:00					
11	12	16	14	1	15	0:32:40	0:32:40	0:48:00					
12	24	30	23	0	23	0:18:58	0:18:58	0:25:00					
13	28	34	24	2	26	0:29:26	0:30:53	0:54:00					
14	16	19	15	3	18	0:30:15	0:33:42	0:47:00					
15	18	23	16	2	18	0:32:57	0:34:04	0:44:00					
16	18	23	15	1	16	0:40:43	0:42:21	0:52:00					
17	11	23	17	0	17	0:22:44	0:22:42	0:28:00					
18	15	20	13	1	14	0:19:40	0:19:40	0:43:00					
19	10	11	7	1	8	0:50:06	0:56:45	1:09:00					
20	8	13	8	3	11	0:34:15	0:35:50	1:00:00					
21	11	12	5	1	6	0:37:33	0:41:53	1:02:00					
22	22	49	24	1	25	0:18:22	0:18:22	0:29:00					
23	35	69	42	0	42	0:12:38	0:12:38	0:19:00					
00	48	65	38	1	39	0:10:01	0:09:59	0:19:00					
01	57	117	58	2	60	0:09:29	0:09:37	0:18:00					
02	46	72	40	3	43	0:13:50	0:14:36	0:24:00					
03	42	92	42	5	47	0:09:29	0:09:47	0:16:00					
04	4	5	4	4	8	0:06:45	0:17:00	0:17:00					
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>455</b>	<b>711</b>	<b>423</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>455</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a					n/a

No passenger waits

**Colchester, Head Street Rank, Thursday 8<sup>th</sup> November 2012, 1500 – 0400**

Maximum passenger wait time (mins)														
Number waiting 11 mins or more														
Number of people waiting 6-10 mins														
Number of people waiting 1-5 mins														
Average passenger waiting time, those waiting only (mins)														
Average passenger waiting time in an hour (mins)														
Maximum vehicle waiting time for a fare (hh:mm:ss)	0													
Average vehicle waiting times (for a fare, hh:mm:ss)	0	0:05:00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Average vehicle waiting times (hh:mm:ss)	0	0:08:30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Vehicle departures	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Empty vehicle departures	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total loaded vehicle departures	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Total passenger departures	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
No of vehicle arrivals	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3
<b>Hour</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>00</b>	<b>01</b>	<b>02</b>	<b>03</b>	<b>TOTALS</b>
														<b>3</b>
														<b>n/a</b>
														<b>n/a</b>
														<b>n/a</b>
														<b>n/a</b>

No passenger waits



## Colchester, Head Street Rank, Friday 9<sup>th</sup> November 2012, 0400 – 0600 next day

Hour	No of vehicle arrivals	Total passenger departures	Total loaded vehicle departures	Empty vehicle departures	Total Vehicle departures	Average vehicle waiting times (hh:mm:ss)	Average vehicle waiting times (for a fare, hh:mm:ss)	Maximum vehicle waiting time for a fare	Average passenger waiting time in	Average passenger waiting time, ..	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time (mins)
04	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
06	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
07	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
08	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
09	2	0	0	2	2	0:01:00	0	0						
10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
11	4	0	0	4	4	0:04:00	0	0						
12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
13	1	0	0	1	1	0:11:00	0	0						
14	1	1	1	0	1	0:22:00	0:22:00	0:22:00						
15	3	6	3	0	3	0:01:20	0:01:20	0:03:00						
16	1	0	0	1	1	0:09:00	0	0		No passenger waits				
17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
22	1	2	1	0	1	0:05:00	0:05:00	0:05:00						
23	1	2	1	0	1	0:49:00	0:49:00	0:49:00						
00	6	4	3	2	5	0:06:50	0:11:40	0:23:00						
01	4	3	3	2	5	0:02:30	0:03:00	0:05:00						
02	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
03	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
<b>TOTALS</b>	24	18	12	12	24	n/a	n/a	n/a						n/a

**Colchester, Queen Street Rank, Thursday 8<sup>th</sup> November 2012, 2200 – 0600**

Maximum passenger wait time (mins)													
Number waiting 11 mins or more													
Number of people waiting 6-10 mins													
Number of people waiting 1-5 mins													
Average passenger waiting time, those waiting only (mins)													
Average passenger waiting time in an hour (mins)													
Maximum vehicle waiting time for a fare (hh:mm:ss)													
Average vehicle waiting times (for a fare, hh:mm:ss)													
Average vehicle waiting times (hh:mm:ss)													
Total Vehicle departures													
Empty vehicle departures													
Total loaded vehicle departures													
Total passenger departures													
No of vehicle arrivals													
<b>Hour</b>													
<b>22</b>	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>23</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>00</b>	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>01</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>02</b>	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>03</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>04</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>05</b>	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>0:02:30</b>	<b>0:02:00</b>	<b>0:02:00</b>	<b>0:02:00</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>

No passenger waits

**Colchester, Queen Street Rank, Friday 9<sup>th</sup> November 2012, 2200 – 0400**

Maximum passenger wait time (mins)																							
Number waiting 11 mins or more																							
Number of people waiting 6-10 mins																							
Number of people waiting 1-5 mins																							
Average passenger waiting time, those waiting only (mins)																							
Average passenger waiting time in an hour (mins)																							
Maximum vehicle waiting time for a fare (hh:mm:ss)																							
Average vehicle waiting times (for a fare, hh:mm:ss)																							
Average vehicle waiting times (hh:mm:ss)																							
Total Vehicle departures																							
Empty vehicle departures																							
Total loaded vehicle departures																							
Total passenger departures																							
No of vehicle arrivals																							
<b>Hour</b>																							
<b>22</b>	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>23</b>	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>00</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>01</b>	2	2	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>02</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>03</b>	2	4	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>0:02:00</b>	<b>0:02:00</b>	<b>0:02:00</b>	<b>0:02:00</b>	<b>0:02:00</b>	<b>0:02:00</b>	<b>0:02:00</b>	<b>0:02:00</b>	<b>0:02:00</b>	<b>0:02:00</b>	<b>0:02:00</b>	<b>0:02:00</b>	<b>0:02:00</b>	<b>0:02:00</b>	<b>0:02:00</b>	<b>0:02:00</b>

No passenger waits

**Colchester, Bus Station Rank, Friday 9<sup>th</sup> November 2012, 0800 – 2200**

Maximum passenger wait time (mins)																													
Number waiting 11 mins or more																													
Number of people waiting 6-10 mins																													
Number of people waiting 1-5 mins																													
Average passenger waiting time, those waiting only (mins)																													
Average passenger waiting time in an hour (mins)																													
Maximum vehicle waiting time for a fare (hh:mm:ss)																													
Average vehicle waiting times (for a fare, hh:mm:ss)		0	0	0	0:26:00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
Average vehicle waiting times (hh:mm:ss)	0:02:30	0:05:00	0:33:20	0:32:30	0:18:00	0	0:27:30	0	0:12:00	0	0	0:12:00	0:03:00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a				
Total Vehicle departures	2	3	1	1	4	1	2	0	2	0	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	n/a				
Empty vehicle departures	2	2	1	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	n/a				
Total loaded vehicle departures	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	n/a				
Total passenger departures	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	n/a				
No of vehicle arrivals	2	3	3	2	2	0	2	0	2	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	n/a				
<b>Hour</b>	<b>08</b>	<b>09</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>22</b>								<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>n/a</b>

No passenger waits

**Colchester, North Railway Station Rank, (private) Friday 9<sup>th</sup> November 2012, 0800 – 0500**

Maximum passenger wait time (mins)  
 Number waiting 11 mins or more  
 Number of people waiting 6-10 mins  
 Number of people waiting 1-5 mins  
 Average passenger waiting time, those waiting only (mins)  
 Average passenger waiting time in an hour (mins)  
 Maximum vehicle waiting time for a fare (mins)  
 Average vehicle waiting times (for a fare, mins)  
 Average vehicle waiting times (mins)  
 Total Vehicle departures  
 Empty vehicle departures  
 Total loaded vehicle departures  
 Total passenger departures  
 No of vehicle arrivals

Hour	No of vehicle arrivals	Total passenger departures	Total loaded vehicle departures	Empty vehicle departures	Total Vehicle departures	Average vehicle waiting times (mins)	Average vehicle waiting times (for a fare, mins)	Maximum vehicle waiting time for a fare (mins)	Average passenger waiting time in an hour (mins)	Average passenger waiting time, those waiting only (mins)	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time (mins)
07	6	0	0	0	0	0:08:30	0:08:30	0:16:00						
08	16	20	18	0	18	0:18:11	0:18:11	0:30:00						
09	38	47	38	0	38	0:12:57	0:12:57	0:30:00						
10	22	23	15	0	15	0:51:38	0:51:38	1:12:00						
11	16	12	10	1	11	1:01:56	1:06:00	1:11:00						
12	17	16	14	4	18	0:53:18	0:54:15	1:03:00						
13	12	19	17	1	18	0:35:05	0:36:06	0:45:00						
14	20	23	20	2	22	0:26:15	0:26:22	0:33:00						
15	26	13	13	0	13	0:44:14	0:44:14	0:59:00						
16	22	40	30	1	31	0:26:38	0:26:57	0:40:00						
18	31	32	28	0	28	0:23:17	0:23:17	0:32:00						
18	47	60	54	1	55	0:09:41	0:09:42	0:17:00	0:06	3	1	0	0	3
19	76	73	65	1	66	0:11:40	0:11:39	0:21:00			No passenger waits	0	0	
20	64	54	46	3	49	0:35:01	0:35:04	1:03:00	0:06	3	1	0	0	3
21	28	33	31	3	34	0:56:34	0:57:51	1:08:00						
22	37	43	28	2	30	0:53:54	0:57:45	1:11:00						
23	25	68	54	3	57	0:32:53	0:33:45	0:42:00						
00	61	45	31	2	33	0:38:26	0:39:08	1:01:00						
01	21	58	48	1	49	0:15:09	0:15:09	0:40:00						
02	15	17	14	1	15	0:00:20	0:00:04	0:01:00						
03	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
04	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>696</b>	<b>574</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>						





## Appendix 2 Stakeholder Feedback Diary

Chapter	Stakeholder Group / Person	Date	Views returned?
5	<b>Supermarkets</b>		
	Queens, Queen Street	10/1/13	Y
	Sainsbury's Priory Walk	10/1/13	Y
	Asda, Petrolea Close	10/1/13	Y
	Waitrose, St Andrew's Ave	10/1/13	
	Ocean, North Road Station	10/1/13	N
5	<b>Hotels</b>		
	Riverside, North Station Road	10/1/13	Y
	Premier Inn, Colchester Central	10/1/13	Y
5	<b>Hospitals</b>		
	Colchester General Hospital	10/1/13	Y
5	<b>Disability representatives</b>		
	Inez Davies, The Haven Project	22/11/12	Y
5	<b>Police</b>		
	Ian Banks	2/10/12	Y
5	<b>Night Clubs / bars</b>		
	Liquid / Envy		N
	Slug and Lettuce	15/1/13	Y
	Silk Road		N
	Playhouse		N
	V Bar		N
	Yates		N
	Qube		N
	Missoula	15/1/13	Y
	Fashion Café Bar		N
5	<b>Rail Operators</b>		
	Greater Anglia	2/10/12	Y
5	<b>Tourism/Policy</b>		
	Karen Turnbull	11/1/13	Y
	Jane Thompson	16/1/13	Y
6	<b>Hackney carriage and private hire trade</b>		
	Letter, questionnaire and consultation day	9/7/12	Y
	David Green, Terry Saunders	2/10/12	Y



e-mail: [licensing.committee@colchester.gov.uk](mailto:licensing.committee@colchester.gov.uk)  
website: [www.colchester.gov.uk](http://www.colchester.gov.uk)