

Consultation Responses Log

Response	Summary of points raised	Amendment to Draft Policy
Response 1 (Councillor)	Full support for proposed amendments	No changes to the Policy
Response 2 (Councillor)	Clarification on what 'a good standard of English' means. Explanation of proposed internal procedures provided. Full support for proposal once clarification provided.	No changes to the Policy
Response 3 (Parish Council)	Full support for proposed amendments	No changes to the Policy
Response 4 (Councillor)	<p>Objection to the proposal regarding tinted windows for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could result in legal challenges to the Council • Luxury vehicles have standard factory fitted legal privacy glass so would these not be licensable? • Privacy glass is within the law in the rear of vehicles • Drivers can see out of the rear windows • Privacy glass is needed for protection for children and adults from dangerous sun rays. • Executive clientele do require the privacy that the glass supplies • One man private hire drivers use luxury vehicles as they can't compete with large run around private hire companies and go for quality not quantity. • Barring this vehicle would penalise the small one man businesses. 	<p>With regards to tinted windows, amendments have been made to include an exemption for executive cars. The proposal will only apply to new vehicle licences issued after 1st July 2019.</p> <p>With regards to the stickers in the rear of the vehicle, wording has been amended so the sticker is not 'dual sided'. The Council have sourced 'stickers' that will not peel off when the window is opened. In addition, the stickers in the rear of the vehicle are for the benefit of the passengers in the vehicle so doesn't need to be seen outside of the vehicle.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drivers have a responsibility to report any suspicious treatment of vulnerable people etc. • The Council has to balance to reactions of keeping people safe and destroying good private hire drivers' livelihood. We should not be telling these drivers that they have to buy lower standard of basic vehicles that don't have privacy glass. <p>Objection to the displaying of internal plates on the rear passengers windows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The rear windows are fully opening so would not stay stuck to the window. • Stickers cannot be seen through legal privacy glass. <p>Unable to support these two proposals as drivers can easily license themselves with less picky licensing authorities and we shouldn't be encouraging that.</p>	
Response 5 (Licence Holder)	Objection to the proposal that hire companies are only licensed for 3 months rather than one year as this will cost hire companies money, time and will not be able to provide the same level of service to the licensed drivers.	This amendment has been proposed due to the amount of Officer time that is being spent on ensuring hire companies comply with the legislation. No amendment to the Policy made as the concerns raised will be covered by internal procedures.
Response 6 (County Council)	Full support for the proposal regarding tinted windows as they support any measure taking by Licensing Authorities that is aimed at improving safeguarding of their passengers.	No amendments to the Policy
Response 7 (County Council)	Full support for the proposal regarding tinted windows in	No amendments to the Policy

APPENDIX 1

	<p>the interest of safety and safeguarding as there is no reason why a licensed vehicle should require tinted glass and given that some vulnerable service users are transported without a passenger assistant on board, it is essential that parents/carers, the public, other road users and schools/day centres can clearly see into the rear of the licensed vehicle.</p>	
--	---	--