

## Response ID ANON-QPYE-1ZZG-B

Submitted to **Have your say on Private Hire Operator Licence Fees**

Submitted on **2017-06-16 18:36:37**

### Our proposals

#### 1 Do you agree with our proposal to change the existing structure to reflect the size of private hire operators?

No

#### 2 Do you agree with the proposed tiers to be used to allocate fees?

No

#### 3 Do you agree that operators in the three largest tiers should be able to pay the grant of licence fee in annual instalments?

No

#### 4 Do you have any further comments?

##### Comments:

The LPHCA opposes Transport for London's (TfL) 'Private Hire Operator Licence Fees' proposals and maintains the need for immediate suspension of the consultation process.

We believe the 'Private Hire Operator Licence Fees' proposals represent a disproportionate increase from the current fee structure. The grounds for the increase remains unsubstantiated and no justification has been presented for the effects upon the livelihoods of licence-holders. It is therefore further submitted that the current fee proposals are unreasonable.

We submit the overall consultation process, incorporating the 'Have your say on Private Hire Operator Licence Fees' survey, unnecessarily and improperly contravenes, amongst other criterion, Cabinet Office 'Consultation Principles 2016' guidance. Our complaints, regarding the consultation to date, include:

(1) TfL has not sought key stakeholder input, nor given any advance-notice, prior to launching the consultation.

(2) TfL has opted to conduct a short 8-week consultation.

(3) TfL has ignored the impact of outside time constraints frustrating responses.

(4) TfL has only directly notified stakeholders through limited channels.

(5) TfL has not clarified how it has indirectly, and publicly, notified other interested parties.

(6) TfL has created an online survey with demonstrable systematic technical failures that reject submissions causing the need to repeat survey completion or submit outside of the online process. This has caused considerable confusion amongst respondents over whether their submission has been received with additional time required to re-write their submission.

(7) TfL has designed an online survey with leading questions and ambiguous multiple-choice answers that could lead to misleading responses.

(8) TfL has disclosed limited justification, or basis, for the proposals.

We have separately presented the above complaints and opened a dialogue with senior TfL representatives on these matters. Supporting Freedom of Information Act 2000 requests have been sent and, whilst TfL has failed to comply with statutory deadlines, information continues to be sought on TfL's basis for these proposals.

In conclusion, the LPHCA strongly opposes the Licence Fee proposals contained in the consultation document and we believe TfL's conduct in undertaking this consultation process has been wholly unacceptable. The Association has been left with no other option but to answer "No" to each question and make a formal complaint to TfL about the consultation process.

As London PHV Operators have historically had very high compliance rates and very few category 7 failings, without the information we have sought from TfL Taxi and Private Hire, it is impossible to use this consultation process as a basis for giving an informed opinion about future licensing fees for licensed PHV Operators.

As Private Hire Licensing in London is determined in law in three separate classifications Operators, Drivers and Vehicles, we also wish to submit that Operator licensing fees must be utilised to manage PHV Operator licensing and must not be appropriated to the wider compliance of PHV Drivers and Vehicles or the London Taxi Industry.

A recent Freedom of Information Act request (TfL Ref: FOI-2585-1617) has determined that 1,290 taxis licensed by TfL TPH were found for not to have a second MOT test six months from the date the taxi licence was granted in financial periods running from 08 January 2016 to 07 January 2017.

In light of the above and because of the failure of TfL TPH to provide us with figures and answers upon request, we wish to establish how compliance funding is determined for both the London taxi and PHV industry and seek re-assurances that any future licensed PHV Operator Fees will not be wrongly utilised to fund compliance activity outside of requirements for PHV Operator compliance.

## About you

### 5 What is your name?

Name:

[REDACTED]

### 6 What is your email address?

Email:

[REDACTED]

### 7 Please provide us with your postcode?

Postcode:

[REDACTED]

### 8 Are you responding as:

A representative of an organisation

Other:

### 9 If responding on behalf of an organisation, business or campaign group, please provide us with the name:

Organisation:

The Licensed Private Hire Car Association

### 10 How did you find out about this consultation?

Other (please specify)

Other:

Through the media

### 11 What do you think about the quality of this consultation (for example, the information we have provided, any printed material you have received, any maps or plans, the website and questionnaire etc.)?

Very poor

Do you have any further comments about the quality of the consultation material?:

We are submitting a formal complaint

## Equality Monitoring

### 12 Gender:

[REDACTED]

### 13 Ethnic Group:

[REDACTED]

### 14 Age:

[REDACTED]

### 15 Sexual Orientation:

[REDACTED]

### 16 Faith:

[REDACTED]

**17 Are your day-to-day activities limited because of a health problem or disability which has lasted, or is expected to last, at least 12 months? (Please include problems related to old age)**

No