

26 February 2016

Your contact is: Richard Woodford - Committee Services

NOTICE OF MEETING - LICENSING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE - 8 MARCH 2016

A meeting of the Licensing Applications Committee will be held on Tuesday 8 March 2016 at 6.30pm in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Bridge Street, Reading. The agenda for the meeting is set out below.

**AGENDA**

	WARDS AFFECTED	PAGE NO
1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST		-
Councillors to declare any disclosable pecuniary interests they may have in relation to the items for consideration.		
2. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF LICENSING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE HELD ON 4 NOVEMBER 2015		1
To confirm the Minutes of the Licensing Applications Committee meeting held on 4 November 2015.		
3. PETITIONS		
Petitions submitted pursuant to Standing Order 36 in relation to matters falling within the Committee's Powers & Duties which have been received by Head of Legal & Democratic Services no later than four clear working days before the meeting.		
4. QUESTIONS		-
To receive any questions from Councillors and members of the public.		

5. REVIEW OF HACKNEY CARRIAGE UNMET DEMAND SURVEY RESULTS      BOROUGHWIDE      4

A report to asking the Committee to consider the results of the recently completed hackney carriage unmet demand survey and whether it is appropriate to amend the current limiting policy approach to hackney carriage numbers.

## LICENSING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE - 4 NOVEMBER 2015

Present: Councillor Woodward (Chair);  
Councillors Chrisp, Dennis, Livingston, Page, Skeats and  
Vickers.

Apologies: Councillors D Edwards, Grashoff and Singh.

### 2. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meetings held on 8 October 2014 and 27 May 2015 were confirmed as correct records and signed by the Chair.

### 3. HACKNEY CARRIAGE CRITERIA

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhood Services submitted a report asking the Committee to consider and approve suitable criteria for the allocation of Hackney Carriage Licence Plates as and when they may become available. A copy of the proposed criteria was attached to the report at Appendix 1.

The report explained that on 28 March 2007 officers had submitted a report to the Licensing Applications Committee (Minute 8 refers) that had recommended the delimitation of Hackney carriage vehicle numbers and had proposed criteria for issuing new licences that potential proprietors would have to meet in order to be granted a licence. A further report had been submitted to Licensing Applications Sub-Committee 3 on 3 September 2007 requesting discretion in applying the approved criteria agreed at the meeting in March 2007 for issuing new Hackney carriage vehicle licences (Minute 13 refers). The discretion was approved to be in conjunction with the Chair of Licensing Applications Sub-Committee 3 and where the Head of Environment and Consumer Services deemed appropriate the Reading Taxi Association (RTA); officers currently met with RTA representatives. Sections of the old criteria were challenged at the time and other areas of the criteria were currently considered inappropriate, as a result officers had drafted a new set of criteria.

The report stated that after a lengthy legal battle a Hackney Carriage Licence plate had become available to be issued to a suitable applicant and it was believed that demand for such a licence would be high. The proposed criteria had been drafted to allow the Council to consider the most suitable group of applicants who could be awarded the licence. It was also proposed that this criteria was used should any unmet demand survey find unmet demand and the Committee approved the issuing of additional Hackney Carriage Vehicle Licences Plates.

Asif Rashid, Chairman Reading Taxi Association, Syed Abbas, Chairman Reading Taxi Drivers Association, and Tahir Abdullah were present at the meeting and addressed the Committee.

The Committee discussed the report and agreed that new Hackney carriage proprietors' licences should be granted to licenced Reading Borough Council Hackney Carriage Drivers who had held a Reading Borough Council Hackney

## LICENSING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE - 4 NOVEMBER 2015

Carriage Drivers licence for eight consecutive years and who had rented a Hackney Carriage Vehicle for the same eight year period. The Committee also agreed that proof of renting for the same relevant eight year period would be via tax records, rental receipts and audit accounts.

Resolved -

- (1) That new Hackney Carriage Proprietors' licences be granted to licensed Reading Borough Council Hackney Carriage Drivers who have held a Reading Borough Council licenced Hackney Carriage Drivers licence for eight consecutive years and have rented a Hackney carriage vehicle for the eight year period and whose intention it is to personally drive the Hackney Carriage vehicle for which any licence is issued full time (37 hours per week) (proof of renting for the same relevant eight year period will be via tax records, rental receipts and audit accounts);
- (2) That licences would not be granted to any person who has previously been issued a Proprietors' licence in the past by the Council, or to any person who currently owns a Reading Borough Council licensed Hackney Carriage Vehicle licence;
- (3) That applicants who successfully meet the criteria and are eligible for a Proprietors' licence must provide a brand new vehicle for licensing within three months of being permitted to apply for a Hackney Carriage Vehicle licence;
- (4) That should one or more applicants meet the required criteria, the Licensing Applications Committee will review the applications and take into consideration the following when awarding the vehicle licence:
  - (a) DVLA driving record;
  - (b) Number of years renting a Hackney Carriage Vehicle;
  - (c) Driving and complaints record;
- (5) That if one or more drivers meet the criteria and the number of licences issued is limited the allocation of licences be via a draw;
- (6) That conditions requiring the following be attached to new Hackney Carriage Proprietors' licences:
  - (a) The proprietor may transfer the licence to another appropriate vehicle, upon application to the Council;
  - (b) The vehicle to which the licence is proposed to be transferred to may not be older than the currently licensed vehicle.

LICENSING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE - 4 NOVEMBER 2015

(The meeting started at 6.30pm and closed at 7.16pm)

READING BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT BY DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AND NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES (DENS)

TO:	LICENSING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE		
DATE:	8 MARCH 2016	AGENDA ITEM:	5
TITLE:	REVIEW OF HACKNEY CARRIAGE UNMET DEMAND SURVEY RESULTS		
LEAD COUNCILLOR:	PAUL GITTINGS	PORTFOLIO:	CULTURE, SPORT AND CONSUMER SERVICES.
SERVICE:	PLANNING DEVELOPMENT & REGULATORY SERVICES	WARDS:	BOROUGHWIDE
LEAD OFFICER:	J S Champeau	TEL:	72239 01189 372239
JOB TITLE:	SENIOR LICENSING & ENFORCEMENT OFFICER	E-MAIL:	Jean.champeau@reading.gov.uk

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 To allow members to consider the results of the recently completed hackney carriage unmet demand survey.
- 1.2 To allow members to consider whether it is appropriate to amend the current limiting policy approach to hackney carriage numbers.

2. RECOMMENDED ACTION

- 2.1 Members note that the results of the unmet demand survey states that there is currently no significant unmet demand for hackney carriages in the Reading rank based market.
- 2.2 Members consider retaining the current policy of not issuing any further hackney carriage licences, pending another review due in late 2018 or consider other options as outlined by officers.

3. POLICY CONTEXT

- 3.1 The Town Police Clauses Act 1847, as amended by the Transport Act 1985, enables Councils to restrict the number of hackney carriage licences issued in their area, but only if they are satisfied that there is no significant unmet demand for

hackney carriage services. In order to be satisfied that there is no significant unmet demand a survey must be carried out, at least every three years.

#### 4. BACKGROUND

- 4.1 Prior to 1998 the number of hackney carriages in Reading was limited to 122. This was increased in 1998 by 16, bringing the number of licences to 138. In 2005 a further 15 licences were issued, bringing the total to 153.
- 4.2 In November 2003 the Office of Fair Trading (OFT) published a market study into the regulation of hackney carriages and private hire vehicles in the UK. The OFT recommended that local authorities should lose their powers to restrict the number of hackney carriage licences issued because they considered that such restrictions can:
- a) reduce the availability of hackney carriages
  - b) increase waiting times for consumers
  - c) reduce choice and safety for consumers
  - d) restrict those wanting to set up a hackney carriage business

Following the OFT report the Government published an Action Plan making it clear that the Government believes restrictions should only be retained where there is shown to be a clear benefit for the consumer, and that Councils should publicly justify their reasons for the retention of restrictions and how decisions on numbers have been reached. The Government considers that unless a specific case can be made, it is not in the interests of consumers for market entry to be refused to those who meet the application criteria. However, the Government also makes clear in the Action Plan that local authorities remain best placed to determine local transport needs and to make the decisions about them in the light of local circumstances.

- 4.3 In October 2006, the Department for Transport published their “Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Licensing Best Practice Guidance”. This Guidance supports the view that an approach of not imposing quantity restrictions constitutes best practice.
- 4.4 From April 2007 to March 2009, the number of HC’s licensed by the Council increased by 40% from 153 to 216 vehicles.
- 4.5 In March 2009, as a result of the increase in numbers of vehicles and down turn in the economy members resolved not to issue any further licences in respect of HC vehicles and instructed officers to carry out an unmet demand survey.
- 4.6 In February 2010, members reviewed both the results of the unmet demand survey and HC quantity control policy. Members resolved to retain the policy of not issuing any further HC licences pending a further review in spring 2012.
- 4.7 In March 2010, the Department for Transport published its latest “Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Licensing Best Practice Guidance”. This Guidance continues to

support the view that an approach of not imposing quantity restrictions constitutes best practice.

- 4.8 In October 2012 an unmet demand survey was carried out, the results of which were presented to members in a report in February 2013. Members of the committee considered the results of the survey and reviewed the impact of the policy in place which limited the number of hackney carriages for the previous 3 years. They considered whether it was appropriate for the policy approach to remain in place. Members resolved to that the current restriction on hackney carriage vehicle licences be retained.

#### 4 THE PROPOSAL

##### (a) Current Position

- 5.1 During the summer of 2015 Officers contacted three transport consultants with requests for proposals to carry out an unmet demand survey. CTS Traffic & Transportation were retained to carry out a survey to determine if any unmet demand existed within the borough of Reading.

- 5.2 Appendix I - Taxi Unmet Demand Study carried out on behalf of Reading Borough Council by CTS Traffic & Transportation.

##### (b) (1) Options Proposed

- 5.3 It is officers' view that there is currently a good supply of hackney carriages in Reading and the results of the recently completed unmet demand survey demonstrates this to be the case. The report identifies some areas of taxi provision which could be changed including the removal of ranks that are not used. The survey does indicate that there is a growth in passenger numbers since the last survey. The south side ranks located at the rail station are still the main source of work for the hackney carriage trade.

- 5.3.1 The re-development of the train station is now complete and operational. The provision of rank space on the north of the station is under used and is unlikely to be fully used for a number of years. The provision of taxi ranks on the south side remains limited due to the removal of the old bus station. During none peak times there are many hackney carriages waiting at ranks for customers and this has caused disruption to other road users. Any additional Hackney Carriage licences would require additional spaces to rank in the station area. For these reasons, officers do not believe that it is necessary for further hackney carriage licences to be issued at this time.

##### (b) (2) Options Proposed

- 5.4 Whilst option 1 above sits within the results of the unmet demand survey results, officers recognise that passenger numbers have grown and are likely to continue over the coming years. Officers would therefore like members to consider removing the limit on hackney carriage numbers but restrict any issuing of licences to a maximum number in a particular period, e.g. 2 per year if the applicants



meet the taxi criteria approved in November 2015. This would provide a drip feed approach to the increase in numbers of passengers identified by the report, rather than a large number of licences issued in 3 years' time if growth continues.

- 5.5 If members are inclined to approve either of the approaches set out above they must be able to legally justify the reasons for their decision. Guidance suggests that this should only occur if it is in the public interest and the Council must be able to publicly justify the reasons for any restrictions.

(c) Other Options Considered

6. Alternative approaches to this issue could include:

Option 1

Completely remove the limit on the number of hackney carriage licences available and allow market forces to determine the number of cabs.

Option 2

Remove the limit on the number of hackney carriage licences available, but put in place criteria that applicants must meet in order to qualify for the issue of a licence, thereby limiting those who would qualify.

7. CONTRIBUTION TO STRATEGIC AIMS

7.1 Equal Opportunities -

The licensing of hackney carriage drivers has the objective of ensuring that all drivers of such vehicles are trained to a high and equal standard and are able to provide an adequate, safe and efficient service to the residents and visitors of the Borough. The provision of wheelchair accessible hackney carriages increases the ability of disabled consumers to utilise taxi services.

7.2 Sustainability Implications -

The use of public transport is supported by Reading Borough Council in order to develop as a green city, thereby reducing unnecessary vehicle use and emissions. Efficient and licensed hackney carriage vehicles and drivers provide a valuable contribution to the economic development of the town.

8. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND INFORMATION

- 8.1 In considering whether it is appropriate to issue additional hackney carriage licences, formal consultation with those affected by any proposal has taken place, including the taxi and private hire trades, the public and other interested parties.

9. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 Section 37 of the Town Police Clauses Act 1847, as amended by section 16 of the Transport Act 1985, enables Councils to licence taxis and to restrict the number of

taxi licences issued only if they are satisfied that there is no significant unmet demand for taxi services in their area.

- 9.2 Any person aggrieved by the Council's refusal to grant a hackney carriage licence may appeal to the Crown Court.

## 10. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 In the event of an appeal, the Council will have to bear the costs of defending their decision.
- 10.2 If, as is proposed, a limiting approach to the issue of hackney carriage licences were maintained a survey costing in the region of £11,000 would have to be undertaken every 3 years, therefore a further survey would need to be undertaken in late 2018.

## 11. BACKGROUND PAPERS

Appendix I - Taxi Unmet Demand Study carried out on behalf of Reading Borough Council by CTS Traffic & Transportation.

Department for Transport Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Licensing Best Practice Guidance.



TRAFFIC + TRANSPORTATION

THE DATA COLLECTION SPECIALISTS

Reading Borough Council

Taxi survey

Final Report

February 2016



# Contents

<b>Executive summary .....</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>1. Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Background to taxi licensing in Reading .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3. Results from rank surveys .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>4. Public Consultation results .....</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>5. Stakeholder Consultation.....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>6. Licensed Vehicle Trade Consultation .....</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>7. Summary and conclusions .....</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>8. Recommendations .....</b>	<b>63</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: 10/02/16

Checked by: Joe Maclaren  
Date: 10/02/16



## **Executive summary**

CTS Traffic and Transportation were appointed by Reading Borough Council to undertake their "Taxi survey" on 10<sup>th</sup> June 2015, with committee confirmation the survey was required on 9<sup>th</sup> July 2015. This report presents the results of all investigations undertaken to provide a database of robust information on which a decision can be taken by councillors in regard to the hackney carriage vehicle limitation policy. All research was undertaken in line with the current Department for Transport Best Practice Guidance (April 2010) and taking advantage of the extensive research undertaken by the Law Commission in their recent review of licensing.

Reading is a unitary authority just to the West of London lying on the Great Western main line routes to Wales and the West Country. It is a university town and is also well-known for its annual music Festival. There has been no change in transport policy background since the last survey although the area – particularly the central area – continues to see development, although the major redevelopment of the railway station itself is now complete.

Present industry statistics show no evidence of strong increases in private hire vehicles arising from the current limited number of hackney carriage vehicles. Driver numbers across the taxi industry are about the same as during the last survey, and overall vehicle numbers remain lower than the level observed in 2009.

A four day rank survey programme was undertaken resulting in 682 hours of data being available to test for the existence of unmet demand across the licensing area. This programme covered all known ranks – including the two new Station ranks and the Hospital rank – and undertook some testing of ranks outside their formal operating hours if they were normally restricted in operating hours. 10% of the overall observations at or near ranks were private cars often abusing rank space.

Compared to 2012, there has been an 11% overall growth in usage of hackney carriages from ranks in an average week (very similar to the 10% growth observed from national statistics for Reading station passenger entries and exits). The ranks remain dominated by the Horseshoe rank although the other two new station ranks have both shared the overall patronage from the station. Interestingly, the sum of the three station ranks retains very similar share of rank patronage to that in 2012 – the new ranks have not generated any new custom at this time.

Patterns of rank usage have changed since 2012 with increases at Yield Hall Place, Headmasters and Quicksilver ranks, and declines at Station Road and Gun Street. The movement between rank usage as the night progresses remains with early focus around Yield Hall Place moving to the Friar Street set of ranks and finally to the Headmasters area.

The fleet observed during the surveys was lower than in 2012 – seeing between 67% and 88% of the fleet over the first three days – compared to 90% overall in 2012. This suggests spare capacity although this survey did see significant growth in passenger queueing in off peak hours, though the proportion of passengers waiting in queues on average more than a minute was very similar to the previous results. The index of significance of unmet demand (ISUD) remains low and significantly lower than either the threshold value or the value identified in 2009 which saw the limit returned.



198 people were consulted in the central area. This sample suggested a significant reduction in overall recent use of licensed vehicles compared to 2012. The main drop was the level of hailing with rank usage taking about the same proportion. Over half of respondents found fares reasonable. Main ranks used match the survey information – Horseshoe and Pitcher and Piano (though called 'Friar St'). No new ranks were felt necessary. Latent demand for hackney carriages was reduced compared to 2012.

Stakeholders had no issue and continued to provide examples of use of both ranks and phoned for bookings – a healthy mix not found in all licensing areas (where bookings can often dominate). Police concerns related to over-ranking. The police remained pleased with the ability of the rank network to clear the central area appropriately.

Although eight wheel chair customers were observed using ranks to access hackney carriages no other input from those with disabilities was obtained.

The council undertaken driver consultation (ahead of the main survey) had a marginally better response than at the time of the previous survey. There appears more support for retention of the fixed limit option now. The only concern raised regarded rent levels and the volume of vehicles available for rent.

In conclusion, the Reading hackney carriage service (and related private hire) continues to provide a high quality service to its customers, day and night. Excellent provision of a wide range of active ranks keeps the central area safe at all times for the general public.

There is no evidence that any observed unmet demand, either patent or latent, is significant at this current time. The committee can retain the current policy and limit at the present level and defend this as necessary.

Key issues for action include need to enforce ranks against car abuse – particularly at the hospital rank but also at some other locations. There is also opportunity for the trade to grow business by taking note of the gaps in service observed at the hospital and the King Street rank.

It would be prudent for discussions to occur about the potential for more vehicles being needed to service hackney carriage demand before the date of the next survey in three years (surveys no later than October 2018). This should be in the context of ensuring real patronage growth was never stunted by lack of supply. The issue of rent levels and vehicle availability to rent could be included in this conversation as increasing double shifting could potentially help more than new plates – though the option of having a few plates on offer for those wishing to move on from renting might also be beneficial.

# 1. Introduction

Reading Council is responsible for the licensing of hackney carriage and private hire vehicles operating within the council area. The licensing authority retains a limit on the number of hackney carriage vehicles it licences. This limit began in 1988 but there was a period between March 2007 and March 2009 when the limit did not apply. There have been regular reviews of policy supported by surveys in 2012, 2009, 2002 and 1997.

## **Study timetable**

Reading appointed CTS Traffic and Transportation on 10<sup>th</sup> June 2015 to undertake this survey of taxi demand in line with our quotation dated May 2015 as revised at the Inception Meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> July 2015. For the sake of clarity the need for our survey was confirmed by Committee on 7<sup>th</sup> July 2015, this decision was advised to us on 14<sup>th</sup> July, the inception meeting was held on 21<sup>st</sup> July and the study purchase order provided on 12<sup>th</sup> August 2015.

The review was carried out between July and December 2015, with pedestrian survey work undertaken in October 2015. Licensed vehicle driver opinions were included from a council survey undertaken in February and March 2015 together with a face to face meeting with those trade representatives wishing to meet us on 15<sup>th</sup> September 2015. Other key stakeholder consultation was undertaken between July and December. Rank surveys were undertaken in mid-October 2015 at a similar time to the previous 2012 rank surveys. A Draft Final report was submitted and this was reviewed in January 2016 to identify any factual or missing issues. The Final Report will be reported to committee on ??? 2016.

## **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 Practice 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 document from the LC was released in mid-May 2012. The final LC recommendations published on 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2014 including 84 recommendations (specific recommendation numbers in brackets below from Report) including:

- Retaining the two-tier system (1)
- A statutory definition of pre-booking (3) and a new offence of anyone other than a locally licensed taxi driver accepting a booking 'there and then' (10)
- That the term "hackney carriage" should be replaced in legislation with the word "taxi" (4)
- New duty on taxi drivers to stop in specified circumstances if so determined by the local licensing authority (12)
- Each licensing authority under a duty to consult on the need to alter rank provision, not exceeding every three years (13)
- Introduction of national standards for taxi and private hire services (30)
- Licensing authorities retain power to set local taxi standards over and above national standards (46)
- A more flexible power to introduce and remove taxi licensing zones (57)
- Licensing authorities continue to have power to limit the number of taxi vehicles licensed in their area (58)
- Subject to a statutory public interest test with how this statutory test should be applied determined by the Secretary of State (59)
- Reviewed every three years and subject to local consultation (60)
- Mandatory disability awareness training for all drivers (62)
- An accessibility review at three year intervals (65)

Other recommendations are included of less relevance to this current report. The status of this report and draft Bill remains unclear at the time of writing this report, with no specific Government response yet provided nor any date for when this might be provided.

The Deregulation Bill originally contained three clauses impacting on taxi licensing. These cover unlicensed relatives being able to drive private hire vehicles (dropped), operators being able to transfer work across borders and length of driver and operator licences. An opportunity was also given for trade representatives to identify conditions of licence that were felt to be unduly restrictive. None of these really impact on the issue of unmet demand directly but could have some impacts on operations which might move demand from hackney carriages towards private hire more than the current situation might. Both clauses taken forward came into effect in October 2015.

At the present time, passenger carrying vehicles in England are split by passenger capacity. All vehicles able to carry nine or more passengers are dealt with under national public service vehicle licensing and licensing authorities only have jurisdiction over those carrying eight or less passengers. These locally administered vehicles are 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, or mini-cabs in London and some other areas). 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.

There is a further current issue that does impact on demand – the fact that many hackney carriages once properly licensed in an area with a driver then undertake private hire work in other licensing areas, often many miles from their home base. Such vehicles can have cost base advantages and can appear to be available for immediate hire when they are not in fact legally able to do so (eg with stickers saying 'this vehicle can be hired immediately', which only applies within their licensing area).

### **Review aims and objectives – national background**

Reading Council 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...". Our database of taxi regulation, updated to December 2015, shows 91 authorities who openly declare a limit on hackney carriage vehicle numbers.

There are other licensing authorities who restrict new plates to various levels of wheelchair accessible vehicles and have various levels of grandfather rights for the remaining saloon vehicles which are effectively often limited in number albeit not in the terms of a formal limit under Section 16 (as this is counted as quality restriction rather than quantity).

Of the 91 authorities in England and Wales with a formal limit on vehicle numbers, four have never seemed to have any formal study of the limit. A further 26 have tested their policy, but on an irregular basis (and not within the last three years). Over two thirds (61 authorities) undertake a regular review, all but three of which tend to undertake this more or less every three years. Many of these authorities are very strict on their repeat cycle.

In recent years several authorities have determined to remove their limit policy – most recently Exeter. Others – most recently Cambridge – have returned a limit. In some cases authorities returning a limit set either a 'settling limit' eg Watford, or a limit beneath the current level (Chesterfield), whilst others fixed at the level when the decision was made (allowing for vehicles in the pipeline at the time of decision). Some limited authorities (notably Knowsley) have set a new limit lower than the current to take account of dormant licences at time of survey. Some authorities still are found needing to issue plates (eg BANES). Other authorities are currently considering if a limit needs to be re-applied in their area given evidence that the market is not restricting numbers appropriately.

### **Current Reading requirements**

Reading held the previous survey in 2012 and is repeating following a committee decision partly based on driver requests that the limit remains appropriate.

The key objectives of the independent study of demand are to:

- Determine whether there is any evidence of significant unmet demand for hackney carriage services in Reading
- If significant unmet demand is found recommend how many licences would be required to eliminate this

The study includes the following:

- Inception meeting
- Rank review
- Rank observations based on direct observations
- Public attitude interviews comprising face to face interviews
- Written consultation
- Report (draft and final)
- A presentation to committee

## **Methodology**

In order to meet Reading Council's objectives, the following methodology was adopted:

- Review of relevant policies, standards etc: to understand the authority's aspirations for meeting travel needs and social inclusion and provide context to determining overall demand for travel and how this should be met;
- Extensive rank observations and audits of all the ranks in the Authority, including monitoring passengers' waiting time, any illegal plying for hire, use of Hackney Carriages by wheelchair users and rank audits;
- On street interviews: a survey of representative people on street to obtain information about their understanding of the sector, their last taxi journey, their overall levels of taxi use, about quality and barriers to use;
- Consultation: including consultation with all relevant stakeholders – the local authorities, police, trade associations, all drivers, mobility impaired, specific user groups, businesses, and other major generators of taxi trips

In essence, the methodology used follows similar principles to all surveys undertaken by CTS together with all developments of methodology more recently applied to our surveys, particularly including guidance from both the 2004 DfT letter and their 2010 Best Practice Guidance (which includes the 2004 guidance as an appendix), and including the latest knowledge arising from the Law Commission Review and the current status of the Equality Act. This report also seeks to provide compatibility with previous reports provided by other consultants to the Council. As the 2012 survey was undertaken by CTS this latter compatibility is readily undertaken. Some items undertaken in 2012 have not been repeated in 2015 to ensure best value for money.

## **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 – summary and conclusions of this review
- Chapter 8 – recommendations for policy arising from this review.



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

### **The Reading Council area**

Reading Council is one of six unitary councils within the former Berkshire county area. The Borough has a current population of just over 159,000 according to the 2015 estimates from the 2011 census. This is around 2% more than the level reported in the 2012 survey for 2012 (155,700).

Reading Borough Council covers a fairly tight urban area around the central part of Reading but also includes more suburban areas of Tilehurst and Caversham. There are no other large urban centres and hardly any rural areas within the boundary, although other authority boundaries do come relatively close to the central area and are contiguous with the urban area.

In terms of rank provision, all ranks are provided by the Council itself which is the highway authority. There are just one private rank within the area on shopping centre land. All three station ranks remain on council land even following the development of the station.

### **Background Council policy**

Reading is a unitary Borough Council having highway and transport powers for the area. Transport Policy is summarised in the current Local Transport Plan (LTP). This covers the period from 2011 to 2026, having been adopted in March 2011. There have been no significant changes since the 2012 report in this regard. The LTP seeks to provide a fully accessible and integrated transport network, enhancing peoples' living environment and enabling key services and facilities to be reached by all members of the community.

The change in policy leading to widened provision of night ranks but tighter access controls for private hire vehicles in a more tightly pedestrianised central area from before 2012 remains in place.

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

Reading 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).

At the present time, overall government taxi policy is under review by the Law Commission (LC) (see Chapter 1, page 1 for more detail). The current status is that the LC recommended that councils are able to retain the option of limiting their number of hackney carriage vehicles, although any change will have to be agreed by Government and then taken through any appropriate legal process. Formal Government encouragement remains towards the minimisation of restrictions, including limit policies.



Reading removed its restriction on the number of hackney carriage vehicles in April 2007 but returned this in March 2009 following the survey of that year. The 2012 survey also found no significant unmet demand, with the limit retained at the same level of 216 vehicles. The authority has long held a 'mandatory' policy restricting all vehicles to be wheel chair accessible. At the present time this tends to provide a mainly London-style vehicle fleet. This Report is undertaken within the context of these requirements. It also cross references with previous survey data where comparison is possible.

The main change since the 2012 survey is in regard to the widened provision of ranks at the completely rebuilt Reading Station, with the original provision now replaced by a set of three ranks. Further change may occur related to building work in the vicinity of the access to what remains the most used rank. A new rank was added at the Casino following the 2012 survey.

### Background statistics

Information was obtained to demonstrate the current make-up of the licensed vehicle fleet in the Reading 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 suggests limited began in 1988			
<b>1994D</b>	117	unknown	n/k	151			
<b>1997D</b>	122	250	372	180	300	n/a	
<b>1999D</b>	138	371	509				
<b>2001D</b>	138	400	538				
<b>2004D</b>	138	425	563	191	489	60	30 ops
<b>2005D</b>	155	489	644	191	489	60	30 ops
<b>2007D</b>	155 (limit = 153 to April 07)	489	644	191	489	60	30 ops
<b>2009S</b>	214	514	728	350	450	n/a	See note below
<b>2010N</b>	214	439	653	Not collected			
<b>2011D</b>	216	449	665	440	619	n/a	38 ops
<b>2012N</b>	216	427	643				48 ops
<b>2013D</b>	216	405	621	396	519	0	44 ops
<b>2014N</b>	216	446	662				
<b>2015D</b>	216	450	666	303	552	132	42 ops
<b>2015C</b>	216	496	712	418	634	0	37 ops

*Note: DFT statistics suggested used from 1994 to 2007, 2011/ 2013 and 2015 (D). National Private Hire Association surveys for 2010/12/14(N) Council figures given at start of survey, Sept 2012(hcv), or by NPHA survey (phv) 2009 figures from 2009 survey (S)- include 66 phv school transport only (with 70 drivers), 49 executive private hire plates. Ops= private hire operators*

The Table above shows that, even when retaining an overall limit on hackney carriage vehicle numbers, Reading regularly added plates. No plates were added from 1999 to 2004. Despite this, between 1994 and when the limit was removed (a 13 year period), plate numbers had increased by 32% through specific plate issues. The two year period without a limit saw a further 38% growth till a limit of 214 was set, although the current actual limit is 216. This level has remained up to the current date. Overall growth from 1994 to 2015 is therefore 85% (or 77% from 1997, the first date comparative private hire numbers were collected by DfT).

In terms of private hire vehicle numbers, which cannot be limited, there has been an almost doubling since 1997, although 2009 saw a level slightly higher than the current level. This was at the same time that hackney carriage numbers were not limited suggesting growth in both sectors, and different to the usual drop in private hire numbers when limits are removed. This may relate to the need to add a wheel chair accessible vehicle as well as the relatively tight conditions placed on new vehicles at that time.

For the total licensed vehicle fleet, growth from 1997 to date has been some 91% overall, with the bulk of growth therefore on the private hire side (but even when there was no limit). This does tend to suggest the two parts of the trade are more separate in Reading than in other places. For example, removal of the limit in Coventry led to what is even today almost a fully hackney carriage fleet whereas this did not appear to be the case for Reading.

Driver numbers on the hackney side peaked in 2011 and are now about 132% more than in 1997 whereas private hire have grown marginally less at 111%. Overall all drivers have grown about 120%. At the present time there are no dual driver licences although the statistics show a few years when these existed, although the recent DfT statistics seem to be in error in this regard.

Operator numbers are now marginally higher than they were at the first date of statistics being available, although there was a peak in 2012 which has now reduced.

### ***Driver ratios***

At the present time there are 1.94 hackney carriage drivers per vehicle and 1.28 private hire drivers per vehicle. Whilst the hackney carriage level does suggest double shifting is very likely and the value is relatively high, there are other places with much higher figures even at present. The private hire value is moderate for private hires and unlike some areas which have about the same number – suggesting the overall market in Reading does need double shifting to occur rather than it being totally an impact of the hackney carriage vehicle limit.



### 3. Results from rank surveys

The Table below shows the result of our review of the ranks available in the Reading licensing area. This is based on a list provided by Reading Borough at the Inception meeting, and working from the list included in the 2012 report to provide details of changes to date. Some revisions were made following site visits around the Inception Meeting.

<b>Rank / operating hours</b>	<b>Spaces</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>24-hour ranks</b>		
Railway Station - Horseshoe	5	Fed from Garrard Street (15 spaces) and Station West (Station Hill)
Garrard Street	15	In 2012 also had bus station, now demolished. Replaced by Station West but much reduced number of spaces. Also this rank is under threat from future road and building revisions.
Station West (Station Hill)	18	New provision since 2012 following rebuild of station.
Station North	25	In several sections on north side of station.
Friar Street East	4	Pitcher and Piano (see below for night feeder)
Friar Street West	3	Quicksilver (see below for night feeder)
Bridge Street	3	Though 24-hour only used at night
Oxford Road, Tesco Express	2	Rarely used
Yield Hall Place	3	Potentially feeds private Yield Hall Place rank but rarely in practise due to bridge and tight access to that rank.
<b>Night ranks</b>		
Station Road	7	Bus stops in day time. Operates 23:00 to 05:00 but more issues now with buses running during period is operating and blocking rank from full use.
Friar Street East	5	In bus stop opposite Pitcher and Piano, feeds Pitcher and Piano rank, operating 23:00-05:00, but rarely used
Friar Street West	4 + 5	First section from end of Quicksilver Rank to Subway. Feeds Quicksilver rank, 23:00-05:00 only, in practice, night section moves forward from current rank and does not use this section. Second section o/s Saver's operating for similar period.
Gun Street	6 + 3	Two sections. 6 spaces o/s Purple Turtle 24 hour (remains so despite plans to make night only), plus 3 spaces o/s White Stuff operating 23:00 to 05:00 to allow for daytime deliveries

Gun Street feeder (Minster Street)	7	Bus stop in day time, marked by plates on road side only. Operates 23:00 to 05:00 only
St Mary's Butts (o/s Headmasters)	6	Bus stop in day time, near to Millet's, well used at night. Operates 23:00 to 05:00 only.
King's Street	4	Outside Mothercare – never used. Operates 23:00 to 05:00.
Blagrove Street	3	Rarely used, at time of survey under roadworks
St Mary's Butts (o/s St Mary's Church)	3	Often abused by parked cars and therefore little used. Amended since 2012 to 20:00 to 08:00 only and adjacent to island in centre of road. Further rank plates exist on opposite kerb but should have been removed.
Queen's Road, Casino	7	Operates 23:00 to 05:00 and formalises previous informal location.
<b>Informal rank locations</b>		
None		(2012 location near Casino now formal rank)
<b>Private rank location</b>		
Yield Hall Place	2 + 2	(see above, partly on Oracle shopping centre land, partly on council road)
<b>Out of town locations</b>		
Royal Berkshire Hospital	3	24-hour spaces outside hospital entrance. Existed in 2012 but not included in survey. Often has issues with other vehicles parking around hackney carriages, and over- ranking by hackney carriages.

There have been several changes since 2012 in rank provision. The major set of changes relates to the completion of the new arrangements around the completely rebuilt Reading station. Access across the station for non-ticket holders as well as for ticket holders has been significantly improved to provide a northern exit towards Caversham. This new exit includes provision for bus services and a large new multi-part taxi rank. Further, on the south side of the station there have been revisions, partly related to the station rebuild and partly due to other redevelopment in the area around the ranks there.

The principal station rank remains the five-space Horseshoe rank which remains directly outside both the former main exit and not far but clearly observable from the new main southern exit. This relatively small area for collecting passengers remains fed by Garrard Street as in 2012, with vehicles driving over the pavement to access the head of the rank. In 2012, however, there was a privately trade paid-for feeder in the former Bus Station which has now been demolished. Further, there is regular disruption to provision of waiting space in Garrard Street as the replacement buildings in that area develop.

Further provision of rank space was added with the station rebuild to include a large area in the former stub of Station Street (now known as the Station West rank). With the redevelopment this area is now totally separate from the Horseshoe (in the past there was a through route here and a long rank which was replaced by the Horseshoe). It is also down either a ramp or several steps from the main station exit and is therefore not as obvious to passengers as the Horseshoe. This area provides a good number of waiting spaces but nowhere near the original level available in the former bus station location.

We understand that hackney carriages now arrive in Station Street and join the queue at the Station West rank. If passengers arrive here, vehicles leave and proceed to the passenger destination. CB radios are used to maintain contact with the vehicles in the Garrard Street feeder so that any vehicles at the head of the Station West rank feed into Garrard Street and on to the main Horseshoe rank. There are busy times when passenger demand is sufficient to empty all feeders and ranks in this system, although there are other times when the waiting provision is insufficient. It is understood that the North rank – and indeed the north exit – has not seen as much use as perhaps expected yet.

Other changes have seen some 24-hour locations amended to night only and a few locations are impacted by the development of 24-hour bus services which now use stops which in 2012 were available for taxi ranks once the bus services ceased. The only other change to actual provision is that the informal location in Queen's Road servicing the Casino is now a formal hackney carriage rank.

During our research we did not find evidence of any other ranks within the Reading area and understand our rank coverage is therefore comprehensive as required by the Department for Transport's Best Practice Guidance on taxi and private hire licensing (BPG). The only private rank we are aware of is that in Yield Hall Place within the shopping complex.

In terms of the council brief for the study, there were two changes in regard to the coverage of ranks. Firstly, the hospital rank was to be included in 2015 (it was not covered in 2012). Secondly, and more significantly, all ranks were to be observed for their full operating hours over a four day weekend. For the sake of clarity, the coverage of station ranks automatically expanded from the single rank in 2012 to the three-fold provision in 2015, together with an estimate of the time taken for vehicles to get from arriving at the Station Hill rank to leaving the main rank head at the Horseshoe.

The breakdown of rank hours covered by video is shown in **Appendix 1**. This is made up of seven ranks covered for 96 hours, a further pair of ranks covered for 96 hours which are made up of three and two parts respectively (the two sets of Friar Street ranks), the Oracle Feeder (council) rank covered for ten hours per day (20:00 to 06:00), the St Mary's Butts rank covered for 12 hours per day and the six part time ranks covered for their formal hours of operation (total of 24 hours over the period – 23:00 to 05:00 per day). This totals some 1,085 hours (and in some cases videos were still running even when the site was not formally in operation with some tests of activity as appropriate). The volume of data collected was reduced by some loss of data, although this still left a significant level of hours available.

Ranks were 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. **Appendix 2** records the hours watched. This covered some 682 hours – significantly more than the 277 in 2012 and more than robust enough for the requirements of testing for significance of any observed unmet demand.

Full details of the observed volumes of passenger and vehicle traffic are included in **Appendix 3**. Our observations took account of feeder ranks where necessary to ensure true estimation of the hackney carriage waiting times at ranks for passengers (as at both Friar Street ranks). The specific operation of the new arrangements at Reading Station were the subject of a separate sample review to confirm the total waiting time for vehicles servicing the Horseshoe rank.

### **Overall comments on ranks**

A total of 17 different rank locations were observed (each termed a sample). In total, some 12,686 hackney carriage vehicle arrivals and departures were recorded, with all vehicle departures some 14,868.

Of the total vehicle arrivals and departures observed, 10% were private cars at or near the ranks. 0.2% was goods vehicles. 4% was private hire vehicles and 0.1% emergency vehicles stopped at a rank. Buses were not recorded as causing any major issue at any location during our observations.

Cars abused all ranks at some point, although eight saw 46 or less incursions during the period surveyed. The worst abuse was at Bridge Street – some 36% of the observed car abuse (546 observed car violations). Second was the hospital (25% of observations) although the small space here and higher hackney carriage use probably implies this has a worst impact on potential hackney carriage service. Third was Station North (10%) then Station West (6%).

In terms of private hire at or near ranks, the worst location was the Hospital with some 125 cases recorded (23% of the total private hire recorded). Second was Bridge Street (101, 18%) with the Casino third (12%) followed closely by the Pitcher and Piano (also 12%). No other site saw more than 40 violations during the periods observed.

There were a total of eight wheel chair using passengers during the survey period. Four were at the Horseshoe rank, two at the Hospital, one at the Pitcher and Piano and one at Oxford Road. No other passengers were observed as being visibly disabled. There were 31 cases observed of drivers assisting passengers beyond those in wheel chairs.

### **Detailed rank performance**

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 (2015)	Total passengers observed	Total loaded vehicle departures	Passengers per loaded vehicle	Empty vehicle departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	No. of passengers having to wait for vehicle to arrive
<b>24-hour ranks</b>							
Horseshoe (Station main rank)	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	1699	1416	1.2	25	2	171
	Friday 16 <sup>th</sup> October	1996	1501	1.3	25	2	180
	Saturday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	2582	1509	1.7	19	1	70
	Sunday 18 <sup>th</sup> October	811	545	1.5	14	3	31
Station West (Station Hill)	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	263	228	1.2	884	80	26
	Friday 16 <sup>th</sup> October	217	174	1.2	903	84	5
	Saturday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	9	8	1.1	102	93	0
Station North	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	326	274	1.2	16	6	43
	Friday 16 <sup>th</sup> October	265	207	1.3	49	19	33
	Saturday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	101	65	1.6	5	7	29
	Sunday 18 <sup>th</sup> October	214	128	1.7	10	7	10
Friar St Pitcher and Piano including feeder	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	554	308	1.8	40	11	0
	Friday 16 <sup>th</sup> October	676	395	1.7	47	11	5
	Saturday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	548	314	1.7	28	8	21
Friar St Quicksilver, including feeders	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	316	123	2.6	26	17	1
	Friday 16 <sup>th</sup> October	438	201	2.2	43	18	0
	Saturday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	367	171	2.1	46	21	8
Bridge Street	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	11	8	1.4	13	65	0
	Friday 16 <sup>th</sup> October	31	16	1.9	9	36	7
	Saturday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	71	31	2.3	18	37	1
	Sunday 18 <sup>th</sup> October	9	4	2.3	0	0	0
Oxford Rd (Tesco Express)	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	7	5	1.4	16	76	0
	Friday 16 <sup>th</sup> October	11	9	1.2	20	69	0
	Saturday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	22	13	1.7	17	57	0
King Street	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	6	3	2	1	25	0
	Friday 16 <sup>th</sup> October	9	4	2.3	2	33	0
	Saturday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	7	4	1.8	7	64	2
	Sunday 18 <sup>th</sup> October	8	3	2.7	1	25	0
Royal Berkshire Hospital (Craven Rd)	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	47	32	1.5	16	33	13
	Friday 16 <sup>th</sup> October	47	30	1.6	10	25	12
	Saturday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	12	6	2	14	70	0
	Sunday 18 <sup>th</sup> October	11	6	1.8	5	45	0
St Mary's Butts	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	15	12	1.3	10	45	0
	Friday 16 <sup>th</sup> October	21	12	1.8	8	40	0
	Saturday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	53	30	1.8	11	27	1
Yield Hall Place (Oracle, private)	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	183	107	1.7	6	5	10
	Friday 16 <sup>th</sup> October	467	219	2.1	16	7	8
	Saturday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	476	228	2.1	9	4	22

Yield Hall Place (Oracle, council feeder)	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	1	1	1	66	99	0
	Friday 16 <sup>th</sup> October	3	3	1	155	98	0
	Saturday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	1	1	1	65	98	0
<b>Night only ranks</b>							
Station Road	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	23	16	1.4	12	43	2
	Friday 16 <sup>th</sup> October	284	156	1.8	33	17	4
	Saturday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	454	199	2.3	24	11	11
Gun Street	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Saturday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	61	35	1.7	7	17	0
	Sunday 18 <sup>th</sup> October	48	29	1.7	13	31	1
Minster Street (Gun St feeder)	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	3	1	3	8	89	0
	Friday 16 <sup>th</sup> October	2	1	2	69	99	0
	Saturday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	2	1	0	5	83	0
St Mary's Butts (Headmasters)	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	119	68	1.8	27	28	1
	Friday 16 <sup>th</sup> October	577	301	1.9	28	9	2
	Saturday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	910	456	2	26	5	1
Queen's Road (Casino)	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	14	8	1.8	18	69	0
	Friday 16 <sup>th</sup> October	5	3	1.7	6	67	1
	Sunday 18 <sup>th</sup> October	1	1	1	3	75	0

For each rank, we conclude with an overall qualitative appreciation of the performance of the rank over the days observed:

- Poor – major issues with service to rank resulting in long passenger queues;
- Fair – rank deals with high volumes but sees some passenger queueing at times;
- Good – no passenger queueing observed but nothing else of note in way rank operates;
- Excellent – very high turnover with no passenger queueing and clear examples of drivers helping passengers use rank;

Developing – rank of recent origin but clearly growing in use

### **Overview**

An initial over-view of the above table suggests that the railway station rank at the Horseshoe clearly has the largest flows, followed by the Pitcher and Piano. Introduction of the new arrangement at the station sees some passengers from both new ranks. Whilst there are some night ranks within the table, there are also a large number of little used ranks although none are really completely unused.

## **Horseshoe rank**

This rank is directly outside the former main exit from the station. Since the last survey, the station redevelopment has been completed although ongoing nearby other redevelopment still impacts on the rank and will in due course completely change the options for service of this rank.

At the time of the survey, the rank was five spaces fed by vehicles waiting in Garrard Street (trade say 12, council list says 15, but this may disappear altogether before the next survey is due) and also at the new Station West rank, fed forwards by use of a mixture of cb-radios and sight. The area is separated for hackney carriages only and passenger access could be from either side of the vehicle with no other vehicles within the space.

The available feeder spaces for this rank are now much less than in 2012 when the old bus station site was available. In future, Garrard Street may be further reduced, and access via this route might end up being closed (the trade have been advised by a councillor this could be within 12 to 18 months).

This rank was observed from 07:00 on Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> October 2015 through to 19:30 on Sunday 18<sup>th</sup> October 2015. A small amount of information was lost after this time due to equipment issues.

### *Thursday observations*

During the Thursday observations (07:00 to 06:59 the next morning) 1,699 passengers were observed leaving in 1,416 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.2 persons per vehicle – very low. Just 25 vehicles left empty (2%) most of which were those which had dropped off passengers near the rank.

171 passengers were observed arriving when no vehicle was available for immediate hire. These occurred during the morning and evening peaks (08:00, 09:00, 10:00 and 17:00 to 21:00 hours) and in each hour from 23:00 to 02:00. However only in one hour (18:00) did anyone wait longer than four minutes – and no-one waited longer than just under seven minutes. When all passenger waiting is added and divided by the total number using this rank, the average expected wait time over all passengers is just 13 seconds.

In passenger terms, total passengers in any hour ranged from three up to 178 (23:00 hour). The two morning peak hours (07:00 and 08:00) saw 106/110 passengers whilst from the 17:00 hour right through till the midnight hour every flow was 107 or more (apart from at 22:00)– very high (nearly two passengers per minute). The quietest hours were 03:00, 04:00 and 05:00.

Average vehicle waiting times for fares were generally very low although at low patronage times these could be longer (particularly when there were less trains operating), although this statistic covers the main rank only. Further information regarding the overall vehicle waiting times including that from the feeders (often given substantial increases in vehicle waits) is provided below.

#### *Friday observations*

During the Friday observations 1,996 passengers were observed leaving in 1,501 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.3 persons per vehicle – low. 25 vehicles left empty (2%).

180 passengers arrived when no vehicle was available for immediate hire. Again, waits covered the morning and evening peaks (08:00, 09:00, 17:00 to 20:00), and the late night (23:00, midnight and 01:00), but in this case there were also waits (but only up to two minutes maximum) in each hour from 14:00 to 16:00. Only the 23:00 hour saw people waiting longer than five minutes (11 people up to eight minutes). Average waiting time over all passengers was again just 13 seconds.

In passenger terms, flows ranged from six up to 165 (in the 19:00 hour). Flows were over 100 in every hour from 17:00 through to 01:00. Four hours had over 150 passengers.

Average vehicle waiting times for fares were very low apart from in the very early hours when a vehicle waited over an hour for a fare. As noted above, this excluded any wait in the feeder ranks (see below).

#### *Saturday observations*

During the Saturday observations 2,582 passengers were observed leaving in 1,509 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.7 persons per vehicle – moderate. 19 vehicles left empty (1%).

70 passengers had to wait for a vehicle to arrive. None waited more than four minutes, with the highest number waiting in the 23:00 hour (nearly half of all those waiting). Averaged over all passengers the typical waiting time was just three seconds.

In passenger terms, there were more hours with over 100 passengers (12), but also the range of numbers was between two (05:00) and 250 (midnight). Remarkably the highest flow saw no passenger turning up when a vehicle was not waiting. There were four hours with over 200 passengers per hour – over three people per minute.

Average vehicle waiting times for fares were generally very low albeit higher in the earlier part of the day than on other days, but inevitably much lower once flows increased. Again this excludes overall waiting time but demonstrates very effective use of the small area available for vehicles.

### *Sunday observations*

During the Sunday observations (which covered only up to 18:59 that evening, ie 12 hours) 811 passengers were observed leaving in 545 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.5 persons per vehicle – moderate. 14 vehicles left empty (3%).

31 passengers had to wait for a vehicle to arrive. Those waiting were in the 15:00, 17:00 and 18:00 hours. At 15:00 the longest wait was just under eight minutes. Averaged over all passengers the wait was just six seconds.

In passenger terms, the rank was quieter than on the other three days. Flows rose from 18 at 07:00 to a peak of 139 in the 18:00 hour (the only hour with over 100 passengers).

Average vehicle waiting times for fares were longer than on other days – with the early hours seeing average vehicle waits up to 16 minutes – although these reduced later but not as much as on the other three days.

### *Summary*

Overall, service to this rank is **fair** although some specific hour see exceptional response to high demand without queues.

### **Station West (Station Hill)**

This newly provided rank is located on Station Hill in a loop of road only otherwise used by some buses and an area for short term set down by cars. Some parts of the rank are double-banked but the pressure for space usually means there are more vehicles there and some end up using the little used bus stop area to wait. The formal capacity is 18 vehicles though the trade suggest 17.

Passenger loading is from the passenger side with a relatively quiet road to the other side, although access routes from either south side station exit are a little contorted, using either steps or a long step free but sloped access route. Signing to the rank could be much better.

This rank was observed from 07:00 on Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> October 2015 through to 11:30 on Saturday 17<sup>th</sup> October 2015. Equipment failure meant the remaining observations were lost.

### *Thursday observations*

During the Thursday observations (again 24-hours from 07:00 to 06:59 the next morning) 263 passengers were observed leaving in 228 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.2 persons per vehicle – very low. 884 vehicles left empty (80%). This is consistent with this location feeding the main Horseshoe rank.

26 passengers had to wait for a vehicle to arrive. Waits occurred in every hour from 18:00 to 22:00, at 15:00 and in the midnight hour. These are hours when most vehicles will be heading direct to the Horseshoe rank rather than coming to this location. There was one very long passenger wait at 15:00, and three others with waits up to 10 minutes during the day. However, over all passengers the average wait was just 28 seconds.

In passenger terms, flows were much lower than at the main station rank – varying from zero to 34. The peak was at 18:00, whilst no hour between 10:00 and 16:00 saw more than seven passengers in any hour – and most hours saw much less. The rank saw no vehicles or passengers from the 02:00 hour onwards.

Average vehicle waiting times were generally low as vehicles tended to move through this area relatively quickly – although there were several hours when vehicles waited here between 20 and 30 minutes before moving on.

#### *Friday observations*

During the Friday observations 217 passengers were observed leaving in 174 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.2 persons per vehicle – very low. 903 vehicles left empty (84%).

Five passengers had to wait for a vehicle to arrive. One waited just under 12 minutes (in the 22:00 hour), another waited just over 10 minutes in the previous hour whilst another waited just over eight minutes in the 20:00 hour. Waits did not occur in any other hours. Over all passengers the average wait was just nine seconds.

In passenger terms, the peak was 41 in the 23:00 hour. Other flows were between zero (all hours from 02:00 to 06:00) up to an otherwise maximum of 21. Between 11:00 and 17:00 flows were nine or usually much less.

Average vehicle waiting times saw maximums up to around 15 minutes as vehicles passed through on their way to service station demand at the Horseshoe rank.

#### *Saturday observations*

The Saturday observations only ran to 11:30 due to equipment issues. During the period from 07:00 to the end of film, 9 passengers were observed leaving in 8 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.1 persons per vehicle – again very low. 102 vehicles left empty (93%).

No passengers had to wait for a vehicle to arrive.

In passenger terms, flows were very low and never more than 4 in any hour. Average vehicle waiting times were up to 13 minutes although at times there were no vehicles using this location (eg 09:00).

#### *Summary*

Overall, service to this rank is **fair** although demand is overall low.

## **Station North**

This rank was purpose-built with the development of the new northern access from Reading station. It is on Council land and has a start section near to the passenger exit from the north side of the station. There is also direct public access from the passage under the station leading to the central area, as well as from the roads to the north of the new access. Loading is from the passenger side, although being purpose built loading from the driver side would also be safe. The rank is supplemented by a further set of spaces out on the main road on the same side as the station, although these are currently rarely used. There are 25 formal spaces available (trade suggest 22).

The only issue with the rank is that egress is by turning left out of the station exit, with any vehicles wishing to head northwards having to go round the nearby large roundabout to the west, and then return east / northwards (though bus services do have a dedicated right turn out of the bus facility).

This rank was observed from 10:40 on Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> October 2015 through to 07:00 on Monday 19<sup>th</sup> October 2015. A small amount of information was lost covering the first four hours of the site, but otherwise this provided a full dataset of information.

### *Thursday observations*

During the Thursday observations (20 hours) 326 passengers were observed leaving in 274 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.2 persons per vehicle – very low. 16 vehicles left empty (6%).

43 passengers had to wait for a vehicle to arrive. These occurred in the 17:00, 18:00, 23:00 and midnight hours. There were four cases where people waited up to 12 or 13 minutes, 9 waiting between six and 10 minutes, with most waiting no more than four minutes. Averaged over all passengers, the typical wait was 36 seconds.

In passenger terms, flows ranged from one up to 51 (in the midnight hour). Many hours saw 9 or less passengers, although there were always 21 or more from 17:00 to midnight.

Average vehicle waiting times for fares were six to 25 minutes with one vehicle observed to wait up to 48 minutes before leaving.

### *Friday observations*

During the Friday observations (24 hours) 265 passengers were observed leaving in 207 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.3 persons per vehicle – low. 49 vehicles left empty (19%).

33 passengers had to wait for a vehicle to arrive. Only in the 16:00 hour did anyone wait more than 10 minutes (16 minutes). There were eight who waited between six and ten minutes, but most waited five minutes or less. The average wait shared over all passengers was 34 seconds.

In passenger terms, flows were low – with no flow over 7 before the 15:00 hour. The maximum flow observed was 43 passengers in the 19:00 hour. 01:00 saw the second highest flow (40 persons). There were no passengers at all in the 03:00 or 04:00 hours.

Average vehicle waiting times for fares were up to 30 minutes with at least one vehicle observed waiting up to 45 minutes.

#### *Saturday observations*

During the Saturday observations (which covered a full 24 hours) 101 passengers were observed leaving in 65 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.6 persons per vehicle – moderate. Just five vehicles left the rank empty (7%).

29 passengers had to wait for a vehicle to arrive. All waited in the midnight hour, with 10 waiting between five and ten minutes. Averaged over all passengers, the typical wait was 1 minute 21 seconds per person.

In passenger terms, the rank only saw use between 23:00 and 01:00 hours, with no vehicles or passengers in other hours.

Average vehicle waiting times for fares were between eight and 35 minutes with one vehicle seen to wait nearly an hour before leaving.

#### *Sunday observations*

During the Sunday observations (which covered a full 24 hours) 214 passengers were observed leaving in 128 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.7 persons per vehicle – moderate. Just ten vehicles left the rank empty (7%).

10 passengers had to wait for a vehicle to arrive. Waits occurred in the 10:00, 17:00, 18:00 and 20:00 hours with the worst being in the 20:00 hour. However, at no time did any passenger wait longer than just under six minutes. The average wait per passenger was just 10 seconds.

In passenger terms, flows were between zero and 35 with the peak in the 20:00 hour. Many flows were between 11 and 16 per hour. The rank was generally quiet before 10:00 and after the midnight hour.

Average vehicle waiting times for fares were between 11 and 42 minutes with one example of a vehicle waiting more than an hour and several others just less than an hour.

#### *Summary*

Overall, service to this rank is **fair** although demand is overall low.



## **Friar St (Pitcher and Piano)**

This rank has space for four vehicles and is, as in 2012, within the main shopping roads of the central area (formal listing suggested 3 spaces). It is directly outside the Pitcher and Piano pub and has a feeder section directly opposite available late at night after bus services cease (council suggest 7 spaces but trade suggest just 4). Loading is from the driver side, with moderately safe loading if required from the passenger side although this would involve the risk of passengers clashing with buses which are the main other vehicle type on this section of road.

This rank was observed from 09:30 on Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> October 2015 through to 01:30 on Sunday 18<sup>th</sup> October 2015. A small amount of information was lost at the start and no film was available after 01:30 on the Sunday morning due to equipment issues.

### *Thursday observations*

During the Thursday observations (covering 22 hours) 554 passengers were observed leaving in 308 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.8 persons per vehicle – high. 40 vehicles left empty (11%), with no passengers having to wait for a vehicle to arrive.

In passenger terms, flows were generally low, and zero in every hour from 04:00 to 06:00 but with a high peak of 129 in the 01:00 hour. Other than flows of 95 in the 02:00 hour and 61 in the midnight hour, the next highest flow was 38 in the 22:00 hour. Most saw between five and 27 passengers.

Average vehicle waiting times for fares were between six and 25 minutes apart from a few exceptions. Some waits of 40 minutes were observed by vehicles for passengers.

### *Friday observations*

During the Friday observations (covering 24 hours) 676 passengers were observed leaving in 395 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.7 persons per vehicle – moderate. 47 vehicles left empty (11%).

Just five passengers had to wait for a vehicle to arrive – all in the hours between 22:00 and midnight with the latter hour having most people waiting. The longest wait was just under three minutes and averaged over all passengers this was negligible.

In passenger terms, flows only occurred between the 09:00 hour and the 04:00 hour, with flows 30 or less per hour until 20:00. The highest flow on this day was some 140 in the 02:00 hour, with 77 and 63 in the preceding two hours.

Average vehicle waiting times for fares were between five and 30 minutes although reduced after 20:00. Early on there were 40 minute vehicle waits.

### *Saturday observations*

During the Saturday observations (which covered 18 hours) 548 passengers were observed leaving in 314 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.7 persons per vehicle – moderate. 46 vehicles left empty (21%).

Eight passengers had to wait for a vehicle to arrive. Those waiting were in the 17:00, midnight and 01:00 hours, with the longest wait in the midnight hour but only of eight minutes. Most waited between one and five minutes. The average wait over all passengers was six seconds.

In passenger terms, the rank saw more even flows over the day than on the previous two days. The peak was 62 in the 23:00 hour, although 17:00 saw a subsidiary peak of 54.

Average vehicle waiting times for fares were between four and 16 minutes. The longest time a vehicle was observed to wait was 26 minutes in the 22:00 hour.

### *Summary*

Overall, service to this rank is **fair**.

### **Friar St Quicksilver**

Friar St West rank accommodates three vehicles (four in the council list) in the all-day rank near to the Quicksilver location. There are two further night only sections either side of this main rank, taking over bus stops not used at night. The council list suggests they add a further nine spaces, although the trade list does not include these spaces. Effectively the night rank is closer to Station Road than the daytime rank, although there is relatively little use of the daytime section of the rank. Loading is from the passenger side, with any driver side-loading having other traffic – albeit restricted – for passengers to contend with. We understand that since 2012 this part of Reading has become less busy.

This rank was filmed from 07:00 on Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> October 2015 through to 07:00 on Monday 19<sup>th</sup> October 2015. The observations undertaken are outlined below.

### *Thursday observations*

During the Thursday observations (covering a sample of the 14 busiest hours) 316 passengers were observed leaving in 123 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 2.6 persons per vehicle – very high. 26 vehicles left empty (17%).

Just one passenger had to wait for a vehicle to arrive – for some 13 minutes in the midnight hour. However, shared over all passengers this wait reduces to an average of just three seconds.

In passenger terms, flows were very low apart from the four hours between midnight and 03:00. The first three hours saw 40, then 101 and the peak of 130 passengers. This is very peaky demand for a location.

Average vehicle waiting times for fares were generally very low although one vehicle was observed waiting up to 15 minutes even in the busiest hour.

#### *Friday observations*

During the Friday observations (again a 14 hour sample) 438 passengers were observed leaving in 201 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 2.2 persons per vehicle – relatively high. 43 vehicles left empty (18%). No passengers had to wait for a vehicle to arrive.

In passenger terms, flows were again very low (two to 13) apart from the four peak hours of midnight, 01:00, 02:00 and 03:00. Peak flow in the 02:00 hour was 152 (slightly higher than on the Thursday).

Average vehicle waiting times for fares were between two and 16 minutes with one vehicle observed waiting up to 55 minutes for a fare.

#### *Saturday observations*

During the Saturday observations (which covered 16 hours) 367 passengers were observed leaving in 171 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 2.1 persons per vehicle – relatively high. 46 vehicles left empty (21%).

Just eight passengers had to wait for a vehicle to arrive. Those waiting were in the 15:00, 01:00 and 02:00 hours. The longest wait was one person waiting 15 minutes in the 15:00 hour. All other waits were six minutes or much less.

In passenger terms, the rank saw generally more passengers throughout the day compared to the previous two days. However, the highest flows did not exceed 16 until the 23:00 hour. The peak was 106 passengers in the 02:00 hour with the previous hour and the two hours following also having relatively high flows.

Average vehicle waiting times for fares were generally low although some were observed waiting up to 20 minutes. Average waits in the busy periods were reduced.

#### *Sunday observations*

During the Sunday observations (which covered 7 hours) no hackney carriage vehicles or potential passengers were observed at the location at all.

#### *Summary*

Overall, service to this rank is **fair** although demand is overall low apart from four key hours around midnight.

## **Bridge Street**

This rank operates for 24 hours per day in a further part of a bus lay-by facing out of the town centre at the far end of Bridge Street. It has good access to one part of the Oracle shopping centre although the area around is not generally busy. The main change since 2012 is that the new Council offices opened almost opposite to this rank. There are three vehicle spaces, with loading from the driver side, and good egress towards the Ring Road (although the trade list suggests just two spaces). Passenger side loading would not be safe given the road is a principal exit from the Oracle and some other car parks.

This rank was observed from 08:30 on Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> October 2015 through to 07:00 on Monday 19<sup>th</sup> October 2015. A small amount of information was lost at the start of the observations but otherwise data was available throughout the period of the survey. Details of observations are provided below.

### *Thursday observations*

During the Thursday observations (17 hours) just 11 passengers were observed leaving in eight vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.4 persons per vehicle – low. 13 vehicles left empty (65%), with no passengers having to wait for a vehicle to arrive.

In passenger terms, flows were very low – never more than five passengers and often zero. Vehicle waits were also very low suggesting more that vehicles tended to pick up here whilst passing by or just pausing briefly when passing through. The peak flow was five passengers in the 22:00 hour.

### *Friday observations*

During the Friday observations (17 hours) 31 passengers were observed leaving in 16 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.9 persons per vehicle – high. Nine vehicles left empty (36%).

Seven passengers had to wait for a vehicle to arrive. All were in the three hours between 21:00 and 23:00. One person waited nearly 11 minutes, another seven, and the rest one to four minutes. Shared over the low level of passengers, the average wait was 1 minute and eight seconds.

In passenger terms, flows were only observed between the 21:00 and the 01:00 hours – at other times there were no passengers and just a handful of vehicles pausing here. The highest number of passengers in any hour was ten, dropping to a single passenger in the 01:00 hour, and none after that.

Average vehicle waiting times for fares were between one and four minutes, although one did wait nearly 12 minutes in the busiest hour.

### *Saturday observations*

During the Saturday observations (which covered nine hours) 71 passengers were observed leaving in 31 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 2.3 persons per vehicle – relatively high. 18 vehicles left empty (37%).

One passenger had to wait for a vehicle to arrive in the 22:00 hour. They waited just over two minutes. Shared over the higher level of total passengers on this day, average waiting time was just two seconds.

In passenger terms, the rank saw a small number of passengers during daytime hours, but again had its peak between the 22:00 and the 01:00 hours. The highest flow on the Saturday was 37 in the 23:00 hour, with 16 in the previous hour and eight the hour after.

Average vehicle waiting times for fares were again between one and four minutes and further one did wait just over 11 minutes again in the busiest hour. Later vehicle wait times were much lower.

### *Sunday observations*

During the Sunday observations (which covered 17 hours) just nine passengers were observed leaving in four vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 2.3 persons per vehicle – relatively high. No vehicles left empty and no passengers had to wait for a vehicle to arrive.

In passenger terms, the rank saw its highest level of use by five passengers in the 20:00 hour. The only other two hours with passengers saw two per hour (18:00 and 22:00). Again, daytime hours were quiet.

Average vehicle waiting times for fares were negligible and appeared more to be vehicles responding to passengers perhaps taking advantage of a passing vehicle (given there were no observed waits).

### *Summary*

Overall, service to this rank is **fair** although demand is overall low. The tendency towards unmet demand here is balanced by the potential the rank is mainly a hailing point for the larger number of vehicles which naturally pass this point.

### **Oxford Road (Tesco Express)**

This rank formally has two spaces available for use at any time (reduced from the four first provided). The rank can be abused by vehicles unloading and in our most recent visit was not as clearly marked – and had been reduced in size from 2012 as noted above. The rank is near to the vehicular route to the railway station, so any passengers waiting here would be seen by such vehicles although it can be an awkward place to leave once entered as the nearby road is one way towards the central area.

This rank was observed from 10:00 on Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> October 2015 through to 07:00 on Monday 19<sup>th</sup> October 2015. A small amount of information was lost at the start of the recordings. The observations undertaken here are outlined below.

### *Thursday observations*

During the Thursday observations (12 hours) just seven passengers were observed leaving in five vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.4 persons per vehicle – low. 16 vehicles left empty (76%), with no passengers having to wait for a vehicle to arrive.

In passenger terms, flows were sporadic and light. Passengers were observed in the 15:00, 18:00, 19:00 and 04:00 hours, with a few vehicle departures (empty) in most other hours.

Average vehicle waiting times for fares were generally negligible although one vehicle did wait in the 15:00 hour for just over ten minutes. It also appears this rank is more a hailing point rather than a place vehicles wait.

### *Friday observations*

During the Friday observations (13 hours) just 11 passengers were observed leaving in nine vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.2 persons per vehicle – very low. 20 vehicles left empty (69%), with no passengers having to wait for a vehicle to arrive.

In passenger terms, flows were very low – between zero and four with passengers only seen in the 11:00, 18:00, 19:00 and 20:00 hours. Vehicles were seen waiting in most hours, but not for long periods, although there was one vehicle which waited an hour and another which waited 30 minutes – both eventually leaving with fares.

### *Saturday observations*

During the Saturday observations (which covered 14 hours) 22 passengers were observed leaving in 13 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.7 persons per vehicle – moderate. 17 vehicles left empty (57%), with no passengers having to wait for a vehicle to arrive.

In passenger terms, most hours saw no passengers, but there were flows between 1 and 9 in the 10:00, 14:00, 15:00 and 17:00 hours (the peak with nine passengers seen). Most vehicle waits tended to be short although one vehicle did wait some 38 minutes.

### *Summary*

Overall, service to this rank is **fair** although demand is overall very low. Although vehicles occasionally wait here, service is more likely provided by passing vehicles being hailed as no passengers ever waited here.

### **King Street**

This location is near to a key public house / hotel but only provides very limited space from 23:00 to 05:00 according to the latest signing. Although formally it is supposed to have four spaces, the nature of the current road layout suggests no more than two vehicles could fit before reaching the restrictions here by the nearby traffic signals. Passenger loading would be from the passenger side, and any driver side loading would be quite dangerous at most times. This location is not recognised formally in the listing provided to us by the Trade.

This rank was filmed from 11:00 on Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> October 2015 through to 06:59 on Monday 19<sup>th</sup> October 2015. A small amount of information was lost at the start of observations. Much of the time was when the rank was not formally in operation (a few of these hours were observed).

#### *Thursday observations*

During the Thursday observations (four sample hours) just six passengers were observed leaving in three vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 2 persons per vehicle – relatively high. Just one vehicle left the location empty (25%) with no passengers having to wait for a vehicle to arrive.

Passengers ranged from one to three and were observed in the 23:00, midnight and 01:00 hours. At other times there were no vehicles or passengers.

#### *Friday observations*

During the Friday observations (an 8-hour sample) just nine passengers were observed leaving in four vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 2.3 persons per vehicle – relatively high. Just two vehicles left the rank empty (33%).

In the 21:00 hour there were two passenger arrivals, both of whom had to wait for a vehicle. The longest waited 22 minutes into the next hour. When shared over the small number of people waiting through this day, the average wait was reduced to just under three minutes.

Although not legally operating, five passengers were observed leaving in three vehicles in the 15:00 hour – with several vehicles having waited from the 14:00 hour. There were between one and seven passengers observed later with the peak of seven in the midnight hour. In this period it appeared most vehicles were possibly hailed. The instance of two passengers arriving in the 21:00 hour is mentioned above. The seven arriving in the midnight hour fared much better.

#### *Saturday observations*

During the Saturday observations (which covered four sample hours) just seven passengers were observed leaving in four vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.8 persons per vehicle – high. Seven vehicles left empty (64%).

Two passengers had to wait for a vehicle to arrive. One waited over 37 minutes and the average over the very small number of users was nearly ten minutes. However, flows here are very low (two at 21:00, four at 23:00 and just one in the midnight hour, with zero flows otherwise), and passing vehicles are less frequent than other locations with a similar usage.

Ironically, after the long wait, one vehicle did wait here for six minutes, although generally vehicles did not wait here, and few passed by.

### *Sunday observations*

During the Sunday observations (which covered two sample hours) just eight passengers were observed leaving in three vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 2.7 persons per vehicle – very high. Just one vehicle left the rank empty (25%), with no passengers having to wait for a vehicle to arrive.

In passenger terms, there were five passengers in the 16:00 and three in the 17:00 hours – times when the rank was not formally operating. A lack of vehicle waits suggests they were either passing and were hailed or had been booked by phone.

### *Summary*

Overall, service to this rank is **poor** although demand is almost nil. This situation is worsened by the facts that less vehicles will tend to pass this point in natural journeys, and that the trade tend not to accept this as an active rank.

### **Royal Berkshire Hospital (Craven Road)**

This rank formally has three spaces in a lay-by on Craven Road facing towards the town centre. It is directly outside the hospital main exit. There is additional space in the layby for private setting down although this can be abused, and there is also a tendency for hackney carriages to over-fill the spaces and also wait nearby. The rank is available at all times and provides entry from the passenger side. Driver side passenger entry would be dangerous given the proximity of moving traffic on Craven Road.

This rank was observed from 10:45 on Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> October 2015 through to 07:00 on Monday 19<sup>th</sup> October 2015. A small amount of information was lost at the start but otherwise most information was available that was required. Details of observed hours are provided below.

### *Thursday observations*

During the Thursday observations (14 hours) 47 passengers were observed leaving in 32 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.5 persons per vehicle – moderate. 16 vehicles left empty (33%).

13 passengers had to wait for a vehicle to arrive. Waiting occurred in every hour between 13:00 and 16:00 and in the 19:00 hour. Although one person had to wait 15 minutes (in the 14:00 hour) and six waited up to 35 minutes in the 16:00 hour, most other waits were five minutes or less. When shared over all passengers during this day, the average waiting time was just under 4.5 minutes.

In passenger terms, flows ranged from none after the 19:00 hour (apart from two single passengers in the 02:00 and 03:00 hours) with the only double figured flow being 14 at 15:00. Other flows were between one and eight though there were hours with zero flows (eg 10:00 and 18:00). Typical vehicle waits in quieter hours were 13 to 20 minutes, although from 13:00 to 17:00 vehicle turnover was much quicker.



### *Friday observations*

During the Friday observations (12 hours) 47 passengers were observed leaving in 30 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.6 persons per vehicle – moderate. Ten vehicles left empty (25%).

12 passengers had to wait for a vehicle to arrive. Waits covered all hours from 10:00 to 13:00, 15:00 and 17:00. Longest waits spilled over into the 12:00 and 13:00 hours. The 17:00 wait was around six minutes, and there was an eight minute wait in the 10:00 hour, with two other waits at around five minutes. Shared over all passengers, the average wait was 13 minutes suggesting high levels of waiting for the small volume of passengers here.

In passenger terms, flows were between zero and 13, with just the 11:00 hour having more than nine passengers. The area was quiet after the 17:00 hour. Despite the long passenger waits there were other times when vehicle waited a long time for a fare as well. The 11:00 peak led to the longer waits noted above.

### *Saturday observations*

During the Saturday observations (which covered 13 hours) 12 passengers were observed leaving in six vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 2 persons per vehicle – relatively high. 14 vehicles left empty (70%), with no passengers having to wait for a vehicle to arrive.

There were just two to five passengers in hours which saw people using the rank. Many other hours, including before 11:00 and after 16:00 saw no passengers and only a small number of vehicles.

### *Sunday observations*

During the Sunday observations (which covered nine hours) 11 passengers were observed leaving in six vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.8 persons per vehicle – high. Five vehicles left empty (45%), with no passengers having to wait for a vehicle to arrive.

Passenger flows ranged from just one to four – with no passengers in the 15:00 hour or any hour 17:00 onwards. Some vehicles did wait during some hours.

### *Summary*

Overall, service to this rank is **poor** although demand is overall very low and can be peaky.

## **St Mary's Butts**

St Mary's Butts has a dual carriageway section with a former taxi rest room on the central island (now a fairly popular café). Rank provision here has changed over time – with some former signage still present from now defunct ranks (on the church side of the road). At the present time, this rank formally operates 2000-0800 although it was formerly 24-hour. It is pay and display parking at other times and some hackney carriages do now tend to use this location during the daytime more than previously – albeit at a very low level.

The rank is also near a key route towards the station meaning a large number of hackney carriages pass empty along this route. It has three spaces but on the outbound side of the road rather than the towards central side.

This rank was observed from 07:00 on Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> October 2015 through to 03:59 on Monday 19<sup>th</sup> October 2015. A small amount of information was lost at the end of the filming. Details of observations are provided below.

### *Thursday observations*

During the Thursday observations (eight hours) 15 passengers were observed leaving in 12 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.3 persons per vehicle – low. 10 vehicles left empty (45%), with no passengers having to wait for a vehicle to arrive.

Passenger flows ranged from two to five, including seeing use when it was not formally a rank (14:00 and 15:00). Many other hours had no flow, including from the 23:00 hour onwards. Some vehicles did wait here for extended periods (up to 35 minutes).

### *Friday observations*

During the Friday observations (six hours) 21 passengers were observed leaving in 12 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.8 persons per vehicle – high. Eight vehicles left empty (40%), with no passengers having to wait for a vehicle to arrive.

Again, the rank was observed for some non-operational hours as well as the operational ones. No passengers or vehicles were seen on this occasion in the non-operational hours. A peak of 14 passengers were observed in the 22:00 hour, with two and five passengers in the hours either side. Some vehicles serviced the rank in the 20:00 hour, with several waiting up to 15 minutes.

### *Saturday observations*

During the Saturday observations (which covered 10 hours) 53 passengers were observed leaving in 30 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.8 persons per vehicle – high. 11 vehicles left empty (27%).

One passenger had to wait for a vehicle to arrive. They waited four minutes in the 15:00 hour (when the rank was not formally operating). The average wait shared over all passengers during this set of observations (including the night ones) was just five seconds.

During the non-operational hours of 14:00 and 15:00 11 and three passengers respectively were serviced. Flows of between six and nine were observed between 20:00 and 23:00, with one, four and four passengers respectively in the 01:00, 02:00 and 03:00 hours. During the earlier part of the evening, vehicles waited up to 24 minutes, although this was much lower for the early morning hours.

### *Summary*

Overall, service to this rank is **fair** although demand is overall low – but very variable and sometimes not negligible.

### **Yield Hall Place (Oracle, private rank)**

There are two spaces provided within the private road network of the Oracle shopping centre. These are accessed over a bridge which is narrow and very humped (and where there is also council rank provision). The trade treat this and the council rank as one, with these two spaces supplemented by the council provision (see below).

This rank was observed from 10:00 on Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> October 2015 through to 06:59 on Sunday 18<sup>th</sup> October 2015. The last day of filming was lost.

### *Thursday observations*

During the Thursday observations (ten hours) 183 passengers were observed leaving in 107 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.7 persons per vehicle – moderate. Six vehicles left empty (5%).

Ten passengers had to wait for a vehicle to arrive. None waited more than just under five minutes. Waits were in the 20:00 and 22:00 hours, with most waiting in the 22:00 hour.

Flows occurred between the 20:00 and 01:00 hours with a range between two people and 66 (in the 22:00 hour). Flows tended to drop after the 23:00 hour and the area became quiet by the 02:00 hour. Some vehicles did wait here up to 18 minutes for fares and even later on vehicles did wait rather than pass by.

### *Friday observations*

During the Friday observations (13 hours) 467 passengers were observed leaving in 219 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 2.1 persons per vehicle – relatively high. 16 vehicles left empty (7%).

Eight passengers had to wait for a vehicle to arrive. Waits were not longer than four minutes in any hour and occurred in the 19:00, 20:00, 23:00 and 03:00 hours. Averaged over all observations on this day, the average wait was just two seconds.

Passenger flows rose from three at 17:00 to a peak of 130 at 23:00 with flows growing every hour. Flows then dropped back to five in the 04:00 hour with the area being quiet after that. Vehicles did wait up to 15 minutes for fares at times. In the 03:00 hour there was one vehicle waiting over half an hour.

#### *Saturday observations*

During the Saturday observations (which covered 12 hours) 476 passengers were observed leaving in 228 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 2.1 persons per vehicle – relatively high. Just nine vehicles left the rank empty (4%).

22 passengers had to wait for a vehicle to arrive. The midnight hour saw some having to wait up to nearly seven minutes, but otherwise all waits were no longer than four minutes and often less.

Passenger flows rose from 40 in the 19:00 hour to a peak of 114 in the 23:00 hour, then falling to 11 in the 03:00 hour and zero afterwards. Again there were some vehicle waits up to 15 minutes although as the site got busier this fell to lower values.

#### *Summary*

Overall, service to this rank is **fair**.

#### **Yield Hall Place (Oracle, council feeder)**

This rank is located on the other side of the humped bridge near to the Casino but on council land accessing the Oracle shopping centre. Though both locations are available 24-hours they are mainly treated as night ranks given the demand in this location.

This rank was observed from 07:00 on Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> October 2015 through to 19:59 on Sunday 18<sup>th</sup> October 2015. A small amount of information was lost at the end of the filming.

#### *Thursday observations*

During the Thursday observations (ten hours) just one passenger was observed leaving in a vehicle, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.0 persons per vehicle – very low. 66 vehicles left empty (99%), with no passengers having to wait for a vehicle to arrive. This is consistent with the location being feeder to the main rank over the bridge.

#### *Friday observations*

During the Friday observations (nine hours) just three passengers were observed leaving in three vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.0 persons per vehicle – very low. 155 vehicles left empty (98%), with no passengers having to wait for a vehicle to arrive.

### *Saturday observations*

During the Saturday observations (which covered five hours) just one passenger was observed leaving in a vehicle, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.0 persons per vehicle – very low. 65 vehicles left empty (98%), with no passengers having to wait for a vehicle to arrive.

### *Summary*

Overall, it is clear this rank is now operating principally as a feeder so no classification of service is appropriate. This appears to be a change since 2012 when the main usage of the pair of ranks focussed on this site rather than the private site.

### ***Night only ranks***

This section covers the ranks that are formally operating only at night (mainly from 23:00 to 05:00). As such, although filming may have covered longer hours in general observations are only valid for the six (or otherwise) formal hours which the rank legally operates for. Where not stated the observations cover six hours per night.

### **Station Road**

This rank was formerly a very busy all day rank. It is now operational only from 23:00 to 05:00 and the formal list suggests seven spaces (rather than the 12 claimed by the trade and the ten listed in 2012). In theory the spaces take over when bus services cease, but extension of routes to run all day and night has compromised this location. During one visit, the rank post signage had been tampered with and on the ground signing is subsidiary to the post signage due to the dual use. The rank does provide passenger side loading and relatively safe driver side loading apart from the issue of bus routes still being active. We were advised that there might be issues with buses blocking this rank during its formal operational hours.

This rank was observed from 07:00 on Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> October 2015 through to 19:59 on Sunday 18<sup>th</sup> October, after which further film was lost. The site was observed from 23:00 to 05:00 on Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> October, and again on each of the two consecutive nights when the rank operated. The Sunday night filming was not available.

### *Thursday observations*

During the Thursday observations 23 passengers were observed leaving in 16 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.4 persons per vehicle – low. 12 vehicles left empty (43%).

Two passengers had to wait for a vehicle to arrive. In the 23:00 hour one waited 15 minutes and in the following hour one waited six minutes. Shared over the relatively low volume of passengers observed during this total period, the average wait was 55 seconds. On the vehicle side, some vehicles did wait here up to 15 minutes for passengers.

Passenger flows were very low, between two and 11 (maximum in the midnight hour).

### *Friday observations*

During the Friday observations 284 passengers were observed leaving in 156 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.8 persons per vehicle – high. 33 vehicles left empty (17%).

Four passengers had to wait for a vehicle to arrive. Waits were in the 03:00 and 04:00 hours. In the latter hour, two people waited up to 20 minutes. Shared over all passengers during this spell of operation, the average wait was eight seconds.

Passenger flows rose from 25 in the 23:00 hour to a peak of 76 in the 02:00 hour. At 03:00 flows were just three passengers. Average vehicle waits were two to ten minutes with some vehicles waiting up to 20 minutes.

### *Saturday observations*

During the Saturday observations 454 passengers were observed leaving in 199 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 2.3 persons per vehicle – relatively high. 24 vehicles left empty (11%).

Eleven passengers had to wait for a vehicle to arrive. None waited more than 3.5 minutes. Shared over all passengers, the average wait was three seconds.

Passenger flows rose from 30 at 23:00 to the peak of 131 in both the 01:00 and 02:00 hours (much busier than on the previous night). The 03:00 flow was fairly similar (129). The 04:00 hour saw just nine people. Vehicle waits were lower – peaking at just eight minutes although some did wait up to 20 minutes.

### *Summary*

Overall, service to this rank is **fair**. It does now appear to be a rank only servicing the Friday and Saturday busy nights rather than most nights as in 2012.

### **Gun Street**

Gun Street is another rank which has seen recent change and development. Formally, it retains a 24-hour section (six spaces) and a 23:00 to 05:00 supplementary section (three spaces) although the trade claim the location as night only and with a total of seven spaces. It is supplemented by the seven spaces in Minster Street (also 23:00 to 05:00) which are bus stops during the day (and not used by night services). Despite expectation the rank would be marked as just night only in 2012 current visits showed markings remain as they were in 2012, with the two sections still marked for different periods of use. Loading is from the passenger side with relatively safe driver side loading apart from other hackney carriages overtaking those that were loading more slowly.

This rank was filmed from 07:00 on Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> October through to the early hours of Monday morning, 19<sup>th</sup> October, although several periods of information were not filmed due to equipment issues. Observations were watched for a number of sample hours to understand the usage of the site from the data available. The key period observed was from 03:30 in the early hours of Saturday morning until 08:59 that morning.

#### *Thursday observations*

During the Thursday observations (2 hour sample) no passengers were observed nor any hackney carriages at all.

#### *Saturday observations*

During the Saturday observations 61 passengers were observed leaving in 35 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.7 persons per vehicle – moderate. Seven vehicles left empty (17%), with no passenger having to wait for a vehicle to arrive.

There were only two hours with passenger flows – 02:00 and 03:00 and flows peaked at just 38. One vehicle had waited nearly two hours at this location before obtaining a fare.

#### *Sunday observations*

During the Sunday observations 48 passengers were observed leaving in 29 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.7 persons per vehicle – moderate. 13 vehicles left empty (31%).

Just one passenger had to wait for a vehicle to arrive. They waited nearly 3.5 minutes in the 04:00 hour when it was quieter.

Passenger flows ranged from one to 16 and were generally quite low, although this night did see flows from 23:00 through to 04:00. Some vehicles waited up to 45 minutes for fares.

#### *Summary*

Overall, service to this rank is **fair** although demand is low.

### **Minster Street**

This rank supplements Gun Street provided extra waiting space, although passengers could join vehicles here (although it is a bit out of the general passenger flow). At night this area is very quiet – but it would otherwise provide passenger side loading with safe driver side.

This rank was filmed from 09:00 on Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> October 2015 through to 19:59 on Sunday 18<sup>th</sup> October. Filming was watched from 23:00 on the Thursday until 05:00 on Friday 16<sup>th</sup> October, and again on each of the next two consecutive nights when the rank operated. There was no information available for the Sunday evening.

### *Thursday observations*

During the Thursday observations just three passengers were observed leaving in one vehicle, giving vehicle occupancy of 3 persons per vehicle – very high. Eight vehicles left empty (89%), with no passengers having to wait for a vehicle to arrive. This is more evidence of the site being mainly a feeder, albeit to a very quiet main rank.

### *Friday observations*

During the Friday observations (three hours) two passengers were observed leaving in one vehicle, giving vehicle occupancy of 2 persons per vehicle – relatively high. 69 vehicles left empty (99%), with no passengers having to wait for a vehicle to arrive.

Vehicle flows responded to the higher demand at the main rank with some 33 waiting here in the 03:00 hour although overall waits were low.

### *Saturday observations*

During the Saturday observations (which covered nine hours as there were vehicles still there at the formal end of the rank operation). Two passengers were observed leaving in one vehicle, giving vehicle occupancy of 2 persons per vehicle – relatively high. Five vehicles left empty (83%), with no passengers having to wait for a vehicle to arrive.

In essence there was little use of this rank even as a feeder during these hours.

### *Summary*

Overall, this rank is clearly a feeder and it is not appropriate to provide any service level summary.

### **St Mary's Butts (Headmasters)**

In 2012, this rank was effectively at the end of a loop providing two spaces, with only buses able to continue forward towards the station and central area. In 2015, the restriction allows hackney carriages to pass through onwards to the station or the central area past this rank. The formal listing suggests six spaces though the trade list says 10-12 spaces. There is little other usage of the roadspace at the time this rank operates (23:00 to 05:00) so potential capacity is quite high.

This rank was filmed from 09:00 on Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> October 2015 through to 19:59 on the evening of Sunday 18<sup>th</sup> October 2015. Activity was observed at the location from 23:00 on Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> October 2015 through to 05:00 on Friday 16<sup>th</sup> October, and again on each of the two consecutive nights when the rank operated. Again, the Sunday evening filming was lost so could not be reviewed.

### *Thursday observations*

During the Thursday observations 119 passengers were observed leaving in 68 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.8 persons per vehicle – high. 27 vehicles left empty (28%).



One passenger had to wait for a vehicle to arrive. This was for around 2.5 minutes in the 01:00 hour. When shared over all passengers, this is an average of just one second.

Flows rose from 30 in the 23:00 hour to a peak of 33 in the midnight hour, then dropping back to 14 at 03:00 and just one at 04:00. Vehicle waits were six to 23 minutes with one waiting nearly 40 minutes.

#### *Friday observations*

During the Friday observations (three hours) 577 passengers were observed leaving in 301 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.9 persons per vehicle – high. 28 vehicles left empty (9%).

Two passengers had to wait for a vehicle to arrive in the midnight hour – but their wait was only just over a minute. Averaged over all passengers this became negligible.

Passenger flows rose from 66 at 23:00 to a peak of 161 in the 03:00 hour, dropping to 89 and then just five in the 05:00 hour. This is significantly higher than the previous night. Vehicle waits were reduced to between three and seven minutes with a longest wait of just 14 minutes observed.

#### *Saturday observations*

During the Saturday observations (which covered nine hours again as vehicles were still there after the formal end of operation) 910 passengers were observed leaving in 456 vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 2 persons per vehicle – relatively high. 26 vehicles left empty (5%).

One passenger had to wait for a vehicle to arrive – just over a minute in the 04:00 hour. Averaged over all passengers this became negligible.

This night was even busier than Friday. Flows rose from 90 at 23:00 to 202 in the 03:00 hour. 04:00 saw 135 and 05:00 27 after which it became quiet. Vehicle waits were very low – never more than just under five minutes, although one vehicle did wait just over 15 minutes at the end of the 04:00 hour.

#### *Summary*

Overall, service to this rank is **fair to good**.

#### **Queen's Road, Casino**

In 2012 this was an informal hackney carriage pick-up area mainly used by private hire. Since that time it has become a formal 23:00 to 05:00 rank with seven formal spaces (trade say 6-7 spaces). It is directly outside the casino and in an ideal location to service patrons. Loading would be from the driver side with relatively safe passenger side loading also possible.

This rank was filmed from 10:00 on Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> October 2015 through to 05:59 in the early hours of Monday 19<sup>th</sup> October 2015. Activity was observed between 23:00 on Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> October 2015 through to 05:00 on Friday 16<sup>th</sup> October, and again on each of the three consecutive nights when the rank operated.

#### *Thursday observations*

During the Thursday observations 14 passengers were observed leaving in eight vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.8 persons per vehicle – high. 18 vehicles left empty (69%), with no passengers having to wait for a vehicle to arrive.

Only 23:00 and 01:00 saw passengers with two and six respectively observed. Some vehicles did wait up to 12 minutes for fares but generally vehicle waits were small.

#### *Friday observations*

During the Friday observations five passengers were observed leaving in three vehicles, giving vehicle occupancy of 1.7 persons per vehicle – moderate. Six vehicles left empty (67%).

One passenger had to wait for a vehicle to arrive. They waited nearly 3.5 minutes in the 02:00 hour. Averaged over all passengers this was about 41 seconds average wait. The 02:00 hour was the only one with passengers although there were a small amount of vehicles observed earlier.

#### *Sunday observations*

During the Sunday observations just one passenger was observed leaving in one vehicle, giving vehicle occupancy of 1 person per vehicle – very low. Three vehicles left empty (75%), with no passengers having to wait for a vehicle to arrive. The only passenger was in the midnight hour, although there were vehicles observed in other hours.

#### *Summary*

Overall, service to this rank is **fair** although demand is overall very low.

## 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 active	Average vehicle arrivals / hr	Average loaded departures / hr	Overall judgment of service provided
<b>24-hour ranks</b>					
Horseshoe (Station main rank)	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	24	60	59	Fair to excellent
	Friday 16 <sup>th</sup> October	24	64	63	
	Saturday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	24	64	63	
	Sunday 18 <sup>th</sup> October	13	43	42	
Station West (Station Hill)	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	19	59	12	Fair
	Friday 16 <sup>th</sup> October	18	60	10	
	Saturday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	4	28	2	
Station North	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	16	18	17	Fair
	Friday 16 <sup>th</sup> October	20	13	10	
	Saturday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	4	18	16	
	Sunday 18 <sup>th</sup> October	16	9	8	
Friar St Pitcher and Piano including feeder	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	19	18	16	Fair
	Friday 16 <sup>th</sup> October	20	22	20	
	Saturday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	18	19	17	
Friar St Quicksilver, including feeders	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	8	19	15	Fair
	Friday 16 <sup>th</sup> October	9	27	22	
	Saturday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	16	13	11	
Bridge Street	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	6	4	1	Fair
	Friday 16 <sup>th</sup> October	5	5	3	
	Saturday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	8	6	4	
	Sunday 18 <sup>th</sup> October	3	1	1	
Oxford Rd (Tesco Express)	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	4	5	1	Fair
	Friday 16 <sup>th</sup> October	4	7	2	
	Saturday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	5	6	3	
King Street	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	3	1	1	Poor
	Friday 16 <sup>th</sup> October	4	2	1	
	Saturday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	3	4	1	
	Sunday 18 <sup>th</sup> October	2	2	2	
Royal Berkshire Hospital (Craven Rd)	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	10	5	3	Poor
	Friday 16 <sup>th</sup> October	8	5	4	
	Saturday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	4	5	2	
	Sunday 18 <sup>th</sup> October	4	3	2	
St Mary's Butts	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	4	6	3	Fair
	Friday 16 <sup>th</sup> October	3	7	4	
	Saturday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	9	5	3	

Yield Hall Place (Oracle, private)	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	6	19	18	Fair
	Friday 16 <sup>th</sup> October	12	20	18	
	Saturday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	9	26	25	
Yield Hall Place (Oracle, council feeder)	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	1	67	1	N/A
	Friday 16 <sup>th</sup> October	2	79	2	
	Saturday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	1	66	1	
<b>Night only ranks</b>					
Station Road	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	5	6	3	Fair
	Friday 16 <sup>th</sup> October	6	32	26	
	Saturday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	6	37	33	
Gun Street	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	0	0	0	Fair
	Saturday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	2	21	18	
	Sunday 18 <sup>th</sup> October	6	7	5	
Minster Street (Gun St feeder)	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	1	9	1	N/A
	Friday 16 <sup>th</sup> October	1	70	1	
	Saturday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	1	6	1	
St Mary's Butts (Headmasters)	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	6	16	11	Fair to good
	Friday 16 <sup>th</sup> October	7	47	43	
	Saturday 17 <sup>th</sup> October	7	69	65	
Queen's Road (Casino)	Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> October	3	9	3	Fair
	Friday 16 <sup>th</sup> October	1	9	3	
	Sunday 18 <sup>th</sup> October	1	4	1	

Of all the 56 rank / days observed, 18 were active in passenger terms for more than 9 hours per day. Six were almost exclusively feeder locations (two sites), and Station West was dominantly a feeder, but not exclusively so.

In terms of overall passenger demand at ranks per hour when operational, the Horseshoe rank took four of the top six slots, although the busiest location was actually marginally the Saturday night at Headmasters.

Over the full set of 56 rank/day observations, four saw an average of over one person per minute. A further three saw over one person every two minutes (although this only adds Station Road Saturday to the list of busy ranks – ie only these three locations are busiest). Saturday shows as the busiest day/night.

In terms of overall service, comparing the number of vehicles supplied and the total number of loaded vehicles leaving (ie taking out the loading factor), the Horseshoe rank is the closest in terms of provision – but this is related to these figures being for the head rank only. However, it is clear that it is critical to this rank that a good and prompt supply of vehicles is needed to prevent unmet demand at this location. Most other locations show spare vehicles available compared to passenger demand.

## Summary of Total demand

The table below calculates a typical week from the observations undertaken in 2015 and compares to information from the previous survey. Ranks or pick-up locations are listed in descending order of passenger usage in 2015.

Rank	Passengers per week 2009 survey	Passengers per week, 2012 survey	Passengers per week 2015 survey
Horseshoe	(69%)	15,830 (59%)	11,719 (40%)
(all station)	[69%]	15,830 [59%]	15,779 [53%]
Pitcher and Piano		3,472 (13%)	4,018 (14%)
Station North	n/a	n/a	2,507 (8%)
Headmasters		620 (2.25%)	2,418 (8%)
Yield Hall Place (private)		132 (0.5%)	2,397 (8%)
Quicksilver		1,010 (4%)	2,289 (8%)
Station West	n/a	n/a	1,553 (5%)
Station Road	(27%)	2,223 (8.3%)	1,057 (4%)
Gun Street		1,854 (7%)	414 (1.1%)
St Mary's Butts 24-hr		12 (0.05%)	342 (1%)
Bridge St		344 (1.3%)	268 (1%)
Royal Berkshire Hospital			264 (1%)
Oxford Rd		84 (0.3%)	125 (0.4%)
Casino	n/a	n/a	67 (0.2%)
King Street			48 (0.2%)
Minster Street			18 (0.1%)
Oracle Feeder		1,057 (4.3%)	13 (0.0%)
<b>Total estimated weekly demand</b>	<b>17,600</b>	<b>26,638</b>	<b>29,516</b>
<b>Growth from previous</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>+51%</b>	<b>+11%</b>
<b>Growth from 2009</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>+51%</b>	<b>+68%</b>

Note – Total includes all observations at relevant points as available, both sets factored to full week from detail available.

Since 2012, there has been some 11% growth overall at ranks in Reading. The growth from the 2009 survey is now around 68% compared to 51% in 2012.

The table above demonstrates that the Horseshoe remains the dominant rank, although totals from the station have been shared between the other two new ranks perhaps a little more than expected. Adding all three station ranks together, the dominance has reduced a little from 59% to 53%, although the Horseshoe itself now takes 40%, with Station North 8% and Station West 5%. Beyond the Horseshoe, only the Pitcher and Piano rank has more than 8% of the total estimated demand.

There are now four ranks taking 8% of estimated weekly demand. It appears that the Yield Hall Place private rank has increased in use partly at the expense of the council section. Headmasters has increased its share from just over 2% to 8%. Quicksilver has increased its share from 4%. The other rank is the new Station North rank.

Station Road has halved its share from the former 8% to 4% now. Gun Street has also dropped its share from 7% to 1%. St Mary's Butts southern rank (formerly 24-hour) has also increased its share a little.

The overall picture is that there are now even more active ranks sharing the burden of moving people from Reading central area than there were in 2012, although the change is amongst ranks existing then rather than from increases from the new Casino rank.

### **Plate activity levels**

A sample of plate numbers were collected during the rank surveys to identify the level of activity of the fleet during the survey. Observations covered each part of the area near to key ranks (but not at the ranks) – covering a total of 9.5 hours on the Thursday, Friday and Saturday of the surveys. This was to identify the level of activity of the fleet and to test if there was any 'playing up' by the trade to the survey. Three key locations were included.

In summary, on the Thursday, 67% of all plates were seen. This rose to 75% on the Friday and 88% on the Saturday. All these figures seem to be reasonable. The overall value for the 2012 survey was 90%. We were advised that some drivers who did not own plates may have not worked during the period of the survey, although there does not seem to be any strong evidence that this was the case from these figures. If this was the case, the overall impact on service to the public does not appear to have been overly significant.

### **Station Feeder times**

A further test was undertaken on the Thursday covering three 90 minute periods during the day to identify how long it took vehicles to move from arriving at Station West to leaving the Horseshoe rank with a passenger. From the sample obtained, the average estimated time was 24 minutes for the morning sample, 20 minutes for the early afternoon and 24 minutes for the late afternoon. This suggests a relatively prompt turnover of vehicles through the two station ranks.

## **Application of the ISUD index**

The industry standard index of significant unmet demand (ISUD) has been used and developed since the initial Government guidance that limits could only apply if there was no significant unmet demand for the service of hackney carriage vehicles. Initially developed by a university, it was then adopted by one of the consultant groups undertaking surveys, developed further by them in the light of various court challenges, and most recently adopted as an 'industry standard' test utilised by most current practitioners of unmet demand studies.

The index is principally used to identify a statistical guide if observed unmet demand is in fact significant. Early in the process of developing the index, a cut-off point of 80 was identified beneath which no conclusion of unmet demand being significant had been drawn, and over which all studies had concluded there was significant unmet demand. This level has become accepted as the guide. Once unmet demand has been identified as significant it is usual for a calculation to be undertaken to identify the exact number of new licences needed in order to reduce the significance of the unmet demand below the threshold – although this cannot be an exact science in terms of outcomes due to the high number of parameters involved in determining where new licences actually end up working – there is no way to guarantee that licences will focus on reducing the unmet demand at all.

The ISUD calculations draw from various elements of the work, reflecting statistics which seek to capture components of 'significant unmet demand' although principal inputs are from the rank surveys, factored to produce a typical week of observations based on the knowledge available to us.

The current index has two elements which can negate the need for use of the index by setting the value to zero. The first test relates to if there are any daytime hours (Monday to Friday 1000 to 1800) where people are observed to queue for hackney carriages. Using the direct outputs from the survey a value of 19.4% is estimated.

The other index that could be zero – proportion of passengers in hours in which waits occurred which was over 1 minute – was 3.8%.

The seasonality index is 1.0 since the surveys were undertaken in October 2015.

The area exhibits peaked demand, so this factor is 0.5.

Average passenger delay in minutes across the whole survey is 0.19 minutes (or 11 seconds).

From the public attitude work, the latent demand factor is 1.03, assuming all who did not give an answer had not ever given up waiting.

The ISUD index is the multiple of all the above. Using detailed numbers (but then rounding) the calculated value is 7. This is well short of the cut-off value of 80 suggesting there is no unmet demand in the Reading area which is significant at this point in time. This result takes on board both patent (measurable) and latent demand. This needs to be considered with other evidence to understand the right course of action with plate numbers but it is unlikely that this guide value would be reversed by other evidence.

**Comparison to previous studies**

The ISUD index was used in the 2009 and 2012 studies. The Table below shows the change in specific indices between years to give an indication of the movement of the market between these two studies (where information is available). The surveys were all undertaken at the same time of year, so the seasonality index was 1.0 in all cases and has not been reported. There will be some differences arising from the specific sample hours used but in general an outline comparison is informative on the state of the hackney carriage market in Reading over the last six years.

Element	2009	2012	2015
Average wait (mins)			0.19
Peak factor		0.5	0.5
% Queues in weekday daytime hours		0	19.4
% pass in hours with waiting over 1 minute		3.6	3.8
Latent demand		1.09	1.03
Overall index	37	0	7.25

Latent demand has reduced, but the 2015 index is now non-zero because of a large increase in the level of the percentage of queues occurring in daytime hours (there were none in 2012). The percentage of passengers in hours with average queues over a minute is marginally higher but otherwise remarkably similar. The current index remains a fraction of the level it was in 2009.

Further discussion occurs below to make use of this information in the decision regarding the significance or otherwise of unmet demand.





## 4. Public Consultation results

An fourteen question survey was undertaken with 198 persons in the Reading Council area (450 were obtained in 2012 including three out of town samples, not required this time). Surveys were undertaken on Wednesday 21<sup>st</sup> October and Thursday 29<sup>th</sup> October 2015 in the shopping area. Responses were mainly from those available during the day time, following standard practise for these interviews. The Table in **Appendix 3** summarises the overall responses.

24% of those interviewed had used a licensed vehicle in the Reading Council area in the last three months, a low level of recent usage. This was much lower than either 2012 or 2009 (52% and 55% for the town centre elements respectively). Looking at the remaining responses, they reflect a generally non-licensed vehicle interested cohort, although this remains a valid response (see later for general content of those interviewed).

Of the respondents who told us they had used a licensed vehicle recently, only 26% said how often they used a licensed vehicle. We have assumed the remaining non-respondents do not use licensed vehicles and calculated the average level of licensed vehicle trips per month. On average, there are 0.9 person trips by licensed vehicle per month based on these assumptions, a low level. Compared to 2012 when the most frequent usage was a few times a month, this set of interviews focussed on people saying less than once a month.

25% of interviewees told us how they obtained licensed vehicles in the Council area. Some gave multiple answers. By far the highest percentage got taxis by booking them by telephone (44%), followed by mobile or smart phone (8%), with the total by phone methods being 52%. 39% said they got them from ranks and 7% said their normal method was hailing (very high). Interestingly, despite the overall less licensed vehicle friendly sample compared to 2012, the rank proportion was exactly the same although the hailing proportion was reduced from 36% (which appeared high compared to the previous result of 15%).

In this questionnaire, people were asked if they felt Reading taxi fares were reasonable. 21% gave a response of which 33% said they were reasonable if booked in advance and 21% if paid on the meter. 21% said too high, and 21% had no opinion. 2% did feel they were too low. Overall this suggests a relatively good satisfaction with fares in Reading – over half feeling they are reasonable which ever means people use (pre-booked or from meter).

The use of phones was queried further, seeking to understand the companies that people used. Across the full survey people suggested just 20 mentions of companies. A similar number of companies were named as in 2012 (13 compared to 14) with only one company getting a quarter of responses, another 15% and one other 10%. All the rest were mentioned just once. This confirms that the situation of 2012, where there was no dominance of any specific private hire companies, is still the case. Once again there was some evidence people were phoning for hackney carriages.

A set of questions were then asked relating specifically to use of hackney carriages. Just 15% of those questioned provided hackney carriage usage frequencies. Only 3% said they could not remember when they had last used a hackney carriage. None said they could not remember seeing a hackney carriage in the area. Overall, the number of trips per person per month from the stated frequencies of use of hackney carriages was 0.2, or 22% of that quoted for total licensed vehicles – perhaps lower than the quoted usage of vehicles from ranks.

People were asked to name all the rank locations they were aware of in the Council area and if they used the locations they named or not. Of the 40 different mentions given, there were 11 different names (some of which may be the same location). 60% of mentions were of the station rank followed by Friar Street (not clear which rank), 13%. Most other ranks were mentioned, although there were some unknown locations such as 'Total Petrol Station' but the overall response was generally low.

When asked about new locations, the whole sample provided only four suggestions none of which were therefore significant.

In terms of problems with the local hackney carriages service there were just three responses – insignificant. More responded what would encourage them to use hackney carriages more although the response was dominated by the 67% 'cheaper cost' response (which people offered as this was not put in the main options offered). Other than this, the highest score was for better standard vehicles but with just three overall responses this cannot be taken as even indicative of views. Overall this suggests the service is performing fairly well – but there is little that could be done to further increase usage.

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. Of the low response, 89% said they did not need, nor aware of anyone, who needed a disabled friendly vehicle. Of those needing a style of vehicle all responded WAV – but again this cannot be seen as significant apart from the fact there was no other answer given.

Of those answering if they had ever given up waiting for a hackney carriage, just five people said they had. All of these were at current ranks – three at the station, one in Bridge Street and the other at Friar Street. If it is assumed all others had no issue, the true latent demand factor is just 3% (or 1.03 in terms of the ISUD index component value) – low.

This is reduced from the value of 1.09 estimated in 2012.

38% said they had regular access to a car (lower than in 2012). 66% lived in the area (slightly higher than in 2012).

Our gender sample saw exactly the national estimate in terms of the proportion of men (51% compared to 51% in the 2015 census estimate). Our age sample saw very slight over-representation of the older group (31% compared to 25%), and the middle group – 50% compared to 42% in the census. The younger group surveyed was correspondingly under-represented (19% compared to 33%). This is a generally representative sample but different in composition to 2012 (where younger people were over-represented, but partially due to including the university sample). This should not have affected the results but may explain the overall low usage of licensed vehicles reported.



## 5. Stakeholder Consultation

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

- Supermarkets
- Hotels
- Hospital
- Pubwatch / night clubs
- Disability representatives
- Police
- Rail operators
- Other council contacts
- County council contacts

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 views of those consulted, and not that of the authors of this Report. **Appendix 5** provides further details of those consulted. Information was obtained by telephone / email / letter as appropriate. Contacts were made with a selection chosen from an extensive list provided by the Council as well as by checking internet sources for other contact details or more detailed references.

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

### ***Supermarkets***

Eight supermarkets were contacted. During the time available and following several attempts, three responses were obtained. Two large supermarkets said their customers used local taxis. Another (who has a long established home delivery service) said their customers only used local taxis 'rarely'. One said customers called for the company they preferred themselves. Two were aware of nearby ranks but did not think people used them – although one store would help people with lots of shopping out onto the street and hail a hackney carriage for them. Only one of the three said there were issues – and that was that one in five phoned for vehicles turned up a long time after being called.

No response was received from the other five stores contacted.

### ***Hotels***

Six hotels were contacted but during the time available none provided any response.

## ***Restaurants / Night venues***

Five restaurants, two entertainment venues, six pubs and seven night venues were contacted.

One restaurant refused to talk with us and three others provided no response. The one restaurant which responded told us their customers did use local taxis, either by customers calling or by them phoning for their customers. They were not aware of ranks nor of any complaints.

One entertainment venue responded that their customers used local taxis which were usually based on booking a return with the company they arrived with. They were therefore unaware of ranks and had not received any complaints. The other venue contacted did not respond.

Four of the six pubs contacted provided us a response. All said their customers used local taxis. One said customers called their own preferred company themselves. Two said people used the business cards left, one said they would call if people asked them to. One said their customers sometimes went and hailed hackney carriages outside. None were aware of ranks nor any complaints.

Four clubs responded whilst one refused and two others did not reply to our various requests. One said there was a rank outside which was the main way people got taxis home. Two others said customers either flagged down hackney carriage, got them from a nearby rank or made a booking using their own private mobile phones. One said they had lots of company cards which people used if they didn't already have a number saved in their phone. All four that responded were aware of ranks. The main issue reported by two people was the expense of hackney carriages.

## ***Hospitals***

The Royal Berkshire hospital was contacted but provided no response despite several attempts to speak with them.

## ***Police***

The police representative met us at the trade meeting. Their main concern related to over-ranking and the impact this had on other traffic, given the tight nature of the town centre traffic provision. They felt there were sufficient vehicles available and continued to praise the present rank system which provided a range of locations for people to get hackney carriages.

## ***Disability representatives***

No response was obtained from those representing people with disabilities.

## **Rail Operators**

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 from 1997/1998 to date (the last year of data ending in March for the last year quoted, with information published the December after this date). The figures after the station name show the position in rank in terms of usage of English, Welsh and Scottish railway stations, with the smallest usage being the 2,539<sup>th</sup> station and the highest being 1<sup>st</sup> in the list (Waterloo, London). Within the Reading area there are three stations – Reading, Reading West and Tilehurst. For 2015, we have only compared rail growth for the main Reading station, which is currently the 26<sup>th</sup> largest station in the terms of this data collection.

Rail year (ends March in last year noted)	Entries / exits	Growth / decline
<b>Reading (26<sup>th</sup>)</b>		
1997 / 1998	9,454,849	n/a
1998 / 1999	10,072,793	+7%
1999 / 2000	11,210,972	+11%
2000 / 2001	12,657,281	+13%
2001 / 2002	12,851,824	+1%
2002 / 2003	12,945,908	+1%
2003 / 2004	n/a	n/a
2004 / 2005	13,297,027	+3%(2 yrs)
2005 / 2006	13,570,560	+2%
2006 / 2007	14,367,752	+6%
2007 / 2008	14,549,487	+1%
2008 / 2009	14,384,236	-1%
2009 / 2010	13,866,258	-4%
2010 / 2011	14,400,405	+4%
2011 / 2012	15,121,768	+5%
2012 / 2013	15,412,998	+2%
2013 / 2014	15,673,400	+2%
2014 / 2015	16,339,602	+4%
Overall	97/98 to 14/15	+73%
Last three available	2011/12 to 2014/15	+8%

Since data began collection, rail patronage at Reading has increased 73%, compared to overall national growth in the same period of 126%. The last data available suggests over 16 million passengers enter or leave the station per year. Growth since the last survey has been in the order of 8%.

The internet-based Train Taxi guide correctly states that Reading is a major station with taxis usually available on a rank. Advance booking 'is not normally necessary or even possible..'. Four private hire operator numbers are given, but none claim wheel chair accessible vehicles. One of the same companies are named for Reading West with another company and suggestion people are best to travel to Reading rather than Reading West if needing a taxi connection onwards.



No comment was obtained from the rail operator, although the land on which the rank is based is in any event owned by Reading Borough Council – for all three ranks at the station.

## 6. Licensed Vehicle Trade Consultation

### *Trade consultation*

As in 2012, trade consultation was undertaken by a meeting with trade representatives face to face early during the project, together with the release of information from the Council questionnaire issued to the trade before it was agreed that the latest study was required.

At the time of survey inception, only the Reading Taxi Association (RTA) was available to meet with us face to face. A police representative also attended the meeting. The main concern from the RTA was that we were properly aware of the current rank provision particularly the new station arrangements. They also pointed out the fragility of the provision of the Garrard Street feeder and access arrangement, which was critical to servicing what was felt to be the main rank at the Horseshoe.

There were few other questions or concerns since the RTA were well aware of our understanding and capability in undertaking the survey based on our having undertaken the previous study in 2012.

After the meeting, the RTA provided us their list of ranks and also advised us that there were significant numbers of times when traffic congestion in Reading, or disruption to train services, both of which could significantly change both demand for hackney carriages whilst at the same time often reducing their ability to respond to demand.

The 'all-driver' element of the trade consultation was, as in 2012, covered by the Council issuing a letter in February 2015 to 650 hackney carriage drivers and vehicle owners. 167 responded (26% - a good response and higher than the 22% of 2012). There were six questions in the 2015 version.

One question gave respondents three options:

- continue not to issue any more vehicle licences for at least the next three years (1)
- limit issue of licences to a fixed number per year (2)
- issue licences to all who apply (3)

70% of responses favoured option 1 (64% in 2012). 20% favoured option 2 (a reduction from 24% in 2012), almost evenly split between 12 extra per year, 12-20 extra per year and 20 extra per year. 6% favoured removing the limit – reduced from the 12% requesting this option in 2012. The remaining 4% did not answer this question. This suggests that there has tended to be a move towards supporting a fixed limit particularly from those supporting complete removal of the limit.

The high response to option 1 however saw 52% (just over half) of the 70% give no further detail. 16% said they supported this option as they felt there was oversupply of vehicles, limited rank space and limited work for the current fleet. 11% said more rank spaces were needed if more vehicles were in place. 6% agreed with option 1 but said there should be a decision only after the unmet demand survey was published.

Those supporting managed increase of plate numbers focussed on rents being too high, there being too few vehicles available to rent, a feeling that those renting were being taken advantage of, that the price of plates was high, that it created a monopoly, and that Reading, as a hub of the Thames Valley should really have more hackney carriages.

Those supporting removal of the limit said there were currently very high numbers of drivers compared to vehicles and that there was potentially large future growth expected at the station with Crossrail.

In effect, 33% of respondents supported the status quo and gave reasons for why they supported that option, whilst 20% favoured managed growth and 6% no limit. This still shows a general dominance of support for retaining the current limit.

## **7. Summary and conclusions**

### ***Policy Background***

The policy background, both from a general transport viewpoint, and from the specific hackney carriage point of view, has not changed since 2012. The only significant change has been the publication of the Law Commission report, but it is not clear if or when any further action will occur regarding this. This Report has been written with the research results from this in mind where relevant. In essence, the LTP continues to seek provision of a fully accessible and integrated transport network whilst the limit on the number of hackney carriages remains and is the subject of this Report.

### ***Statistical Background***

Although there has been an increase in private hire vehicle numbers since the last survey, this number fluctuates in any event, and there is no evidence of any strong increase arising from the restriction on hackney carriage plates. In fact, driver numbers are about the same as in 2012 and overall vehicle numbers still remain lower than those in 2009.

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

A significant programme of rank surveys were undertaken resulting in some 682 hours of data covering Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Sunday (through to the early hours of Monday) during a weekend in October 2015. This is a large increase compared to the 277 hours covered in 2012, and included the two new ranks at the station, formal coverage of the rank introduced near the Casino, coverage for the first time of the hospital rank, and a total of 17 sites (all operational ranks in the area).

In total, 14,868 different vehicle arrivals and departures were recorded of which 12,686 were those by hackney carriages. 10% of the overall total were private cars many of which were abusing rank space, the worst being at Bridge Street (a lesser used rank) and at the hospital (a more significant issue).

When factored to an average week, 2015 saw about an 11% growth overall in usage of hackney carriages from ranks in passenger terms. The Horseshoe rank remains dominant, although the overall level of usage of the station ranks has been shared with the two new ranks. Although the station saw about 10% growth in patronage between the two surveys, its actual current share (when all three ranks are considered) remains very similar at 53% (although taking just the Horseshoe the percentage is 40% of the total).

Ranks seeing increased patronage in 2015 are Yield Hall Place, Headmasters and Quicksilver, all which now see 8% of total estimated patronage. The Pitcher and Piano rank remains the second largest used rank, taking some 14% of the total (very similar to in 2012).

Ranks losing usage include Station Road, which halved its total estimated usage compared to 2012. Gun Street and its feeder also appear to have reduced in usage.

In terms of volumes of loaded departures when a rank is active, the top six ranks/days are made up of observations from the Horseshoe and from Headmasters. Saturday was found to be the busiest night.

The pattern of movement of people between areas of the centre is from the Yield Hall Place area to the Pitcher and Piano / Station Road / Quicksilver area and then finally towards the rank at Headmasters.

Vehicle activity was sampled and found to rise from 67% of plates seen on the Thursday to 75% on the Friday and 88% on the Saturday – lower than in 2012 (90% overall). This still shows some spare capacity in the vehicle fleet. There is no suggestion of the fleet 'playing up' to the survey, nor is there evidence that any significant number of vehicles were not working during the survey period.

Overall, the picture is of even more active ranks sharing the burden of moving people away from the centre of Reading at critical times – with ranks being located in places able to react to any change in the provision or opening hours of clubs by their spread.

The only concerns arising are that there appeared to be a significant growth in passenger queueing in off-peak hours (from nothing in 2012 to 20% now), although the proportion of people in queues over a minute was very similar to 2012. All other parts of the ISUD index remained similar, and the overall conclusion remains that there is no unmet demand at this point in time in Reading which is significant. The index remains low and significantly lower than either the threshold value or the value identified in 2009 after which the limit was put back in place.

### ***Public Consultation***

The central area focussed on-street public consultation covered 198 persons in 2015. The sample suggested a significant reduction in those using licensed vehicles in the last three months compared to 2012. The results also suggested people were using them less. However, the proportion using ranks seemed unchanged with the main drop being the level of hailing.

Over half of respondents felt fares were reasonable. It was found that the lack of dominance of any private hire company found in 2012 continued in 2015. The main ranks known equated to the top two ranks from the rank survey – ie the Station and possibly the Pitcher and Piano rank (though people just called this 'Friar Street'. There was no call for new ranks.

There was no real issue with the service provided by hackney carriages – nor much that the trade could do to increase usage. The latent demand estimate of 1.03 was reduced from that in 2012 (1.09).

## ***Stakeholder Consultation***

Stakeholder results found no real issue with the service provided, and a generally healthy mix of customers using ranks and pre-booked vehicles. This is not always the case with private hire (bookings) often dominating the views of stakeholders. The police were mainly concerned with over-ranking rather than any shortage of vehicles, and continued to be pleased with the late night spread of ranks and service provided to various areas reducing walking to ranks.

Some eight wheel chair customers were observed accessing hackney carriages at ranks during the survey. 31 further cases of drivers assisting passengers were observed.

## ***Trade Consultation***

The council-led trade consultation which preceded the survey obtained a marginally better response than in 2012. There appears to be a move towards supporting the fixed limit option compared to 2012. The only issue identified was concern about rent levels and the number of vehicles available to those preferring to rent, but this was not significant overall.

## ***Synthesis and Conclusions***

The hackney carriage service in Reading continues to provide a high quality service to those needing to use its services, both in the day and at night. Whilst a good proportion of users focus on departures from the station (including a reasonable level of use of all three ranks following the rebuild) the excellent provision of a wide range of ranks near to late night venues continues to keep the central area safe for those using it. Stakeholder and public views support these conclusions.

Marginal requirements for development include a need to increase capacity and enforcement of the rank at the hospital to ensure the unmet demand observed there is reduced. There is also evidence that people are expecting to see hackney carriages near the King Street rank – during the day as well as at night – and there would be benefit in vehicles seeking to pass this location more frequently. With growth in the level of usage continuing, early discussion with the hackney carriage trade on what might constitute the need for more plates would be prudent. This should include frank discussion about the issue of levels of rent and availability of vehicles to rent – which might lead to higher levels of double-shifting which could help the current trade increase its potential. The issue of possibly providing a very small number of plates for those wishing to move on from renting could also be included in these discussions.



## **8. Recommendations**

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

There is **no evidence** of any unmet demand for hackney carriages either patent or latent which is significant at this point in time in the Reading area. The committee is therefore able to retain the current policy and limit at the present level and defend this if necessary.

### ***Rank provision***

Current rank provision is sufficient and excellent, and meets current public need. It also has resilience to allow change in club locations to be taken account of. The principal need is to ensure that enforcement of ranks against car abuse is progressed further. This is particularly necessary at the hospital rank.

### ***Future review of hackney carriage demand***

The Council should ensure that record is kept that, unless legislation or guidance changes, the next review of unmet demand ensures that fresh rank surveys are undertaken no later than October 2018 with relevant accompanying research by an independent review body.

### ***Trade development opportunities***

The survey has shown some potential gaps in service particularly at the hospital rank and at King Street which may provide the trade the opportunity for growing their business further.

There is also continued growth in actual usage of hackney carriages from ranks and the potential future implications of this in terms of possible need for more vehicles before the next survey takes place would be worth discussion between the trade and council. This should be in the light of seeking to ensure that potential patronage growth could never be stunted by any lack of supply. The issue of rent levels and vehicle availability for rent might be included in this discussion to ensure best use was obtained from the vehicles currently within the fleet. This might include a very small number of extra vehicles to help any wishing to leave renting to move on although it would be likely that any such vehicles would tend to work in preferred times for the new owner rather than necessarily at key times of passenger demand.





## **Appendix 1 – Planned Video Observation Hours**



		Horseshoe (Railway Station)	Station West (Station Hill)	Station North	Station Road	Friar Street Quicksilver / Subway / Savers	Gun Street	Minster St	Bridge Street	Yield Hall Place (The Oracle)	The Oracle Feeder	St Mary's Butts (Headmasters)	St Mary's Butts 24 hr	Friar Street West (Pitcher and Piano and Hickey's)	Oxford Road	Kings Street	Royal Berkshire Hospital (Craven Rd)	Queen's Road (Casino)	Hours
2012 survey hours		52	Not there	Not there	20	20	28	10	22	19	15	16	8	46	16	0	? Not there	5	277
2015 spaces / operating hours		5 + 15 24 hr	18 24 hr	25 24 hr	7 23/05	5 + 4 + 4 23/05 24 hr 23/05	6 + 3 24 hr 23/05	7 23/05	3 24 hr	3 24 hr		6 23/05	3 20/08	3 + 7 24 hr 23/05		4 23/05	3 24 hr	7 23/05	
operational comment from walk-round / client discussion		fed from Garrard St	feeds Horseshoe via Garrard St	low pass use but veh always there	issue with late buses	3 consecutive parts - 24 hr in middle	2 consecutive parts	feeds Gun St			feeds main rank			Part time section supplements night		believed rarely if ever used	appears to suffer abuse by parked vehicles		
2015 Comment		obs will cover arrival at back of queue	New for 2015	New for 2015		part furthest from town centre is bus stop in day	mainly used at night	bus stop in day				bus stop in day					Possibly new for 2015	Now formal rank	
Thursday	07:00	1	1	1		1			1	1				1	1		1		9
Thursday	08:00	2	2	2		2			2	2				2	2		2		9
Thursday	09:00	3	3	3		3			3	3				3	3		3		9
Thursday	10:00	4	4	4		4			4	4				4	4		4		9
Thursday	11:00	5	5	5		5			5	5				5	5		5		9
Thursday	12:00	6	6	6		6			6	6				6	6		6		9
Thursday	13:00	7	7	7		7			7	7				7	7		7		9
Thursday	14:00	8	8	8		8			8	8				8	8		8		9
Thursday	15:00	9	9	9		9			9	9				9	9		9		9
Thursday	16:00	10	10	10		10			10	10				10	10		10		9
Thursday	17:00	11	11	11		11			11	11				11	11		11		9
Thursday	18:00	12	12	12		12			12	12				12	12		12		9

Thursday	19:00	13	13	13		13			13	13				13	13		13		9
Thursday	20:00	14	14	14		14			14	14	1		1	14	14		14		11
Thursday	21:00	15	15	15		15			15	15	2		2	15	15		15		11
Thursday	22:00	16	16	16		16			16	16	3		3	16	16		16		11
Thursday	23:00	17	17	17	1	17	1	1	17	17	4	1	4	17	17	1	17	1	17
Thursday	00:00	18	18	18	2	18	2	2	18	18	5	2	5	18	18	2	18	2	17
Friday	01:00	19	19	19	3	19	3	3	19	19	6	3	6	19	19	3	19	3	17
Friday	02:00	20	20	20	4	20	4	4	20	20	7	4	7	20	20	4	20	4	17
Friday	03:00	21	21	21	5	21	5	5	21	21	8	5	8	21	21	5	21	5	17
Friday	04:00	22	22	22	6	22	6	6	22	22	9	6	9	22	22	6	22	6	17
Friday	05:00	23	23	23		23			23	23	10		10	23	23		23		11
Friday	06:00	24	24	24		24			24	24			11	24	24		24		10
Friday	07:00	25	25	25		25			25	25			12	25	25		25		10
Friday	08:00	26	26	26		26			26	26				26	26		26		9
Friday	09:00	27	27	27		27			27	27				27	27		27		9
Friday	10:00	28	28	28		28			28	28				28	28		28		9
Friday	11:00	29	29	29		29			29	29				29	29		29		9
Friday	12:00	30	30	30		30			30	30				30	30		30		9
Friday	13:00	31	31	31		31			31	31				31	31		31		9
Friday	14:00	32	32	32		32			32	32				32	32		32		9
Friday	15:00	33	33	33		33			33	33				33	33		33		9
Friday	16:00	34	34	34		34			34	34				34	34		34		9
Friday	17:00	35	35	35		35			35	35				35	35		35		9
Friday	18:00	36	36	36		36			36	36				36	36		36		9
Friday	19:00	37	37	37		37			37	37				37	37		37		9
Friday	20:00	38	38	38		38			38	38	11		13	38	38		38		11
Friday	21:00	39	39	39		39			39	39	12		14	39	39		39		11
Friday	22:00	40	40	40		40			40	40	13		15	40	40		40		11
Friday	23:00	41	41	41	7	41	7	7	41	41	14	7	16	41	41	7	41	7	17
Friday	00:00	42	42	42	8	42	8	8	42	42	15	8	17	42	42	8	42	8	17
Saturday	01:00	43	43	43	9	43	9	9	43	43	16	9	18	43	43	9	43	9	17
Saturday	02:00	44	44	44	10	44	10	10	44	44	17	10	19	44	44	10	44	10	17
Saturday	03:00	45	45	45	11	45	11	11	45	45	18	11	20	45	45	11	45	11	17
Saturday	04:00	46	46	46	12	46	12	12	46	46	19	12	21	46	46	12	46	12	17
Saturday	05:00	47	47	47		47			47	47	20		22	47	47		47		11
Saturday	06:00	48	48	48		48			48	48			23	48	48		48		10
Saturday	07:00	49	49	49		49			49	49			24	49	49		49		10
Saturday	08:00	50	50	50		50			50	50				50	50		50		9

Saturday	09:00	51	51	51		51			51	51				51	51		51		9
Saturday	10:00	52	52	52		52			52	52				52	52		52		9
Saturday	11:00	53	53	53		53			53	53				53	53		53		9
Saturday	12:00	54	54	54		54			54	54				54	54		54		9
Saturday	13:00	55	55	55		55			55	55				55	55		55		9
Saturday	14:00	56	56	56		56			56	56				56	56		56		9
Saturday	15:00	57	57	57		57			57	57				57	57		57		9
Saturday	16:00	58	58	58		58			58	58				58	58		58		9
Saturday	17:00	59	59	59		59			59	59				59	59		59		9
Saturday	18:00	60	60	60		60			60	60				60	60		60		9
Saturday	19:00	61	61	61		61			61	61				61	61		61		9
Saturday	20:00	62	62	62		62			62	62	21		25	62	62		62		11
Saturday	21:00	63	63	63		63			63	63	22		26	63	63		63		11
Saturday	22:00	64	64	64		64			64	64	23		27	64	64		64		11
Saturday	23:00	65	65	65	13	65	13	13	65	65	24	13	28	65	65	13	65	13	17
Saturday	00:00	66	66	66	14	66	14	14	66	66	25	14	29	66	66	14	66	14	17
Sunday	01:00	67	67	67	15	67	15	15	67	67	26	15	30	67	67	15	67	15	17
Sunday	02:00	68	68	68	16	68	16	16	68	68	27	16	31	68	68	16	68	16	17
Sunday	03:00	69	69	69	17	69	17	17	69	69	28	17	32	69	69	17	69	17	17
Sunday	04:00	70	70	70	18	70	18	18	70	70	29	18	33	70	70	18	70	18	17
Sunday	05:00	71	71	71		71			71	71	30		34	71	71		71		11
Sunday	06:00	72	72	72		72			72	72			35	72	72		72		10
Sunday	07:00	73	73	73		73			73	73			36	73	73		73		10
Sunday	08:00	74	74	74		74			74	74				74	74		74		9
Sunday	09:00	75	75	75		75			75	75				75	75		75		9
Sunday	10:00	76	76	76		76			76	76				76	76		76		9
Sunday	11:00	77	77	77		77			77	77				77	77		77		9
Sunday	12:00	78	78	78		78			78	78				78	78		78		9
Sunday	13:00	79	79	79		79			79	79				79	79		79		9
Sunday	14:00	80	80	80		80			80	80				80	80		80		9
Sunday	15:00	81	81	81		81			81	81				81	81		81		9
Sunday	16:00	82	82	82		82			82	82				82	82		82		9
Sunday	17:00	83	83	83		83			83	83				83	83		83		9
Sunday	18:00	84	84	84		84			84	84				84	84		84		9
Sunday	19:00	85	85	85		85			85	85				85	85		85		9
Sunday	20:00	86	86	86		86			86	86			37	86	86		86		10
Sunday	21:00	87	87	87		87			87	87			38	87	87		87		10
Sunday	22:00	88	88	88		88			88	88			39	88	88		88		10

Sunday	23:00	89	89	89	19	89	19	19	89	89		19	40	89	89	19	89	19	16
Sunday	00:00	90	90	90	20	90	20	20	90	90		20	41	90	90	20	90	20	16
Monday	01:00	91	91	91	21	91	21	21	91	91		21	42	91	91	21	91	21	16
Monday	02:00	92	92	92	22	92	22	22	92	92		22	43	92	92	22	92	22	16
Monday	03:00	93	93	93	23	93	23	23	93	93		23	44	93	93	23	93	23	16
Monday	04:00	94	94	94	24	94	24	24	94	94		24	45	94	94	24	94	24	16
Monday	05:00	95	95	95		95			95	95			46	95	95		95		10
Monday	06:00	96	96	96		96			96	96			47	96	96		96		10
Monday	07:00																		0
Total hours at site		96	96	96	24	96	24	24	96	96	30	24	47	96	96	24	96	24	1085
																			<b>1085</b>

## Appendix 2 – Observed Video Observation Hours





		Horseshoe (Railway Station) - camera watching Garrard St and front	Station West (Station Hill)	Station North	Friar Street Pitcher and Piano and Hickey's	Friar Street Quicksilver / Subway / Savers	Bridge Street	Oxford Road	Kings Street	Royal Berkshire Hospital (Craven Rd)	St Mary's Butts	Yield Hall Place (The Oracle)	The Oracle Feeder	Station Road	Gun Street	Minster St	St Mary's Butts (Headmasters)	Queen's Road (Casino)	Hours	
Thursday	06:00																		0	
Thursday	07:00	1	1	Lost	Lost		Lost	Lost	Lost	Lost									2	
Thursday	08:00	2	2		1	1	Lost												3	
Thursday	09:00	3	3		2	2	1												4	
Thursday	10:00	4	4		3	3	2												5	
Thursday	11:00	5	5	1	3	1	4	2		1	1								9	
Thursday	12:00	6	6	2	4	2	5	3		2	2								8	
Thursday	13:00	7	7	3	5		6	4		3					1				8	
Thursday	14:00	8	8	4	6		7	5		4	1				2				9	
Thursday	15:00	9	9	5	7		8	6		5	2								8	
Thursday	16:00	10	10	6	8		9	7		6									7	
Thursday	17:00	11	11	7	9		10	8		7									7	
Thursday	18:00	12	12	8	10		11	9		8									7	
Thursday	19:00	13	13	9	11	3	12	10		9									8	
Thursday	20:00	14	14	10	12	4	13			10	3	3	1						10	
Thursday	21:00	15	15	11	13	5	14			11	4	4	2						10	
Thursday	22:00	16	16	12	14	6	15			12	5	5	3						9	
Thursday	23:00	17	17	13	15	7	16			13	6	6	4	1					14	
Thursday	00:00	18	18	14	16	8	17			14	7	7	5	2					14	
Friday	01:00	19	19	15	17	9	18			15	8	8	6	3					14	
Friday	02:00	20	20	16	18	10	19			16	9	9	7	4	Lost				14	
Friday	03:00	21	21	17	19	11	20	11		17	10	10	8	5		3	1	1	1	14
Friday	04:00	22	22	18	20	12	21	12		18	11	11	9	6		4	2	2	2	12
Friday	05:00	23	23	19	21	13				19	12	12	10							6
Friday	06:00	24	24	20	22	14				20									5	
Friday	07:00	25	25	21	23					21									4	
Friday	08:00	26	26	22	24					22									4	
Friday	09:00	27	27	23	25					23									5	
Friday	10:00	28	28	24	26		22	13		24									7	

Friday	11:00	29	29	25	27		23	14		17	9							8	
Friday	12:00	30	30	26	28	15	24	15		18	10							9	
Friday	13:00	31	31	27	29	16	25	16		19								8	
Friday	14:00	32	32	28	30		26	17	5	20								8	
Friday	15:00	33	33	29	31		27	18	6	21								8	
Friday	16:00	34	34	30	32		28	19		22								7	
Friday	17:00	35	35	31	33		29	20		23		11						8	
Friday	18:00	36	36	32	34		30	21		24		12						8	
Friday	19:00	37	37	33	35	17	31	22	7	25		13						10	
Friday	20:00	38	38	34	36	18	32	23	8	26	11	14	11					12	
Friday	21:00	39	39	35	37	19	33	24	9		12	15	12					11	
Friday	22:00	40	40	36	38	20	34	25	10		13	16	13					11	
Friday	23:00	41	41	37	39	21	35		11		14	17	14	7		7		13	
Friday	00:00	42	42	38	40	22	36		12			18	15	8		8		12	
Saturday	01:00	43	43	39	41	23	37					19	16	9		9		11	
Saturday	02:00	44	44	40	42	24	38					20	17	10		10	Lost	11	
Saturday	03:00	45	45	41	43	25						21	18	11	3	11		11	
Saturday	04:00	46	46	42	44	26						22	19	12	4	12		11	
Saturday	05:00	47	47	43	45	27						23			5		7	8	
Saturday	06:00	48	48	44	46	28									6		8	7	
Saturday	07:00	49	49	45	47										7		9	6	
Saturday	08:00	50	50	46	48										8			5	
Saturday	09:00	51	51	47	49					27								5	
Saturday	10:00	52	52	48	50		39	26		28								7	
Saturday	11:00	53	Lost	49	51		40	27		29								6	
Saturday	12:00	54		50	52			28			30								5
Saturday	13:00	55		51	53			29			31								5
Saturday	14:00	56		52	54	29		30			32	15							7
Saturday	15:00	57		53	55	30		31			33	16							7
Saturday	16:00	58		54	56	31		32			34								6
Saturday	17:00	59		55	57	32		33			35								6
Saturday	18:00	60		56	58	33		34			36								6
Saturday	19:00	61		57	59	34		35			37		24						7
Saturday	20:00	62		58	60	35					38	17	25						7
Saturday	21:00	63	59	61	36				13	39	18	26						8	
Saturday	22:00	64	60	62	37	41			14		19	27						8	
Saturday	23:00	65	61	63	38	42			15		20	28	20	13		13	10	12	
Saturday	00:00	66	62	64	39	43			16		21	29	21	14		14	11	12	

Sunday	01:00	67		63	65	40	44				22	30	22	15		15	12		11	
Sunday	02:00	68		64			41	45				23	31	23		16	16		13	10
Sunday	03:00	69		65			42	46	36			24	32	24		17	17		14	11
Sunday	04:00	70		66			43	47	37				33			18	18		15	9
Sunday	05:00	71		67			44		38				34						16	6
Sunday	06:00	72		68					39				35						17	5
Sunday	07:00	73		69															18	3
Sunday	08:00	74		70																2
Sunday	09:00	75		71																2
Sunday	10:00	76		72																2
Sunday	11:00	77		73				48												3
Sunday	12:00	78		74				49												3
Sunday	13:00	79		75				50		40										4
Sunday	14:00	80		76				51		41										4
Sunday	15:00	81		77				52		42										4
Sunday	16:00	82		78	Lost			53		17	43									5
Sunday	17:00	83		79					54		18	44								
Sunday	18:00	84	80				55		45								4			
Sunday	19:00	85	81				45	56		46							5			
Sunday	20:00	Lost	82				46	57		47							4			
Sunday	21:00		83				47	58		48							4			
Sunday	22:00		84				48	59									3			
Sunday	23:00		85				49	60							9			13	5	
Sunday	00:00		86				50	61							10			14	5	
Monday	01:00		87				51	62							11	Lost	Lost	15	5	
Monday	02:00		88					63							12	Lost	Lost	16	4	
Monday	03:00		89					64		Lost					13			17	4	
Monday	04:00		90												14			18	3	
Monday	05:00			91															1	
Monday	06:00							Lost										0		
Monday	07:00																	0		
	weekday day																			
	weekday night																			
	weekend day																			
	weekend night																			
	other hours																			
	rank not formally used																			

Lost																		
Total hours at site	85	52	91	65	51	64	39	18	48	24	35	24	18	14	18	18	18	682
																		<b>682</b>

## Appendix 3 – Detailed rank observation results



Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time in Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins +	Maximum passenger wait time
Horseshoe Th	15/10/2015	7	37	40	32	1.3	1	3%	33	00:06:21	00:06:31	00:22:48						
Horseshoe Th	15/10/2015	8	86	110	89	1.2	0	0%	89	00:01:36	00:01:36	00:08:54	00:00:14	00:01:50	11	0	0	00:02:32
Horseshoe Th	15/10/2015	9	87	106	85	1.2	2	2%	87	00:02:08	00:02:11	00:10:53	00:00:04	00:01:07	2	0	0	00:01:10
Horseshoe Th	15/10/2015	10	71	83	69	1.2	2	3%	71	00:02:53	00:02:58	00:09:25	00:00:03	00:01:18	2	0	0	00:01:22
Horseshoe Th	15/10/2015	11	54	61	47	1.3	3	6%	50	00:05:03	00:05:21	00:10:58						
Horseshoe Th	15/10/2015	12	32	40	33	1.2	0	0%	33	00:08:51	00:08:51	00:20:50						
Horseshoe Th	15/10/2015	13	41	52	38	1.4	0	0%	38	00:07:00	00:07:00	00:13:27						
Horseshoe Th	15/10/2015	14	32	38	35	1.1	0	0%	35	00:08:38	00:08:38	00:18:20						
Horseshoe Th	15/10/2015	15	38	40	37	1.1	0	0%	37	00:07:29	00:07:29	00:15:33						
Horseshoe Th	15/10/2015	16	50	60	48	1.3	3	6%	51	00:04:17	00:04:33	00:10:37						
Horseshoe Th	15/10/2015	17	84	107	86	1.2	2	2%	88	00:01:15	00:01:16	00:05:50	00:00:16	00:01:54	13	0	0	00:04:03
Horseshoe Th	15/10/2015	18	102	113	98	1.2	1	1%	99	00:00:18	00:00:18	00:03:45	00:01:03	00:02:42	34	4	0	00:06:42
Horseshoe Th	15/10/2015	19	103	117	103	1.1	2	2%	105	00:01:30	00:01:32	00:10:39	00:00:03	00:01:15	1	0	0	00:01:15
Horseshoe Th	15/10/2015	20	125	146	122	1.2	0	0%	122	00:00:58	00:00:58	00:05:17	00:00:32	00:01:54	35	0	0	00:03:30
Horseshoe Th	15/10/2015	21	99	100	92	1.1	0	0%	92	00:02:52	00:02:52	00:17:55	00:00:28	00:02:23	19	0	0	00:03:29
Horseshoe Th	15/10/2015	22	107	71	62	1.1	0	0%	62	00:24:08	00:24:08	00:32:58						
Horseshoe Th	15/10/2015	23	103	178	151	1.2	0	0%	151	00:05:15	00:05:15	00:16:27	00:00:12	00:01:45	19	0	0	00:02:37
Horseshoe Th	16/10/2015	0	90	120	97	1.2	1	1%	98	00:02:23	00:02:25	00:09:05	00:00:32	00:02:19	27	0	0	00:03:47
Horseshoe Th	16/10/2015	1	48	55	41	1.3	2	5%	43	00:07:35	00:07:55	00:46:58	00:00:09	00:01:14	3	0	0	00:01:20
Horseshoe Th	16/10/2015	2	20	31	23	1.3	1	4%	24	00:09:10	00:09:39	00:32:05	00:00:05	00:02:13	1	0	0	00:02:13
Horseshoe Th	16/10/2015	3	14	3	3	1	3	50%	6	00:49:01	01:02:23	02:05:49						
Horseshoe Th	16/10/2015	4	5	8	7	1.1	2	22%	9	00:58:30	01:37:30	01:51:57						
Horseshoe Th	16/10/2015	5	1	3	3	1	0	0%	3	00:19:30	00:19:30	00:19:30						
Horseshoe Th	16/10/2015	6	14	17	15	1.1	0	0%	15	00:14:37	00:14:37	00:24:32						
<b>Horseshoe Th</b>	<b>15/10/2015</b>		<b>1443</b>	<b>1699</b>	<b>1416</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>1441</b>				<b>00:00:13</b>	<b>00:02:09</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	



Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time in Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Horseshoe Fr	16/10/2015	7	38	37	35	1.1	1	3%	36	00:04:07	00:04:13	00:11:16						
Horseshoe Fr	16/10/2015	8	77	92	74	1.2	1	1%	75	00:02:36	00:02:38	00:08:51	00:00:13	00:01:53	10	0	0	00:04:03
Horseshoe Fr	16/10/2015	9	58	75	62	1.2	0	0%	62	00:03:57	00:03:57	00:07:51	00:00:06	00:01:25	4	0	0	00:01:45
Horseshoe Fr	16/10/2015	10	50	56	44	1.3	1	2%	45	00:05:17	00:05:24	00:15:09						
Horseshoe Fr	16/10/2015	11	42	57	42	1.4	1	2%	43	00:06:33	00:06:42	00:22:26						
Horseshoe Fr	16/10/2015	12	39	60	43	1.4	0	0%	43	00:04:49	00:04:49	00:12:25						
Horseshoe Fr	16/10/2015	13	46	52	46	1.1	0	0%	46	00:04:45	00:04:45	00:09:36						
Horseshoe Fr	16/10/2015	14	49	65	51	1.3	0	0%	51	00:04:14	00:04:14	00:09:52	00:00:02	00:01:21	1	0	0	00:01:21
Horseshoe Fr	16/10/2015	15	53	61	46	1.3	0	0%	46	00:04:31	00:04:31	00:13:09	00:00:14	00:01:40	8	0	0	00:02:17
Horseshoe Fr	16/10/2015	16	59	81	65	1.2	0	0%	65	00:03:08	00:03:08	00:10:32	00:00:02	00:01:27	1	0	0	00:01:27
Horseshoe Fr	16/10/2015	17	85	120	85	1.4	0	0%	85	00:01:32	00:01:32	00:04:42	00:00:06	00:01:37	6	0	0	00:02:13
Horseshoe Fr	16/10/2015	18	93	110	87	1.3	0	0%	87	00:01:43	00:01:43	00:05:17	00:00:04	00:01:15	2	0	0	00:01:23
Horseshoe Fr	16/10/2015	19	126	165	131	1.3	0	0%	131	00:00:54	00:00:54	00:04:35	00:00:23	00:01:56	29	0	0	00:03:31
Horseshoe Fr	16/10/2015	20	118	154	118	1.3	0	0%	118	00:01:29	00:01:29	00:07:28	00:00:08	00:01:28	7	0	0	00:01:54
Horseshoe Fr	16/10/2015	21	97	139	94	1.5	0	0%	94	00:02:24	00:02:24	00:06:31						
Horseshoe Fr	16/10/2015	22	91	135	88	1.5	2	2%	90	00:02:39	00:02:43	00:08:05						
Horseshoe Fr	16/10/2015	23	112	150	110	1.4	1	1%	111	00:01:17	00:01:18	00:08:49	00:01:18	00:03:04	50	11	0	00:07:41
Horseshoe Fr	17/10/2015	0	119	163	119	1.4	0	0%	119	00:01:51	00:01:51	00:14:52	00:00:25	00:02:12	26	0	0	00:03:10
Horseshoe Fr	17/10/2015	1	85	116	87	1.3	0	0%	87	00:02:27	00:02:27	00:32:11	00:00:43	00:02:57	25	0	0	00:04:25
Horseshoe Fr	17/10/2015	2	33	46	33	1.4	3	8%	36	00:06:34	00:07:14	00:32:02						
Horseshoe Fr	17/10/2015	3	19	14	9	1.6	7	44%	16	00:13:26	00:21:17	00:37:13						
Horseshoe Fr	17/10/2015	4	24	34	21	1.6	6	22%	27	00:05:53	00:07:51	00:50:09						
Horseshoe Fr	17/10/2015	5	9	6	5	1.2	2	29%	7	00:41:19	00:53:07	01:08:12						
Horseshoe Fr	17/10/2015	6	6	8	6	1.3	0	0%	6	00:14:44	00:14:44	00:22:46						
<b>Horseshoe Fr</b>	<b>16/10/2015</b>		<b>1528</b>	<b>1996</b>	<b>1501</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>1526</b>				<b>00:00:13</b>	<b>00:02:26</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time in Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Horseshoe Sa	17/10/2015	7	10	16	12	1.3	0	0%	12	00:21:42	00:21:42	00:42:57						
Horseshoe Sa	17/10/2015	8	29	38	28	1.4	0	0%	28	00:08:00	00:08:00	00:16:05						
Horseshoe Sa	17/10/2015	9	29	37	26	1.4	1	4%	27	00:08:41	00:09:00	00:15:04						
Horseshoe Sa	17/10/2015	10	32	50	32	1.6	0	0%	32	00:07:25	00:07:25	00:11:30						
Horseshoe Sa	17/10/2015	11	39	57	38	1.5	0	0%	38	00:06:33	00:06:33	00:14:46						
Horseshoe Sa	17/10/2015	12	37	64	39	1.6	0	0%	39	00:07:27	00:07:27	00:15:56						
Horseshoe Sa	17/10/2015	13	62	106	61	1.7	0	0%	61	00:03:21	00:03:21	00:10:28	00:00:02	00:01:03	1	0	0	00:01:03
Horseshoe Sa	17/10/2015	14	71	175	71	2.5	0	0%	71	00:02:47	00:02:47	00:07:26						
Horseshoe Sa	17/10/2015	15	41	55	42	1.3	0	0%	42	00:05:58	00:05:58	00:11:47						
Horseshoe Sa	17/10/2015	16	30	46	32	1.4	0	0%	32	00:07:22	00:07:22	00:12:50						
Horseshoe Sa	17/10/2015	17	80	151	82	1.8	0	0%	82	00:01:07	00:01:07	00:04:51	00:00:07	00:02:00	8	0	0	00:03:43
Horseshoe Sa	17/10/2015	18	102	178	98	1.8	3	3%	101	00:00:51	00:00:53	00:06:23	00:00:03	00:01:24	3	0	0	00:01:58
Horseshoe Sa	17/10/2015	19	119	212	116	1.8	0	0%	116	00:01:27	00:01:27	00:04:58	00:00:06	00:01:19	8	0	0	00:01:59
Horseshoe Sa	17/10/2015	20	128	219	130	1.7	0	0%	130	00:00:56	00:00:56	00:04:44	00:00:05	00:01:15	11	0	0	00:01:35
Horseshoe Sa	17/10/2015	21	81	137	82	1.7	0	0%	82	00:02:24	00:02:24	00:11:24						
Horseshoe Sa	17/10/2015	22	101	162	93	1.7	4	4%	97	00:02:11	00:02:16	00:09:43						
Horseshoe Sa	17/10/2015	23	143	223	148	1.5	0	0%	148	00:00:57	00:00:57	00:08:12	00:00:19	00:01:49	34	0	0	00:03:03
Horseshoe Sa	18/10/2015	0	149	250	147	1.7	0	0%	147	00:00:24	00:00:24	00:01:49						
Horseshoe Sa	18/10/2015	1	108	183	110	1.7	0	0%	110	00:00:38	00:00:38	00:05:18						
Horseshoe Sa	18/10/2015	2	72	115	63	1.8	7	10%	70	00:02:27	00:02:43	00:23:56						
Horseshoe Sa	18/10/2015	3	40	70	36	1.9	2	5%	38	00:02:38	00:02:46	00:15:42	00:00:08	00:01:42	5	0	0	00:02:13
Horseshoe Sa	18/10/2015	4	13	24	12	2	1	8%	13	00:26:42	00:28:55	01:20:10						
Horseshoe Sa	18/10/2015	5	5	4	2	2	1	33%	3	01:03:14	01:19:03	01:24:05						
Horseshoe Sa	18/10/2015	6	5	10	9	1.1	0	0%	9	00:28:53	00:28:53	00:38:07						
			<b>1526</b>	<b>2582</b>	<b>1509</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1528</b>				<b>00:00:03</b>	<b>00:01:39</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>00:03:43</b>

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time in Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Horseshoe Su	18/10/2015	7	16	18	12	1.5	0	0%	12	00:16:32	00:16:32	00:45:33						
Horseshoe Su	18/10/2015	8	14	18	13	1.4	2	13%	15	00:12:43	00:14:50	00:25:12						
Horseshoe Su	18/10/2015	9	22	30	19	1.6	2	10%	21	00:12:32	00:13:47	00:25:14						
Horseshoe Su	18/10/2015	10	26	28	25	1.1	1	4%	26	00:09:19	00:09:41	00:15:27						
Horseshoe Su	18/10/2015	11	26	42	29	1.4	0	0%	29	00:08:10	00:08:10	00:15:10						
Horseshoe Su	18/10/2015	12	39	56	38	1.5	0	0%	38	00:06:13	00:06:13	00:12:15						
Horseshoe Su	18/10/2015	13	41	62	40	1.6	1	2%	41	00:06:48	00:06:59	00:14:40						
Horseshoe Su	18/10/2015	14	43	84	44	1.9	1	2%	45	00:05:10	00:05:17	00:09:33						
Horseshoe Su	18/10/2015	15	44	67	42	1.6	1	2%	43	00:04:59	00:05:06	00:12:36	00:00:37	00:05:48	3	4	0	00:07:47
Horseshoe Su	18/10/2015	16	56	84	56	1.5	1	2%	57	00:02:58	00:03:02	00:06:11						
Horseshoe Su	18/10/2015	17	67	91	65	1.4	0	0%	65	00:02:56	00:02:56	00:08:59	00:00:10	00:01:38	9	0	0	00:02:31
Horseshoe Su	18/10/2015	18	97	139	101	1.4	0	0%	101	00:01:42	00:01:42	00:05:24	00:00:12	00:01:25	15	0	0	00:02:03
Horseshoe Su	18/10/2015	19	66	92	61	1.5	5	8%	66	00:01:16	00:01:23	00:03:42						
		#																
<b>DATA LOST</b>		#																
		#																
		#																
		0																
		1																
		2																
		3																
		4																
		5																
		6																
<b>Horseshoe Su</b>	<b>18/10/2015</b>		<b>557</b>	<b>811</b>	<b>545</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>559</b>				<b>00:00:06</b>	<b>00:02:28</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time in Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Station West Th	15/10/2015	7	35	2	2	1	33	94%	35	00:00:35	00:10:22	00:20:45						
Station West Th	15/10/2015	8	84	10	8	1.3	74	90%	82	00:00:35	00:04:56	00:27:26						
Station West Th	15/10/2015	9	93	29	23	1.3	72	76%	95	00:00:20	00:01:30	00:11:40						
Station West Th	15/10/2015	10	63	4	4	1	58	94%	62	00:00:19	00:04:06	00:12:51						
Station West Th	15/10/2015	11	43	4	3	1.3	40	93%	43	00:00:11	00:02:42	00:04:16						
Station West Th	15/10/2015	12	31	8	6	1.3	26	81%	32	00:00:35	00:03:37	00:09:46						
Station West Th	15/10/2015	13	38	3	3	1	34	92%	37	00:00:30	00:04:53	00:12:00						
Station West Th	15/10/2015	14	31	5	4	1.3	28	88%	32	00:00:34	00:05:59	00:12:12						
Station West Th	15/10/2015	15	34	2	2	1	32	94%	34	00:00:15	00:04:26	00:08:53	00:16:02	00:24:03	0	1	1	00:39:48
Station West Th	15/10/2015	16	45	7	7	1	38	84%	45	00:00:30	00:03:17	00:06:57						
Station West Th	15/10/2015	17	73	11	10	1.1	60	86%	70	00:01:02	00:05:51	00:20:01						
Station West Th	15/10/2015	18	75	34	29	1.2	49	63%	78	00:00:05	00:00:15	00:01:24	00:00:29	00:01:57	8	0	0	00:05:35
Station West Th	15/10/2015	19	74	13	13	1	61	82%	74	00:00:05	00:00:30	00:02:41	00:01:44	00:04:22	4	1	0	00:07:01
Station West Th	15/10/2015	20	107	26	23	1.1	84	79%	107	00:00:08	00:00:39	00:02:31	00:00:28	00:02:47	4	0	0	00:05:25
Station West Th	15/10/2015	21	76	24	22	1.1	53	71%	75	00:00:57	00:03:09	00:08:43	00:00:08	00:03:17	1	0	0	00:03:17
Station West Th	15/10/2015	22	83	30	27	1.1	57	68%	84	00:00:11	00:00:35	00:02:57	00:00:39	00:04:04	3	1	0	00:10:24
Station West Th	15/10/2015	23	59	11	9	1.2	50	85%	59	00:00:20	00:02:13	00:06:12						
Station West Th	16/10/2015	0	54	27	23	1.2	30	57%	53	00:01:25	00:03:11	00:23:15	00:00:24	00:02:53	2	0	0	00:04:39
Station West Th	16/10/2015	1	13	13	10	1.3	4	29%	14	00:00:18	00:00:26	00:01:11						
Station West Th	16/10/2015	2		0	0	0	0	0%										
Station West Th	16/10/2015	3		0	0	0	0	0%										
Station West Th	16/10/2015	4		0	0	0	0	0%										
Station West Th	16/10/2015	5		0	0	0	0	0%										
Station West Th	16/10/2015	6	1	0	0	0	1	100%										
<b>Station West Th</b>	<b>15/10/2015</b>		<b>1112</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>884</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>1111</b>				<b>00:00:28</b>	<b>00:04:42</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>00:39:48</b>

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time in Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Station West F	16/10/2015	7	42	0	0	0	42	100%	42	00:00:00								
Station West F	16/10/2015	8	65	15	14	1.1	51	78%	65	00:00:27	00:02:05	00:06:11						
Station West F	16/10/2015	9	56	8	8	1	46	85%	54	00:00:28	00:02:41	00:08:41						
Station West F	16/10/2015	10	50	11	8	1.4	43	84%	51	00:00:53	00:06:22	00:11:01						
Station West F	16/10/2015	11	26	3	3	1	24	89%	27	00:00:01	00:00:21	00:00:35						
Station West F	16/10/2015	12	32	1	1	1	30	97%	31	00:00:11	00:02:56	00:03:37						
Station West F	16/10/2015	13	40	5	4	1.3	36	90%	40	00:00:06	00:01:06	00:02:18						
Station West F	16/10/2015	14	47	9	6	1.5	41	87%	47	00:00:37	00:04:55	00:10:17						
Station West F	16/10/2015	15	46	4	3	1.3	44	94%	47	00:00:01	00:00:33	00:01:07						
Station West F	16/10/2015	16	62	7	6	1.2	56	90%	62	00:00:20	00:03:33	00:06:56						
Station West F	16/10/2015	17	73	6	6	1	67	92%	73	00:00:10	00:02:06	00:03:56						
Station West F	16/10/2015	18	79	14	13	1.1	65	83%	78	00:00:07	00:00:44	00:03:18						
Station West F	16/10/2015	19	101	21	15	1.4	86	85%	101	00:00:17	00:01:59	00:05:00						
Station West F	16/10/2015	20	77	21	19	1.1	59	76%	78	00:00:09	00:00:40	00:02:57	00:00:35	00:08:19	0	1	0	00:08:19
Station West F	16/10/2015	21	63	10	9	1.1	54	86%	63	00:00:17	00:01:59	00:08:44	00:01:21	00:04:31	2	1	0	00:10:31
Station West F	16/10/2015	22	63	11	8	1.4	54	87%	62	00:00:26	00:03:04	00:10:42	00:01:07	00:11:52	0	0	1	00:11:52
Station West F	16/10/2015	23	78	41	30	1.4	49	62%	79	00:00:43	00:01:56	00:11:27						
Station West F	17/10/2015	0	51	15	11	1.4	39	78%	50	00:00:29	00:02:07	00:12:55						
Station West F	17/10/2015	1	23	15	10	1.5	14	58%	24	00:00:48	00:02:02	00:08:59						
Station West F	17/10/2015	2	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1									
Station West F	17/10/2015	3	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
Station West F	17/10/2015	4	2	0	0	0	2	100%	2									
Station West F	17/10/2015	5	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
Station West F	17/10/2015	6	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
<b>Station West F</b>	<b>16/10/2015</b>		<b>1077</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>903</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>1077</b>				<b>00:00:09</b>	<b>00:06:45</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>00:11:52</b>

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time in Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Station West Sa	17/10/2015	7	16	1	1	1	15	94%	16	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Station West Sa	17/10/2015	8	26	3	3	1	23	88%	26	00:00:19	00:02:46	00:04:08						
Station West Sa	17/10/2015	9	23	0	0	0	23	100%	23	00:00:00								
Station West Sa	17/10/2015	10	26	1	1	1	25	96%	26	00:00:30	00:13:00	00:13:00						
Station West Sa	17/10/2015	11	19	4	3	1.3	16	84%	19	00:00:34	00:03:36	00:04:50						
<b>Station West Sa</b>	<b>17/10/2015</b>		<b>110</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>110</b>						<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Station N Th	15/10/2015	10	3	1	1	1	0	0%	1	00:16:33	00:16:33	00:22:41						
Station N Th	15/10/2015	11	5	5	4	1.3	3	43%	7	00:07:19	00:18:18	00:27:09						
Station N Th	15/10/2015	12	10	7	6	1.2	2	25%	8	00:15:19	00:19:09	00:48:30						
Station N Th	15/10/2015	13	4	5	4	1.3	0	0%	4	00:24:17	00:24:17	00:29:51						
Station N Th	15/10/2015	14	9	10	8	1.3	1	11%	9	00:05:55	00:06:39	00:15:12						
Station N Th	15/10/2015	15	9	11	10	1.1	0	0%	10	00:08:45	00:08:45	00:13:06						
Station N Th	15/10/2015	16	9	9	8	1.1	0	0%	8	00:10:44	00:10:44	00:19:42						
Station N Th	15/10/2015	17	16	21	18	1.2	0	0%	18	00:06:41	00:06:41	00:16:43	00:01:23	00:10:12	0	1	2	00:12:10
Station N Th	15/10/2015	18	26	31	26	1.2	0	0%	26	00:01:16	00:01:16	00:07:54	00:02:17	00:04:34	11	2	2	00:13:03
Station N Th	15/10/2015	19	37	29	28	1	1	3%	29	00:09:24	00:09:40	00:19:32						
Station N Th	15/10/2015	20	31	31	29	1.1	1	3%	30	00:10:53	00:11:15	00:21:52						
Station N Th	15/10/2015	21	20	26	21	1.2	2	9%	23	00:15:49	00:17:34	00:22:54						
Station N Th	15/10/2015	22	28	36	31	1.2	1	3%	32	00:13:54	00:14:28	00:27:07						
Station N Th	16/10/2015	23	33	41	32	1.3	0	0%	32	00:06:20	00:06:20	00:30:00	00:00:42	00:03:37	8	0	0	00:04:00
Station N Th	16/10/2015	0	41	51	39	1.3	0	0%	39	00:05:01	00:05:01	00:25:00	00:01:20	00:04:00	11	6	0	00:08:00
Station N Th	16/10/2015	1	9	12	9	1.3	5	36%	14	00:16:00	00:05:45	00:10:00						
		2																
<b>Station N Th</b>	<b>15/10/2015</b>		<b>290</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>290</b>				<b>00:00:36</b>	<b>00:04:34</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>00:13:03</b>

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time in Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Station N F	16/10/2015	7	2	1	1	1	2	25%	8	00:00:03	00:00:04	00:00:24	00:00:51	00:01:44	3	0	0	00:01:59
Station N F	16/10/2015	8	8	7	6	1.2	1	20%	5	00:09:57	00:11:56	00:41:27						
Station N F	16/10/2015	9	6	4	4	1	3	60%	5	00:00:17	00:01:10	00:01:10						
Station N F	16/10/2015	10	4	2	2	1	0	0%	2	00:14:03	00:14:03	00:27:06						
Station N F	16/10/2015	11	5	3	2	1.5	0	0%	4	00:30:34	00:30:34	00:43:43						
Station N F	16/10/2015	12	2	5	4	1.3	1	20%	5	00:03:15	00:04:20	00:12:25	00:00:48	00:03:12	1	0	0	00:03:12
Station N F	16/10/2015	13	4	4	4	1	3	60%	5	00:10:01	00:20:02	00:26:47						
Station N F	16/10/2015	14	6	3	2	1.5	0	0%	7	00:29:47	00:29:47	00:54:09						
Station N F	16/10/2015	15	11	10	7	1.4	1	10%	10	00:10:21	00:11:49	00:19:18						
Station N F	16/10/2015	16	8	12	9	1.3	0	0%	16	00:02:08	00:02:08	00:09:04	00:02:22	00:07:26	3	4	1	00:16:45
Station N F	16/10/2015	17	13	21	16	1.3	1	4%	28	00:00:54	00:00:56	00:03:56	00:02:18	00:05:30	7	4	0	00:10:50
Station N F	16/10/2015	18	30	31	27	1.1	1	3%	36	00:06:58	00:07:10	00:17:29	00:00:17	00:02:42	4	0	0	00:03:35
Station N F	16/10/2015	19	34	43	35	1.2	6	32%	19	00:14:23	00:20:33	00:26:15						
Station N F	16/10/2015	20	20	15	13	1.2	9	47%	19	00:12:42	00:21:31	00:31:36						
Station N F	16/10/2015	21	22	13	10	1.3	9	64%	14	00:11:11	00:27:59	00:46:12						
Station N F	16/10/2015	22	15	5	5	1	9	47%	19	00:11:30	00:23:01	00:44:58						
Station N F	16/10/2015	23	18	12	10	1.2	0	0%	22	00:03:54	00:03:54	00:15:33						
Station N F	17/10/2015	0	25	30	22	1.4		0%										
Station N F	17/10/2015	1	20	40	24	1.7	3	11%	27	00:02:57	00:03:00	00:15:00	00:00:15	00:02:00	5	0	0	00:03:00
Station N F	17/10/2015	2	4	4	4	1	0	0%	4	00:04:30	00:04:30	00:09:00	00:00:30	00:02:00	1	0	0	00:02:00
Station N F	17/10/2015	3	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Station N F	17/10/2015	4	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
<b>Station N F</b>	<b>16/10/2015</b>		<b>257</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>255</b>				<b>00:00:34</b>	<b>00:04:35</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	



Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time in Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Station N Sa	17/10/2015	22	5	0	0	0	0	0%		00:29:12	00:29:12	00:35:00						
Station N Sa	17/10/2015	23	21	35	24	1.5	0	0%	24	00:08:40	00:08:40	00:15:00						
Station N Sa	18/10/2016	0	36	57	34	1.7	1	3%	35	00:04:53	00:05:01	01:02:00	00:02:23	00:04:41	19	10	0	00:10:00
Station N Sa	18/10/2016	1	4	7	5	1.4	1	17%	6	00:34:30	00:35:00	00:56:00						
Station N Sa	18/10/2016	2	4	2	2	1	2	50%	4	00:02:53	00:05:47	00:11:35						
Station N Sa	18/10/2016	3	0	0	0	0	0	0%										
Station N Sa	18/10/2016	4	1	0	0	0	0	0%										
Station N Sa	18/10/2016	5	0	0	0	0	0	0%										
Station N Sa	18/10/2016	6	0	0	0	0	0	0%										
Station N Sa	18/10/2016	7	0	0	0	0	1	100%	1									
<b>Station N Sa</b>	<b>17/10/2015</b>		<b>71</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>70</b>				<b>00:01:21</b>	<b>00:04:41</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Station N Su	18/10/2015	7	1	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:24:26	00:24:26	00:24:26						
Station N Su	18/10/2015	8	2	2	2	1	1	33%	3	00:00:26	00:00:52	00:00:52						
Station N Su	18/10/2015	9	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1	00:00:00								
Station N Su	18/10/2015	10	4	7	4	1.8	0	0%	4	00:11:10	00:11:10	00:19:41	00:00:45	00:05:19	1	0	0	00:05:19
Station N Su	18/10/2015	11	1	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:13:34	00:13:34	00:13:34						
Station N Su	18/10/2015	12	5	11	3	3.7	1	25%	4	00:22:21	00:27:56	00:36:18						
Station N Su	18/10/2015	13	7	15	7	2.1	0	0%	7	00:22:26	00:22:26	01:01:52						
Station N Su	18/10/2015	14	7	6	3	2	2	40%	5	00:22:07	00:30:58	00:40:46						
Station N Su	18/10/2015	15	5	11	8	1.4	0	0%	8	00:11:48	00:11:48	00:24:49						
Station N Su	18/10/2015	16	5	6	4	1.5	0	0%	4	00:19:24	00:19:24	00:32:39						
Station N Su	18/10/2015	17	6	13	8	1.6	0	0%	8	00:10:15	00:10:15	00:19:40	00:00:08	00:01:53	1	0	0	00:01:53
Station N Su	18/10/2015	18	9	11	8	1.4	0	0%	8	00:04:35	00:04:35	00:14:21	00:00:59	00:03:19	3	0	0	00:05:45
Station N Su	18/10/2015	19	17	27	17	1.6	0	0%	17	00:05:13	00:05:13	00:15:47						
Station N Su	18/10/2015	20	21	35	19	1.8	0	0%	19	00:04:38	00:04:38	00:11:00	00:00:31	00:03:30	5	0	0	00:05:03
Station N Su	18/10/2015	21	14	22	10	2.2	2	17%	12	00:11:54	00:13:53	00:34:57						
Station N Su	18/10/2015	22	15	25	18	1.4	0	0%	18	00:17:46	00:17:46	00:30:28						
Station N Su	18/10/2015	23	8	6	6	1	0	0%	6	00:42:38	00:42:38	00:54:16						
Station N Su	19/10/2015	0	9	16	10	1.6	2	17%	12	00:30:07	00:38:43	01:52:50						
Station N Su	19/10/2015	1	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1	00:00:00								
Station N Su	19/10/2015	2		1	1	1	0	0%	1									
<b>Station N Su</b>	<b>18/10/2015</b>		<b>138</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>138</b>				<b>00:00:10</b>	<b>00:03:28</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time in Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Pitcher/Piano Th	15/10/2015	9	6	5	3	1.7	0	0%	3	00:11:35	00:11:35	00:17:57						
Pitcher/Piano Th	15/10/2015	10	8	5	5	1	2	29%	7	00:14:33	00:19:24	00:27:23						
Pitcher/Piano Th	15/10/2015	11	8	10	9	1.1	0	0%	9	00:22:48	00:22:48	00:40:42						
Pitcher/Piano Th	15/10/2015	12	11	12	10	1.2	2	17%	12	00:11:50	00:14:28	00:27:59						
Pitcher/Piano Th	15/10/2015	13	15	9	9	1	2	18%	11	00:19:13	00:22:11	00:36:36						
Pitcher/Piano Th	15/10/2015	14	15	16	12	1.3	5	29%	17	00:16:47	00:25:11	00:40:15						
Pitcher/Piano Th	15/10/2015	15	14	14	12	1.2	1	8%	13	00:14:10	00:15:16	00:21:11						
Pitcher/Piano Th	15/10/2015	16	14	17	12	1.4	2	14%	14	00:15:29	00:18:03	00:29:35						
Pitcher/Piano Th	15/10/2015	17	14	17	16	1.1	3	16%	19	00:07:44	00:09:51	00:26:12						
Pitcher/Piano Th	15/10/2015	18	23	21	19	1.1	2	10%	21	00:03:30	00:03:50	00:07:20						
Pitcher/Piano Th	15/10/2015	19	24	24	20	1.2	1	5%	21	00:06:56	00:07:15	00:16:55						
Pitcher/Piano Th	15/10/2015	20	11	13	12	1.1	0	0%	12	00:12:39	00:12:39	00:30:34						
Pitcher/Piano Th	15/10/2015	21	14	24	16	1.5	0	0%	16	00:10:30	00:10:30	00:21:55						
Pitcher/Piano Th	15/10/2015	22	21	38	17	2.2	2	11%	19	00:06:42	00:07:25	00:23:02						
Pitcher/Piano Th	15/10/2015	23	21	27	19	1.4	4	17%	23	00:07:58	00:09:50	00:20:04						
Pitcher/Piano Th	16/10/2015	0	33	61	30	2	4	12%	34	00:05:08	00:05:51	00:11:08						
Pitcher/Piano Th	16/10/2015	1	57	129	48	2.7	0	0%	48	00:06:49	00:06:49	00:20:33						
Pitcher/Piano Th	16/10/2015	2	27	95	33	2.9	4	11%	37	00:07:03	00:08:17	00:25:47						
Pitcher/Piano Th	16/10/2015	3	11	17	6	2.8	5	45%	11	00:01:33	00:02:51	00:06:33						
Pitcher/Piano Th	16/10/2015	4	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1	00:00:00								
Pitcher/Piano Th	16/10/2015	5	0	0	0	0	0	0%										
Pitcher/Piano Th	16/10/2015	6	0	0	0	0	0	0%										
<b>Pitcher/Piano Th</b>	<b>15/10/2015</b>		<b>348</b>	<b>554</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>348</b>				<b>00:00:00</b>	<b>00:00:00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time in Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Pitcher/Piano F	16/10/2015	7	1	0	0	0	1	25%	4	00:17:35	00:17:35	00:40:33						
Pitcher/Piano F	16/10/2015	8	0	0	0	0		0%	7	00:23:54	00:23:54	00:36:35						
Pitcher/Piano F	16/10/2015	9	6	4	4	1	0	0%	8	00:24:57	00:29:06	00:39:12						
Pitcher/Piano F	16/10/2015	10	9	8	7	1.1	0	0%	11	00:07:51	00:07:51	00:14:31						
Pitcher/Piano F	16/10/2015	11	7	11	7	1.6	1	11%	9	00:05:15	00:05:15	00:16:16						
Pitcher/Piano F	16/10/2015	12	9	16	11	1.5	0	0%	17	00:10:53	00:11:27	00:20:53						
Pitcher/Piano F	16/10/2015	13	9	13	9	1.4	0	0%	11	00:10:31	00:12:51	00:20:55						
Pitcher/Piano F	16/10/2015	14	20	19	16	1.2	1	5%	22	00:05:41	00:06:00	00:12:09						
Pitcher/Piano F	16/10/2015	15	11	10	9	1.1	2	8%	24	00:10:06	00:10:06	00:20:35						
Pitcher/Piano F	16/10/2015	16	19	30	21	1.4	1	5%	21	00:05:54	00:06:35	00:14:31						
Pitcher/Piano F	16/10/2015	17	27	29	24	1.2	0	0%	20	00:06:35	00:06:53	00:23:05						
Pitcher/Piano F	16/10/2015	18	19	26	19	1.4	2	8%	26	00:06:45	00:07:04	00:15:02						
Pitcher/Piano F	16/10/2015	19	23	22	19	1.2	1	5%	22	00:10:30	00:10:55	00:21:10						
Pitcher/Piano F	16/10/2015	20	23	40	25	1.6	1	4%	25	00:05:30	00:06:05	00:12:57						
Pitcher/Piano F	16/10/2015	21	26	33	21	1.6	1	3%	33	00:06:06	00:07:00	00:12:52						
Pitcher/Piano F	16/10/2015	22	21	46	23	2	2	5%	37	00:05:23	00:06:04	00:14:32	00:00:01	00:01:09	1	0	0	00:01:09
Pitcher/Piano F	16/10/2015	23	31	47	29	1.6	4	8%	49	00:04:29	00:05:01	00:12:41	00:00:01	00:01:14	1	0	0	00:01:14
Pitcher/Piano F	17/10/2015	0	45	63	32	2	5	7%	67	00:01:17	00:01:25	00:05:17	00:00:02	00:01:57	3	0	0	00:02:46
Pitcher/Piano F	17/10/2015	1	47	77	44	1.8	5	23%	22	00:02:16	00:04:02	00:09:32						
Pitcher/Piano F	17/10/2015	2	61	140	61	2.3	6	100%	6	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Pitcher/Piano F	17/10/2015	3	23	40	12	3.3	10	0%										
Pitcher/Piano F	17/10/2015	4	5	2	2	1	4	0%										
Pitcher/Piano F	17/10/2015	5	0	0	0	0		0%										
Pitcher/Piano F	17/10/2015	6	0	0	0	0		0%										
<b>Pitcher/Piano F</b>	<b>16/10/2015</b>		<b>442</b>	<b>676</b>	<b>395</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>441</b>				<b>00:00:00</b>	<b>00:00:00</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>00:02:46</b>

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Pitcher/Piano Sa	17/10/2015	7	1	0	0	0	0	0%		00:44:13	00:44:13	00:44:13						
Pitcher/Piano Sa	17/10/2015	8	2	2	2	1	0	0%	2	00:33:40	00:33:40	00:35:39						
Pitcher/Piano Sa	17/10/2015	9	6	9	4	2.3	0	0%	4	00:24:27	00:24:27	00:33:19						
Pitcher/Piano Sa	17/10/2015	10	7	7	6	1.2	1	14%	7	00:10:42	00:12:30	00:21:39						
Pitcher/Piano Sa	17/10/2015	11	8	12	9	1.3	1	10%	10	00:14:21	00:16:24	00:24:40						
Pitcher/Piano Sa	17/10/2015	12	20	22	15	1.5	3	17%	18	00:07:05	00:08:20	00:18:01						
Pitcher/Piano Sa	17/10/2015	13	20	33	18	1.8	1	5%	19	00:06:53	00:07:15	00:14:04						
Pitcher/Piano Sa	17/10/2015	14	21	45	24	1.9	0	0%	24	00:03:49	00:03:49	00:11:05						
Pitcher/Piano Sa	17/10/2015	15	25	33	20	1.7	2	9%	22	00:15:19	00:16:39	00:24:58						
Pitcher/Piano Sa	17/10/2015	16	23	31	24	1.3	1	4%	25	00:08:34	00:08:57	00:18:47						
Pitcher/Piano Sa	17/10/2015	17	32	54	31	1.7	2	6%	33	00:04:24	00:04:41	00:10:06	00:00:04	00:02:03	2	0	0	00:02:12
Pitcher/Piano Sa	17/10/2015	18	20	36	16	2.3	1	6%	17	00:05:58	00:06:17	00:28:17						
Pitcher/Piano Sa	17/10/2015	19	16	25	17	1.5	0	0%	17	00:11:27	00:11:27	00:22:05						
Pitcher/Piano Sa	17/10/2015	20	28	44	23	1.9	4	15%	27	00:06:16	00:07:19	00:23:40						
Pitcher/Piano Sa	17/10/2015	21	24	36	21	1.7	1	5%	22	00:13:23	00:13:58	00:22:15						
Pitcher/Piano Sa	17/10/2015	22	17	37	19	1.9	0	0%	19	00:16:44	00:16:44	00:26:08						
Pitcher/Piano Sa	17/10/2015	23	32	62	34	1.8	1	3%	35	00:02:12	00:02:16	00:11:31						
Pitcher/Piano Sa	18/10/2015	0	23	37	21	1.8	3	13%	24	00:00:07	00:00:08	00:01:15	00:01:12	00:03:10	12	2	0	00:08:00
Pitcher/Piano Sa	18/10/2015	1	17	23	10	2.3	7	41%	17	00:01:09	00:01:58	00:07:39	00:00:25	00:01:57	5	0	0	00:03:20
<b>Pitcher/Piano Sa</b>	<b>17/10/2015</b>		<b>342</b>	<b>548</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>342</b>				<b>00:00:06</b>	<b>00:02:46</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of Vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Quicksilver Th	15/10/2015	21	1	3	1	3	0	0%	1	00:06:36	00:06:36	00:06:36						
Quicksilver Th	15/10/2015	22	6	7	3	2.3	3	50%	6	00:01:15	00:02:31	00:05:24						
Quicksilver Th	15/10/2015	23	7	4	3	1.3	4	57%	7	00:01:32	00:03:35	00:10:18						
Quicksilver Th	16/10/2015	0	22	40	18	2.2	4	18%	22	00:01:29	00:01:49	00:07:32	00:00:20	00:13:18	0	0	1	00:13:18
Quicksilver Th	16/10/2015	1	43	101	38	2.7	4	10%	42	00:03:51	00:04:15	00:11:26						
Quicksilver Th	16/10/2015	2	49	130	46	2.8	3	6%	49	00:05:43	00:06:06	00:15:22						
Quicksilver Th	16/10/2015	3	17	29	13	2.2	5	28%	18	00:02:37	00:03:43	00:06:20						
Quicksilver Th	16/10/2015	4	4	2	1	2	3	75%	4	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
<b>Quicksilver Th</b>	<b>15/10/2015</b>		<b>149</b>	<b>316</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>149</b>				<b>00:00:03</b>	<b>00:13:18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>00:13:18</b>

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Quicksilver F	16/10/2015	20	4	6	3	2	1	25%	4	00:02:14	00:02:58	00:06:49						
Quicksilver F	16/10/2015	21	7	2	2	1	3	60%	5	00:05:49	00:10:12	00:13:09						
Quicksilver F	16/10/2015	22	8	12	7	1.7	1	13%	8	00:14:38	00:16:43	00:55:16						
Quicksilver F	16/10/2015	23	10	13	7	1.9	1	13%	8	00:10:41	00:11:52	00:24:07						
Quicksilver F	17/10/2015	0	30	49	26	1.9	4	13%	30	00:04:11	00:04:49	00:10:11						
Quicksilver F	17/10/2015	1	57	116	49	2.4	10	17%	59	00:03:25	00:04:08	00:09:59						
Quicksilver F	17/10/2015	2	77	152	66	2.3	13	16%	79	00:01:48	00:02:09	00:06:11						
Quicksilver F	17/10/2015	3	39	82	39	2.1	3	7%	42	00:04:47	00:04:38	00:16:00						
Quicksilver F	17/10/2015	4	7	6	2	3	6	75%	8	00:01:42	00:02:00	00:02:00						
Quicksilver F	17/10/2015	5	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1	00:12:00								
<b>Quicksilver F</b>	<b>16/10/2015</b>		<b>240</b>	<b>438</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>244</b>				<b>00:00:00</b>	<b>00:00:00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Quicksilver Sa	17/10/2015	14	1	1	1	1	0	0%	1	00:00:18	00:00:18	00:00:18						
Quicksilver Sa	17/10/2015	15	5	16	4	4	1	20%	5	00:03:04	00:03:50	00:13:16	00:00:57	00:15:12	0	0	1	00:15:12
Quicksilver Sa	17/10/2015	16	3	4	1	4	3	75%	4	00:03:20								
Quicksilver Sa	17/10/2015	17	4	1	1	1	3	75%	4	00:01:15	00:01:00	00:01:00						
Quicksilver Sa	17/10/2015	18	2	2	2	1	0	0%	2	00:03:00	00:03:00	00:06:00						
Quicksilver Sa	17/10/2015	19	2	2	1	2	1	50%	2	00:10:20	00:20:41	00:20:41						
Quicksilver Sa	17/10/2015	20	2	2	1	2	1	50%	2	00:05:54	00:11:48	00:11:48						
Quicksilver Sa	17/10/2015	21	10	14	7	2	3	30%	10	00:03:16	00:04:40	00:20:20						
Quicksilver Sa	17/10/2015	22	8	7	4	1.8	2	33%	6	00:06:57	00:09:17	00:27:51						
Quicksilver Sa	17/10/2015	23	20	37	18	2.1	4	18%	22	00:01:40	00:02:05	00:12:26						
Quicksilver Sa	18/10/2015	0	11	7	4	1.8	5	56%	9	00:00:45	00:01:23	00:04:58						
Quicksilver Sa	18/10/2015	1	40	62	32	1.9	10	24%	42	00:00:22	00:00:30	00:02:28	00:00:06	00:01:23	3	0	0	00:01:41
Quicksilver Sa	18/10/2015	2	51	106	46	2.3	5	10%	51	00:01:05	00:01:12	00:05:20	00:00:07	00:02:21	4	0	0	00:05:42
Quicksilver Sa	18/10/2015	3	41	76	39	1.9	3	7%	42	00:04:07	00:04:14	00:12:00						
Quicksilver Sa	18/10/2015	4	10	29	9	3.2	4	31%	13	00:04:36	00:04:50	00:08:00						
Quicksilver Sa	18/10/2015	5	2	1	1	1	1	50%	2	00:29:30	00:30:00	00:30:00						
<b>Quicksilver Sa</b>	<b>17/10/2015</b>		<b>212</b>	<b>367</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>217</b>						<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	



Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Bridge St Th	15/10/2015	13	1	1	1	1	0	0%	1	00:00:08	00:00:08	00:00:08						
Bridge St Th	15/10/2015	14	0	0	0	0	0	0%										
Bridge St Th	15/10/2015	15	0	0	0	0	0	0%										
Bridge St Th	15/10/2015	16	2	1	1	1	1	50%	2	00:02:23	00:04:47	00:04:47						
Bridge St Th	15/10/2015	17	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1	00:00:00								
Bridge St Th	15/10/2015	18	1	0	0	0	0	0%										
Bridge St Th	15/10/2015	19	3	1	1	1		0%										
Bridge St Th	15/10/2015	20	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1	00:00:00								
Bridge St Th	15/10/2015	21	3	1	1	1	2	67%	3	00:02:02	00:06:08	00:06:08						
Bridge St Th	15/10/2015	22	7	5	3	1.7	4	57%	7	00:00:24	00:00:57	00:01:49						
Bridge St Th	15/10/2015	23	3	2	1	2	2	67%	3	00:01:22	00:04:08	00:04:08						
Bridge St Th	16/10/2015	0	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1	00:00:00								
Bridge St Th	16/10/2015	1	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1	00:00:00								
<b>Bridge St Th</b>	<b>15/10/2015</b>		<b>24</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>20</b>				<b>00:00:00</b>	<b>00:00:00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>00:00:00</b>

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Bridge St F	16/10/2015	13	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1									
Bridge St F	16/10/2015	14	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1									
Bridge St F	16/10/2015	15	0	0	0	0		0%	0									
Bridge St F	16/10/2015	16	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1									
Bridge St F	16/10/2015	17	0	0	0	0		0%	0									
Bridge St F	16/10/2015	18	0	0	0	0		0%	0									
Bridge St F	16/10/2015	19	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1									
Bridge St F	16/10/2015	20		0	0	0		0%	0									
Bridge St F	16/10/2015	21	5	10	4	2.5	1	20%	5	00:03:32	00:04:25	00:11:38	00:00:31	00:04:20	1	0	0	00:04:20
Bridge St F	16/10/2015	22	6	9	5	1.8	1	17%	6	00:01:27	00:01:45	00:05:30	00:01:25	00:03:54	3	1	0	00:07:11
Bridge St F	16/10/2015	23	5	5	3	1.7	2	40%	5	00:01:58	00:03:16	00:09:50	00:03:01	00:07:33	1	1	0	00:10:48
Bridge St F	17/10/2015	0	3	6	3	2	0	0%	3	00:00:08	00:00:08	00:00:18						
Bridge St F	17/10/2015	1	1	1	1	1	0	0%	1	00:00:01	00:00:01	00:00:01						
Bridge St F	17/10/2015	2	1		0	0	1	100%	1									
<b>Bridge St F</b>	<b>16/10/2015</b>		<b>25</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>25</b>				<b>00:01:08</b>	<b>00:05:00</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>00:10:48</b>

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Bridge St Sa	17/10/2015	10	3	1	1	1	2	67%	3	00:00:03	00:00:11	00:00:11						
Bridge St Sa	17/10/2015	11	7	3	3	1	4	57%	7	00:02:12	00:05:09	00:10:38						
Bridge St Sa	17/10/2015	22	9	16	7	2.3	2	22%	9	00:03:03	00:03:55	00:11:21	00:00:08	00:02:14	1	0	0	00:02:14
Bridge St Sa	17/10/2015	23	20	37	13	2.8	7	35%	20	00:01:09	00:01:46	00:08:06						
Bridge St Sa	18/10/2015	0	4	8	4	2	0	0%	4	00:01:18	00:01:18	00:02:27						
Bridge St Sa	18/10/2015	1	2	2	1	2	1	50%	2	00:00:02	00:00:05	00:00:05						
Bridge St Sa	18/10/2015	2	1	2	1	2	0	0%	1	00:00:04	00:00:04	00:00:04						
Bridge St Sa	18/10/2015	3	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1	00:00:00								
Bridge St Sa	18/10/2015	4	2	2	1	2	1	50%	2	00:00:01	00:00:02	00:00:02						
<b>Bridge St Sa</b>	<b>17/10/2015</b>		<b>49</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>49</b>				<b>00:00:02</b>	<b>00:02:14</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>00:02:14</b>

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of Vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Bridge St Su	18/10/2015	18	1	2	1	2	0	0%	0								
Bridge St Su	18/10/2015	19	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0								
Bridge St Su	18/10/2015	20	2	5	2	2.5	0	0%	0								
Bridge St Su	18/10/2015	21	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0								
Bridge St Su	18/10/2015	22	1	2	1	2	0	0%	0								
<b>Bridge St Su</b>	<b>18/10/2015</b>		<b>4</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>			<b>00:00:00</b>	<b>#DIV/0!</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>00:00:00</b>

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Oxford Rd Th	15/10/2015	10	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1									
Oxford Rd Th	15/10/2015	11	2	0	0	0	2	100%	2									
Oxford Rd Th	15/10/2015	12	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1									
Oxford Rd Th	15/10/2015	13	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
Oxford Rd Th	15/10/2015	14	3	0	0	0	3	100%	3									
Oxford Rd Th	15/10/2015	15	2	2	2	1	0	0%	2	00:08:10	00:08:10	00:10:50						
Oxford Rd Th	15/10/2015	16	5	0	0	0	5	100%	5									
Oxford Rd Th	15/10/2015	17	3	0	0	0	3	100%	3									
Oxford Rd Th	15/10/2015	18	2	3	1	3	1	50%	2	00:00:03	00:00:06	00:00:06						
Oxford Rd Th	15/10/2015	19	1	1	1	1	0	0%	1	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Oxford Rd Th	16/10/2015	4	1	1	1	1	0	0%	1	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
<b>Oxford Rd Th</b>	<b>15/10/2015</b>		<b>21</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>21</b>				<b>00:00:00</b>	<b>#DIV/0!</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>00:00:00</b>

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Oxford Rd F	16/10/2015	10	2	0	0	0	2	100%	2									
Oxford Rd F	16/10/2015	11	3	4	3	1.3	0	0%	3	00:11:53	00:11:53	00:30:59						
Oxford Rd F	16/10/2015	12	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1									
Oxford Rd F	16/10/2015																	
Oxford Rd F	16/10/2015	14	4	0	0	0	4	100%	4									
Oxford Rd F	16/10/2015	15	2	0	0	0	2	100%	2									
Oxford Rd F	16/10/2015	16	4	0	0	0	4	100%	4									
Oxford Rd F	16/10/2015	17	3	0	0	0	2	100%	2	00:20:04	01:00:12	01:00:12						
Oxford Rd F	16/10/2015	18	0	1	1	1	0	0%	1									
Oxford Rd F	16/10/2015	19	3	2	2	1	1	33%	3	00:00:05	00:00:08	00:00:13						
Oxford Rd F	16/10/2015	20	6	4	3	1.3	3	50%	6	00:00:35	00:01:11	00:03:32						
Oxford Rd F	16/10/2015	21	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1									
<b>Oxford Rd F</b>	<b>16/10/2015</b>		<b>29</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>29</b>				<b>00:00:00</b>	<b>#DIV/0!</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>00:00:00</b>

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Oxford Rd Sa	17/10/2015	10	1	1	1	1	0	0%	1	00:00:01	00:00:01	00:00:01						
Oxford Rd Sa	17/10/2015	11	3	0	0	0	3	100%	3									
Oxford Rd Sa	17/10/2015	12	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1									
Oxford Rd Sa	17/10/2015	13	2	0	0	0	1	100%	1	00:08:32	00:17:05	00:17:05						
Oxford Rd Sa	17/10/2015	14	2	4	2	2	1	33%	3	00:01:18	00:02:36	00:02:36						
Oxford Rd Sa	17/10/2015	15	7	5	4	1.3	3	43%	7	00:01:11	00:02:05	00:04:41	00:00:23	00:01:58	1	0	0	00:01:58
Oxford Rd Sa	17/10/2015	16	4	0	0	0	2	100%	2	00:18:21	00:36:42	00:38:14						
Oxford Rd Sa	17/10/2015	17	4	9	5	1.8	1	17%	6	00:01:06	00:01:28	00:04:07	00:00:21	00:03:09	1	0	0	00:03:09
Oxford Rd Sa	17/10/2015	18	2	0	0	0	2	100%	2									
Oxford Rd Sa	17/10/2015	19	4	3	1	3	3	75%	4									
<b>Oxford Rd Sa</b>	<b>17/10/2015</b>		<b>30</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>30</b>									

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
<b>Rank not legally operating</b>			7															
		<b>to</b>																
		<b>#</b>																
King St Th	15/10/2015	23	1	1	1	1	0	0%	1	00:00:01	00:00:01	00:00:01						
King St Th	16/10/2015	0	2	2	1	2	1	50%	2	00:00:00	00:00:01	00:00:01						
King St Th	16/10/2015	1	1	3	1	3	0	0%	1	00:00:03	00:00:03	00:00:03						
		2																
		3																
		4																
		5																
<b>Rank not legally operating</b>			6															
King St Th	15/10/2015		4	6	3	2	1	25%	4				00:00:00	#DIV/0!	0	0	0	00:00:00



Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
<b>Rank not legally operating</b>		<b>7 to</b>																
		<b>#</b>																
		16 #	7	0	0	0	4	100%	4	00:30:34	01:11:21	01:15:41						
		16 #	2	5	3	1.7	2	40%	5	00:00:00								
		<b>16 to</b>																
		<b>#</b>																
King St F	16/10/2015	21	1	1	1	1	0	0%	1	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:13:27	00:13:27	1	0	1	00:22:05
King St F	16/10/2015	22	1	1	1	1	0	0%	1	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
King St F	16/10/2015	23	2	0	0	0	2	100%	2	00:00:00								
King St F	17/10/2015	0	2	7	2	3.5	0	0%	2	00:00:01	00:00:01	00:00:02						
		1																
		2																
		3																
		4																
		5																
<b>Rank not legally operating</b>		<b>6</b>																
King St F	16/10/2015		6	9	4	2.3	2	33%	6				00:02:59	00:13:27	1	0	1	00:22:05

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
King St Sa	17/10/2015	21	2	2	1	2	1	50%	2	00:00:13	00:00:26	00:00:26						
King St Sa	17/10/2015	22	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
King St Sa	17/10/2015	23	4	4	2	2	2	50%	4	00:01:35	00:03:10	00:06:21	00:13:39	00:34:07	0	0	2	00:37:09
King St Sa	18/10/2015	0	5	1	1	1	4	80%	5	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
		1																
		2																
		3																
		4																
		5																
<b>Rank not legally operating</b>		6																
King St Sa	17/10/2015		11	7	4	1.8	7	64%	11				00:09:45	00:34:07	0	0	2	00:37:09

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
King St Su	18/10/2015	16	2	5	1	5	1	50%	2	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
King St Su	18/10/2015	17	2	3	2	1.5	0	0%	2	00:00:02	00:00:02	00:00:05						
<b>Rank not legally operating</b>		<b>7 to 22</b>																
		<b>5 to 6</b>																
King St Su	18/10/2015		4	8	3	2.7	1	25%	4				00:00:00	00:00:00	0	0	0	00:00:00

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
R Berks Hos Th	15/10/2015	10	2	0	0	0	1	100%	1	00:09:43	00:19:26	00:19:26						
R Berks Hos Th	15/10/2015	11	4	5	3	1.7	2	40%	5	00:06:41	00:13:22	00:21:31						
R Berks Hos Th	15/10/2015	12	3	1	1	1	2	67%	3	00:04:55	00:14:47	00:14:47						
R Berks Hos Th	15/10/2015	13	7	3	3	1	4	57%	7	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:01	00:01:30	00:04:07	1	0	0	00:04:07
R Berks Hos Th	15/10/2015	14	4	8	3	2.7	0	0%	3	00:01:23	00:01:23	00:03:43	00:02:13	00:08:53	1	0	1	00:15:06
R Berks Hos Th	15/10/2015	15	11	14	10	1.4	2	17%	12	00:02:41	00:03:17	00:08:41	00:00:35	00:04:05	2	0	0	00:05:28
R Berks Hos Th	15/10/2015	16	6	6	5	1.2	1	17%	6	00:00:11	00:00:14	00:01:10	00:17:15	00:24:39	1	0	6	00:35:20
R Berks Hos Th	15/10/2015	17	4	4	3	1.3	1	25%	4	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
R Berks Hos Th	15/10/2015	18	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
R Berks Hos Th	15/10/2015	19	3	4	2	2	1	33%	3	00:00:01	00:00:02	00:00:05	00:00:35	00:02:21	1	0	0	00:02:21
R Berks Hos Th	15/10/2015	20	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
R Berks Hos Th	15/10/2015	21	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
R Berks Hos Th	15/10/2015	22	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
		23																
		0																
		1																
R Berks Hos Th	16/10/2015	2	2	1	1	1	1	50%	2	00:00:04	00:00:09	00:00:09						
R Berks Hos Th	16/10/2015	3	2	1	1	1	1	50%	2	00:02:18	00:04:37	00:04:37						
R Berks Hos Th	16/10/2015	4	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
<b>R Berks Hos Th</b>	<b>15/10/2015</b>		<b>48</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>48</b>				<b>00:04:22</b>	<b>00:15:46</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>00:35:20</b>

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
R Berks Hos F	16/10/2015	9	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
R Berks Hos F	16/10/2015	10	7	4	4	1	1	20%	5	00:09:31	00:11:06	00:33:09	00:02:40	00:05:20	1	1	0	00:08:20
R Berks Hos F	16/10/2015	11	4	13	5	2.6	1	17%	6	00:03:19	00:04:25	00:06:51	00:00:18	00:04:18	1	0	0	00:04:18
R Berks Hos F	16/10/2015	12	1	1	1	1	0	0%	1	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:50:09	01:15:14	0	0	4	01:17:29
R Berks Hos F	16/10/2015	13	1	1	1	1	0	0%	1	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00	01:35:23	01:35:23	0	0	3	01:38:13
R Berks Hos F	16/10/2015	14	7	8	6	1.3	1	14%	7	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
R Berks Hos F	16/10/2015	15	4	8	4	2	0	0%	4	00:00:04	00:00:04	00:00:14	00:00:40	00:05:23	1	0	0	00:05:23
R Berks Hos F	16/10/2015	16	7	9	6	1.5	1	14%	7	00:03:48	00:04:27	00:11:38						
R Berks Hos F	16/10/2015	17	5	3	3	1	2	40%	5	00:00:12	00:00:20	00:00:34	00:02:08	00:06:26	0	1	0	00:06:26
R Berks Hos F	16/10/2015	18	3	0	0	0	3	100%	3	00:00:00								
R Berks Hos F	16/10/2015	19	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1	00:00:00								
R Berks Hos F	16/10/2015	20	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
R Berks Hos F	16/10/2015	21	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
<b>R Berks Hos F</b>	<b>16/10/2015</b>		<b>40</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>40</b>				<b>00:13:04</b>	<b>00:51:09</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>01:38:13</b>

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
R Berks Hos Sa	17/10/2015	9	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
R Berks Hos Sa	17/10/2015	10	3	0	0	0	3	100%	3	00:00:00								
R Berks Hos Sa	17/10/2015	11	3	3	2	1.5	1	33%	3	00:00:44	00:01:06	00:01:55						
R Berks Hos Sa	17/10/2015	12	4	2	1	2	2	67%	3	00:01:27	00:02:55	00:03:55						
R Berks Hos Sa	17/10/2015	13	1	5	2	2.5	0	0%	2	00:00:02	00:00:02	00:00:02						
R Berks Hos Sa	17/10/2015	14	2	0	0	0	2	100%	2	00:00:00								
R Berks Hos Sa	17/10/2015	15	3	2	1	2	2	67%	3	00:01:34	00:04:42	00:04:42						
R Berks Hos Sa	17/10/2015	16	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
R Berks Hos Sa	17/10/2015	17	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
R Berks Hos Sa	17/10/2015	18	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
R Berks Hos Sa	17/10/2015	19	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
R Berks Hos Sa	17/10/2015	20	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1	00:00:00								
R Berks Hos Sa	17/10/2015	21	3	0	0	0	3	100%	3	00:00:00								
<b>R Berks Hos Sa</b>	<b>17/10/2015</b>		<b>20</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>20</b>				<b>00:00:00</b>	<b>00:00:00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>00:00:00</b>

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
R Berks Hos Su	18/10/2015	13	1	1	1	1	0	0%	1	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
R Berks Hos Su	18/10/2015	14	2	4	1	4	1	50%	2	00:02:58	00:05:57	00:05:57						
R Berks Hos Su	18/10/2015	15	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1	00:00:00								
R Berks Hos Su	18/10/2015	16	2	2	2	1	0	0%	2	00:00:18	00:00:18	00:00:37						
R Berks Hos Su	18/10/2015	17	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
R Berks Hos Su	18/10/2015	18	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
R Berks Hos Su	18/10/2015	19	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
R Berks Hos Su	18/10/2015	20	5	4	2	2	3	60%	5	00:00:29	00:01:13	00:02:27						
R Berks Hos Su	18/10/2015	21	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
R Berks Hos Su	18/10/2015	22	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
<b>R Berks Hos Su</b>	<b>18/10/2015</b>		<b>11</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>11</b>				<b>00:00:00</b>	<b>00:00:00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>00:00:00</b>

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
St Marys B Th	15/10/2015	14	6	5	4	1.3	2	33%	6	00:00:50	00:01:16	00:02:36						
St Marys B Th	15/10/2015	15	4	2	2	1	2	50%	4	00:00:03	00:00:06	00:00:13						
St Marys B Th	15/10/2015	20	2	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:23:14	00:23:14	00:24:53						
St Marys B Th	15/10/2015	21	2	3	2	1.5	1	33%	3	00:17:56	00:35:52	00:35:52						
St Marys B Th	15/10/2015	22	4	5	4	1.3	1	20%	5	00:06:05	00:08:07	00:18:32						
St Marys B Th	15/10/2015	23	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1	00:00:00								
St Marys B Th	16/10/2015	0	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1	00:00:00								
St Marys B Th	16/10/2015	1	2	0	0	0	2	100%	2	00:00:00								
<b>St Marys B Th</b>	<b>15/10/2015</b>		<b>22</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>22</b>				<b>00:00:00</b>	<b>00:00:00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>00:00:00</b>



Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
St Marys B F	16/10/2015	11	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
St Marys B F	16/10/2015	12	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
St Marys B F	16/10/2015	20	2	0	0	0	2	100%	2									
St Marys B F	16/10/2015	21	3	2	2	1	1	33%	3	00:07:55	00:11:53	00:15:01						
St Marys B F	16/10/2015	22	8	14	7	2	1	13%	8	00:03:16	00:03:44	00:13:47						
St Marys B F	16/10/2015	23	7	5	3	1.7	4	57%	7	00:01:11	00:02:46	00:06:25						
<b>St Marys B F</b>	<b>16/10/2015</b>		<b>20</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>20</b>						<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
St Marys B Sa	17/10/2015	14	9	11	6	1.8	3	33%	9	00:02:44	00:04:07	00:17:48						
St Marys B Sa	17/10/2015	15	4	3	3	1	1	25%	4	00:00:32	00:00:42	00:01:56	00:01:21	00:04:04	1	0	0	00:04:04
St Marys B Sa	17/10/2015	20	2	8	2	4	0	0%	2	00:07:55	00:07:55	00:15:51						
St Marys B Sa	17/10/2015	21	6	9	6	1.5	0	0%	6	00:07:26	00:07:26	00:17:33						
St Marys B Sa	17/10/2015	22	5	6	4	1.5	1	20%	5	00:13:21	00:16:42	00:24:18						
St Marys B Sa	17/10/2015	23	5	7	4	1.8	1	20%	5	00:04:31	00:05:39	00:18:00						
St Marys B Sa	18/10/2015	0	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1									
St Marys B Sa	18/10/2015	1	1	1	1	1	0	0%	1	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
St Marys B Sa	18/10/2015	2	1	4	1	4	0	0%	1	00:01:05	00:01:05	00:01:05						
St Marys B Sa	18/10/2015	3	7	4	3	1.3	4	57%	7	00:00:19	00:00:46	00:00:49						
<b>St Marys B Sa</b>	<b>17/10/2015</b>		<b>41</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>41</b>				<b>00:00:05</b>	<b>00:00:00</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
YHP Th	15/10/2015	10	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
YHP Th	15/10/2015	11	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
YHP Th	15/10/2015	20	21	28	17	1.6	1	6%	18	00:04:36	00:04:50	00:11:27	00:00:06	00:02:46	1	0	0	00:02:46
YHP Th	15/10/2015	21	21	32	21	1.5	0	0%	21	00:04:57	00:04:57	00:15:49						
YHP Th	15/10/2015	22	40	66	39	1.7	1	3%	40	00:02:11	00:02:15	00:12:05	00:00:27	00:03:10	9	0	0	00:04:46
YHP Th	15/10/2015	23	18	42	19	2.2	1	5%	20	00:03:49	00:04:02	00:17:50						
YHP Th	16/10/2015	0	11	13	9	1.4	2	18%	11	00:01:26	00:01:45	00:07:09	00:00:05					
YHP Th	16/10/2015	1	2	2	2	1	1	33%	3	00:02:27	00:04:54	00:04:54						
YHP Th	16/10/2015	2		0	0	0	0	0%	0									
YHP Th	16/10/2015	3		0	0	0	0	0%	0									
<b>YHP Th</b>	<b>15/10/2015</b>		<b>113</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>113</b>				<b>00:00:10</b>	<b>00:00:00</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
YHP Fr	16/10/2015	17	8	3	3	1	4	57%	7	00:06:34	00:13:08	00:17:03						
YHP Fr	16/10/2015	18	6	15	7	2.1	0	0%	7	00:06:49	00:06:49	00:15:31						
YHP Fr	16/10/2015	19	17	31	13	2.4	1	7%	14	00:02:54	00:03:05	00:06:12	00:00:09	00:02:29	2	0	0	00:03:22
YHP Fr	16/10/2015	20	19	38	19	2	1	5%	20	00:04:10	00:04:24	00:10:55	00:00:06	00:03:55	1	0	0	00:03:55
YHP Fr	16/10/2015	21	23	49	24	2	0	0%	24	00:03:28	00:03:28	00:10:23						
YHP Fr	16/10/2015	22	46	103	43	2.4	2	4%	45	00:01:50	00:01:55	00:08:02						
YHP Fr	16/10/2015	23	53	130	53	2.5	0	0%	53	00:01:37	00:01:37	00:08:40	00:00:04	00:01:23	4	0	0	00:01:29
YHP Fr	17/10/2015	0	27	46	27	1.7	2	7%	29	00:02:51	00:03:05	00:13:39						
YHP Fr	17/10/2015	1	18	26	16	1.6	2	11%	18	00:03:45	00:04:13	00:11:01						
YHP Fr	17/10/2015	2	10	14	7	2	3	30%	10	00:02:39	00:03:48	00:10:59						
YHP Fr	17/10/2015	3	7	7	5	1.4	1	17%	6	00:04:36	00:05:23	00:31:01	00:00:34	00:03:45	1	0	0	00:03:45
YHP Fr	17/10/2015	4	1	5	2	2.5	0	0%	2	00:02:03	00:02:03	00:02:03						
YHP Fr	17/10/2015	5		0	0	0	0	0%	0									
<b>YHP Fr</b>	<b>16/10/2015</b>		<b>235</b>	<b>467</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>235</b>				<b>00:00:02</b>	<b>00:00:00</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
YHP Sa	17/10/2015	19	21	40	19	2.1	0	0%	19	00:03:14	00:03:14	00:08:39	00:00:08	00:02:54	2	0	0	00:03:40
YHP Sa	17/10/2015	20	17	42	17	2.5	0	0%	17	00:05:39	00:05:39	00:14:34	00:00:05	00:03:10	1	0	0	00:03:10
YHP Sa	17/10/2015	21	29	62	28	2.2	0	0%	28	00:03:30	00:03:30	00:13:44	00:00:00					
YHP Sa	17/10/2015	22	40	88	41	2.1	1	2%	42	00:02:49	00:02:54	00:10:39	00:00:02	00:02:31	1	0	0	00:02:31
YHP Sa	17/10/2015	23	60	114	59	1.9	0	0%	59	00:01:54	00:01:54	00:07:30	00:00:01					
YHP Sa	18/10/2015	0	39	81	39	2.1	0	0%	39	00:00:43	00:00:43	00:06:56	00:00:40	00:03:29	11	3	0	00:06:29
YHP Sa	18/10/2015	1	12	23	11	2.1	3	21%	14	00:01:28	00:01:58	00:08:01	00:00:08	00:01:25	2	0	0	00:01:39
YHP Sa	18/10/2015	2	16	15	11	1.4	4	27%	15	00:00:33	00:00:45	00:02:55	00:00:18	00:01:35	1	0	0	00:01:35
YHP Sa	18/10/2015	3	3	11	3	3.7	1	25%	4	00:00:20	00:00:30	00:01:01	00:00:09	00:01:46	1	0	0	00:01:46
		4		0	0	0	0	0%	0									
		5		0	0	0	0	0%	0									
		6		0	0	0	0	0%	0									
<b>YHP Sa</b>	<b>17/10/2015</b>		<b>237</b>	<b>476</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>237</b>				<b>00:00:08</b>	<b>00:00:00</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Oracle Feeder Th	15/10/2015	20	17	1	1	1	16	94%	17	00:00:02	00:00:34	00:00:34						
Oracle Feeder Th	15/10/2015	21	14	0	0	0	14	100%	14									
Oracle Feeder Th	15/10/2015	22	26	0	0	0	26	100%	26									
Oracle Feeder Th	15/10/2015	23	10	0	0	0	10	100%	10									
Oracle Feeder Th	16/10/2015	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
Oracle Feeder Th	16/10/2015	1	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
Oracle Feeder Th	16/10/2015	2	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
Oracle Feeder Th	16/10/2015	3	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
Oracle Feeder Th	16/10/2015	4	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
Oracle Feeder Th	16/10/2015	5	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
<b>Oracle Feeder Th</b>	<b>15/10/2015</b>		<b>67</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>99%</b>	<b>67</b>						<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Oracle Feeder F	16/10/2015	20	15	1	1	1	13	93%	14	00:01:09	00:08:40	00:12:19						
Oracle Feeder F	16/10/2015	21	28	2	2	1	27	93%	29	00:00:34	00:16:01	00:16:01						
Oracle Feeder F	16/10/2015	22	43	0	0	0	43	100%	43									
Oracle Feeder F	16/10/2015	23	54	0	0	0	54	100%	54									
Oracle Feeder F	17/10/2015	0	15	0	0	0	15	100%	15									
Oracle Feeder F	17/10/2015	1	3	0	0	0	3	100%	3									
Oracle Feeder F	17/10/2015	2	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
Oracle Feeder F	17/10/2015	3	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
Oracle Feeder F	17/10/2015	4	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
Oracle Feeder F	17/10/2015	5	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
<b>Oracle Feeder F</b>	<b>16/10/2015</b>		<b>158</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>158</b>						<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Oracle Feeder Sa	17/10/2015	23	52	0	0	0	52	100%	52									
Oracle Feeder Sa	18/10/2015	0	11	1	1	1	10	91%	11	00:00:33	00:06:11	00:06:11						
Oracle Feeder Sa	18/10/2015	1	3	0	0	0	3	100%	3									
Oracle Feeder Sa	18/10/2015	2	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
Oracle Feeder Sa	18/10/2015	3	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
<b>Oracle Feeder Sa</b>	<b>17/10/2015</b>		<b>66</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>66</b>						<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	



Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Station Rd Th	15/10/2015	23	6	4	4	1	1	20%	5	00:04:56	00:05:56	00:13:57	00:03:46	00:15:04	0	0	1	00:15:04
Station Rd Th	16/10/2015	0	9	11	8	1.4	2	20%	10	00:02:11	00:02:48	00:08:51	00:00:33	00:06:11	0	1	0	00:06:11
Station Rd Th	16/10/2015	1	6	3	2	1.5	3	60%	5	00:02:46	00:05:32	00:15:31	00:00:01					
Station Rd Th	16/10/2015	2	3	3	1	3	3	75%	4	00:00:00								
Station Rd Th	16/10/2015	3	3	2	1	2	2	67%	3	00:00:37	00:01:53	00:01:53						
Station Rd Th	16/10/2015	4	1		0	0	1	100%	1	00:00:00								

Rank not legally operating to 23:00 or from 05:00

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of Vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Station Rd Th	15/10/2015		28	23	16	1.4	12	43%	28				00:00:55	00:00:00	0	1	1	
Station Rd F	16/10/2015	23	26	25	18	1.4	4	18%	22	00:06:34	00:07:46	00:13:45						
		0	39	49	36	1.4	4	10%	40	00:04:15	00:04:44	00:10:43						
		1	43	71	34	2.1	4	11%	38	00:09:21	00:10:18	00:19:35	00:00:00					
		2	40	76	36	2.1	10	22%	46	00:04:11	00:05:34	00:21:21	00:00:00					
		3	35	60	29	2.1	8	22%	37	00:01:39	00:02:08	00:06:24	00:00:04	00:01:12	2	0	0	00:01:18
		4	6	3	3	1	3	50%	6	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:11:35	00:17:11	0	0	2	00:20:11

Rank not legally operating to 23:00 or from 05:00

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Station Rd F	16/10/2015		189	284	156	1.8	33	17%	189				00:00:08	00:00:00	2	0	2	
Station Rd Sa	17/10/2015	23	19	30	15	2	4	21%	19	00:06:12	00:07:51	00:19:09						
Station Rd Sa	18/10/2015	0	13	24	9	2.7	3	25%	12	00:00:42	00:00:54	00:03:33	00:00:00					
Station Rd Sa	18/10/2015	1	63	131	60	2.2	4	6%	64	00:01:12	00:01:17	00:04:34	00:00:02	00:01:55	1	0	0	00:01:55
Station Rd Sa	18/10/2015	2	65	131	59	2.2	3	5%	62	00:03:17	00:03:27	00:07:49	00:00:00	00:01:58	1	0	0	00:01:58
Station Rd Sa	18/10/2015	3	55	129	50	2.6	6	11%	56	00:01:54	00:02:08	00:14:33	00:00:09	00:01:57	9	0	0	00:03:25
Station Rd Sa	18/10/2015	4	8	9	6	1.5	4	40%	10	00:03:41	00:07:23	00:13:51						
Rank not legally operating to 23:00 or from 05:00																		
Station Rd Sa	17/10/2015		223	454	199	2.3	24	11%	223				00:00:03	00:00:00	11	0	0	

Survey	Date	Hour	Maximum passenger wait time			Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Total Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Empty Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Total Passenger Departures	No of Vehicle Arrivals
			Number waiting 11 mins or more	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins												
Gun St Th	15/10/2015	13	0	0	0					0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	
Gun St Th	15/10/2015	14	0	0	0					0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>Gun St Th</b>	<b>15/10/2015</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>					<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of Vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only			
														Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	
Gun St Sa	17/10/2015	2	9	0	0	0	0	0%	0	01:43:16	01:43:16	01:49:07					
Gun St Sa	17/10/2015	3	13	23	13	1.8	3	19%	16	00:07:27	00:09:41	00:18:30					
Gun St Sa	17/10/2015	4	20	38	22	1.7	4	15%	26	00:04:16	00:05:20	00:11:26					
Gun St Sa	17/10/2015	5	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0								
Gun St Sa	17/10/2015	6	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0								
Gun St Sa	17/10/2015	7	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0								
Gun St Sa	17/10/2015	8	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0								
<b>Gun St Sa</b>	<b>17/10/2015</b>		<b>42</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>42</b>						<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Gun St Su	18/10/2015	23	10	8	5	1.6	5	50%	10	00:04:10	00:08:20	00:14:30						
Gun St Su	19/10/2015	0	7	2	2	1	4	67%	6	00:13:50	00:32:17	00:41:56						
Gun St Su	19/10/2015	1	12	16	9	1.8	0	0%	9	00:13:50	00:13:50	00:39:22						
Gun St Su	19/10/2015	2	5	12	6	2	0	0%	6	00:19:38	00:19:38	00:30:14						
Gun St Su	19/10/2015	3	7	9	6	1.5	4	40%	10	00:01:27	00:03:23	00:04:08						
Gun St Su	19/10/2015	4	1	1	1	1	0	0%	1	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:03:24	00:03:24	1	0	0	00:03:24
<b>Gun St Su</b>	<b>18/10/2015</b>		<b>42</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>42</b>				<b>00:00:04</b>	<b>00:00:00</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of Vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time	
Minster St Th	15/10/2015	23	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0										
Minster St Th	16/10/2015	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0										
Minster St Th	16/10/2015	1	2	3	1	3	1	50%	2	00:02:48	00:05:37	00:05:37							
Minster St Th	16/10/2015	2	7	0	0	0	7	100%	7										
Minster St Th	16/10/2015	3	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0										
Minster St Th	16/10/2015	4	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0										
Rank not legally operating to 23:00 or from 05:00																			
<b>Minster St Th</b>	<b>15/10/2015</b>		<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>9</b>						<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>		

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time	
Minster St F	16/10/2015	23	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:05	00:01:43	00:01:43			0	0	0		
		0	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1										
		1	19	2	1	2	18	95%	19										
		2	17	0	0	0	17	100%	17										
		3	33	0	0	0	33	100%	33										
4	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0												
Rank not legally operating to 23:00 or from 05:00																			
<b>Minster St F</b>	<b>16/10/2015</b>		<b>70</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>99%</b>	<b>70</b>						<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>		



Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of Vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time	
Minster St Sa	17/10/2015	23	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0										
Minster St Sa	18/10/2015	0	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1										
Minster St Sa	18/10/2015	1	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0										
Minster St Sa	18/10/2015	2	1	2	1	2	0	0%	1	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:02						
Minster St Sa	18/10/2015	3	4	0	0	0	4	100%	4										
Minster St Sa	18/10/2015	4	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0										
Rank not legally operating to 23:00 or from 05:00																			
<b>Minster St Sa</b>	<b>17/10/2015</b>		<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>6</b>						<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>		

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Headmasters Th	15/10/2015	23	15	30	14	2.1	1	7%	15	00:06:49	00:07:18	00:14:15						
Headmasters Th	16/10/2015	0	26	33	19	1.7	3	14%	22	00:05:30	00:06:13	00:18:43						
Headmasters Th	16/10/2015	1	20	24	17	1.4	6	26%	23	00:06:21	00:09:04	00:29:55	00:00:07	00:02:34	1	0	0	00:02:34
Headmasters Th	16/10/2015	2	13	17	8	2.1	5	38%	13	00:05:52	00:09:33	00:17:22						
Headmasters Th	16/10/2015	3	19	14	9	1.6	11	55%	20	00:07:22	00:17:32	00:38:46						
Headmasters Th	16/10/2015	4	2	1	1	1	1	50%	2	00:11:36	00:23:12	00:23:12						
Rank not legally operating to 23:00 or from 05:00																		
<b>Headmasters Th</b>	<b>15/10/2015</b>		<b>95</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>95</b>				<b>00:00:01</b>	<b>00:00:00</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Headmasters F	16/10/2015	23	36	66	33	2	1	3%	34	00:06:16	00:06:27	00:11:00						
Headmasters F	17/10/2015	0	53	67	42	1.6	5	11%	47	00:03:01	00:03:20	00:08:37	00:00:03	00:01:18	2	0	0	00:01:21
Headmasters F	17/10/2015	1	43	73	45	1.6	3	6%	48	00:05:09	00:05:32	00:16:37						
Headmasters F	17/10/2015	2	63	116	57	2	4	7%	61	00:03:27	00:03:41	00:09:03						
Headmasters F	17/10/2015	3	79	161	77	2.1	5	6%	82	00:03:54	00:04:10	00:14:03						
Headmasters F	17/10/2015	4	49	89	43	2.1	5	10%	48	00:05:43	00:06:24	00:13:24						
Headmasters F	17/10/2015	5	6	5	4	1.3	5	56%	9	00:04:20	00:05:00	00:05:00						
Rank not legally operating to 23:00 or from 05:00																		
<b>Headmasters F</b>	<b>16/10/2015</b>		<b>329</b>	<b>577</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>329</b>				<b>00:00:00</b>	<b>00:00:00</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Headmasters Sa	17/10/2015	23	54	90	46	2	6	12%	52	00:03:15	00:03:40	00:10:11						
Headmasters Sa	18/10/2015	0	68	116	65	1.8	3	4%	68	00:01:00	00:01:03	00:09:44						
Headmasters Sa	18/10/2015	1	77	144	75	1.9	3	4%	78	00:00:57	00:01:00	00:05:19						
Headmasters Sa	18/10/2015	2	98	196	93	2.1	3	3%	96	00:00:30	00:00:31	00:02:41						
Headmasters Sa	18/10/2015	3	109	202	100	2	2	2%	102	00:01:37	00:01:39	00:07:43						
Headmasters Sa	18/10/2015	4	63	135	62	2.2	3	5%	65	00:04:21	00:04:36	00:15:21	00:00:01	00:01:08	1	0	0	00:01:08
Headmasters Sa	18/10/2015	5	13	27	15	1.8	6	29%	21	00:11:00	00:11:52	00:29:00						
Rank not legally operating to 23:00 or from 05:00																		
<b>Headmasters Sa</b>	<b>17/10/2015</b>		<b>482</b>	<b>910</b>	<b>456</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>482</b>				<b>00:00:00</b>	<b>00:00:00</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Casino Th	15/10/2015	23	3	2	2	1	1	33%	3	00:00:39	00:00:58	00:01:30						
Casino Th	16/10/2015	0	2	0	0	0	2	100%	2	00:00:00								
Casino Th	16/10/2015	1	6	6	3	2	3	50%	6	00:00:37	00:01:15	00:03:27						
Casino Th	16/10/2015	2	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1	00:00:00								
Casino Th	16/10/2015	3	7	6	3	2	4	57%	7	00:01:51	00:04:20	00:12:31						
Casino Th	16/10/2015	4	7	0	0	0	7	100%	7	00:00:00								
Rank not legally operating to 23:00 or from 05:00																		
<b>Casino Th</b>	<b>15/10/2015</b>		<b>26</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>26</b>						<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of Vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Casino F	16/10/2015	23	2	0	0	0	2	100%	2									
Casino F	17/10/2015	0	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1									
Casino F	17/10/2015	1	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1									
Casino F	17/10/2015	2	5	5	3	1.7	2	40%	5	00:01:31	00:02:33	00:07:39	00:00:42	00:03:24	1	0	0	00:03:24
Casino F	17/10/2015	3	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
Casino F	17/10/2015	4	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0									
Rank not legally operating to 23:00 or from 05:00																		
Casino F	16/10/2015		9	5	3	1.7	6	67%	9				00:00:41	00:00:00	1	0	0	

Survey	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of Vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time	
Casino Su	18/10/2015	23	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0										
Casino Su	19/10/2015	0	2	1	1	1	1	50%	2	00:00:34	00:01:08	00:01:08							
Casino Su	19/10/2015	1	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1										
Casino Su	19/10/2015	2	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1										
Casino Su	19/10/2015	3	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0										
Casino Su	19/10/2015	4	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0										
Rank not legally operating to 23:00 or from 05:00																			
<b>Casino Su</b>	<b>18/10/2015</b>		<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>4</b>						<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>		

Totals (no private)

12686 15417 9631 1.6 3059 24% 12682

00:00:11 00:00:00 645 61 29





## **Appendix 4 Public on street survey results**



<b>Q1: Have you used a taxi in this area?</b>	<b>READING</b>	
Yes	47	24%
No	151	76%
<b>Total</b>	198	100%

<b>Q2. How often do you use a taxi within this area?</b>	<b>READING</b>	
Almost Daily	5	10%
Once a week	9	18%
A few times a month	9	18%
Once a month	9	18%
Less than once a month	19	37%
<b>Total</b>	51	100%

Almost daily	20
Once a week	4
A few times a month	2
Once a month	1
Less than once a month	0.5
<b>Resulting estimate of trips per person per month</b>	<b>0.9</b>

<b>Q3: How do you normally book a taxi within this area?</b>	<b>READING</b>	
At a Taxi rank	23	39%
Hail in the street	4	7%
Telephone a company	26	44%
Use a Freephone	3	5%
Use my mobile or smart phone	2	3%
Other – ONLINE	1	2%
<b>Total</b>	59	100%

<b>Q4. Are the taxi fares in Reading reasonable?</b>	<b>READING</b>	
Yes - if book ahead	14	33%
Yes - if pay on meter	9	21%
Too Low	1	2%
Too High	9	21%
No Opinion	9	21%
<b>Total</b>	42	100%

<b>Q4: If you book a taxi by phone, which 3 companies do you call most often?</b>	<b>READING</b>	
500 CARS	1	5%
AAA CARS	1	5%
ACE	1	5%
CORONATION SQUARE CARS	1	5%
EAGLE CAR	1	5%

GREEN MANTRA CARS	1	5%
KENNETT CARS	1	5%
LONDON TAXI	1	5%
PREMIER CARS	3	15%
SOL	2	10%
STAR CARS	1	5%
TOP CARS	5	25%
YELL CAR	1	5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100%</b>

<b>Q5: How often do you use a hackney carriage within the area?</b>	<b>READING</b>	
Almost daily	0	0%
Once a week	5	17%
A few times a month	2	7%
Once a month	5	17%
Less than once a month	17	57%
I can't remember when I last used a hackney carriage	1	3%
I can't remember seeing a hackney carriage in the area	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	30	100%

Almost daily	20
Once a week	4
A few times a month	2
Once a month	1
Less than once a month	0.5
<b>Resulting estimate of trips per person per month</b>	<b>0.2</b>

<b>Q6: Which ranks are you aware of in the Reading area?</b>	<b>READING</b>	
BROAD STREET NR STATION	1	3%
FRIARS STREET	5	13%
HIGH STREET	1	3%
HOUSE OF FRASER	1	3%
O NEALS	1	3%
ORACLE SHOPPING CENTRE	3	8%
STADIUM	1	3%
STATION	24	60%
STATION HILL	2	5%
TOTAL PETROL STATION	1	3%
TOWN	1	3%
<b>Total</b>	40	100%

<b>Q7: Is there anywhere in the Reading area you would like to see a rank?</b>	<b>READING</b>	
OXFORD ROAD	1	25%
PIANO SHOP	1	25%
TOWN	1	25%
ST MARY BATHS	1	25%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>

<b>Q8: Have you had any problems with the local Hackney carriage service?</b>	<b>READING</b>	
Design or type of vehicle	0	0%
Driver Issues	1	33%
Position of ranks	0	0%
Delay in getting a Taxi	0	0%
Cleanliness	1	33%
Other problems (specify)	1	33%
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100%</b>

<b>Q9: What would encourage you to use taxis or use them more often?</b>	<b>READING</b>	
Better standard of vehicles	3	11%
More hackney carriages I could phone for	1	4%
Better Drivers	2	7%
More hackney carriages I could hail or get at a rank	2	7%
Better located ranks	1	4%
Rank in ...	0	0%
Other - CHEAPER COST	18	67%
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>

<b>Q10. Do you consider you or anyone you know to have a disability that means you need an adapted vehicle?</b>	<b>READING</b>	
No	24	89%
Yes	2	7%
If yes: I need a WAV	0	0%
someone I know WAV	1	4%
Yes, but not WAV	0	0%
Someone I know, but not WAV	0	0%
Other	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	27	100%

<b>Q11. Have you ever given up waiting for a taxi?</b>	<b>READING</b>	
No	20	80%
Yes	5	20%
<b>Total</b>	25	100%

<b>Q12. Do you have regular access to a car?</b>	<b>READING</b>	
Yes	72	38%
No	116	62%
<b>Total</b>	188	100%

<b>Q13. Do you live in the area?</b>	<b>READING</b>	
Yes	129	66%
No	67	34%
<b>Total</b>	196	100%



<b>Q14.Gender</b>	<b>READING</b>	
1. Male	101	51%
2. Female	96	49%
<b>Total</b>	197	100%

<b>Q15: Age</b>	<b>READING</b>	
1. Under 30	37	19%
2. 31 – 55	98	50%
3. Over 55	62	31%
<b>Total</b>	197	100%





## Appendix 5 Stakeholder Feedback Diary

Chapter	Stakeholder Group / Person	Views returned?
5	<b>Supermarkets</b>	
	Sainsbury's Friar St	Y
	Sainsbury's Broad St	Y
	Iceland Caversham	Y
	Waitrose Church St	N
	Morrisons Basingstoke Rd	N
	Asda Honey End Lane	N
	Tesco Napier Rd	N
	Tesco Portman Way	N
5	<b>Hotels</b>	
	Malmaison Station Rd	N
	Thameside Hotel	R
	Hilton Reading	N
	Six	N
	Novotel	R
	Majedski Hotel	N
	<b>Restaurants</b>	
	The Southcote	Y
	Island Bar and Restaurant	N
	Pepe Sale	N
	Barts Grill and Restaurant	R
	Bills Reading Restaurant	N
5	<b>Night clubs / Entertainment / Pubs</b>	
	Hexagon	Y
	Reading Film Theatre	N
	Allied Arms	Y
	Back of Beyond	Y
	Baron Cadogan	Y
	Hook and Tackle	N
	Sun Inn	Y
	Fruitbat	N
	Oakford Social Club	Y
	Q Bar	N
	Lola Lo	Y
	Be At One	N
	Matchbox (Bed Bar)	Y
	White Stuff	R
	Purple Turtle	Y

5	<b>Hospital</b>	
	Royal Berkshire Hospital	N
5	<b>Disability, equality and other local group representatives</b>	
	Oracle Shopping Centre	N
5	<b>Police</b>	
	Thames Valley Police	Y
6	<b>Hackney carriage and private hire trade</b>	
	Via survey to all drivers (Council undertaken)	Y
	Meeting with Trade Reps	Y

**TAXI AND PRIVATE HIRE VEHICLE LICENSING:  
BEST PRACTICE GUIDANCE**

**March 2010**

## TAXI AND PRIVATE HIRE VEHICLE LICENSING: BEST PRACTICE GUIDANCE

<u>Table of contents</u>	<u>Para Nos</u>
Introduction	1-5
The role of taxis and PHVs	6-7
The role of licensing: policy justification	8-10
Scope of the guidance	11
Consultation at the local level	12
Accessibility	13-25
Vehicles	26-44
Quantity restrictions of taxi licences	45-51
Taxi fares	52-54
Drivers	55-76
PHV operators	77-81
Repeal of the PHV contract exemption	82-83
Enforcement	84-88
Taxi Zones	89-91
Flexible transport services	92-95
Local transport plans	96-97

**Annex A - Useful questions when assessing quantity controls**

**Annex B - Sample notice between taxi/PHV driver and passenger**

**Annex C – Assessing applicants for a taxi or PHV driver licence in accordance with C1 standard**

## **INTRODUCTION**

1. The Department first issued Best Practice Guidance in October 2006 to assist those local authorities in England and Wales that have responsibility for the regulation of the taxi and private hire vehicle (PHV) trades.
2. It is clear that many licensing authorities considered their licensing policies in the context of the Guidance. That is most encouraging.
3. However, in order to keep our Guidance relevant and up to date, we embarked on a revision. We took account of feedback from the initial version and we consulted stakeholders in producing this revised version.
4. The key premise remains the same - it is for individual licensing authorities to reach their own decisions both on overall policies and on individual licensing matters, in the light of their own views of the relevant considerations. This Guidance is intended to assist licensing authorities but it is only guidance and decisions on any matters remain a matter for the authority concerned.
5. We have not introduced changes simply for the sake of it. Accordingly, the bulk of the Guidance is unchanged. What we have done is focus on issues involving a new policy (for example trailing the introduction of the Safeguarding Vulnerable Groups legislation); or where we consider that the advice could be elaborated (eg enforcement); or where progress has been made since October 2006 (eg the stretched limousine guidance note has now been published).

## **THE ROLE OF TAXIS AND PHVs**

6. Taxis (more formally known as hackney carriages) and PHVs (or minicabs as some of them are known) play an important part in local transport. In 2008, the average person made 11 trips in taxis or private hire vehicles. Taxis and PHVs are used by all social groups; low-income young women (amongst whom car ownership is low) are one of the largest groups of users.
7. Taxis and PHVs are also increasingly used in innovative ways - for example as taxi-buses - to provide innovative local transport services (see paras 92-95)

## **THE ROLE OF LICENSING: POLICY JUSTIFICATION**

8. The aim of local authority licensing of the taxi and PHV trades is to protect the public. Local licensing authorities will also be aware that the public should have reasonable access to taxi and PHV services, because of the part they play in local transport provision. Licensing requirements which are unduly stringent will tend unreasonably to restrict the supply of taxi and PHV services, by putting up the cost of operation or otherwise restricting entry to the trade. Local licensing authorities should recognise that too restrictive an approach can work against the public interest – and can, indeed, have safety implications.



9. For example, it is clearly important that somebody using a taxi or PHV to go home alone late at night should be confident that the driver does not have a criminal record for assault and that the vehicle is safe. But on the other hand, if the supply of taxis or PHVs has been unduly constrained by onerous licensing conditions, then that person's safety might be put at risk by having to wait on late-night streets for a taxi or PHV to arrive; he or she might even be tempted to enter an unlicensed vehicle with an unlicensed driver illegally plying for hire.

10. Local licensing authorities will, therefore, want to be sure that each of their various licensing requirements is in proportion to the risk it aims to address; or, to put it another way, whether the cost of a requirement in terms of its effect on the availability of transport to the public is at least matched by the benefit to the public, for example through increased safety. This is not to propose that a detailed, quantitative, cost-benefit assessment should be made in each case; but it is to urge local licensing authorities to look carefully at the costs – financial or otherwise – imposed by each of their licensing policies. It is suggested they should ask themselves whether those costs are really commensurate with the benefits a policy is meant to achieve.

## **SCOPE OF THE GUIDANCE**

11. This guidance deliberately does not seek to cover the whole range of possible licensing requirements. Instead it seeks to concentrate only on those issues that have caused difficulty in the past or that seem of particular significance. Nor for the most part does the guidance seek to set out the law on taxi and PHV licensing, which for England and Wales contains many complexities. Local licensing authorities will appreciate that it is for them to seek their own legal advice.

## **CONSULTATION AT THE LOCAL LEVEL**

12. It is good practice for local authorities to consult about any significant proposed changes in licensing rules. Such consultation should include not only the taxi and PHV trades but also groups likely to be the trades' customers. Examples are groups representing disabled people, or Chambers of Commerce, organisations with a wider transport interest (eg the Campaign for Better Transport and other transport providers), womens' groups or local traders.

## **ACCESSIBILITY**

13. The Minister of State for Transport has now announced the way forward on accessibility for taxis and PHVs. His statement can be viewed on the Department's website at: <http://www.dft.gov.uk/press/speechesstatements/statements/accesstotaxis>. The Department will be taking forward demonstration schemes in three local authority areas to research the needs of people with disabilities in order to produce guidance about the most appropriate provision. In the meantime, the Department recognises that some local licensing authorities will want to make progress on enhancing accessible taxi provision and the guidance outlined below constitutes the Department's advice on how this might be achieved in advance of the comprehensive and dedicated guidance which will arise from the demonstration schemes.

14. Different accessibility considerations apply between taxis and PHVs. Taxis can be hired on the spot, in the street or at a rank, by the customer dealing directly with a driver. PHVs can only be booked through an operator. It is important that a disabled person should be able to hire a taxi on the spot with the minimum delay or inconvenience, and having accessible taxis available helps to make that possible. For PHVs, it may be more appropriate for a local authority to license any type of saloon car, noting that some PHV operators offer accessible vehicles in their fleet. The Department has produced a leaflet on the ergonomic requirements for accessible taxis that is available from: <http://www.dft.gov.uk/transportforyou/access/taxis/pubs/research>

15. The Department is aware that, in some cases, taxi drivers are reluctant to pick up disabled people. This may be because drivers are unsure about how to deal with disabled people, they believe it will take longer for disabled people to get in and out of the taxi and so they may lose other fares, or they are unsure about insurance arrangements if anything goes wrong. It should be remembered that this is no excuse for refusing to pick up disabled people and that the taxi industry has a duty to provide a service to disabled people in the same way as it provides a service to any other passenger. Licensing authorities should do what they can to work with operators, drivers and trade bodies in their area to improve drivers' awareness of the needs of disabled people, encourage them to overcome any reluctance or bad practice, and to improve their abilities and confidence. Local licensing authorities should also encourage their drivers to undertake disability awareness training, perhaps as part of the course mentioned in the training section of this guidance that is available through Go-Skills.

16. In relation to enforcement, licensing authorities will know that section 36 of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (DDA) was partially commenced by enactment of the Local Transport Act 2008. The duties contained in this section of the DDA apply only to those vehicles deemed accessible by the local authority being used on "taxibus" services. This applies to both hackney carriages and private hire vehicles.

17. Section 36 imposes certain duties on drivers of "taxibuses" to provide assistance to people in wheelchairs, to carry them in safety and not to charge extra for doing so. Failure to abide by these duties could lead to prosecution through a Magistrates' court and a maximum fine of £1,000.

18. Local authorities can take action against non-taxibus drivers who do not abide by their duties under section 36 of the DDA (see below). This could involve for example using licence conditions to implement training requirements or, ultimately, powers to suspend or revoke licences. Some local authorities use points systems and will take certain enforcement actions should drivers accumulate a certain number of points

19. There are plans to modify section 36 of the DDA. The Local Transport Act 2008 applied the duties to assist disabled passengers to drivers of taxis and PHVs whilst being used to provide local services. The Equality Bill which is currently on its passage through Parliament would extend the duties to drivers of taxis and PHVs whilst operating conventional services using wheelchair accessible vehicles. Licensing authorities will be informed if the change is enacted and Regulations will have to be made to deal with exemptions from the duties for drivers who are unable, on medical grounds to fulfil the duties.

### **Duties to carry assistance dogs**

20. Since 31 March 2001, licensed taxi drivers in England and Wales have been under a duty (under section 37 of the DDA) to carry guide, hearing and other prescribed assistance dogs in their taxis without additional charge. Drivers who have a medical condition that is aggravated by exposure to dogs may apply to their licensing authority for an exemption from the duty on medical grounds. Any other driver who fails to comply with the duty could be prosecuted through a Magistrates' court and is liable to a fine of up to £1,000. Similar duties covering PHV operators and drivers have been in force since 31 March 2004.

21. Enforcement of this duty is the responsibility of local licensing authorities. It is therefore for authorities to decide whether breaches should be pursued through the courts or considered as part of the licensing enforcement regime, having regard to guidance issued by the Department.

<http://www.dft.gov.uk/transportforyou/access/taxis/pubs/taxis/carriageofassistancedogsinta6154?page=2>

### **Duties under the Part 3 of the DDA**

22. The Disability Discrimination Act 2005 amended the DDA 1995 and lifted the exemption in Part 3 of that Act for operators of transport vehicles. Regulations applying Part 3 to vehicles used to provide public transport services, including taxis and PHVs, hire services and breakdown services came into force on 4 December 2006. Taxi drivers now have a duty to ensure disabled people are not discriminated against or treated less favourably. In order to meet these new duties, licensing authorities are required to review any practices, policies and procedures that make it impossible or unreasonably difficult for a disabled person to use their services.

23. The Disability Rights Commission, before it was incorporated into the Equality and Human Rights Commission, produced a Code of Practice to explain the Part 3 duties for the transport industry; this is available at [http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/uploaded\\_files/code\\_of\\_practice\\_provision\\_and\\_use\\_of\\_transport\\_vehicles\\_dda.pdf](http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/uploaded_files/code_of_practice_provision_and_use_of_transport_vehicles_dda.pdf). There is an expectation that Part 3 duties also now demand new skills and training; this is available through GoSkills, the sector skills council for road passenger transport. Go-Skills has also produced a DVD about assisting disabled passengers. Further details are provided in the training section of this guidance.

24. Local Authorities may wish to consider how to use available courses to reinforce the duties drivers are required to discharge under section 3 of DDA, and also to promote customer service standards for example through GoSkills.

25. In addition recognition has been made of a requirement of basic skills prior to undertaking any formal training. On-line tools are available to assess this requirement prior to undertaking formal training.

## **VEHICLES**

### **Specification Of Vehicle Types That May Be Licensed**

26. The legislation gives local authorities a wide range of discretion over the types of vehicle that they can license as taxis or PHVs. Some authorities specify conditions that in practice can only be met by purpose-built vehicles but the majority license a range of vehicles.

27. Normally, the best practice is for local licensing authorities to adopt the principle of specifying as many different types of vehicle as possible. Indeed, local authorities might usefully set down a range of general criteria, leaving it open to the taxi and PHV trades to put forward vehicles of their own choice which can be shown to meet those criteria. In that way there can be flexibility for new vehicle types to be readily taken into account.

28. It is suggested that local licensing authorities should give very careful consideration to a policy which automatically rules out particular types of vehicle or prescribes only one type or a small number of types of vehicle. For example, the Department believes authorities should be particularly cautious about specifying only purpose-built taxis, with the strict constraint on supply that that implies. But of course the purpose-built vehicles are amongst those which a local authority could be expected to license. Similarly, it may be too restrictive to automatically rule out considering Multi-Purpose Vehicles, or to license them for fewer passengers than their seating capacity (provided of course that the capacity of the vehicle is not more than eight passengers).

29. The owners and drivers of vehicles may want to make appropriate adaptations to their vehicles to help improve the personal security of the drivers. Licensing authorities should look favourably on such adaptations, but, as mentioned in paragraph 35 below, they may wish to ensure that modifications are present when the vehicle is tested and not made after the testing stage.

### **Tinted windows**

30. The minimum light transmission for glass in front of, and to the side of, the driver is 70%. Vehicles may be manufactured with glass that is darker than this fitted to windows rearward of the driver, especially in estate and people carrier style vehicles. When licensing vehicles, authorities should be mindful of this as well as the large costs and inconvenience associated with changing glass that conforms to both Type Approval and Construction and Use Regulations.

### **Imported vehicles: type approval (see also “stretched limousines”, paras 40-44 below)**

31. It may be that from time to time a local authority will be asked to license as a taxi or PHV a vehicle that has been imported independently (that is, by somebody other than the manufacturer). Such a vehicle might meet the local authority's criteria for licensing, but the local authority may nonetheless be uncertain about the wider rules for foreign vehicles being used in the UK. Such vehicles will be subject to the 'type approval' rules. For

passenger cars up to 10 years old at the time of first GB registration, this means meeting the technical standards of either:

- a European Whole Vehicle Type approval;
- a British National Type approval; or
- a Individual Vehicle Approval.

Most registration certificates issued since late 1998 should indicate the approval status of the vehicle. The technical standards applied (and the safety and environmental risks covered) under each of the above are proportionate to the number of vehicles entering service. Further information about these requirements and the procedures for licensing and registering imported vehicles can be seen at

[www.businesslink.gov.uk/vehicleapprovalschemes](http://www.businesslink.gov.uk/vehicleapprovalschemes)

## **Vehicle Testing**

32. There is considerable variation between local licensing authorities on vehicle testing, including the related question of age limits. The following can be regarded as best practice:

- **Frequency Of Tests.** The legal requirement is that all taxis should be subject to an MOT test or its equivalent once a year. For PHVs the requirement is for an annual test after the vehicle is three years old. An annual test for licensed vehicles of whatever age (that is, including vehicles that are less than three years old) seems appropriate in most cases, unless local conditions suggest that more frequent tests are necessary. However, more frequent tests may be appropriate for older vehicles (see 'age limits' below). Local licensing authorities may wish to note that a review carried out by the National Society for Cleaner Air in 2005 found that taxis were more likely than other vehicles to fail an emissions test. This finding, perhaps suggests that emissions testing should be carried out on ad hoc basis and more frequently than the full vehicle test.
- **Criteria For Tests.** Similarly, for mechanical matters it seems appropriate to apply the same criteria as those for the MOT test to taxis and PHVs\*. The MOT test on vehicles first used after 31 March 1987 includes checking of all seat belts. However, taxis and PHVs provide a service to the public, so it is also appropriate to set criteria for the internal condition of the vehicle, though these should not be unreasonably onerous.

\*A manual outlining the method of testing and reasons for failure of all MOT tested items can be obtained from the Stationary Office see  
<http://www.tsoshop.co.uk/bookstore.asp?FO=1159966&Action=Book&From=SearchResults&ProductID=0115525726>

- **Age Limits.** It is perfectly possible for an older vehicle to be in good condition. So the setting of an age limit beyond which a local authority will not license vehicles may be arbitrary and inappropriate. But a greater frequency of testing may be appropriate for older vehicles - for example, twice-yearly tests for vehicles more than five years old.

- **Number Of Testing Stations.** There is sometimes criticism that local authorities provide only one testing centre for their area (which may be geographically extensive). So it is good practice for local authorities to consider having more than one testing station. There could be an advantage in contracting out the testing work, and to different garages. In that way the licensing authority can benefit from competition in costs. (The Vehicle Operators and Standards Agency – VOSA – may be able to assist where there are local difficulties in provision of testing stations.)

33. The Technical Officer Group of the Public Authority Transport Network has produced Best Practice Guidance which focuses on national inspection standards for taxis and PHVs. Local licensing authorities might find it helpful to refer to the testing standards set out in this guidance in carrying out their licensing responsibilities. The PATN can be accessed via the Freight Transport Association.

### **Personal security**

34. The personal security of taxi and PHV drivers and staff needs to be considered. The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 requires local authorities and others to consider crime and disorder reduction while exercising all of their duties. Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships are also required to invite public transport providers and operators to participate in the partnerships. Research has shown that anti-social behaviour and crime affects taxi and PHV drivers and control centre staff. It is therefore important that the personal security of these people is considered.

35. The owners and drivers of vehicles will often want to install security measures to protect the driver. Local licensing authorities may not want to insist on such measures, on the grounds that they are best left to the judgement of the owners and drivers themselves. But it is good practice for licensing authorities to look sympathetically on - or actively to encourage - their installation. They could include a screen between driver and passengers, or CCTV. Care however should be taken that security measures within the vehicle do not impede a disabled passenger's ability to communicate with the driver. In addition, licensing authorities may wish to ensure that such modifications are present when the vehicle is tested and not made after the testing stage.

36. There is extensive information on the use of CCTV, including as part of measures to reduce crime, on the Home Office website (e.g. <http://scienceandresearch.homeoffice.gov.uk/hosdb/cctv-imaging-technology/CCTV-and-imaging-publications>) and on the Information Commission's Office website ([www.ico.gov.uk](http://www.ico.gov.uk)). CCTV can be both a deterrent to would-be trouble makers and be a source of evidence in the case of disputes between drivers and passengers and other incidents. There is a variety of funding sources being used for the implementation of security measures for example, from community safety partnerships, local authorities and drivers themselves.

37. Other security measures include guidance, talks by the local police and conflict avoidance training. The Department has recently issued guidance for taxi and PHV drivers to help them improve their personal security. These can be accessed on the Department's website at: <http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/crime/taxiphv/>.

In order to emphasise the reciprocal aspect of the taxi/PHV service, licensing authorities might consider drawing up signs or notices which set out not only what passengers can expect from drivers, but also what drivers can expect from passengers who use their service. Annex B contains two samples which are included for illustrative purposes but local authorities are encouraged to formulate their own, in the light of local conditions and circumstances. Licensing authorities may want to encourage the taxi and PHV trades to build good links with the local police force, including participation in any Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships.

### **Vehicle Identification**

38. Members of the public can often confuse PHVs with taxis, failing to realise that PHVs are not available for immediate hire and that a PHV driver cannot be hailed. So it is important to distinguish between the two types of vehicle. Possible approaches might be:

- a licence condition that prohibits PHVs from displaying any identification at all apart from the local authority licence plate or disc. The licence plate is a helpful indicator of licensed status and, as such, it helps identification if licence plates are displayed on the front as well as the rear of vehicles. However, requiring some additional clearer form of identification can be seen as best practice. This is for two reasons: firstly, to ensure a more positive statement that the vehicle cannot be hired immediately through the driver; and secondly because it is quite reasonable, and in the interests of the travelling public, for a PHV operator to be able to state on the vehicle the contact details for hiring;
- a licence condition which requires a sign on the vehicle in a specified form. This will often be a sign of a specified size and shape which identifies the operator (with a telephone number for bookings) and the local licensing authority, and which also has some words such as 'pre-booked only'. This approach seems the best practice; it identifies the vehicle as private hire and helps to avoid confusion with a taxi, but also gives useful information to the public wishing to make a booking. It is good practice for vehicle identification for PHVs to include the contact details of the operator.
- Another approach, possibly in conjunction with the previous option, is a requirement for a roof-mounted, permanently illuminated sign with words such as 'pre-booked only'. But it can be argued that any roof-mounted sign, however unambiguous its words, is liable to create confusion with a taxi. So roof-mounted signs on PHVs are not seen as best practice.

### **Environmental Considerations**

39. Local licensing authorities, in discussion with those responsible for environmental health issues, will wish to consider how far their vehicle licensing policies can and should support any local environmental policies that the local authority may have adopted. This will be of particular importance in designated Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs), Local authorities may, for example, wish to consider setting vehicle emissions standards for taxis and PHVs. However, local authorities would need to carefully and thoroughly

assess the impact of introducing such a policy; for example, the effect on the supply of taxis and PHVs in the area would be an important consideration in deciding the standards, if any, to be set. They should also bear in mind the need to ensure that the benefits of any policies outweigh the costs (in whatever form).

### **Stretched Limousines**

40. Local licensing authorities are sometimes asked to license stretched limousines as PHVs. It is suggested that local authorities should approach such requests on the basis that these vehicles – where they have fewer than nine passenger seats - have a legitimate role to play in the private hire trade, meeting a public demand. Indeed, the Department's view is that it is not a legitimate course of action for licensing authorities to adopt policies that exclude limousines as a matter of principle and that any authorities which do adopt such practices are leaving themselves open to legal challenge. A policy of excluding limousines creates an unacceptable risk to the travelling public, as it would inevitably lead to higher levels of unlawful operation. Public safety considerations are best supported by policies that allow respectable, safe operators to obtain licences on the same basis as other private hire vehicle operators. The Department has now issued guidance on the licensing arrangements for stretched limousines. This can be accessed on the Department's web-site at <http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/regional/taxis/stretchlimousines.pdf>.

41. The limousine guidance makes it clear that most operations are likely to fall within the PHV licensing category and not into the small bus category. VOSA will be advising limousine owners that if they intend to provide a private hire service then they should go to the local authority for PHV licences. The Department would expect licensing authorities to assess applications on their merits; and, as necessary, to be proactive in ascertaining whether any limousine operators might already be providing an unlicensed service within their district.

42. Imported stretched limousines were historically checked for compliance with regulations under the Single Vehicle Approval (SVA) inspection regime before they were registered. This is now the Individual Vehicle Approval (IVA) scheme. The IVA test verifies that the converted vehicle is built to certain safety and environmental standards. A licensing authority might wish to confirm that an imported vehicle was indeed tested by VOSA for IVA before being registered and licensed (taxed) by DVLA. This can be done either by checking the V5C (Registration Certificate) of the vehicle, which may refer to IVA under the "Special Note" section; or by writing to VOSA, Ellipse, Padley Road, Swansea, SA1 8AN, including details of the vehicle's make and model, registration number and VIN number.

43. Stretched limousines which clearly have more than 8 passenger seats should not of course be licensed as PHVs because they are outside the licensing regime for PHVs. However, under some circumstances the SVA regime accepted vehicles with space for more than 8 passengers, particularly where the precise number of passenger seats was hard to determine. In these circumstances, if the vehicle had obtained an SVA certificate, the authority should consider the case on its merits in deciding whether to license the vehicle under the strict condition that the vehicle will not be used to carry more than 8 passengers, bearing in mind that refusal may encourage illegal private hire operation.



44. Many councils are concerned that the size of limousines prevents them being tested in conventional MoT garages. If there is not a suitable MoT testing station in the area then it would be possible to test the vehicle at the local VOSA test stations. The local enforcement office may be able to advise (contact details on <http://www.vosa.gov.uk>).

## QUANTITY RESTRICTIONS OF TAXI LICENCES OUTSIDE LONDON

45. The present legal provision on quantity restrictions for taxis outside London is set out in section 16 of the Transport Act 1985. This provides that the grant of a taxi licence may be refused, for the purpose of limiting the number of licensed taxis 'if, but only if, the [local licensing authority] is satisfied that there is no significant demand for the services of hackney carriages (within the area to which the licence would apply) which is unmet'.

46. Local licensing authorities will be aware that, in the event of a challenge to a decision to refuse a licence, the local authority concerned would have to establish that it had, reasonably, been satisfied that there was no significant unmet demand.

47. Most local 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. The Department further urges that the issue to be addressed first in each reconsideration is whether the restrictions should continue at all. It is suggested that the matter should be approached in terms of the interests of the travelling public - that is to say, the people who use taxi services. What benefits or disadvantages arise for them as a result of the continuation of controls; and what benefits or disadvantages would result for the public if the controls were removed? Is there evidence that removal of the controls would result in a deterioration in the amount or quality of taxi service provision?

48. In most cases where quantity restrictions are imposed, vehicle licence plates command a premium, often of tens of thousands of pounds. This indicates that there are people who want to enter the taxi market and provide a service to the public, but who are being prevented from doing so by the quantity restrictions. This seems very hard to justify.

49. If a local authority does nonetheless take the view that a quantity restriction can be justified in principle, there remains the question of the level at which it should be set, bearing in mind the need to demonstrate that there is no significant unmet demand. This issue is usually addressed by means of a survey; it will be necessary for the local licensing authority to carry out a survey sufficiently frequently to be able to respond to any challenge to the satisfaction of a court. An interval of three years is commonly regarded as the maximum reasonable period between surveys.

50. As to the conduct of the survey, the Department's letter of 16 June 2004 set out a range of considerations. But key points are:

- **the length of time that would-be customers have to wait at ranks.** However, this alone is an inadequate indicator of demand; also taken into account should be...

- **waiting times for street hailings and for telephone bookings.** But waiting times at ranks or elsewhere do not in themselves satisfactorily resolve the question of unmet demand. It is also desirable to address...
- **latent demand,** for example people who have responded to long waiting times by not even trying to travel by taxi. This can be assessed by surveys of people who do not use taxis, perhaps using stated preference survey techniques.
- **peaked demand.** It is sometimes argued that delays associated only with peaks in demand (such as morning and evening rush hours, or pub closing times) are not 'significant' for the purpose of the Transport Act 1985. The Department does not share that view. Since the peaks in demand are by definition the most popular times for consumers to use taxis, it can be strongly argued that unmet demand at these times should not be ignored. Local authorities might wish to consider when the peaks occur and who is being disadvantaged through restrictions on provision of taxi services.
- **consultation.** As well as statistical surveys, assessment of quantity restrictions should include consultation with all those concerned, including user groups (which should include groups representing people with disabilities, and people such as students or women), the police, hoteliers, operators of pubs and clubs and visitor attractions, and providers of other transport modes (such as train operators, who want taxis available to take passengers to and from stations);
- **publication.** All the evidence gathered in a survey should be published, together with an explanation of what conclusions have been drawn from it and why. If quantity restrictions are to be continued, their benefits to consumers and the reason for the particular level at which the number is set should be set out.
- **financing of surveys.** It is not good practice for surveys to be paid for by the local taxi trade (except through general revenues from licence fees). To do so can call in question the impartiality and objectivity of the survey process.

51. Quite apart from the requirement of the 1985 Act, the Department's letter of 16 June 2004 asked all local licensing authorities that operate quantity restrictions to review their policy and justify it publicly by 31 March 2005 and at least every three years thereafter. The Department also expects the justification for any policy of quantity restrictions to be included in the Local Transport Plan process. A recommended list of questions for local authorities to address when considering quantity controls was attached to the Department's letter. (The questions are listed in Annex A to this Guidance.)

## TAXI FARES

52. Local licensing authorities have the power to set taxi fares for journeys within their area, and most do so. (There is no power to set PHV fares.) Fare scales should be designed with a view to practicality. The Department sees it as good practice to review the fare scales at regular intervals, including any graduation of the fare scale by time of day or day of the week. Authorities may wish to consider adopting a simple formula for

deciding on fare revisions as this will increase understanding and improve the transparency of the process. The Department also suggests that in reviewing fares authorities should pay particular regard to the needs of the travelling public, with reference both to what it is reasonable to expect people to pay but also to the need to give taxi drivers sufficient incentive to provide a service when it is needed. There may well be a case for higher fares at times of higher demand.

53. Taxi fares are a maximum, and in principle are open to downward negotiation between passenger and driver. It is not good practice to encourage such negotiations at ranks, or for on-street hailings; there would be risks of confusion and security problems. But local licensing authorities can usefully make it clear that published fares are a maximum, especially in the context of telephone bookings, where the customer benefits from competition. There is more likely to be a choice of taxi operators for telephone bookings, and there is scope for differentiation of services to the customer's advantage (for example, lower fares off-peak or for pensioners).

54. There is a case for allowing any taxi operators who wish to do so to make it clear – perhaps by advertising on the vehicle – that they charge less than the maximum fare; publicity such as ‘5% below the metered fare’ might be an example.

## **DRIVERS**

### **Duration Of Licences**

55. It is obviously important for safety reasons that drivers should be licensed. But it is not necessarily good practice to require licences to be renewed annually. That can impose an undue burden on drivers and licensing authorities alike. Three years is the legal maximum period and is in general the best approach. One argument against 3-year licences has been that a criminal offence may be committed, and not notified, during the duration of the licence. But this can of course also be the case during the duration of a shorter licence. In relation to this, authorities will wish to note that the Home Office in April 2006 issued revised guidance for police forces on the Notifiable Occupations Scheme. Paragraphs 62-65 below provide further information about this scheme.

56. However, an annual licence may be preferred by some drivers. That may be because they have plans to move to a different job or a different area, or because they cannot easily pay the fee for a three-year licence, if it is larger than the fee for an annual one. So it can be good practice to offer drivers the choice of an annual licence or a three-year licence.

### **Acceptance of driving licences from other EU member states**

57. Sections 51 and 59 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 as enacted stated that an applicant for a taxi or private hire vehicle (PHV) driver's licence must have held a full ordinary GB driving licence for at least 12 months in order to be granted a taxi or PHV driver's licence. This requirement has subsequently been amended since the 1976 Act was passed. The Driving Licences (Community Driving Licence) Regulations 1996 (SI 1996 No 1974) amended sections 51 and 59 of the 1976 Act to allow full driving licences issued by EEA states to count towards the qualification

requirements for the grant of taxi and PHV driver's licences. Since that time, a number of central and eastern European states have joined the EU and the EEA and the Department takes the view that drivers from the Accession States are eligible to acquire a taxi or PHV driver's licence under the 1976 Act if they have held an ordinary driving licence for 12 months which was issued by an acceding State (see section 99A(i) of the Road Traffic Act 1988). To complete the picture, the Deregulation (Taxis and Private Hire Vehicles) Order 1998 (SI 1998 No 1946) gave equal recognition to Northern Ireland driving licences for the purposes of taxi and PHV driver licensing under the 1976 Act (see section 109(i) of the Road Traffic Act 1988, as amended).

## **Criminal Record Checks**

58. A criminal record check is an important safety measure particularly for those working closely with children and the vulnerable. Taxi and PHV drivers can be subject to a Standard Disclosure (and for those working in "Regulated Activity" to an Enhanced Disclosure) through the Criminal Records Bureau. Both levels of Disclosure include details of spent and unspent convictions, cautions reprimands and final warnings. An Enhanced Disclosure may also include any other information held in police records that is considered relevant by the police, for example, details of minor offences, non-conviction information on the Police National Computer such as Fixed Penalty Notices and, in some cases, allegations. An Enhanced Disclosure is for those working in Regulated Activity<sup>1</sup> and the Government has produced guidance in relation to this and the new "Vetting and Barring Scheme" which is available at [www.isa.gov.org.uk/default.aspx?page=402](http://www.isa.gov.org.uk/default.aspx?page=402). [*The Department will issue further advice as the new SVG scheme develops.*]

59. In considering an individual's criminal record, local licensing authorities will want to consider each case on its merits, but they should take a particularly cautious view of any offences involving violence, and especially sexual attack. In order to achieve consistency, and thus avoid the risk of successful legal challenge, local authorities will doubtless want to have a clear policy for the consideration of criminal records, for example the number of years they will require to have elapsed since the commission of particular kinds of offences before they will grant a licence.

60. Local licensing authorities will also want to have a policy on background checks for applicants from elsewhere in the EU and other overseas countries. One approach is to require a certificate of good conduct authenticated by the relevant embassy. The Criminal Records Bureau website ([www.crb.gov.uk](http://www.crb.gov.uk)) gives information about obtaining certificates of good conduct, or similar documents, from a number of countries.

61. It would seem best practice for Criminal Records Bureau disclosures to be sought when a licence is first applied for and then every three years, even if a licence is renewed annually, provided drivers are obliged to report all new convictions and cautions to the licensing authority.

---

<sup>1</sup> "Regulated Activity" is defined in The Safeguarding Vulnerable Groups Act 2006 (Miscellaneous Provisions) Regulations 2009

## **Notifiable Occupations Scheme**

62. Under this Scheme, when an individual comes to the notice of the police and identifies their occupation as a taxi or PHV driver, the police are requested to notify the appropriate local licensing authority of convictions and any other relevant information that indicates that a person poses a risk to public safety. Most notifications will be made once an individual is convicted however, if there is a sufficient risk, the police will notify the authority immediately.

63. In the absence of a national licensing body for taxi and PHV drivers, notifications are made to the local licensing authority identified on the licence or following interview. However, it is expected that all licensing authorities work together should they ascertain that an individual is operating under a different authority or with a fraudulent licence.

64. The police may occasionally notify licensing authorities of offences committed abroad by an individual however it may not be possible to provide full information.

65. The Notifiable Occupations Scheme is described in Home Office Circular 6/2006 which is available at <http://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/CommitteeDocs/Committees/Licensing/20070710/3%20yr%20licences-update%20on%20hants%20constab%20procedures%20re%20Home%20office%20circ%206;2006-%20Appendix%202.pdf>. Further information can also be obtained from the Criminal Records Team, Joint Public Protection Information Unit, Fifth Floor, Fry Building, 2 Marsham Street, London SW1P 4DF; e-mail Samuel.Wray@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk.

## **Immigration checks**

66. The Department considers it appropriate for licensing authorities to check on an applicant's right to work before granting a taxi or PHV driver's licence. It is important to note that a Criminal Records Bureau check is not a Right to Work check and any enquires about the immigration status of an individual should be addressed to the Border and Immigration Agency. Further information can be found at [www.bia.homeoffice.gov.uk/employingmigrants](http://www.bia.homeoffice.gov.uk/employingmigrants). More generally, the Border and Immigration Agency's Employers' Helpline (0845 010 6677) can be used by licensing staff to obtain general guidance on immigration documentation, although this Helpline is not able to advise on individual cases. The authority can obtain case specific immigration status information, including whether a licensing applicant is permitted to work or details of work restrictions, from the Evidence and Enquiry Unit, Floor 12, Lunar House, Wellesley Road, Croydon CR9 2BY . Further details on the procedures involved can be obtained by contacting the Unit (020 8196 3011).

## **Medical fitness**

67. It is clearly good practice for medical checks to be made on each driver before the initial grant of a licence and thereafter for each renewal. There is general recognition that it is appropriate for taxi/PHV drivers to have more stringent medical standards than those applicable to normal car drivers because:

- they carry members of the general public who have expectations of a safe journey;
- they are on the road for longer hours than most car drivers; and
- they may have to assist disabled passengers and handle luggage.

68. It is common for licensing authorities to apply the “Group 2” medical standards – applied by DVLA to the licensing of lorry and bus drivers – to taxi and PHV drivers. This seems best practice. The Group 2 standards preclude the licensing of drivers with insulin treated diabetes. However, exceptional arrangements do exist for drivers with insulin treated diabetes, who can meet a series of medical criteria, to obtain a licence to drive category C1 vehicles (ie 3500-7500 kgs lorries); the position is summarised at Annex C to the Guidance. It is suggested that the best practice is to apply the C1 standards to taxi and PHV drivers with insulin treated diabetes.

### **Age Limits**

69. It does not seem necessary to set a maximum age limit for drivers provided that regular medical checks are made. Nor do minimum age limits, beyond the statutory periods for holding a full driver licence, seem appropriate. Applicants should be assessed on their merits.

### **Driving Proficiency**

70. Many local authorities rely on the standard car driving licence as evidence of driving proficiency. Others require some further driving test to be taken. Local authorities will want to consider carefully whether this produces benefits which are commensurate with the costs involved for would-be drivers, the costs being in terms of both money and broader obstacles to entry to the trade. However, they will note that the Driving Standards Agency provides a driving assessment specifically designed for taxis.

### **Language proficiency**

71. Authorities may also wish to consider whether an applicant would have any problems in communicating with customers because of language difficulties.

### **Other training**

72. Whilst the Department has no plans to make training courses or qualifications mandatory, there may well be advantage in encouraging drivers to obtain one of the nationally-recognised vocational qualifications for the taxi and PHV trades. These will cover customer care, including how best to meet the needs of people with disabilities. More information about these qualifications can be obtained from *GoSkills*, the Sector Skills Council for Passenger Transport. *GoSkills* is working on a project funded by the Department to raise standards in the industry and *GoSkills* whilst not a direct training provider, can guide and support licensing authorities through its regional network of Regional Managers.

73. Some licensing authorities have already established training initiatives and others are being developed; it is seen as important to do this in consultation with the local taxi and PHV trades. Training can cover customer care, including how best to meet the needs of people with disabilities and other sections of the community, and also topics such as the relevant legislation, road safety, the use of maps and GPS, the handling of emergencies, and how to defuse difficult situations and manage conflict. Training may also be considered for applicants to enable them to reach an appropriate standard of comprehension, literacy and numeracy. Authorities may wish to note that nationally recognised qualifications and training programmes sometimes have advantages over purely local arrangements (for example, in that the qualification will be more widely recognised).

Contact details are:

*GoSkills*, Concorde House, Trinity Park, Solihull, Birmingham, B37 7UQ.

Tel: 0121-635-5520

Fax: 0121-635-5521

Website: [www.goskills.org](http://www.goskills.org)

e-mail: [info@goskills.org](mailto:info@goskills.org)

74. It is also relevant to consider driver training in the context of the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games which will take place at a number of venues across the country. One of the key aims of the Games is to “change the experience disabled people have when using public transport during the Games and to leave a legacy of more accessible transport”. The Games provide a unique opportunity for taxi/PHV drivers to demonstrate their disability awareness training, and to ensure all passengers experience the highest quality of service.

### **Topographical Knowledge**

75. Taxi drivers need a good working knowledge of the area for which they are licensed, because taxis can be hired immediately, directly with the driver, at ranks or on the street. So most licensing authorities require would-be taxi-drivers to pass a test of local topographical knowledge as a pre-requisite to the first grant of a licence (though the stringency of the test should reflect the complexity or otherwise of the local geography, in accordance with the principle of ensuring that barriers to entry are not unnecessarily high).

76. However, PHVs are not legally available for immediate hiring in the same way as taxis. To hire a PHV the would-be passenger has to go through an operator, so the driver will have an opportunity to check the details of a route before starting a journey. So it may be unnecessarily burdensome to require a would-be PHV driver to pass the same ‘knowledge’ test as a taxi driver, though it may be thought appropriate to test candidates’ ability to read a map and their knowledge of key places such as main roads and railway stations. The Department is aware of circumstances where, as a result of the repeal of the PHV contract exemption, some people who drive children on school contracts are being deterred from continuing to do so on account of overly burdensome topographical

tests. Local authorities should bear this in mind when assessing applicants' suitability for PHV licences.

## **PHV OPERATORS**

77. The objective in licensing PHV operators is, again, the safety of the public, who will be using operators' premises and vehicles and drivers arranged through them.

### **Criminal Record Checks**

78. PHV operators (as opposed to PHV drivers) are not exceptions to the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974, so Standard or Enhanced disclosures cannot be required as a condition of grant of an operator's licence. But a Basic Disclosure, which will provide details of unspent convictions only, could be seen as appropriate, after such a system has been introduced by the Criminal Records Bureau. No firm date for introduction has yet been set; however, a feasibility study has been completed; the Criminal Records Bureau is undertaking further work in this regard. Overseas applicants may be required to provide a certificate of good conduct from the relevant embassy if they have not been long in this country. Local licensing authorities may want to require a reference, covering for example the applicant's financial record, as well as the checks outlined above.

### **Record Keeping**

79. It is good practice to require operators to keep records of each booking, including the name of the passenger, the destination, the name of the driver, the number of the vehicle and any fare quoted at the time of booking. This information will enable the passenger to be traced if this becomes necessary and should improve driver security and facilitate enforcement. It is suggested that 6 months is generally appropriate as the length of time that records should be kept.

### **Insurance**

80. It is appropriate for a licensing authority to check that appropriate public liability insurance has been taken out for premises that are open to the public.

### **Licence Duration**

81. A requirement for annual licence renewal does not seem necessary or appropriate for PHV operators, whose involvement with the public is less direct than a driver (who will be alone with passengers). Indeed, a licence period of five years may well be appropriate in the average case. Although the authority may wish to offer operators the option of a licence for a shorter period if requested.



## **Repeal of the PHV contract exemption**

82. Section 53 of the Road Safety Act 2006 repealed the exemption from PHV licensing for vehicles which were used on contracts lasting not less than seven days. The change came into effect in January 2008. A similar change was introduced in respect of London in March 2008. As a result of this change, local licensing authorities are considering a range of vehicles and services in the context of PHV licensing which they had not previously licensed because of the contract exemption.

83. The Department produced a guidance note in November 2007 to assist local licensing authorities, and other stakeholders, in deciding which vehicles should be licensed in the PHV regime and which vehicles fell outside the PHV definition. The note stressed that it was a matter for local licensing authorities to make decisions in the first instance and that, ultimately, the courts were responsible for interpreting the law. However, the guidance was published as a way of assisting people who needed to consider these issues. A copy of the guidance note can be found on the Department's web-site at: <http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/regional/taxis/rsa06privatehirevehicles> As a result of a recent report on the impact of the repeal of the PHV contract exemption, the Department will be revising its guidance note to offer a more definite view about which vehicles should be licensed as PHVs. The report is also on the Department's web-site at: <http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/regional/taxis/phvcontractexemption/>.

## **ENFORCEMENT**

84. Well-directed enforcement activity by the local licensing authority benefits not only the public but also the responsible people in the taxi and PHV trades. Indeed, it could be argued that the safety of the public depends upon licensing authorities having an effective enforcement mechanism in place. This includes actively seeking out those operators who are evading the licensing system, not just licensing those who come forward seeking the appropriate licences. The resources devoted by licensing authorities to enforcement will vary according to local circumstances, including for example any difficulties with touting by unlicensed drivers and vehicles (a problem in some urban areas). Local authorities will also wish to liaise closely with the police. Multi-agency enforcement exercises (involving, for example, the Benefits Agency) have proved beneficial in some areas.

85. Local licensing authorities often use enforcement staff to check a range of licensed activities (such as market traders) as well as the taxi and PHV trades, to make the best use of staff time. But it is desirable to ensure that taxi and PHV enforcement effort is at least partly directed to the late-night period, when problems such as touting tend most often to arise. In formulating policies to deal with taxi touts, local licensing authorities might wish to be aware that the Sentencing Guidelines Council have, for the first time, included guidance about taxi touting in their latest Guidelines for Magistrates. The Guidelines, which came into effect in August 2008, can be accessed through the SGC's web-site - [www.sentencing-guidelines.gov.uk](http://www.sentencing-guidelines.gov.uk).

86. Some local licensing authorities employ taxi marshals in busy city centres where there are lots of hirings, again perhaps late at night, to help taxi drivers picking up, and would-be passengers queuing for taxis.

87. As part of enforcement, local licensing authorities will often make spot checks, which can lead to their suspending or revoking licences. They will wish to consider carefully which power should best be used for this purpose. They will note, among other things, that section 60 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 provides a right of appeal for the licence-holder, whereas section 68, which is also sometimes used, does not; this can complicate any challenge by the licence-holder.

88. Section 52 of the Road Safety Act 2006 amended the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 such that local authorities can now suspend or revoke a taxi or PHV driver's licence with immediate effect on safety grounds. It should be stressed that this power can only be used where safety is the principal reason for suspending or revoking and where the risk justifies such an approach. It is expected that in the majority of cases drivers will continue to work pending appeal and that this power will be used in one-off cases. But the key point is that the law says that the power must be used in cases which can be justified in terms of safety. The Department is not proposing to issue any specific guidance on this issue, preferring to leave it to the discretion of licensing authorities as to when the power should be used.

## **TAXI ZONES**

89. The areas of some local licensing authorities are divided into two or more zones for taxi licensing purposes. Drivers may be licensed to ply for hire in one zone only. Zones may exist for historical reasons, perhaps because of local authority boundary changes.

90. The Department recommends the abolition of zones. That is chiefly for the benefit of the travelling public. Zoning tends to diminish the supply of taxis and the scope for customer choice - for example, if fifty taxis were licensed overall by a local authority, but with only twenty five of them entitled to ply for hire in each of two zones. It can be confusing and frustrating for people wishing to hire a taxi to find that a vehicle licensed by the relevant local authority is nonetheless unable to pick them up (unless pre-booked) because they are in the wrong part of the local authority area. Abolition of zones can also reduce costs for the local authority, for example through simpler administration and enforcement. It can also promote fuel efficiency, because taxis can pick up a passenger anywhere in the local authority area, rather than having to return empty to their licensed zone after dropping a passenger in another zone.

91. It should be noted that the Government has now made a Legislative Reform Order which removed the need for the Secretary of State to approve amalgamation resolutions made by local licensing authorities. The Legislative Reform (Local Authority Consent Requirements)(England and Wales) Order 2008 came into force in October 2008. Although these resolutions no longer require the approval of the Secretary of State, the statutory procedure for making them – in paragraph 25 of schedule 14 to the Local Government Act 1972- remains the same.

## **FLEXIBLE TRANSPORT SERVICES**

92. It is possible for taxis and PHVs to provide flexible transport services in a number of different ways. Such services can play a valuable role in meeting a range of transport

needs, especially in rural areas – though potentially in many other places as well. In recent years there has been a significant increase in the provision of flexible services, due partly to the availability of Rural Bus Subsidy Grant and Rural Bus Challenge Support from the Department.

93. The Department encourages local licensing authorities, as a matter of best practice, to play their part in promoting flexible services, so as to increase the availability of transport to the travelling public. This can be done partly by drawing the possibilities to the attention of taxi and PHV trade. It also should be borne in mind that vehicles with a higher seating capacity than the vehicles typically licensed as taxis (for example those with 6, 7 or 8 passenger seats) may be used for flexible services and should be considered for licensing in this context.

94. The main legal provisions under which flexible services can be operated are:

- **Shared taxis and PHVs – advance bookings (section 11, Transport Act 1985)**: licensed taxis and PHVs can provide a service at separate fares for up to eight passengers sharing the vehicle. The operator takes the initiative to match up passengers who book in advance and agree to share the vehicle at separate fares (lower than for a single hiring). An example could be passengers being picked up at home to go to a shopping centre, or returning from the shops to their homes. The operator benefits through increased passenger loadings and total revenues.
- **Shared taxis – immediate hirings (section 10, Transport Act 1985)**: such a scheme is at the initiative of the local licensing authority, which can set up schemes whereby licensed taxis (not PHVs) can be hired at separate fares by up to eight people from ranks or other places that have been designated by the authority. (The authority is required to set up such a scheme if holders of 10% or more of the taxi licences in the area ask for one.) The passengers pay only part of the metered fare, for example in going home after a trip to the local town, and without pre-booking, but the driver receives more than the metered fare.
- **Taxibuses (section 12, Transport Act 1985)**: owners of licensed taxis can apply to the Traffic Commissioner for a ‘restricted public service vehicle (PSV) operator licence’. The taxi owner can then use the vehicle to run a bus service for up to eight passengers. The route must be registered with the Traffic Commissioner and must have at least one stopping place in the area of the local authority that licensed the taxi, though it can go beyond it. The bus service will be eligible for Bus Service Operators Grant (subject to certain conditions) and taxibuses can be used for local authority subsidised bus services. The travelling public have another transport opportunity opened for them, and taxi owners have another business opportunity. The Local Transport Act 2008 contains a provision which allows the owners of PHVs to acquire a special PSV operator licence and register a route with the traffic commissioner. A dedicated leaflet has been sent to licensing authorities to distribute to PHV owners in their area alerting them to this new provision.

95. The Department is very keen to encourage the use of these types of services. More details can be found in the Department’s publication ‘Flexible Transport Services’ which can be accessed at:

<http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/regional/buses/bol/flexibletransportservices>

## LOCAL TRANSPORT PLANS

96. The Transport Act 2000 as amended by the Transport Act 2008, requires local transport authorities in England outside London to produce and maintain a Local Transport Plan (LTP), having regard to any guidance issued by the Secretary of State. The latest guidance published in July 2009 will cover the next round of LTPs from 2011. LTPs set out the authority's local transport strategies and policies for transport in their area, and an implementation programme. 82 LTPs covering all of England outside London have been produced and cover the period up to 2011. From 2011 local authorities will have greater freedom to prepare their LTPs to align with wider local objectives.

97. All modes of transport including taxi and PHV services have a valuable part to play in overall transport provision, and so local licensing authorities have an input to delivering the LTPs. The key policy themes for such services could be availability and accessibility. LTPs can cover:

- quantity controls, if any, and plans for their review;
- licensing conditions, with a view to safety but also to good supply of taxi and PHV services;
- fares;
- on-street availability, especially through provision of taxi ranks;
- vehicle accessibility for people with disabilities;
- encouragement of flexible services.

## TAXI AND PRIVATE HIRE VEHICLE LICENSING: BEST PRACTICE GUIDANCE

### Useful questions when assessing quantity controls of taxi licences

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

#### Questions relating to the policy of controlling numbers

- Have you recently reviewed the need for your policy of quantity controls?
- What form did the review of your policy of quantity controls take?
- Who was involved in the review?
- What decision was reached about retaining or removing quantity controls?
- Are you satisfied that your policy justifies restricting entry to the trade?
- Are you satisfied that quantity controls do not:
  - reduce the availability of taxis;
  - increase waiting times for consumers;
  - reduce choice and safety for consumers?
- What special circumstances justify retention of quantity controls?
- How does your policy benefit consumers, particularly in remote rural areas?
- How does your policy benefit the trade?
- If you have a local accessibility policy, how does this fit with restricting taxi licences?

#### Questions relating to setting the number of taxi licences

- When last did you assess unmet demand?
- How is your taxi limit assessed?
- Have you considered latent demand, ie potential consumers who would use taxis if more were available, but currently do not?
- Are you satisfied that your limit is set at the correct level?
- How does the need for adequate taxi ranks affect your policy of quantity controls?

#### Questions relating to consultation and other public transport service provision

- When consulting, have you included etc
  - 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?
- Do you receive representations about taxi availability?
- What is the level of service currently available to consumers (including other public transport modes)?

## TAXI AND PRIVATE HIRE VEHICLE LICENSING: BEST PRACTICE GUIDANCE

***Notice for taxi passengers - what you can expect from the taxi trade and what the taxi trade can expect from you***

### **The driver will:**

- ***Drive with due care and courtesy towards the passenger and other road users.***
- ***Use the meter within the licensed area, unless the passenger has agreed to hire by time.***
- ***If using the meter, not start the meter until the passenger is seated in the vehicle.***
- ***If travelling outside the licensed area, agree the fare in advance. If no fare has been negotiated in advance for a journey going beyond the licensing area then the driver must adhere to the meter.***
- ***Take the most time-efficient route, bearing in mind likely traffic problems and known diversions, and explain any diversion from the most direct route.***

### **The passenger will:**

- ***Treat the vehicle and driver with respect and obey any notices (e.g. in relation to eating in the vehicle).***
- ***Ensure they have enough money to pay the fare before travelling. If wishing to pay by credit card or to stop on route to use a cash machine, check with the driver before setting off.***
- ***Be aware of the fare on the meter and make the driver aware if it is approaching the limit of their financial resources.***
- ***Be aware that the driver is likely to be restricted by traffic regulations in relation to where s/he can stop the vehicle.***

**Notice for PHV passengers - what you can expect from the PHV trade and what the PHV trade can expect from you**

**The driver will:**

- **Ensure that the passenger has pre-booked and agrees the fare before setting off.**
- **Drive with due care and courtesy towards the passenger and other road users.**
- **Take the most time-efficient route, bearing in mind likely traffic problems and known diversions, and explain any diversion from the most direct route.**

**The passenger will:**

- **Treat the vehicle and driver with respect and obey any notices (eg. in relation to eating in the vehicle).**
- **Ensure they have enough money to pay the fare before travelling. If wishing to pay by credit card or to stop on route to use a cash machine, check with the driver before setting off.**
- **Be aware that the driver is likely to be restricted by traffic regulations in relation to where s/he can stop the vehicle.**

## TAXI AND PRIVATE HIRE VEHICLE LICENSING: BEST PRACTICE GUIDANCE

### Assessing applicants for a taxi or PHV driver licence in accordance with C1 standard

Exceptional circumstances under which DVLA will consider granting licences for vehicles over 3.5 tonnes or with more than 8 passenger seats.

Insulin treated diabetes is a legal bar to driving these vehicles. The exceptional arrangements that were introduced in September 1998 were only in respect of drivers who were employed to drive small lorries between 3.5 tonnes and 7.5 tonnes (category C1). The arrangements mean that those with good diabetic control and who have no significant complications can be treated as "exceptional cases" and may have their application for a licence for category C1 considered. The criteria are

- To have been taking insulin for at least 4 weeks;
- Not to have suffered an episode of hypoglycaemia requiring the assistance of another person whilst driving in the last 12 months;
- To attend an examination by a hospital consultant specialising in the treatment of diabetes at intervals of not more than 12 months and to provide a report from such a consultant in support of the application which confirms a history of responsible diabetic control with a minimal risk of incapacity due to hypoglycaemia;
- To provide evidence of at least twice daily blood glucose monitoring at times when C1 vehicles are being driven (those that have not held C1 entitlement in the preceding 12 months may provide evidence of blood glucose monitoring while driving other vehicles);
- To have no other condition which would render the driver a danger when driving C1 vehicles; and
- To sign an undertaking to comply with the directions of the doctor(s) treating the diabetes and to report immediately to DVLA any significant change in condition.