

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Licensing Applications Committee - 12 February 2026.

List of representations received after the publication of the agenda:

Representation:	PAGE NO.
Email from Shahid Rafique, Reading Private Hire Association (RPHA), dated 05 February 2026.	5
Email from Nabeel Iftikhar, dated 05 February 2026.	6
Email and attachments from Jasvir Singh, Reading Private Hire Association (RPHA), dated 08 February 2026.	7 - 16
Email from Zulfoqar Hussain, dated 08 February 2026.	17
Email from Crown Wheelchair Travel, dated 10 February 2026.	18
Email and attachment from Queen Bee Cars and Berkshire Mobility Transport, dated 11 February 2026.	19 - 24

This page is intentionally left blank

From: [Reading Private Hire Association](#)
To: [Butler, Nicola](#)
Subject: Re: Hackney Carriage & Private Hire Licensing Policy report - committee meeting 12/02/2026
Date: 05 February 2026 08:06:34
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Warning!
For the attention of
RBC Staff and Councillors

This mail is from an external sender - please do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust this sender, and know the content is safe

Request for Additional Speaking Time – Licensing Applications Committee

Dear Nicola,

Thank you very much for informing us about the Licensing Applications Committee meeting scheduled for 12 February 2026 and for sharing the agenda details.

We appreciate the opportunity for the Reading Private Hire Association to speak at this meeting. However, I would like to respectfully raise a concern regarding the allocated five-minute speaking time.

Given that the Council is proposing new rules and regulations that will have a significant impact on our members and the wider private hire trade, we feel that five minutes is unfortunately not sufficient for us to properly explain our major concerns and key points to the Committee. These matters are complex and affect many drivers and operators, and it is important that they are clearly and fully understood by Council Members.

While we will do our best to be concise, reducing our representation further is not feasible, and the current time allocation does not allow us to adequately present the issues faced by our association.

We therefore kindly request that you consider allowing us some additional speaking time so that we can clearly and responsibly explain our position to the Committee.

Thank you for your understanding and consideration. We look forward to your response.

Kind regards,

Shahid Rafique
Chairman
Reading Private Hire Association

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Butler, Nicola](#)
Subject: RE: Hackney Carriage & Private Hire Licensing Policy report - committee meeting 12/02/2026
Date: 05 February 2026 12:21:28
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)

Warning!
For the attention of
RBC Staff and Councillors

This mail is from an external sender - please do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust this sender, and know the content is safe

Dear Nicola,

Thank you for informing us about the Licensing Applications Committee meeting scheduled for 12 February 2026 and for sharing the agenda and speaking arrangements.

We appreciate the opportunity for private hire and school transport operators to address the Committee. However, I would like to formally raise a concern regarding the allocation of just five minutes for our sector to speak.

The proposals being considered represent significant changes to licensing conditions and operating requirements. These changes will have a direct and serious impact on drivers, operators, passengers, and the wider transport network in Reading. Many of these issues are complex, involve legal, financial, and safeguarding considerations, and affect livelihoods across the trade. In our view, five minutes is not sufficient to properly explain these matters or ensure that Committee Members have a clear and full understanding of the real-world implications.

While we fully appreciate the need to manage time during the meeting, the scale and importance of these proposals warrant more meaningful engagement. We are keen to present our concerns constructively, responsibly, and in a way that supports good decision-making, but doing so within such a limited timeframe will be extremely challenging.

We will of course make every effort to be concise and focused, but we respectfully request that the Committee consider allowing additional speaking time for private hire and school transport operators, given the breadth and significance of the issues being discussed.

Thank you for your time and consideration. We look forward to your response and to engaging positively with the Committee.

Kind regards,
Kind Regards



Nabeel Iftikhar – CUSTOMER RELATIONS MANAGER

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

62 Portman Road, Room 36 Reading RG30 1EA

[REDACTED]



CAPITAL CARS

Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: RBC committee presentation 12
Date: 08 February 2026 18:44:54
Attachments: [image004.png](#)
[Email.pdf](#)
[RBC committee presentaiton 12 Feb 2026.pdf](#)

Warning!
For the attention of
RBC Staff and Councillors

This mail is from an external sender - please do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust this sender, and know the content is safe

Hi Clyde

As requested outline of the 5 min talk for the committee on Thursday, please can you email this for the committee member for me.

Thank you

Jasvir Singh



Tel: + [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]
Web: [REDACTED]

Have you tried the [500 Cars](#) online booking system

Follow us on



We are committed to protecting
our environment.



this is why, we have invested in a
new fleet of hybrid cars.

The information contained in this message may be CONFIDENTIAL and is intended for the addressee only. Any unauthorised use, dissemination of the information or copying of this message is prohibited. If you are not the addressee, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and delete this message.
Thank you

Please think of the environment - do you really need to print this email?

Today, I'm here to tell you why this new policy— is one of the most disconnected from reality I've ever seen.

For over 20 Year I have been trying to communicate with Licencing
15 years ago, Reading Borough council sent out a new proposed condition,
I sent a letter to the council then (copy of letter attached)

*you say consultation but quite clearly make the point of “a Copy of the proposed conditions” and a summary of your views will be included, but you have advised **we can appeal!***

Surely a consultation would be Operators and licensing team working together on the condition and agreeing / disagreeing and the resulting proposed conditions with a summary of views from both sides included in the report to be submitted to committee?

Fast forward to 2026

Once again, I am standing here asking the Council to work with us, not around us.

This is not my first or last request —I have asked several times before to collaborate in shaping these policies, yet here we are in 2026, doing it all over again.

Let us make no mistake here, the duties placed upon you as the regulator, by the regulators code 2014 are very clear in the requirement for ACTIVE engagement! This is not optional; it is a statutory requirement.

When we asked for more meaningful time to review and respond, we were told: 'We need to get this through committee.'

Surely running the risk of such committee decisions being delayed by appeal is counter productive and will cause longer delays than active engagement and agreed final draft ever could?

When we raised practical concerns, we were met with rigid deadlines, not dialogue.

The council officers say, this policy has been in development for two years.

But if that work was done behind a desk, in secret, not developed in accordance with the regulators code at all—with no input from customers, drivers or operators, the industry who actually provide and use these services every day—that's not collaboration. That's policy by imposition.

To make matters worse, we were handed a 180-page document with no highlights, no tracked changes, no clear indication of what was added, removed, or modified. How can we provide informed feedback when we're given a finished product and told it's already decided? That is predetermination, which simply cannot and must not happen.

And to add insult to injury, we received an email from Rob Abell that said—and I quote—

'There are several deadlines I have to deal with in getting something through the various Council stages, so pausing a committee paper part way through is not viable and would only delay the inevitable.'

"The inevitable." That says it all. Our input was never intended to shape policy—only to tick a box.

It does not need to be viable, it must be legal, and as below, the inevitable may actually be that any decisions made by officers and imposed on you as the committee and us as the industry, may be cancelled quite soon anyway.

That email makes it painfully clear: this consultation was a show.

Our input was never truly welcomed. Our experience was never truly valued.

This wasn't "active engagement" in accordance with the regulators code 2014—it was a box-ticking exercise.

Once again, we've been excluded where decisions are made about our livelihoods, our businesses, our customers and the transport services our community relies on.

It's time for that to changed!

I also wonder why this is being done now and in such a rush when

1. The current government national standards consultation for hackney carriage and private hire is not due to close until the 1st April, at which point any changes made here tonight may well be cancelled as a result of central government intervention, resulting in statutory standards.
2. Currently, the devolution white paper is at its final stages, having had its first, second and third reading in parliament, its first and second reading in the house of lords, currently at the government committee stage, leaving only two stages left including royal ascent, as most of you will be aware this is a bill

which aims to reduce number of local authorities from around 286 right down to 70 unitary authorities at which point, Reading council will cease to exist as an individual licensing authority, this will render any decisions made tonight, potentially null and void.

3. The final hearing of the transport select committee took place in January, final written submissions have already been accepted, the transport select committee report is being prepared as we speak, where it is forecast to be submitted within 2 months, which takes us to mid-march/early April to coincide with the time frames from the other two above points.

In light of the above two points, we would recommend taking the logical and sensible approach here and defer these decisions until we have more updates on a national scale, and of course better compliance with the regulators code 2014, with active engagement.

As you can see it would appear that the government have lined all of the above to coincide early April, it would seem to be a waste of officer time and council time to re draft licensing policies which may only be in effect for a very short period, naturally our major concern is the cost incurred to our sector and our members.

let me give you just **2 examples** of how this policy is out of touch

On paper, requiring 10% of private hire fleets to be wheelchair accessible sounds noble. But in practice, it ignores real demand.

Most WAV trips in Reading are covered by dedicated school and social care transport — not general private hire.

The False Availability, A quota system confuses vehicle ownership with service availability. A single WAV in a fleet of ten cars offers no guarantee it will be free, nearby, or in service when a user needs it.

Forcing operators to buy and maintain expensive, underused accessible vehicles, will make our service less competitive and not help the people that need the vehicle, this should be about service not having the vehicle available

I've been providing executive travel since the '90s. Clients don't ask for a Bentley we are not carrying king and queens — they want a clean, reliable, professional car like an Audi A6 BMW 5 series or Mercedes E-Class.

This policy bans those very models from executive work. You're pushing corporate clients — and their revenue — out of Reading driver in to out of town cars. We're being regulated out of the market we helped build."

The policy states

- The vehicle shall not be designed or adapted for off-road purposes.

But then list

- VOLVO XC90
- AUDI Q8,
- ROLLS – ROYCE CULLINAN
- LAND ROVER – RANGE ROVER
- TOYOTA LAND CRUISER

That are all off road vehicles

And in truth, executive work is not about the make and model of the vehicle at all, it is ONLY about the way in which the vehicle is used, for clarity, prebooked executive work only. Not a specific vehicle type, simply not standard shopping trips, nights out, but only executive bookings.

“We raised these concerns in the consultation. We were told the policy was ‘evidence-based’.

But where’s the evidence that 10% WAVs are needed in general private hire?

In fact, where is the evidence, the unmet demand survey to show that 10% of the entire hackney and private hire fleet is ever used by wheelchair bound passengers who would require such a vehicle, where is the evidence that a high enough percentage of the entire community of Reading are confined to a wheelchair and cannot sit on a standard seat whether that be at home, in a restaurant, or in a taxi or PH?

Where’s the impact assessment on driver retention, operator viability, affordability, availability, genuine demand or passenger choice?

This feels like a policy written in an office, not on the streets.”

I’ve spent my career serving this town. I want it to be accessible, safe, and thriving. But this policy will make it harder — not easier — for disabled passengers, operators, drivers. and for the traveling public.

Let’s work together on rules that are practical, affordable, and based on real need — not just good intentions.”

Letter from 2010

Licensing Department
Reading Borough Council
Civic Centre
Reading
RG1 7TD

Dear Sir / Madam

22/07/2010

Ref your Letter dated 14 June 2010

First I would like to say I feel we are ageing being railroaded, you say consultation but quite clearly make the point of "a Copy of the proposed conditions" and a summary of your views will be included, but you have advised we can appeal!

Surely a consultation would be Operators and licensing team working together on the condition and agreeing / disagreeing and the resulting proposed conditions with a summary of views from both sides included in the report to be submitted to committee?

Once again I look at this and wonder how much thought has gone in to the proposed changes or is this just a kneejerk reaction to some recent event.

Just the sort of think I have stated in my email to you dated 17/06/10, for every action there will be a reaction, the same sort of thing happed a few years ago with driver/vehicle conditions and today we have to spend hundreds of thousands on re-signing the town, changing bus lane to try and keep driver/vehicles licensed by other authority out of the town and bus lanes.

Our first priority should be the customer safety and the customer, alienating operators is not the best way to achieve this priority, I agree the current condition need to be addressed and updated but don't agree this is the best way to do this.

Has anyone in the licensing team acutely tried speaking to any operators?

There are a number of particular concerns the Council wishes to address:

- 1. The use of unlicensed vehicles and drivers plying for hire in the borough;*
- 2. The levels of plying for hire, particularly from out of town licensed vehicles;*
- 3. The use of vehicles, both private hire and hackney carriages and their drivers licensed by other authorities and hence working remotely from their licensing authority.*

The first 2 no operator would anchorage or condone these practices and if it is an out of town licensed vehicles the current conditions cover this adequately how many prosecution have taken place? (Can you please provide some examples numbers and dates) but yes there is room for update.

ON 3

Public safety is and should be the first concern for everyone and as much as you and I want everyone to use Reading Company's the reality is with current technology and call cost people don't see what number they are dialling, customers just call and book, if you search on a mobile for taxi and press call you will no doubt be ringing Non-Geographical number if you search online using web browsers google/MSN ect it the same even yell.com will give you Non-Geographical number.

The same as your proposed condition 10, 70% of call/contact are regular who know exactly who they are calling 40% from customer are directed by third party advertising Non-Geographical company's I pay a commission too companies that put call through to the nearest company, with your proposal if I signalled a geographic area on my website or advertising

Sorely dose is matter if the customer rings from Reading or from Woodley the fact the customer from Woodley in not a Reading passenger dose he deserve a lesser unsafe service? The first and most important thing for all concerned should be the member of public where ever he calls from should know he is getting a good reliable and safe service licensed by a good local authority

Yours Faithfully

Jasvir Singh
Operator 500 Cars.

[REDACTED]

From: shahid rafique [REDACTED] >
Sent: 16 October 2025 08:11
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Fwd: Urgent Concerns Regarding the Ongoing conditions Process

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Abell, Rob" [REDACTED] >
Date: October 7, 2025 at 19:11:53 GMT+1
To: shahid rafique [REDACTED]
Cc: "Masson, Clyde" [REDACTED] >
Subject: RE: Urgent Concerns Regarding the Ongoing conditions Process

Dear Mr Rafique

We need to get this policy work completed and finished off so I am not at liberty to pause or stop it. It is a requirement we have been putting off for a while to pull all of our separate HC & PH licensing policies together into one place; it was something suggested in the statutory standards work the Council adopted some time ago, now. There are several deadlines I have to deal with in getting something through the various Council stages, so pausing a committee paper part way through is not viable, and would only delay the inevitable - we need to bring a draft policy forward for consultation and openly discussed as we are doing here at some point and this timing is as good as any.

Clyde and the wider Licensing Team have made extensive strides to try and engage with drivers and operators to get information out there before and at the start of the consultation process. Since it went live several emails have been sent, and several drop-in surgery sessions have been held, and this is still ongoing. Trade representatives (including yours) were told ahead of time when it was going to go live, and were told when it did. Word has clearly spread far and wide as we have had a lot of responses, attendees at our events and emails.

It has not been possible or desirable for us to prepare the comparison document you request. We could also be criticised of tailoring the information we direct you to in such a document by highlighting certain sections or changes over others. It is one whole policy, so you have to see the lot as a whole and comment during the consultation process on the aspects which are of relevance to you. I recognise your view that this could have been made easier for you in a summary version and apologise that this was not possible to deliver it in that way.

8 weeks is longer than the standard default consultation period of 6 weeks, we consciously ensured it was given extra time to allow sufficient opportunity for you to respond, and we also purposefully avoided the main summer holiday period.

It has been a fair and transparent process, but if you have specific accusations that you are capable of backing up then please put them in writing, with evidence, otherwise please cease your attempts at unwarranted defamation.

As the new Chairman of the Private Hire Association for the area I hope you can work on a more constructive, professional and productive working relationship going forwards.

Kind regards

Rob

Rob Abell
Consumer Protection Group Manager
Trading Standards | Licensing | Food & Safety

Public Protection
Directorate of Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services

Reading Borough
Council
Bridge
Street, Reading, RG1 2LU

T:

[REDACTED]

M:

[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: shahid rafique [REDACTED] >

Sent: 01 October 2025 22:21

To: [REDACTED] Abell, Rob <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Urgent Concerns Regarding the Ongoing conditions Process

Warning ! For the attention of RBC, BfC Staff and Councillors

This mail is from an external sender - please do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust this sender, and know the content is safe

Dear Cathrine Lewis Rob Abell

Good afternoon. I hope you are well.

I am writing to express serious concerns regarding the current process of changing the conditions Unfortunately, we are unable to proceed with the proposed changes as we have not been provided with a clear comparison between the current (old) rules and regulations and the proposed new ones.

We respectfully ask again:

Please share all proposed changes clearly and separately — section by section — so we can fully understand what is being amended. At the moment, the process is

creating a great deal of confusion among both operators and drivers, including private hire drivers and black cab drivers. Most people do not understand what exactly is being changed, which is very concerning.

It is unacceptable to change the conditions without properly informing and consulting all stakeholders. Everyone has the right to review and understand each proposed amendment before it is approved.

We have already requested this before, and we are now requesting it again, firmly: Please stop the current process of changing the conditions until all changes are fully documented, presented separately, and clearly explained. Only then can we review them properly.

This process has already taken over a year, and it is not reasonable to expect everyone to approve major changes in just 6–8 weeks. The lack of transparency and rushed timeline is not acceptable to us or to the wider driver and operator community.

If this process continues without proper consultation and clarity, we will have no choice but to explore other options, including legal action and involving our local MP. We want to avoid that route, but we must stand up for our rights and those of our members.

We urge you once again to pause this process and provide all conditions changes in a clear and separate format, along with the existing rules, so they can be reviewed properly.

This is our final request for a fair and transparent process.

Kind regards,
Shahid Rafique
Chairman private hire association
Reading

From: [Zulfoqar Hussain](#)
To: democratic.services@reading.gov.uk
Cc: [Licensing](#); [Gavin, Jan \(Councillor\)](#); [Ennis, John \(Councillor\)](#); [Goss, Stephen \(Councillor\)](#); [Hornsby-Smith, Andrew \(Councillor\)](#); [Leng, Micky \(Councillor\)](#); [Lovelock, Jo \(Councillor\)](#); [McCann, Kathryn \(Councillor\)](#); [Moore, James \(Councillor\)](#); [Rowland, Karen \(Councillor\)](#); [Tarar, Amjad \(Councillor\)](#); [Davies, Richard \(Councillor\)](#)
Subject: FWD LI/Lic Enf - Private hire Roof signs
Date: 08 February 2026 23:36:25

Warning!
For the attention of
RBC Staff and Councillors

This mail is from an external sender - please do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust this sender, and know the content is safe

Dear Cabinet Members of Reading Borough Council,

I am writing to raise a concern on the motion being taken to the Committee to remove the roof signs from the Private Hire vehicles in Reading. Roof signs have been a staple of our trade for over 30 years. The safety of passengers is paramount in our industry and this signage is vital to ensure that our customers feel safe and secure when identifying our vehicles, especially late in the evening. I have been given feedback on countless occasions that these have supported with identifying the company and myself when I have collected passengers.

This includes passengers of all demographics, but especially our older community within Reading who tend to use us as the traditional form of transport rather than newer ride-hailing apps on their phone. The replacement of this would make it confusing for our passengers to see as well as being mistaken for a vehicle from another licensing authority when looking from a significant distance or when there is a pickup in a heavy footfall area. The implications of entering the wrong vehicle could be potentially catastrophic. It is a slippery slope. Roof signs are a form of safety for our passengers. We have seen several times in the news around impersonators coercing vulnerable passengers into their cars and this change could make this problem escalate.

The cost of this transition would also impact each and every driver financially. In the current market, where we have significant competition from innovation, this seems an unnecessary expense for us.

Reading Private Hire Association failed to notify every member underneath their umbrella of this change in a clear manner, until around a week ago. The Association members were given the impression that the Chairman and Vice-Chairman would be summarising the conditions to them in a face-to-face meeting and this was not done adequately and with full information provided. This has caused significant distress and unrest within the Private Hire community where they feel like their right to have an opinion has been undermined in this process. It has led to a number of individuals exiting their membership.

I would like these concerns to be raised in the committee meeting. I hope that this change can be reconsidered based on the points raised above.

Thank you so much for your understanding.

Yours faithfully,

Zulfoqar Hussain

Sent from [Outlook for Android](#)

From: [Crown Wheelchair](#)
To: [Butler, Nicola](#); [Masson, Clyde](#)
Subject: committee meeting 12th February
Date: 10 February 2026 11:25:01

Warning!
For the attention of
RBC Staff and Councillors

This mail is from an external sender - please do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust this sender, and know the content is safe

Dear Nicola

Thank you for informing us about the Licensing Applications Committee meeting scheduled for 12 February 2026 and for sharing the agenda details.

We appreciate the opportunity for the Reading Private Hire Association to speak at this meeting. However, I would like to respectfully express that allowing only 5 minutes for our presentation feels disrespectful and embarrassing to the loyal and hardworking operators we represent. As you say, this is a 'public meeting', so sufficient time needs to be allowed for the public to express their concerns in full.

Regarding school transport, it seems you are effectively undermining companies that have dedicated themselves to providing essential services, especially for those with special needs. The costs and bureaucratic hurdles involved are becoming unmanageable for us. I fear that the decisions being enforced by licensing will have serious repercussions for public safety, as you are driving out a highly appreciated and necessary streamlined service.

Has there been a feedback survey involving special needs parents and school who will have a service impact following licensing initiatives of driving specialist services out of this sector?

Kind regards,
Nazneen

From: [Queen Bee Cars LTD](#)
To: [Butler, Nicola](#)
Subject: Re: Hackney Carriage & Private Hire Licensing Policy report - committee meeting 12/02/2026
Date: 11 February 2026 02:11:38
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[Demonstration on the importance of School Transport Service.pptx](#)

Warning!
For the attention of
RBC Staff and Councillors

This mail is from an external sender - please do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust this sender, and know the content is safe

Good morning Nicola, can you please add the following attached points from me for the attention of the councillors for the meeting on the 12/02/26.

It is possible that I may voice my concerns in the meeting, however I would like them to have in Writing as well. I speak for Both Queen Bee Cars and Berkshire Mobility Transport.

Kind regards Nazreen

Hackney Carriage Emissions & Age Policy 14th Nov 2024 to 1st Oct 2035 Price £56,995



- Hackney Carriage Emissions & Age Policy **14th Nov 2024** to 1st Oct 2035
*unless reviewed earlier Dates Policy 23 October 2023 All replacement vehicles must be less than **8 years old and minimum of Euro 5b**. This rule applies regardless of whether the vehicle is new to fleet or an existing vehicle. The maximum age limit is **12 years**. 01 October 2028 All replacement vehicles are minimum **ULEV** and less than **7 years** old. This rule will apply regardless of whether the vehicle is new to fleet or an existing vehicle. Age limit for ULEV vehicles to be set at a maximum **15yrs** and then removed from fleet. *Each vehicle shall be assessed on its own merit and an extension of a year to a maximum of 3 additional years might be granted on renewal of the licence after a successful RBC compliance test. That the revised Hackney Carriage Vehicle Emissions and Age Policy run until 2035 at which point it would be reviewed again unless changes prompt a review sooner.

“Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy 2026 Page 42”

Appendix C - Private Hire Vehicle Specifications

Vehicle emissions and age policy Private Hire

- Appendix C - Private Hire Vehicle Specifications Vehicle emissions and age policy Private Hire Emissions & Age Policy **13 February 2026** to 1 October 2035 *Unless reviewed earlier Dates Policy 13 February 2026 All new to fleet vehicles are minimum ULEV and less than 5 years old.
- Age limit for all vehicles to be set at a maximum of **15 years** and **then removed from the fleet**. 13 February 2027 All replacement vehicles are minimum ULEV and less than 5 years old. This rule will apply regardless of whether the vehicle is new to fleet or an existing vehicle. Age limit for all vehicles to be set at a maximum of 12 years and then removed from the fleet. 13 February 2028 All replacement vehicles are minimum ULEV and less than 5 years old. This rule will apply regardless of whether the vehicle is new to fleet or an existing vehicle. Age limit for ULEV vehicles to be set at a maximum **10 years** and **then removed from the fleet*** Each vehicle shall be assessed on its own merits and an **extension of a year to a maximum of 2 additional years** might be granted on renewal after a successful RBC compliance test. That the revised Private Hire Vehicle Emissions and Age Policy run until 2035 at which point it would be reviewed again unless changes prompt a review sooner.

Price £44599



“Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy 2026 page 56”

Where will These Vehicles Come From?

Lets Face it ,**if** the policy comes into effect, **immediately** existing RBC Fleet of Licenced WAV that are mostly above **15** Years will get **declined**?

- **How** will children currently using WAV for school get to school?
- **Who** will pay for the new vehicles?



If a New Vehicle Costs £45000 & can only be Licenced for 15 Years, How Can Drivers or Operators Earn a Living?



- **Ask yourselves will the Operators be able to take Home even Minimum Wage for themselves?**
- **Who in a rightful mind will go in such a highrisk trade?**
- **Please Do The Maths**

Currently the daily average price paid on a School Bus Contract with a Passenger Assistant in RBC is £150 to £160 ,

Time taken is around 3 hours daily for 195 days a year.

On most contracts you can only use one vehicle on a contract due to similar school closing times.

- **You still have to take out the following expenses:**

Fual, Vehicle Insurance , Public and Employer liability Insurance
Vehicle Repair Costs, Operator Base Rent

- Garage Rent, office equipment, Licencing fees, Staff Training
Staff wage, HMRC Taxes

If An Operator Runs a Private Hire as well as School Transport will that not compromise on the service for the most Venerable Citizens?

Anyone who works or lives with Special Needs Children will understand how important routine, familiar faces, and even vehicles are and how the whole day of the child can be affected.

Licencing claim they are making this service safer in their Report. **How? By taking a specialised service away.**

I request the present Councillors ask Licencing to show a comparison on complaints received for a few months from Home to School Transport Authorities. Licencing, Can't? Because they have not asked for it?

The answer is clear, School Transport Operators have the least complaints and that's why all the experienced School Transport Operators from RBC are working with neighbouring Authorities as well.

School Transport is a Specialised Service run by people experienced in working with people with various disabilities and understand that you do not rush the clients. Its Nothing like a Taxi Trade working 24 hours.

The main focus is the clients needs and wellbeing, not getting from A to B in the shortest time. The two services must not be merged. Please don't allow Safety to be compromised for the most venerable people in our society.