

---

### Licensing and Regulatory Committee

---

**Time and Date**

9.30 am on Tuesday, 20th August, 2019

**Place**

Diamond Room 2 - Council House

---

**Public Business**

1. **Apologies**
2. **Declarations of Interest**
3. **Minutes** (Pages 1 - 4)  
To agree the minutes of the Committee meeting held on 23 July, 2019
4. **Exclusion of Press and Public**  
To consider whether to exclude the press and public for the items of private business for the reasons shown in the reports.
5. **Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Fee Review 2019 - Objections** (Pages 5 - 22)  
Report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place)
6. **Report of Recent Prosecutions from 1 February 2019 to 7 August 2019** (Pages 23 - 28)  
Report of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place)
7. **Outstanding Issues Report**  
There are no outstanding issues to report.
8. **Any other items of public business which the Chair decides to take as matters of urgency because of the special circumstances involved**

**Private Business**

9. **Reports of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place)**
  - 9.1 Take Away Meal with Undeclared Allergens (Pages 29 - 34)

**PLEASE NOTE: The first taxi applicant has been requested to attend Committee at 10.15 am**

**10. Applications for the Grant/Suitability to hold Hackney Carriage & Private Hire Drivers' Licences**

Reports of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) on the following:  
(Listing Officer: Mick Coggins – tel: 024 7697 1997)

10.1 Application for Hackney Carriage Driver's Licence (Pages 35 - 54)

**11. Any other items of private business which the Chair decides to take as matters of urgency because of the special circumstances involved**

---

Martin Yardley, Deputy Chief Executive (Place), Council House Coventry

Monday, 12 August 2019

Note: The person to contact about the agenda and documents for this meeting is Usha Patel

Membership: Councillors F Abbott, J Birdi, J Clifford, B Gittins, J Innes, B Kaur (Deputy Chair), R Lakha, G Lloyd, A Lucas, T Mayer, R Thay, C Thomas (Chair) and S Walsh

Please note: a hearing loop is available in the committee rooms

If you require a British Sign Language interpreter for this meeting  
OR if you would like this information in another format or  
language please contact us.

**Usha Patel/Carolyn Sinclair**

**Tel: 024 7697 2301/2302**

**Email: [usha.patel@coventry.gov.uk](mailto:usha.patel@coventry.gov.uk) or  
[Carolyn.sinclair@coventry.gov.uk](mailto:Carolyn.sinclair@coventry.gov.uk)**

**Coventry City Council**  
**Minutes of the Meeting of Licensing and Regulatory Committee held at 9.30 am**  
**on Tuesday, 23 July 2019**

Present:

Members:

Councillor C Thomas (Chair)  
Councillor J Birdi  
Councillor J Clifford  
Councillor J Innes  
Councillor B Kaur  
Councillor R Lakha  
Councillor G Lloyd  
Councillor T Mayer  
Councillor R Thay

Employees (by Directorate):

Place: M Coggins, P Hibbard, M McHugh, C Sinclair, B Welch, A Wright, S Yarker

Apologies: Councillor F Abbott, B Gittins, A Lucas and S Walsh

## **Public Business**

### **17. Declarations of Interest**

Councillor R Lakha declared an interest in the matter referred to in Minute 27(b) below (Renewal of Private Hire Driver's Licence). He withdrew from the meeting during consideration of this matter.

### **18. Minutes**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 25 June 2019 were signed as a true record.

### **19. Exclusion of Press and Public**

**RESOLVED** that under Section 1004(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the items of business indicated below on the grounds that those items involve the likely disclosure of exempt information, as defined in Schedule 12A of that Act, in particular those paragraphs of Part 1 of the Schedule as indicated:

Minute No.	Subject	Relevant Paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
23 to 26	Non-compliance with a Formal Notice under the Prevention of Damage by Pests Act 1949	7

27	Trading without a licence to provide boarding for cats.	7
28	Applications for the Grant/Suitability to hold Hackney Carriage & Private Hire Driver's Licences	1 & 3

**20. Outstanding Issues Report**

There were no outstanding issues.

**21. Any other items of public business which the Chair decides to take as matters of urgency because of the special circumstances involved**

There were no other items of public business.

**22. Non-compliance with a Formal Notice Under the Prevention of Damage by Pests Act 1949 (1)**

**RESOLVED** that, having considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive, Place:

- 1) The Council Solicitor be authorised to institute legal proceedings under the Prevention of Damage by Pests Act against appropriate persons in respect of the alleged non-compliance with a Formal Notice served under the above Act on the owners of 12 Lorenzo Close, Coventry.
- 2) That authority be delegated to the Director of Streetscene and Regulatory Services to authorise legal proceedings for any further offences which may come to light before the case under consideration has been resolved in court.

**23. Non-compliance with a Formal Notice Under the Prevention of Damage by Pests Act 1949 (2)**

**RESOLVED** that, having considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive, Place:

- 1) The Council Solicitor be authorised to institute legal proceedings under the Prevention of Damage by Pests Act against appropriate persons in respect of the alleged non-compliance with a Formal Notice served under the above Act on the owners of 60 Melbourne Road, Coventry.
- 2) That authority be delegated to the Director of Streetscene and Regulatory Services to authorise legal proceedings for any further

**offences which may come to light before the case under consideration has been resolved in court.**

**24. Non-compliance with a Formal Notice Under the Prevention of Damage by Pests Act 1949 (3)**

**RESOLVED that, having considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive, Place:**

- 1) The Council Solicitor be authorised to institute legal proceedings under the Prevention of Damage by Pests Act against appropriate persons in respect of the alleged non-compliance with a Formal Notice served under the above Act on the owners of 60 St George's Road, Coventry.**
- 2) That authority be delegated to the Director of Streetscene and Regulatory Services to authorise legal proceedings for any further offences which may come to light before the case under consideration has been resolved in court.**

**25. Non-compliance with a Formal Notice Under the Prevention of Damage by Pests Act 1949 (4)**

- 1) The Council Solicitor be authorised to institute legal proceedings under the Prevention of Damage by Pests Act against appropriate persons in respect of the alleged non-compliance with a Formal Notice served under the above Act on the owners of 28 Red Lane, Coventry.**
- 2) That authority be delegated to the Director of Streetscene and Regulatory Services to authorise legal proceedings for any further offences which may come to light before the case under consideration has been resolved in court.**

**26. Applications for the Grant/Suitability to hold Hackney Carriage & Private Hire Drivers' Licences**

**RESOLVED that, having considered the circumstances set out in the reports of the Deputy Chief Executive, Place, now submitted:**

- (a) The Hackney Carriage Driver's Licence held by Mr Farid Mohammed Dawod be revoked.**

**(Note: Mr Dawod and his legal representative attended the meeting in support of his case)**

- (b) The Private Hire Driver's Licence held by Mr Palwinder Singh be granted but suspended for a period of four months.**

**(Note: Mr Singh and his legal representative attended the meeting in support of his case)**

**(c) That the application for a Private Hire Driver's Licence be granted to Mr Samad Hussain, with a written warning.**

(Note: Mr Hussain and his father attended the meeting in support of his case.)

**(d) The Hackney Carriage Driver's Licence held by Mr Mohamed Rahim Haydari be granted with a written warning.**

(Mr Haydari attended the meeting in support of his case.)

**(e) The Hackney Carriage Driver's Licence held by Mr Khalil Ahmed Naziri be granted with a written warning.**

(Mr Naziri attended the meeting in support of his case.)

**27. Any other items of private business which the Chair decides to take as matters of urgency because of the special circumstances involved**

(Meeting closed at 1.50 pm)



## **Public report** Licensing & Regulatory Committee

Licensing & Regulatory Committee

20 August 2019

**Name of Cabinet Member:**

Not applicable

**Director Approving Submission of the report:**

Deputy Chief Executive (Place)

**Ward(s) affected:**

Not applicable

Title:

**Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Fee Review 2019 - Objections**

---

**Is this a key decision?**

No

---

**Executive Summary:**

In 2015 the introduction of the Deregulation Act changed the timescales for the issue of licences to drivers of Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Vehicles from annual renewals to three yearly renewals. It also amended the renewals of Private Hire Operators Licences to five yearly only.

A fee review was undertaken on 25 August 2015 to address the charges made for the processing and issuing of licences to drivers and operators to reflect the changes and associated costs.

This review resulted in an overall (pro rata) reduction in fees over the new respective licence periods.

Subsequently a review of the impact of the changes within the Taxi Licensing Office was undertaken resulting in an overall reduction in administrative staff and the introduction of a new role to provide support across the service.

Following this a further review of fees has been undertaken to reflect the staffing changes and current costs for providing the service.

**Recommendations:**

It is recommended that the Licensing & Regulatory Committee approve, subject to consideration of the objections, the proposed fee changes detailed in Appendix A to commence on the 30 August 2019.

**List of Appendices included:**

**Appendix A – Proposed fee changes**

**Appendix B – Objections to the fee changes**

**Other useful background papers:**

None

**Other Useful documents**

None

**Has it been or will it be considered by Scrutiny?**

No

**Has it been or will it be considered by any other Council Committee, Advisory Panel or other body?**

No

**Will this report go to Council?**

No



## Report title:

### Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Fee Review 2019 - Objections

#### 1. Information / Background

- 1.1 The Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 provides that the City Council may charge as fees the reasonable cost of administering and enforcing the hackney carriage and private hire licensing function. The fees charged by the Taxi Licensing Office are intended to enable the service to operate on a self-financing basis.
- 1.2 A review of fees was carried out in 2015 and before that in 2009, which involved assessing the resources used for each activity represented by a fee. Any increased costs to taxi licensing since 2015 have been managed within available resources.
- 1.3 The Licensing & Regulatory Committee on the 25 June 2019 approved the proposed fee increases subject to objections. The advertisement publicising the fee changes ran for 28 days together with a consultation sent to all the licensed drivers (1260); hackney carriage vehicle proprietors (833); private hire vehicle proprietors (185) and 17 private hire operators. Many vehicle proprietors will also be licensed drivers.
- 1.4 There were 93 (approx 7%) objections received which can be seen at Appendix B. The majority of responses received object to the increased costs based on affordability due to a general decrease in business across the City.
- 1.5 Under the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976, the City Council can only charge a level of fees which is sufficient to cover the reasonable cost of administering and enforcing the hackney carriage and private hire licensing function. The proposed increases are intended to enable the service to operate on a self-financing basis based on the costs of providing the function. The increases have been calculated to ensure that the taxi licensing reserve account can be retained without deficit.

#### 2. Recommendation

It is recommended that the Licensing & Regulatory Committee approve, subject to consideration of the objections at Appendix B, the proposed fee changes detailed in Appendix A to commence forthwith.

- 3.1 It is proposed to increase charges for the fees as indicated in the tables below;

Licence Fee	Current Charge		Proposed Charge		Increase	
	Hackney Carriage	Private Hire	Hackney Carriage	Private Hire	Hackney Carriage	Private Hire
	£	£	£	£	£	£
New Applicant Driver Licence	518	458	585	515	67	57
Driver Renewal	223		310		87	
Additional Driver Licence	223		260		37	
Driver Re-Grant	243		330		87	
New Vehicle	217		275		58	
Vehicle Renewal	187		245		58	
Vehicle Re-Grant	207		265		58	
New & Renewal Operator	1668		2000		332	
Operator Re-Grant	1708		2040		332	

A detailed breakdown of the proposed changes is attached at Appendix A.

Ancillary Fee	Current Charge	Proposed Charge	Increase
	£	£	£
DBS/DVLA Enquiry	53.00	60.00	7.00
Hackney Carriage Road Knowledge Test	40.00	50.00	10.00
3 Yearly Driver Refresher Training (Mandatory)*		50.00	50.00
Vehicle MOT Inspection	47.00	55.00	8.00
Vehicle MOT Inspection (re-test)	21.00	27.50	6.50

\* New Requirement

3.2 There would be no change to any other licences and charges.

3.3 The above changes are summarised in Appendix A.

3.4 These fees will be reviewed annually, and proposed changes discussed at Taxi Forum Meetings.

#### 4. Financial implications

The proposed fee structure has been designed to enable the continued operation of the Taxi Licensing Office on a self-financing basis. Future fee revisions and staffing levels will be routinely re-evaluated in line with any further legislative changes and financial considerations. Any shortfall in licensing income during the implementation period will be managed within existing resources. Fee revisions are explained in section 3 with a detailed list of proposed fee changes shown in Appendix A.

#### 5. Legal implications

5.1 Under the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976, the City Council can only charge a level of fees which is sufficient to cover the reasonable costs of administering and enforcing the hackney carriage and private hire licensing function.

5.2 The 1976 Act lays down a statutory procedure for varying fees for Hackney Carriage Proprietors (i.e. vehicle) licences, Private Hire Vehicle licences and Private Hire Operators' licences. This procedure involves giving public notice of the proposed changes and a 28-day objection period. If objections are made, these must be considered by the Committee before the proposed fees, relating to those types of licences, can be implemented.

5.3 The above statutory procedure does not apply to varying fees for Hackney Carriage and Private Hire drivers' licences. However, it is considered simpler and fairer if the whole proposed fee table including drivers' licence fees, is advertised and the trade or public are given an opportunity to object to any item on the proposed fee table.

5.4 The issue of Hackney Carriage/Private Hire licences and the amount of any charge for their issue is excluded from being an 'executive function' by Regulation 2(6) and Schedule 1 of the Local Authorities (Functions and Responsibilities) (England) Regulations 2000.

5.5 Co-jointly running with the public notice of the proposed changes will be undertaken a survey sent to the trade and other interested stakeholders.

#### 6. Timescale

6.1 The proposed fees will come into force on the 30 August 2019.

#### 7. Other implications

None

7.1 **How will this contribute to achievement of the Council's key objectives / corporate priorities (corporate plan/scorecard) / organisational blueprint or Coventry Sustainable Community**

Ensuring that the public are safe by assessing drivers are fit and proper and vehicles safe.

**7.2 How is risk being managed?**

Ensuring that established procedures are followed.

**7.3 What is the impact on the organisation?**

None

**7.4 Equalities / EIA**

Not applicable

**7.5 Implications for (or impact on) the environment**

None

**7.6 Implications for partner organisations?**

None

**7.7 Human Rights Act Implications**

None

**Report author(s):**

**Name and job title:**

Mick Coggins, Senior Licensing & Enforcement Officer

**Directorate:**

Place Directorate

**Tel and email contact:**

024 7683 2183 Taxi.Licensing@coventry.gov.uk

Enquiries should be directed to the above person.

<b>Contributor/approver name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Directorate or organisation</b>	<b>Date doc sent out</b>	<b>Date response received or approved</b>
<b>Contributors:</b>				
<b>Names of approvers for submission:</b> (officers and members)				
Legal: Amy Wright	Licensing & Criminal Solicitor	Place Directorate	02/08/2019	05/08/2019
Sarah Elliott on behalf of Director Place: Andrew Walster	Director of Streetscene & Regulatory Services	Place Directorate	02/08/2019	09/08/2019
Usha Patel	Governance Services Officer	Place Directorate	02/08/2019	07/08/2019
Cath Crosby	Lead Accountant – Business Partnering	Place Directorate	02/08/2019	12/08/2019

**Hackney Carriage/Private Hire Licensing Proposed Fee Structure 2019 – Proposed Fee Increases**

**Drivers both Hackney Carriage (HC) and Private Hire (PH)**

**Cost for New Applicant's Driver Licence**

	Current cost		Proposed cost	
	Hackney Carriage	Private Hire	Hackney Carriage	Private Hire
Application	65	65	85	85
DBS / DVLA Cost	53	53	60	60
Driver Training	100	100	100	100
Road Knowledge Test (HC only)	40	-	50	-
Driving / wheelchair assessment	90	70	90	70
Licence (3 year)	170	170	200	200
<b>Total</b>	<b>£518</b>	<b>£458</b>	<b>£585</b>	<b>£515</b>

**Cost for Driver Licence Renewal**

	Current cost	Proposed cost
DBS / DVLA Cost	53	60
Licence (3 year)	170	200
Mandatory Refresher Training	-	50
<b>Total</b>	<b>£223</b>	<b>£310</b>

**Cost for Additional Driver Licence (where a driver already has a HC or PH licence and requires the other licence PH or HC in addition)**

	Current cost	Proposed cost
DBS / DVLA Cost (only if within 6 months of current licence expiring)	53	60
Additional Licence (3 year)	170	200
<b>Total</b>	<b>£223</b>	<b>£260</b>

**Cost for Driver Licence Re-Grant (grant licence within 6 months of licence expiring)**

	Current cost	Proposed cost
DBS / DVLA Cost	53	60
Licence (3 year)	190	220
Mandatory Refresher Training	-	50
<b>Total</b>	<b>£243</b>	<b>£330</b>

## **Vehicles both Hackney Carriage and Private Hire**

### **Cost for New Vehicle Licence**

	Current cost	Proposed cost
Licence	170	220
Taxi Test	47	55
<b>Total</b>	<b>£217</b>	<b>£275</b>

### **Cost for Vehicle Licence Renewal**

	Current cost	Proposed cost
Vehicle Licence	140	190
Taxi Test	47	55
<b>Total</b>	<b>£187</b>	<b>£245</b>

### **Cost for Vehicle Licence Re-Grant (grant licence within 90 days of licence expiring)**

	Current cost	Proposed cost
Vehicle Licence	160	210
Taxi Test	47	55
<b>Total</b>	<b>£207</b>	<b>£265</b>

## **Operators**

### **Cost for Operators (New and Renewal)**

	Current cost	Proposed cost
Operator's Licence	1668	2000
<b>Total</b>	<b>£1668</b>	<b>£2000</b>

### **Cost for Operators Re-Grant of Licence (Grant licence within 6 months of licence expiring)**

	Current cost	Proposed cost
Operator's Licence	1708	2040
<b>Total</b>	<b>£1708</b>	<b>£2040</b>

**N.B. – DBS's may be requested by the Taxi Licensing Office at anytime and the new pricing will be as in the above tables.**

## Objections to the Fee changes

1. Mot
2. The increase of mot and licence cost can not be warranted as the recent change to the taxi badge being 3 years has significantly reduced time and queues. Furthermore bookings are now online reducing the need for manpower in serving customers as all applications are now online. The price for an mot at £47 is already quite high and a further increase does not seem justifiable. The increase of licence cost also has no merit as the increased charge doesn't represent how it will benefit the taxi trade. The taxi trade already pay a lot with very little worth for the vast amount spent at the council depot, maybe outsource the mot to save money and time
3. Hardly any work you should cut all expenses not increase them
4. The charges are too much  
The £50 for a refresh course is not needed it's another way for the council to make money from taxi drivers  
We have to do the most of the work online then take the reference numbers to the office and then wait for ages to be served.  
We the Coventry city hackney and private hire drivers pay all the fees as we don't have a choice  
But Uber drivers use Coventry city roads and pick up fares and pay absolutely nothing to Coventry city council but we the Coventry drivers have to pay
5. I can not see justification in increase in fees as taxi trade has suffered significantly since app based companies have started trading in Coventry to my knowledge Coventry city council has failed to help protect us taxi drivers. This is just my personal view
6. Increases fees means more hard time for us. We already struggling because of Uber & other mobile app, everyone knows that our work has gone down. Fees should not increase
7. I am against increase any fee increase because there is no income to sustain our livelihood. All cabbies are riding Uber.
8. In the current climate I feel any rise in costs for operators and drivers is outrageous to say the least. The city is flooded with drivers licensed outside the city and this is due to the archaic procedures in place currently which have been endorsed by clueless councillors that have been left behind by technology.  
A number of simple changes could make life easier for operators and drivers alike but even getting a email response from the current clueless councillor is a like trying to win the lottery.
9. Hi I think this increase is totally unfair our earnings are going down daily because of Uber which council has done nothing about I'm very annoyed about this it should be linked to rate of inflation which this is not.
10. This increase cannot be affordable. Because my earnings don't increase
11. Price increases should only be the rate of inflation. Drivers are leaving the taxi trade because they are struggling to make a living. UBERS numbers are rising all of the time and we all know that is the issue. It is not the answer to pass the cost onto drivers and local companies that

are already struggling.

Maybe taxi licenseing will have to look at streamlining the way the office and trade can be more cost effective.

12. Dear sir/madam

As the lack of work we can not afford any extra money than what we pay at the moment.

Get red off Uber in the city so that we have enough work than make changes please.

Many thanks

13. I'm so confused, why should I pay the significantly increased licence fee proposed by Coventry City Council, when their approved licensing authority, Wolverhampton City Council is so much cheaper and more efficient and effective and proactive and..... I could go on and on.

If this is to happen then, myself and an awful lot more of my colleagues' will have no choice but to get licensed by Wolverhampton City Council and still able to work Coventry

14. I object to the increases due to fact that uber has taken majority of the work in the city, we the drivers are being crippled by the current situation we do not need our council to add to the situation.

If the council either licenses uber or gets rid of uber i wiÄ¶I have no objection to the increase.

15. Coventry taxi trade is nearly die because of Uber. All coventry cabby and private hire drivers are suffering badly. This fees increase will bring more suffering for drivers. I'm disagree with this fees increase proposal. Thank you.

16. Why you increasing the charges on everything,there is no work in this city for black cabs,we cant afford to pay extra to you guys,Uber took our livelihood,its very hard to make the money nowadays,i am completely disagree with this purposal sorry to say..

17. What are you charging Wolverhampton's drivers whos working more than us in our council ?

We are struggling and you say to us our hands are tied our trade is ruined. in twelve hours i made 93 pounds with 2 radios and you talking about increment what for

I rejected this increment

18. Where can i start. Absolute disgrace. I have been a hackney driver for 8 years and i have never seen trade this bad. Average wait on any taxi rank 70 to 100 minutes. Average fare between Â£3.55 to Â£5.05. Times this by 10 hours well below minimum wage. Well this is my last year and i cannot wait to leave

What a shambles. You coventry city council have no back bone to help the drivers. You have back stabbed the drivers over the last 20 years. The vehicles we drive are horribe lti tx4 total failure. These fees do not reflect the current situation we drivers are in. Please reconsider we the black cab trade are dying a slow painful death. Trade is very bad average 10 to 15 hour shift we are pulling in Â£45 to Â£75. The maintenance for lti tx4 is killing us along with coventry city council biggest sponsor uber. A huge student population only use us to for house moves. Our customers are now elderly and wheelchair users. Come on coventry city council you have raped us guys long enough with you pathetic rules and regulations enough is enough. I have 12 months of training left for a new career i will happily throw my badge and plate in the blue wheelie bin. You have let us down a lot. I wonder how much taxi licensing staff are paid all ex police on a nice wage don't do a lot always look busy when we go to the dust bin in Whitley depot. I bet all the staff will get yearly wage increases along with a nice pension to live happily ever after. Oh and your new electric cab is rubbish good luck to the fools who buy it typical taxi full of faults and bad workmanship. You taxi licensing have sold us for uber. How on earth can battered cheap saloon cars which do 700 to 1000 miles a week be safe? Double standards and lies from tlo. How can i survive doing 60 hours a week on less



than £200 a week after diesel and other expenses. Modern day slavery at its best. After this survey no doubt you will go and increase the fees anyway. You will do as you please. Hopefully uber can give you nice fat envelopes for your christmas bonus for allowing them to break every rule in your licencing book.  
Enjoy lol.

19. Local taxi trade specially in coventry has danger of extinction. Consolidating upon my own experience as a customer I understand there is still significance and great need of Hackney services but unfortunately there is unfair government support for UBER business model. Council should impose limit on number of uber cabs in the city before thinking of further increase in fee.  
Conduct another survey on satisfaction level of local taxi drivers.  
90% of them wants to quit but tied with investment of cabs.  
Have pity on us please. Never had a thought we would survive on half of the national minimum wage.
20. Drivers are already finding it difficult to make ends meet with Uber drivers working in the city and increasing the cost of staying on the road will only elevate the problem also without providing a better service it is unprecedented
21. Absolutely disagree. How can you justify the fee increase when we have to wait for month's to get inspection dates. And when Coventry city council knowingly distorting the local taxi trade in favour of uber by not willing to even try to stop uber. Or even do enforcement on uber car's openly doing street pick-up. Even when we have reported it to Hackney carriage office. These fee increase will bring no value or benefit to the local taxi trade. This is just coventry city council making extra money on the backs of local trade who are struggling as is.
22. I think this proposal is intentionnly in attempt to finish off the black cab trade in genral, the council are fully aware of the hardships being faced by the drivers due heavlily increased external competitors. I perosnally think its forcing drivers to leave the trade due to these unnecessary changs being applied !!!
23. I oppose the decision to increase the prices of the licensing fee because uber have taken the taxi trade
24. So sad ithink you want me to ge and get wolverhampton badge no benefit of coventry badge and exlencive
25. There is no work left of taxi trade uber taken over our work at least 75% instet of increaseing taxi licencing should decreas .
26. I think the increase of the proposed fees is ridiculous and far too high as the business is very quiet. The council are doing nothing to help the taxi industry in Coventry and favour Uber, who are not even registered to work in the city. In my opinion they should be charged instead
27. The work is almost finish,we have to wait minimum 1 hr for one job, council is not taking any step to stop the Uber and other outsiders driver's who work with the local radio companies.i think this is not a right time to increase the licencing fees.council must protect the local driver's then thinking about fees review

28. I would like to know what considerations have been made when increasing these fees. The taxi trade has been suffering for the last few years drivers are being forced to work longer hours to make ends meet or look towards leaving the trade. Yet the council is again looking after its own interests at the cost of the drivers. We are forced to buy unfit vehicles at extortionate prices. That then cost the driver to maintain to make the council more money through licensing and mot issues. But so long as the council can charge extra for a dying trade. Just because drivers still hold a badge doesnt mean they are still in the trade there are numerous drivers who now do other jobs yet still have a badge for the next three years. You can only serve 1 person at a time at the hackney office. The phone is never answered . Yet you have more than 4 members of staff at a time. Deal with your issues. Rather than make the public pay. Money for old rope is what comes to mind. THANKS COVENTRY CITY COUNCIL. YOU DO A GREAT JOB LOOKING AFTER THE TRADE. WHAT A JOKE.
29. I would like to know what considerations have been made when increasing these fees. The taxi trade has been suffering for the last few years drivers are being forced to work longer hours to make ends meet or look towards leaving the trade. Yet the council is again looking after its own interests at the cost of the drivers. We are forced to buy unfit vehicles at extortionate prices. That then cost the driver to maintain to make the council more money through licensing and mot issues. But so long as the council can charge extra for a dying trade. Just because drivers still hold a badge doesnt mean they are still in the trade there are numerous drivers who now do other jobs yet still have a badge for the next three years. You can only serve 1 person at a time at the hackney office. The phone is never answered . Yet you have more than 4 members of staff at a time. Deal with your issues. Rather than make the public pay. Money for old rope is what comes to mind. THANKS COVENTRY CITY COUNCIL. YOU DO A GREAT JOB LOOKING AFTER THE TRADE. WHAT A JOKE.
30. Taxi are a dieing trade with uber in the city and the council all they do is make life hard for us driver by ripping us off  
Im not surprised that is the council for you  
The publif csn noy afford to hire a cab so they use uber cheaper faster and better then hanckney  
No matter what any one rights in the feedback it will not go anywhere the driver concern means nothing to the council hiw about asking the public what they think to it  
This is a discrace and the council shoule be ashamed
31. Fees are already too much. We have not much left because of uber,we are really struggling for our livings, average job time is about 1hr, we can't afford more fees, if uber has been stopped in coventry then we have no objection.
32. i totally disagree with the increase due to the increase in illegal activities by other unlicensed drivers such as uber and economic conditions in the country. the increase isnt justified as currently we are not getting currently valur for money on existing fees and services that we are provided with. already driver's are under pressure due to high fees and low returns . it seems as if we are being forced out of the trade with drivers leaving a much loved trade
33. Life is harder anyway with Uber working unchallenged in Coventry and now this price hike will make life even more harder...
34. I object in the increase of fees. There are not in line with taxi driver earnings.

the increase as we are struggling to make ends meet hope you people come out and look at the ranks

You would know thank you

36. It's just unfair to increase the fees because there's not much work left in Coventry
37. Surely council is making wrong decisions to increase the fees it will have big impact on drivers, I believe council must take action to protect the taxi trade in Coventry as work is significantly down.  
Coventry council have failed to do something about this so far, for now it's already considering not to invest with taxi trade in Coventry but rather go with Wolverhampton council which it's doing at the moment.
38. Absolute disgrace, I don't know how you have the audacity to increase fees for taxi drivers! Coventry council are intentionally finishing off the local taxi trade you are well aware of all the pressures we are facing at the moment but as usual you are not interested in our concerns, never have been.
39. At a time when uber has taken a lot of business from the taxi trade I think it is wrong for the council to increase our charges. I am not happy about this.
40. The taxi trade is going down significantly and yet you insist on 2 inspections a year where as most councils are happy with 1 inspection per year your greed is astonishing and you think that by putting it onto the taxi drivers is acceptable You are one of the worst councils out there and only thinking about your own job security and not the taxi drivers. Most of us have took a massive pay reduction but I am sure the council or you guys at the taxi licensing office have not. Thanks for putting in the final nails in the coffin.
41. I think licensing fees are too high already and should be decreased not increased and mot retest should be free within 14 days if vehicle fails to meet council requirements. I am just about making ends meet to licence a expensive hackney carriage vehicle already due to influx of out of town vehicle operating in Coventry and also lack of enforcement safe guarding our trade, what do you want paying more with buttons?
42. We have lost so much trade in this city yet you still see fit to increase fees  
How is this fair
43. Due to the lack of work I am struggling to make ends meet working long hours for nothing I can barely afford to feed my family. Waiting in taxi ranks for one hour for £3-5 jobs. Just so you are aware minimum wage is £8.21. Let alone the expense for fuel inspection and so on. I will be going to work for Wolverhampton council as at least they are working with the drivers. Coventry City Council all they do is increase costs only for their benefit. If you want blood don't try and take it from a stone. Eventually you guys will single handedly wipe out Coventry's black cab trade. Congratulations but it's out!!!!
44. No these charges are not fair considering uber is in the town our earnings are down
45. I don't agree with these increments because Hackney trade is struggling because of Uber charges need to go down not up

46. There is immense work competition in Coventry, on top Cov council is not providing any security to Coventry drivers against outside driver and there radio bases. So in my opinion it is not justifiable in current situation to increase any sort of fees. Regards
47. There is no jobs available for Black cab and private hire drivers in Coventry because of Uber. Stop or Control Uber in Coventry. Now there are 1400 uber driver working in Coventry. Drivers not making any profit nor taking their wages at the moment . Stop uber now and control the Uber in Coventry. Far too many Uber working in Coventry.
48. i think TLO really need to look at the mistake they have made with not applying for uber ,now they want to make that money up from taxi drivers in coventry . can they not see how slow the taxi trade has become in coventry ?? infact i think TLO should put the price of the black cabs meter down ,& normal rate through out the year ( christmas .new years & bank holidays )
49. There is no work. Cost me 1500 pounds just to renew my licenses. How much more you want.
50. I do not agree with the increase in fees as it is harder enough already with a lot of taxi driver working 12 hour shifts a day to make ends meet, with the new electric taxi being pushed in the city as well there is more pressure on the taxi driver and now with increases in fees too, and not to mention all the app base companys coming in the city it is far difficult. So i hope the council will work together with us taxi driver and not just do what they want and not listen to us. Thankyou
51. After this increase in fees I would be very surprised if there were any taxis left licensed in Coventry after Uber has taken all the work absolute madness
52. Well is there any work left in our city due to uber NO. And to put the icing on the cake the city council want to increase the fee. Ridiculous.. you can't do anything about uber and yet your quick enough to increase fees..
53. Donâ€™t think it is good for the trade at this time as all the drivers are suffering from the lack of work in the city, where most of the jobs are covered by drivers licensed with another councils but if the Coventry council could have protected the Coventry jobs for Coventry licenses drivers we all would have welcomed the fee increase as it would improve the service all around.
54. Dear sir/madam  
It would be really harsh on the drivers as we are already struggling to make a decent living now a days,there isnt much work left for Coventry taxi drivers because of uber,on top we have alots of other expenses to pay like insurance road tax and cab maintenance plus high fuel costs therefore please do not go ahead with this proposal it will our lifes soo hard.thank you ðŸ˜ˆ
55. Hackney cabs and private hire in Coventry are struggling to survive because of Uber took over 70% of work .Drivesrs are so upset and worried about trade destroying by Uber and you are the people sitting in ur offices having chat with each other laughing with no sense and without any solid policies to save the private hire and Hackney cabs business in Coventry ,just thinking about ur wages and perks and lounching new proposals to increase these fees and putting more pressure on these poor drivers because you know 99% of taxi drivers are not English in Coventry so you do not care about drivesrs livings .  
I would say these all new proposals are bullshits and unjustified rather to increase these fee or what lever just focus on how to build up taxi trade in Coventry for Hackney and Coventry private hire .

these non English Coventry taxi drivers then it's up to you whatever ur proposals are , doesn't matter for anyone

56. Absolutely ridiculous these increases!

57. The work in Coventry has been cut more than 50-70 % and instead of Coventry council lowering their fees and helping the drivers who have been supporting the council all these years. The council wants to put on such huge increase of fees, it is absolutely ridiculous. It's about time Coventry council think about their own drivers for once . I'm sure I can speak for every single taxi driver in Coventry and are against these increases of prices by the council

58. We are already struggling to stay in the taxi trade because of UBER its cut our work by 75% ,these increases on licensing fees are not affordable you should help us to reduce UBER not make it harder for us to survive.

59. We already struggling to survive and you doing nothing to help us why not finish the city taxi office and let Wolverhampton council to took over so you can feel the pain so sad

60. Difficult times

61. Taxi drivers incomes have dropped drastically with all the competition from Uber etc. Council needs to privatise all the services it currently provides especially Inspection and MOT's. There needs to be competition. At the moment Council is charging extortionate amounts of money for services that can be done by any garage. Council has a monopoly and is abusing its position and urgently needs competition.

62. This increase will put more burden on taxi drivers when there is no work left and taxi drivers are already struggling for their living and other side council is not doing anything to Uber to protect our work.

63. Yes I totally disagree with the proposal as it's to excessive especially as cab drivers a struggling to make ends meet as increase in illegal taxi drivers such as uber has taken 60% of the work. And high maintenance fees of cab at a time of brexit and down turn economic environment. If the proposal go ahead will of wages or meter reflect the changes

64. This increase will put more burden on taxi drivers when there is no work left and taxi drivers are already struggling for their living and other side council is not doing anything to Uber to protect our work.

65. In a time where the industry is being aggressively disrupted by companies that have no respect for rules and regulations and are undermining the industry by cheap taxi fares, this is not appropriate to increase licence fees, the industry can't stand it, however if these increases led to GREATER policing of our industry, by this I mean full time taxi marshalls with powers to fine and remove vehicles/ drivers that are not complying with regulations, then I would welcome such increase in licence fees

66. Work is not busy at is used to be thanks to Uber who have taken away near on 50% of our work. None of this will affect them as they don't pay you anything anyway. But for some reason we are being penalised.

It's a ridiculous increase and not even in line with inflation, which we can still understand thou. You need to be a lot more reasonable with your pricing and this most definitely is not!

You will start forcing more and more drivers to leave you and work with Uber as it is going already! No black cabs will mean a big hole in the councils pocket and more people losing jobs as if we don't have a problem already in Coventry!

67. I feel with the increase in the use of out of area licence private hire and the reduction in Hackney use to suggest increasing fees to the trade is unfair I feel that a proper investigation
68. We haven't had a pay rise for a while ,the taxi trade in Coventry is having hardest time ever because of Uber which council has done nothing about I feel that council is targeting hackney trade very unfairly
69. We are having our hardest times as taxi owners and driver out trade has decreased by 40% or more maybe cuts should be made at the licensing office , besides we haven't had any fair increase of a long time I strongly object to these proposals infact we should be getting a decrease not a increase.
70. Taxi drivers already suffering for less jobs.most of the jobs of the city has been taken to uber.if you increase fees ,drivers will more suffer.my humble request please consider the circumstance and not to increase fees.thanks
71. Hi  
It is really unjustified for covetry drivers to pay more in today circumstances  
When Uber has taken almost everything from our plates
72. How can the council even think about increasing this money considering that drivers have to work twice as many hours to try to make a living The council should be putting all there resources into helping proper license taxi drivers in Coventry. Its a absolute cheek to ask for more money while the fiasco of uber continues in are city
73. No fare increase for years.trade decimated by out of town vehicles but you feel a 30% increase in fees is justified!! .congestion fees soon.are you on the same planet as the rest of us?
74. we haven't had a pay rise for past 4 yrs cost of repairs are rising daily ,the presence of uber is eroding our earnings, i don't know how you can justify these increases, may u can make some cuts at taxi licencing office .
75. We are already struggling with our work in the city because of the uber taking over our cury work we are not making enough money so im not happy with council to increase the fee.
76. As our taxi work is really quiet due to the Uber in Coventry so this fee increase is not fair at all thanks.
77. Totally unacceptable, drivers are already struggling with making a living due to competition from uber and the council wants to increase there prices for themselves, mot re-test should be free and they already charge £21 for this.  
Full mot is £46.00 this already is overpriced compared to all other garages
78. I object as the word has been effect by the Uber and we are struggling to make the cost meet it will be hard and very hard for us if you increase the fee instead of decreasing Thanks
79. We are already struggling with our work because of the Uber working in the city they taking our work we not making enough money so im not happy with council to increase the fee.

80. We don't have enough work left in Coventry for us and fees increase more.
81. At the time when coventry taxi drivers are struggling to earn a living wage for themselves, due to the under priced competitor UBER taxis, it will have an huge impact on coventry private hire driver like myself to pay these extra cost , to keep my vehicle/drivers license renewed every year. I would urge coventry taxi office to re-consider their decision.
82. I don't agree with the increased fees due to the following. First of all the work has dramatically gone down due to uber taxis. So we are waiting around for longer period of time for a job. So I don't think it fair to increase the fees when the work has decreased a lot. Thanks
83. Taxi drivers are finding it very difficult to make a living as it is without further expenses. plus with your idea of us having to replace our vehicles for zero emission vehicles by 2024 will put the costs out of reach for a lot of drivers including myself
84. Good morning  
Due shortage work and competition in the city, is going to be very difficult for the drivers. Please consider your driver the challenge they are facing on daily basis.  
Regards
85. I am in objection to increase in fees with current trade conditions please spend more time and resources justifying the current fees we pay start by banning Coventry taxi radio companies using in Coventry licenced vehicles to operate under their radio umbrella totally in necessary even covering local authority school runs I am sure if this is the case remove operators licences from said companies this will create more work with which drivers will earn more revenue to pay extra fees
86. The taxi trade is dying in Coventry as Uber is taking most of the business and seems the local government is not acknowledging that instead they are willingly to increase their price. I think that's not fair for taxi trade .  
For that reason I object to the proposed increase to the fees.
87. Increasing fees will be another discouragement for us (taxi drivers) as we are struggling a lot because of unfair competition i.e they can do a job from Coventry but we cannot do a job in another city then coventry . We are losing business day by day and nobody is helping us instead increasing license fee so we definitely leave this trade and or this council and get a license from Wolverhampton who allow you to work with uber and work anywhere in West Midlands . Thanks but no thanks
88. Dear Sir/Madam,  
I think it's unreasonable to increase fees at this period in time, currently work is scarce due to Uber , there is vehicle emissions issues too , forcing drivers to buy more expensive vehicles to meet regulations, your timing couldn't be worse!  
Putting people's livelihoods at risk!  
I believe your adding insult to injury!
89. Just another nail in the coffin. Last licence for me. How about the council choose to get rid of all cabs by outpricing us out of our licences and let uber take over; sorry you already doing that.....
90. No way takings down, Uber cars everywhere and you want more money. there won't be any licensed Coventry cars. We will all go to Wolverhampton, Dudley etc,
91. You're right I object your letting Uber run riot all over us killing our trade and you want

put the fees up your having a laugh final nail in the coffin Coventry City Council kill off the trade shame on you

92. Uber taking over work so no work we can't afford to pay more
93. The work has reduced significantly as it is because of Uber and all the other app based firms . Firstly something should be done by the Coventry City Council to securing the taxi trade for Coventry Driver's before putting prices up.  
But not that the Coventry City Council takes any notice of Driver's in Coventry anyway. Because if they did .... the trade wouldn't be in the position it is in now.



20 August 2019

**Name of Cabinet Member:**

Not applicable

**Director Approving Submission of the report:**

Deputy Chief Executive, Place

**Ward(s) affected:**

Not applicable

**Title:**

Report of Recent Prosecutions: 1 February 2019 – 7 August 2019

---

**Is this a key decision?**

No

---

**Executive Summary:**

The purpose of this report is to update Members on any prosecutions authorised by Licensing and Regulatory committee that have concluded at Court between 1 February 2019 and 7 August 2019.

**Recommendations:**

That the report is noted.

**List of Appendices included:**

Schedule of Prosecutions concluded between 1 February 2019 and 7 August 2019.

**Other useful background papers:**

None

**Has it been or will it be considered by Scrutiny?**

*No*

**Has it been or will it be considered by any other Council Committee, Advisory Panel or other body?**

*No*

**Will this report go to Council?**

*No*

**1. Context (or background)**

- 1.1 At a Licensing and Regulatory Committee meeting on 24<sup>th</sup> January 2017, Members indicated that they would like to receive feedback of the results of any prosecutions that were authorised by the Committee once they had concluded at Court. It was subsequently decided that the most appropriate way of achieving this would be a Public Report to the Licensing and Regulatory Committee on a quarterly basis.

**2. Options considered and recommended proposal**

- 2.1 *Not applicable*

**3. Results of consultation undertaken**

- 3.1 *Not applicable*

**4. Timetable for implementing this decision**

- 4.1 *Not applicable*

**5. Comments from Director of Finance and Corporate Services**

5.1 Financial implications

Upon conviction before the Court, an application is made to recover investigation and legal costs in full. A Court will consider the application in conjunction with the defendant's financial means, if known, and make an Order for costs. There is no guarantee that full costs, or indeed any costs, will be awarded at the conclusion of a Prosecution case.

5.2 Legal implications

Each defendant convicted of an offence in the Magistrates Court has an automatic right of appeal to the Crown Court against conviction or sentence within 21 days. As some of the cases contained within this report are still subject to this 21 day period, it is possible that appeals may be lodged subsequent to this Committee meeting. Members will be updated on future reports if this is the case.

**6. Other implications**

*None*

**6.1 How will this contribute to achievement of the Council's key objectives / corporate priorities (corporate plan/scorecard) / organisational blueprint / Local Area Agreement (or Coventry Sustainable Community Strategy)?**

*Not applicable*

**6.2 How is risk being managed?**

*Not applicable*

**6.3 What is the impact on the organisation?**

*Not applicable*

#### 6.4 Equalities / EIA

*Not applicable*

#### 6.5 Implications for (or impact on) Climate Change or the environment

*Not applicable*

#### 6.6 Implications for partner organisations?

*Not applicable*

**Report author(s): Amy Wright**

**Name and job title: Criminal & Licensing Solicitor**

**Directorate: Place**

**Tel and email contact: 02476827660 [amy.wright@coventry.gov.uk](mailto:amy.wright@coventry.gov.uk)**

Enquiries should be directed to the above person.

<b>Contributor/approver name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Directorate or organisation</b>	<b>Date doc sent out</b>	<b>Date response received or approved</b>
<b>Contributors:</b>				
<b>Names of approvers for submission: (officers and members)</b>				
Legal: Gill Carter	Senior Solicitor	Place	07.08.19	07.08.19

This report is published on the council's website:  
[www.coventry.gov.uk/councilmeetings](http://www.coventry.gov.uk/councilmeetings)

## Appendices

### Schedule of Prosecutions concluded between 1 February 2019 and 7 August 2019

Name(s)	Offence(s)	Date of L&R Authorisation	Plea	Date Case Concluded	Sentence	Costs Awarded
Bartomiej Karczewski	Possession with intent to supply illicit cigarettes and alcohol	26.06.18	Guilty	15.02.19	6mths imprisonment suspended for 12mths with 150 hours unpaid work	£1000 (Partial)
Paulina Karczewska	Possession with intent to supply illicit cigarettes and alcohol	26.06.18	Guilty	15.02.19	Community Order with 100 hours unpaid work	£1000 (Partial)
Fargo Retail Ltd	Displaying food for sale beyond use by date	18.12.18	Guilty	20.02.19	Fine £14,400 Victim Surcharge £170	£1,204.00 (Full)
Mohammed Shazad	Displaying food for sale beyond use by date	18.12.18	Guilty	20.02.19	Fine £10,400 Victim Surcharge £170	£0 (Costs paid awarded in full to be paid by company above)
Jaspal Singh Dillon	Food safety and hygiene offences	20.11.18	Guilty	03.04.19	Fine £2,500 Victim Surcharge £170	£1,555.50 (Full)
Abdul Qayyum Khan	Failing or refusing to carry a disabled passenger with an assistance dog	23.10.18	Not guilty	08.05.19	Fine £750 Victim Surcharge £75	£750 (Partial)
Abdul Basit	Food Hygiene Offences (glass in take away food)	26.02.19	Guilty	07.08.19	Fine £961.00 Victim Surcharge £96.00	£2,384.66 (Full)
Zaakir Hussain	Food Hygiene Offences (severe rat infestation)	02.04.19	Guilty	07.08.19	Fine £1,260.00 Victim Surcharge £31.00	£1,154.75 (Full)
Rathanam Sinnathamby	Food Hygiene Offences (broken boiler and filthy conditions)	02.04.19	Guilty	07.08.19	Fine £500.00 Victim Surcharge £50.00	£1154.75 (Full)

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



By virtue of paragraph(s) 1, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank