CABINET MEMBERS DELEGATED DECISION

Open		Would	Would any decisions proposed :							
Any especially affected Wards	Mandatory/ Discretionary /		irely wit o be rec	YES/ NO YES /NO						
	Operational	ls it a k	Key Dec	¥es /No						
Lead Member: Cllr Paul Kunes			Othe	r Cabinet N	lembers consulted: N	lone				
E-mail: <u>cllr.paul.kunes@West-norfolk.gov.uk</u>			Othe	Other Members consulted: Cllr Don Tyler						
	Lead Officer: Marie Malt			Other Officers consulted:						
E-mail: marie.malt@west-norfolk.gov.uk				Vicki Hopps						
Financial Implications YES / NO	Policy/Personr Implications YES / NO	In	tatutory nplicatic ES / NO	olications Assessment		Risk Management Implications YES / NO				
Date meeting advertised: 7 th June 2019				Date of meeting decision to be taken: 14 th June 2019						
Deadline for Call-In: 21st June 2019										

FIXING OF FARES FOR HACKNEY CARRIAGE VEHICLES

Summary

The Council are responsible for fixing the rates of fares for Hackney Carriage vehicles licensed by this authority.

Recommendation

That there is an increase to the hackney carriage fares as set out within the report.

Reason for Decision

Request from the members of the hackney carriage trade.

1.0 Background

- 1.1 Under Section 65 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 the Borough Council may fix the rates or fares within the district for a time as distance, and all other charges in connection with the hire of a vehicle. Hackney carriages cannot charge passengers more than the rates prescribed by the Borough Council.
- 1.2 The current fare rates were introduced on the 4th January 2016.
- 1.3 Whilst the Act gives the Borough Council the power to set fares it is considered appropriate to consult those members of the trade affected before doing so.
- 1.4 Between the 1st February 2019 and 30th April 2019 all members of the hackney carriage licensed trade were consulted as to whether they would like

an increase. Of the 90 letters sent 44 responses were received and a summary of those responses is shown in Figure 1 below.

Number of co	nsultation le	etters:	90												
Number of res				49%											
				4370											
	Current	No.	%		No.	%		No.	%		No.	%		No.	%
Flag/1 st Mile	£4.00	26	59	£4.20	1	2	£4.50	10	23	£5.00	7	16			
Subsequent 160 yds	£0.16	3	7.5	£0.17	2	4.5	£0.18/ £2 per mile	27	61	£0.20	11	25	£0.22	1	2
Waiting Time (1min)	£0.25	31	70.5	£0.28	1	2	£0.30	10	23	£0.35	2	4.5			•
Soiling Charge	£90.00	18	41	£100.00	24	54.5	£110.00	2	4.5						
Sundays 6am- 11.30pm	25%	37	84	50%	7	16				,					
MPV Extra over 4 persons	50%	43	98	25%	1	2									

Summary of Responses Received to Hackney Fare Consultation

Figure 1

- 1.5 The summary provides that the majority of those who responded are in favour of the fares and charges being increased in respect of the rate charged per mile (after the flag/first mile) and the soiling charge.
- 1.6 The current fare per mile is £1.76 and 61% would like an increase to £2.00 per mile. The current soiling charge is £90.00 and 54.5% would like an increase to £100.00.
- 1.7 In order to achieve the fare rate of £2.00 per mile, the fare charge card and meters installed in hackney carriage vehicles will need to change from measuring distance per 160 yards to measuring distance per 176 yards. As there are 1760 yards to a mile, each 176 yards will need to be set to charge 20p.
- 1.8 The table below provides fare comparisons with neighboring authorities as at January 2019.

	BCKLWN	Fenland	East Cambs	Forest Heath	Breckland	North Norfolk	South Holland
Flag / 1 st mile	£4.00	£3.30	£4.00	£3.80	£3.60	£3.60	£2.20
Per mile	£1.76	£2.00	£2.00	£2.00	£2.00	£2.00	£1.50
5 miles	£11.04	£11.30	£12.00	£11.80	£11.60	£11.60	£8.20
10 miles	£19.84	£21.30	£22.00	£21.80	£21.60	£21.60	£15.70

2.0 Options Considered

- 2.1 To increase the fares and charges.
- 2.2 To make no increase to the current fares and charges.

3.0 Policy Implications

None

4.0 Financial Implications

None

5.0 Personnel Implications

None

6.0 Statutory Considerations

- 6.1 Section 65 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976
- 7.0 Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) (Pre-screening report template attached)
- 8.0 Risk Management Implications

9.0 Declarations of Interest / Dispensations Granted

10.0 Background Papers

None

Signed: Councillor Paul Kunes, Cabinet Member for Commercial Services:

Date:....

Pre-Screening Equality Impact Assessment

Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk



Name of policy/service/function	Environment	tal Health – Licensing					
Is this a new or existing policy/ service/function?	Existing						
Brief summary/description of the main aims of the policy/service/function being screened. Please state if this policy/service rigidly constrained by statutory obligations	to be implem Lynn & West	nented within the Borou t Norfolk area.	Carriage Fare increase is rough Council of King's us Provisions) Act 1975,				
Question	Answer						
1. Is there any reason to believe that the policy/service/function could have a specific impact on people from one or more of the following groups according to their different protected characteristic, for example, because			Positive	Negative	Neutral	Unsure	
they have particular needs, experiences, issues	Age				\checkmark		
or priorities or in terms of ability to access the service?	Disability				~		
Service :	Gender				~		
	Gender Re-as	ssignment			~		
Please tick the relevant box for each group.	Marriage/civil partnership				✓		
	Pregnancy & maternity				✓		
NB. Equality neutral means no negative impact on any group.	Race				✓		
on any group.	Religion or be			✓			
	Sexual orientation				✓		
	Other (eg low	income)			✓		
Question	Answer	Comments	1	I		1	
2 . Is the proposed policy/service likely to affect relations between certain equality communities or to damage relations between the equality communities and the Council, for example because it is seen as favouring a particular community or denying opportunities to another?	Yes / No						
3 . Could this policy/service be perceived as impacting on communities differently?	¥es / No						
4. Is the policy/service specifically designed to tackle evidence of disadvantage or potential discrimination?	Yes / No						
5. Are any impacts identified above minor and if so, can these be eliminated or reduced by minor actions? If yes, please agree actions with a member of the Corporate Equalities Working Group and list	¥es / No Actions: Actions agreed b		EWG	memb	er:		
agreed actions in the comments section							
Assessment completed by: Name: Marie Malt							
Assessment completed by:	Date						

Please Note: If there are any positive or negative impacts identified in question 1, or there any 'yes' responses to questions 2 - 4 a full impact assessment will be required.