

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET

LICENSING COMMITTEE

Friday, 19th June, 2015

Present:- Councillors Paul Myers (Chair), Cherry Beath, Neil Butters, Emma Dixon, Deirdre Horstmann and Will Sandry

Also in attendance: Cathryn Humphries (Team Manager for Licensing and Environmental Protection), Alan Bartlett (Public Protection Team Leader), John Dowding (Senior Public Protection Officer), Shaine Lewis (Principal Solicitor and Deputy Monitoring Officer) and Carrie-Ann Evans (Senior Legal Adviser)

19 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

These were accepted as a correct record of the meeting and signed by the Chair.

20 ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIR (IF DESIRED)

RESOLVED that a Vice-Chair was not required on this occasion.

21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

Apologies were received from Cllr Donal Hassett, Cllr Caroline Roberts and Cllr Karen Walker. Cllr Neil Butters substituted for Cllr Roberts.

22 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

23 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIR

24 ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC - TO RECEIVE DEPUTATIONS, STATEMENTS, PETITIONS OR QUESTIONS

25 MINUTES: 6TH OCTOBER 2014

26 REVIEW OF HACKNEY CARRIAGE DEMAND SURVEY REPORT

The Licensing and Environmental Protection Team Manager presented the report. She introduced Ian Millership, author of CTS's Taxi unmet demand survey.

She said that some years ago the Council adopted a policy of limiting the number of taxis in Zone 1, corresponding to the area of the former Bath City Council, whereas there is no limit in Zone 2, which has the same boundaries as the former Wansdyke District Council. When the number of taxis in an area is regulated, it is best practice to test regularly whether there is significant unmet demand for taxis in that area and to consider whether the limit should be raised. After the survey conducted in 2011, it was concluded that there was no significant unmet demand in Zone 1 and the limit remained 122. Following the 2014 survey, it had been concluded that there was significant unmet demand and that the limit should be raised to 125.

Ian Millership gave a PowerPoint presentation about the survey. A copy of his slides is attached to these minutes. In reply to a question about the usage of new taxi ranks, he referred to the table on page 25 of his report (agenda page 47).

Members suggested that the signage of the taxi rank in Southgate Street could be improved. They also suggested that signage for taxi ranks could give information about which rank was best for travelling to a particular destination, as it would assist in reducing traffic congestion in the City if taxis could travel by the most direct route.

A Member asked why there was variation in the charges made taxi drivers for baggage. The Senior Public Protection Officer advised that there was a set charge for luggage, but that drivers had discretion about what they classified as luggage.

A Member asked about the response of groups representing disabled people to the consultation. Mr Millership referred to the list of consultees in Appendix 2 of the report, and said that there had been no specific complaint from a disability group about facilities for disabled people. There did not appear to be a business case for the provision of more taxis that could accommodate wheelchairs; larger taxis tended to be used by parties rather than wheelchair users.

A Member said that while he was aware that the area where the taxi rank was located in front of Bath Spa Railway Station was a private, this rank was probably the most important one in Bath and usage of it was likely to increase following the electrification of the Great Western main line. He wondered whether there was dialogue between the Council and First Great Western about this. The Senior Public Protection Officer confirmed that there was. Bob Hollingdale of Bath Taxi Association said that the number of places at this rank had been increased three years ago; driving off the rank into the street was very difficult because of traffic congestion.

Replying to a question from a Member, the Senior Public Protection Officer said that the hours of work of taxi drivers in Bath and North East Somerset were not regulated, nor were they by any other local authority as far as he was aware.

Members said that there was a sound case set out in the survey report to increase the number of permitted taxis from 122 to 125 in Zone 1.

RESOLVED to recommend to the Cabinet Member:

1. that the number of taxi licences in Zone 1 be increased from 122 to 125;
2. that there should be dialogue between the Council and the owners of the Southgate Shopping Centre about improved signage for the taxi rank there;
3. that public information and signage for taxi ranks should indicate which taxi ranks were the most appropriate for particular journeys.

27 UPDATE ON GAMBLING CONSULTATION

The Licensing and Environmental Protection Team Manager presented the report and made a PowerPoint presentation. A copy of her slides is attached.

She said that there had only been two responses to the previous consultation. The gambling policy would be considered by a PDS Panel and would be brought back to the Committee in October before being taken to Council.

A Member expressed surprise at the low number of betting shops in the BANES area. In reply to questions from Members officers advised:

- a betting shop had to have planning permission as well as a betting premises licence; if there were representations about a premises licence application, there would have to be a hearing before the Licensing Sub-Committee
- all betting shops in BANES had been assessed as low-risk following inspections
- inspections had to be risk-based and not annual
- there were different regulations for gaming machines in pubs and clubs; clubs are premises not open to the general public (eg Tesco's canteen) and were allowed to have higher stakes and prizes
- there was no evidence about the level of gambling addiction in BANES

RESOLVED to note the update.

The meeting ended at 11.01 am

Chair(person)

Date Confirmed and Signed

Prepared by Democratic Services

This page is intentionally left blank



Bath and North East Somerset Council Taxi unmet demand study 2014

Ian Millership

**Licensing Committee
Bath and North East Somerset Council
Friday 19th June 2015**

Introduction



- Team: Joe MacLaren Director
Ian Millership Study Manager
- Appointed: 6 March 2014
- Public Consultations: May 2014
- Rank Surveys October 2014
- Key stakeholders March - December 2014
- Trade Consultations: March 2014
- Presentation to committee 19 Jun 2015

Outline of slides

- Aims of survey
- Fleet / Industry issues
- Rank activity
- Public questionnaire / consultation
- Stakeholder consultation
- Disability issues
- Trade Consultation
- Key Conclusions
- Any Questions ?

Aim of this survey

- Identify any significant unmet demand (SUD)(or otherwise)
- If SUD found, recommend number of licence increases required to eliminate this
- Include in recommendations only issues practically achievable and within gift of licensing

Fleet / Industry issues

- Limit on hackney carriage vehicle (hcv) numbers in city zone
- Area has zones from local government reorganisation
- 122 hcv
- Plus 31 outer area hcv and 334 all-area phv
- Hcv numbers in city zone 37% more than in 1994
- Phv growth 88% since 1997 to present but currently falling
- Level of hcv to population just below average for “Avon” and English levels
- Overall total licensed vehicle levels just below English average but well above “Avon” level (hcv + phv)
- Fares 4% above Avon average and 14% above national average, 35th= at time of report (now 38th= at May 15)

Rank activity

- 127 hours observed at ranks
- Abbey (47%) and Bath Spa Station (private) (45%) see similar proportions of passengers as in 2008 and 2011
- Between 2011 and 2014 every rank has seen real growth in passenger numbers
- Rail passenger growth 20% in similar period
- New shopping centre fully opened
- Two new ranks successfully introduced
- Estimated annual hcv usage from ranks just under 916k

Public consultation

- 201 members of public interviewed (local only)
- 57% had used licensed vehicle in last three months (less than 90% of 2011)
- A quarter said they had used taxis less than three years ago
- 2.7 licensed vehicle trips per person per month, 0.5 for hcv
- 62% obtain by phone, 38% at rank
- Few companies named – competition levels low
- Know ranks well – only need is better signing for recent ranks
- About 1 in 5 had issues, focus on delay getting licensed vehicle
- Latent demand (from asking public how many have given up waiting at ranks for hcv) 16%

Stakeholder consultation

- Lot of usage of phv via freephones
- Also lot of stakeholder customers chose to use ranks
- Police view that vehicle numbers 'balanced'
- View that marshals had improved night service
- But this had increased usage as well

Disability issues

- Just one person observed using wheel chair to access hcv at ranks during survey
- No other visibly disabled observed during rank surveys
- Despite attempts no response from disability groups
- Most needing disability vehicles appear to have own provision or use organisations related to their specific needs

Trade consultation

- 4% response received from trade – fair level for such studies
- 52% from hcv
- 81% support retaining limit
- Average driver experience 10 years
- Typical week 50 hours
- Overall stated coverage of working hours in week also good

Key conclusions

- Good reason to retain limit on city zone hcv numbers
- Avoids congestion potential
- Ensures passengers benefit from stability
- ISUD estimates either side of cut-off limit (detail to be given)
- Retain limit but add three licences to eliminate significance of the unmet demand observed
- NB - Estimate EXCLUDES performance at private station rank
- Appears to be due to passenger growth
- Increase congestion reducing response time
- Council can't do anything to encourage more phv which market doesn't currently appear to be providing



Thank You.

Any Questions?

Review of B&NES Gambling Policy



Why are we reviewing our policy?

- » The Council is the Licensing Authority for the Gambling Act 2005
- » We grant premises licences and permits for various gambling activities
- » The Act requires us to review and publish our statement of licensing principles every 3 years

What are the licensing objectives?

- » Preventing gambling from being a source of crime or disorder, being associated with crime or disorder, or being used to support crime;
- » Ensuring that gambling is conducted in a fair and open way;
- » Protecting children and other vulnerable persons from being harmed or exploited by gambling;

What gambling premises do we have?

- » **1** casino premises licence
- » **1** racetrack premises licence
- » **14** betting shop premises licences
- » **17** club gaming machine permits
- » **98** licensed premises gaming machine permits

How are we going to consult?

- » 12 week consultation period
- » via consultation portal on Council's website
[insert web address here]
- » Responsible authorities contacted e.g.
Police, HM Revenue and Customs

The Democratic process

- » Policy will be reviewed by Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel during consultation
- » Be brought back to Licensing Committee in October 2015 for recommendation to proceed to Full Council decision
- » Adoption in November 2015 by Full Council

Any questions?

This page is intentionally left blank