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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1) Introduction

Middlesbrough has an ambitious community strategy and well developed community engagement process. Key themes of the strategy are ensuring diversity, neighbourhood renewal, management; sustainability; community cohesion; and a transport network to support these – in which taxis and private hire vehicles play a key part. In addition, the Council is seeking to ensure quality taxis and private hire vehicles play an appropriate role in supporting the Mayor’s raising hope agenda built on the four pillars of: clean and safe environment; physical regeneration; enterprise culture and a transport network that meets the needs of the town.

To assist in taking forward this agenda Middlesbrough Council commissioned Transportation Planning (International) Ltd to undertake an independent review of taxi operations in the town. The study comprised two separate elements of work:

- Rank and Traffic Management Review; and
- Hackney Carriage Vehicle Accessibility Audit.

2) Rank and Traffic Management Review

The Rank and Traffic Management Review has the following objectives:

- An examination of rank provision in the town centre, including pedestrian and vehicle access routes and permeability;
- The establishment of customer needs;
- Examination of ‘pinch points’ (locations identified as having high volumes of traffic at night);
- Identification of parking/waiting locations for private hire vehicles and the potential implications of this;
- An assessment of the safety issues;
- Consideration of cost effective options for a centralised ranking arrangement;
- Examination of the opportunities and benefits of road closures;
- Identification of the potential for other traffic management measures;
- Examination of the potential role of Taxi Marshall’s;
- Ensuring solutions proposed accommodate all sectors of the taxi trade; and
- Production of a final report detailing options and recommendations.

To achieve these objectives the following tasks were undertaken:

- Examination of recent reviews of taxi or rank provision;
- Examination of traffic flow data in the town centre, Linthorpe Road and Southfield Road environs;
- Examination of traffic regulation orders;
- Examination of current traffic and transport planning policy in Middlesbrough;
- Examination of good practice in other UK cities in terms of rank provision and operation;
- Night and day time audit of existing ranks in terms of accessibility for passengers, current demand and supply;
- Night and day time audit of existing town centre traffic management conditions;
- Night and day time audit of existing town centre pedestrian desire lines;
• Traffic count data was obtained at key town centre vehicular access points;
• CCTV footage was collected in order to observe rank activity and pedestrian / traffic movements within the vicinity of ranks;
• Consultation with passengers undertaken at ranks in the town centre;
• Consultation with hackney carriage drivers undertaken at ranks in the town centre;
• Consultation with the hackney carriage and private hire trades at various existing taxi forum and via meetings arranged specifically for this purpose;
• Consultation with a wide range of representatives of key stakeholder groups including Council Officers, Police and Middlesbrough Town Centre Management; and
• Observations of the night time economy via the use of the Council's CCTV Control Room.

Analysis of the outputs from the audits and consultation process are drawn together to provide specific conclusions and recommendations for Middlesbrough on the improvements needed to enhance taxi operations in the town. These conclusions and recommendations are summarised as follows:

2.1) Conclusions

Middlesbrough presents a typical picture of the night time economy with significant levels of footfall, demand for transport and high traffic volumes. Unique to Middlesbrough is that such activity is concentrated to specific locations at specific time periods having a consequential effect on the efficient and effective management of the taxi operation.

Based on the rank surveys whilst the overall number of rank spaces meets overall demand, a number of individual ranks are unable to meet demand whilst other ranks are under utilised. This has resulted in an imbalance between rank demand and supply. This imbalance gives rise to adverse traffic management, pedestrian and highway safety issues. This is compounded by some discord between key partners in the provision of taxi services, in particular the Council Licensing authority, the Hackney and Private Hire Vehicle (PHV) sectors.

Issues of inefficient enforcement by the Council have been raised by the hackney carriage and private hire trades. Whilst enforcement plays a key role in delivering successful taxi arrangements, increased enforcement in Middlesbrough as a sole measure to improve taxi operations is not seen as a practical way forward. Enforcement alone will not resolve the issue of inefficient rank operation and issues concerning pedestrian and highway safety.

A co-ordinated package of management and physical measures is required that brings together the various components of delivering successful taxi operations in an efficient and safe road environment. It is envisaged that this will add to the attraction of the Town Centre and in turn increase the demand for taxi services, especially in relation to the night time economy.

2.2) Recommendations

The following recommendations are made to address the issues identified. These are detailed in full in section 5 in the main body of the report and are also illustrated in Chart 1 on page 63.

• That a Quality Taxi Partnership (QTP) is established between taxi operators, licensing authority, the Police and other key partners such as bodies representing interests of businesses or user groups. The aim of the QTP is to provide a framework to facilitate joint working between partners to improve the provision of taxi services in Middlesbrough, including efficient enforcement and to build trust between partners in order that all other recommendations can be implemented successfully.
That Taxi Marshall’s are appointed (minimum 6no.) to manage and coordinate taxi demand and provision within the town centre and Linthorpe Road / Southfield Road area, especially at the ranks and PHV holding areas proposed.

That town centre hackney and PHV policy guidance should be developed alongside an unlicensed PCV and out of area vehicle policy to support the enforcement role.

That a ‘Policy for New Ranks’ should be introduced dealing with all aspects of the formation of ranks ranging from policy to detailed design, monitoring and review.

That a taxi trade website is developed to be run as part of the QTP, possibly over time incorporating a trade booking system. Access to the booking system will be given to those operators who become (full) members of the QTP.

That town centre ranks are rationalised with the removal of some ranks and formation of a series of super ranks at Exchange Square, Albert Road and Corporation Road.

That the ranks located at Linthorpe Road and Southfield Road are rationalised with the provision of a super rank at Southfield Lane with additional ranks located on Linthorpe Road.

That final decisions on the traffic management measures to be introduced for Wilson Street are made based on a pilot. Up to 4 stages for the pilot are envisaged, as follows, with outcomes dependent on monitoring and review at each stage a) retention of Wilson Street as a two-way road, b) operation of Wilson Street under one-way (traffic flows east to west), c) full closure of Wilson Street during the night time economy and d) if none of the above prove entirely satisfactory a decision based on that which worked best.

That a night time closure of Corporation Road (fronting the Walkabout) is implemented.

That the removal of build-outs along Albert Road is undertaken to increase on street parking, pick-up and drop-off opportunities.

That private hire vehicle holding areas are created at Station Street / Zetland road car park (north of the town centre) and at Park Vale Road adjacent to Claireville Common (south of the town centre). Their location, town centre policy and enforcement to ensure the private hire holding areas are not used as private hire ‘ranks’ and this to be monitored by mystery passengers. Supplementary Planning Guidance should be adopted by the Council to ensure that the private hire holding areas are compatible with future development proposals.

That Buxton Street car park should be promoted as a night time economy business car park to remove existing business car parking located along Albert Road.

That in the interests of safety pedestrian guard railing should be installed along Albert Road along the frontage of Spenseley’s night club and outside the Empire.

That awareness of the recommendations should be promoted through an effective Communication and Marketing Strategy to include use of Taxi Marshall’s, use of the proposed taxi website, businesses and the taxi trade, with adequate lead-in time ahead of implementation.

That the recommendations should be monitored once in place.

That the recommendations should be taken into account when producing the next Local Transport Plan for Middlesbrough.

3) Hackney Carriage Vehicle Accessibility Audit

The Hackney Carriage Vehicle Accessibility Audit has the following objectives:

- A review of current good practice and guidance in the provision of accessible taxis;
- An examination of current legislation, including the Disability Discrimination Act;
- An assessment of the needs of disabled people for accessible hackney carriages;
- An audit of the current vehicle mix in the hackney fleet, as a whole;
- An assessment of the benefits and disadvantages of rear loading wheelchair accessible vehicles;
3.1) Research

To achieve these objectives the following tasks were undertaken:

- A detailed examination and summary of the current legislation which, primarily, consists of the Disability Discrimination Act 2005 (soon to be incorporated into the Single Equalities Act 2010);
- A detailed examination of recent Department for Transport (DfT) guidance including the guidance issued to licensing officers in March 2010 and the consultation on accessible taxis undertaken by DfT during 2009;
- An examination of good practice in Europe and elsewhere in the UK in terms of both accessible taxis in general and specifically in relation to the use of side or rear loading wheelchair accessible vehicles;
- An audit of the current policy position in Middlesbrough and the outcomes of this in terms of the accessibility of the current taxi fleet;
- Consultation with the general public through a survey undertaken at taxi ranks in the town centre;
- Consultation with taxi operators at various existing taxi forum and via meetings arranged specifically for the purpose;
- Consultation with a wide range of representatives of key stakeholder organisations, including Council Officers, organisations that commission taxis for use by disabled people, Middlesbrough Shopmobility and the Council older people’s reference group officer;
- A questionnaire based survey of disabled people to obtain their views on taxi access in Middlesbrough;
- A detailed accessibility audit, by disabled people, of a selection of the current hackney carriage fleet operating in Middlesbrough; and
- An examination of the market for taxis both in general and specifically for disabled people.

Analysis of the outputs from this research are drawn together to provide specific conclusions and recommendations for Middlesbrough on the improvements needed to enhance access to taxis for disabled and mobility impaired people. These conclusion and recommendations are summarised below.

3.2) Conclusions

In Middlesbrough there is a significant market for accessible taxi services. While estimates provided need to be treated with some caution, as they are based on extrapolation, there is potentially demand from disabled people for 270,000 trips (one way) per annum, including 30,000 trips per annum by people who use a wheelchair. In general in the fields of passenger and public transport there is a need for a better understanding of the market potential offered by disabled people and in particular, how to go about developing this market. The taxi sector is no different in this.

There is currently no government regulation of the type of taxi or specifically hackney vehicles that should be provided to meet the needs of disabled people. This has received substantial consideration since the DDA was first introduced in 1995 but to date government has been unable to reconcile its desire for accessibility with concerns that this could have a substantial impact on the viability of hackney operations and hence cause a reduction in the hackney fleet available.

The recent DfT consultation exercise remains inconclusive and as a result government is proposing to undertake 3 pilot studies to obtain further information before coming to a decision on the best way
forward. This will take some time and even then any change is likely to be phased in suggesting it
could be 2020, at least, before any government led change would finally be put in place. In the
meantime government advise that the licensing authority should decide what is best for their area.

The current policy has worked well for Middlesbrough achieving an almost 50/50 split in the Hackney
fleet between saloon and wheelchair accessible vehicles. It also fits well with evidence from this study
that disabled people in the town welcome a mix of vehicle types in the hackney fleet as this best
meets the needs of different disabled people. However, it is not clear this approach is entirely
consistent with DfT who appear to have a preference for all hackneys being wheelchair accessible
vehicles. Debate arises primarily because there is no vehicle yet available that is suitable to meet the
needs of all. In this context it does not seem unreasonable for Middlesbrough to maintain their current
policy approach until the matter is resolved.

However, there are significant safety concerns over the use of rear loading wheelchair accessible
hackney vehicles. These concerns have led to a number of significant interest groups, the National
Taxi Association, the Taxi Trade Union, Radar, and the Spinal Injuries association calling for rear
loading vehicles not to be licensed as hackneys. They include:

- Difficulties using rear loading vehicles safely at ranks;
- There being no dropped kerb at ranks to facilitate access to the road (and therefore ramp);
- That deploying ramps safely for flag downs and drop offs cannot be guaranteed;
- The impacts of the camber in the road on the stability of ramps; and
- Potential impacts on driver's health from having to push a person in a wheelchair up the ramp,
  which from the road needs to be longer to achieve an appropriate gradient.

In Middlesbrough this issue relates in particular to the Fiat Doblo which makes up nearly 2/3 of all
wheelchair accessible vehicles in the hackney fleet. There are also issues identified for some
ambulant disabled people accessing this vehicle due to the height of the side step, reaching the
passenger seats in the vehicle and with the comfort of the seats. This lack of suitability was confirmed
by the vehicle audit undertaken where the Fiat Doblo proved to be the least popular vehicle of all
those examined.

The taxi trade are reluctant to accept proposals to remove these vehicles from the hackney fleet due
to the cost of the alternatives, especially at a time of recession and perceived reduction in demand
and because they regard them as the only vehicle that suit those needing a high roof height, that can
carry a wheelchair user that prefers to travel facing forwards and that offer a fixing to all four corners of
the wheelchair. To replace all 108 does have a potential additional cost of approximately £10,000 per
vehicle or just over £1m in total, more than the cost of replacing like for like. However, this increase in
costs can be compensated for by increasing the life cycle for a more expensive vehicle. It is also the
case that costs can be spread by considering vehicle leasing as opposed to outright purchase and
there are side loading accessible hackney vehicles on the market (Peugeot E7 or Mercedes M8) that
can offer the same features for wheelchair users as those provided by the Fiat Doblo. Therefore,
overall it is considered that the safety issues outweigh all other issues and rear loading vehicles
should no longer be licensed as hackneys when they come up for renewal.

It is notable that there are currently only 2 wheelchair accessible vehicles licensed within the PHV
fleet. This does not match with the view of the DfT that PHV operators have a propensity to make
these vehicles available. Also, while it is the case that a number of PHV operators draw on wheelchair
accessible vehicles from hackney operators to address this shortcoming in their fleet in order to
respond to requests for journeys from people who need to travel in their wheelchair it cannot be
guaranteed that these will always be available or available to respond immediately to such demands.
While there is no current government regulation or guidance on the taxi vehicles that should be licensed, taxi services are subject to the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act (soon to be superseded by the Single Equalities Act 2010). The most common service issues identified in Middlesbrough include:

- Concerns amongst disabled people about the cost of using hackney vehicles;
- That disabled people are not aware of the access features that are available from vehicles or are unfamiliar with how to use these; ie that saloon style hackneys have swivel seats or how to go about opening a sliding door;
- That disabled people are uncertain how or where to go about booking a hackney by telephone or how find out about the accessibility features available from different vehicles;
- That some drivers do not provide assistance to disabled people when required or appear reluctant to respond to demands from this group;
- That taxi schedulers are not always responsive to the needs of disabled people; and
- That there is a need to improve infrastructure at ranks; ie dropped kerbs, signage, seating, shelter.

3.3) Recommendations

To address the issues identified a co-ordinated package of recommendations are proposed. These are detailed in full in section 10 in the main body of the report and are also illustrated in Chart 2 on page 143.

- That it is in the public interest that Middlesbrough retain their current policy of capping hackneys that are saloon style vehicles at 190 while requiring all new hackney licenses issued to be for wheelchair accessible vehicles.
- That in consultation with the trade, disabled people and other interested stakeholders via the Quality Taxi Partnership proposed (see R18) Middlesbrough establish two detailed vehicle specifications one for wheelchair accessible vehicles that can carry (most) disabled people that need to travel in their wheelchair and the other for accessible saloon cars that can accommodate wheelchair users that can transfer to a passenger seat and carry the persons wheelchair in the boot.
- That both vehicle specifications should be based on the interim specification provided by the DfT in their 2009 consultation document, ensuring they address the issues of step and roof height, seating, door opening, need for grab handles, driver communication, WAV identification, colour contrast, etc identified in the vehicle audit, consultation undertaken and by good practice elsewhere.
- That the vehicle specifications, once agreed, should be applied to all new and replacement vehicles (hackney and PHV) at the time all current vehicles become due for replacement according to their currently agreed lifespan and the further recommendations below.
- That the wheelchair accessible specification for hackneys should accept only vehicles with a side loading ramp or passenger lift while that for PHVs should allow for rear loading as an alternative.
- That the saloon car specification for hackneys should continue to require these to be fitted with a swivel seat but that this should not be required of PHV saloons.
- That PHV operators with 10 or more vehicles (owned or operated) should be required to replace every 10th vehicle (when it comes up for replacement or from new if moving from operating 9 to 10 vehicles) in their fleet as a wheelchair accessible vehicle and should also continue to build and formalise their partnership working with wheelchair accessible hackney operators to supplement the available wheelchair accessible fleet they offer to provide an immediate response to demands from disabled people.
- That if this does not achieve at least a 30:70 percent mix of wheelchair accessible to accessible saloon type vehicles in the overall fleet each offer for immediate response within a period of 2 years the requirement to replace vehicles with wheelchair accessible vehicles should be increased.
from every 10th vehicle to every 9th vehicle and so on every 2 years until either the 30:70 percent mix is achieved or a minimum of every 5th vehicle is required to be wheelchair accessible. This to be monitored as part of the monitoring proposed in R19 below, in part by the use of mystery passengers and by operators demonstrating to their fleet to the Council using copies of the agreements they have established with hackney operators and the specifications of vehicles they operate directly.

- That the lifespan for all new and replacement vehicles is extended to a maximum of 12 years where these are Euro 4 compliant and have a purchase cost new of £24,000 or more, 10 years (if Euro 4 and have a purchase cost of between £20,000 and £23,999.99) and 8 years (if Euro 4 and have a purchase cost of less than £20,000). Where the vehicle is not new when it’s first licensed as a taxi the lifespan should be adjusted downwards based on the age of the vehicle.

- That all new and replacement vehicles licensed as taxis must be less than 3 years old (from the time they were 1st registered with DVLA) and that vehicles which are not, at least, Euro 4 compliant should not be accepted as new or replacement vehicles.

- That all taxi drivers (hackney and PHV) should be required to receive disability awareness and passenger handling training or if this is already in place refresher training now and at least every 4 years from now on before they are allowed to renew their license and all drivers of wheelchair accessible vehicles should be required to receive training in use of wheelchair equipment and providing assistance to wheelchair users, or if this is already in place refresher training now at least every 4 years from now on before they are allowed to renew their license.

- That the Council should establish a simple, 1 to 5, ranking system for taxi vehicles where 1 identifies a wheelchair accessible vehicle that exceeds (in terms of wheelchair accessibility) the minimum wheelchair accessible specification the Council adopt, 2 meets this specification, 3 meets or exceeds the minimum accessible saloon vehicle specification adopted, 4 meets the current wheelchair accessible vehicle specification and 5 the current saloon car specification.

- That the Council should make information available on their taxi licensing website, as well as in documented and audio format, on where and how to book wheelchair accessible vehicles (hackney and PHV) together with their ranking and other specific details of the access features available from different vehicles; ie swivel seats.

- That the Council should ensure any super ranks established and over time all ranks comply with guidance on accessibility of taxi ranks as issued by DfT.

- That the Council and Taxi operators should work together, through the Quality Taxi Partnership, to promote and raise awareness amongst disabled people of the availability of accessible taxis, how to book them, where to obtain information on accessible taxis and what access features they offer in general, in terms of the ranking system (ie R 12) developed and specifically in terms of swivel seats, fares, taxi sharing opportunities, etc. Also that the Council and taxi operators should work with organisations of and for disabled, older and mobility impaired people to better understand how to develop the taxi market from amongst these groups.

- That the Council and hackney operators should work together to encourage fare negotiation with passengers and medium to longer term establish a taxi sharing scheme to enable disabled people (and others) to travel together in order to reduce the costs of hackney use. For pre-booking this may require a central booking point (web and/or telephone based) to be established which could be based on a shared radio circuit for hackney operators or an existing booking and scheduling system offered by one or more existing PHV operators or bought in from an external call centre operator (including the Council).

- That medium to longer term any central web based booking point established should be used as the basis for establishing a facility for those (individuals or organisations) seeking to procure taxis on a spot hire or possibly longer term contract basis. At this point it will need to facilitate competitive bidding by operators for the booking requests received.

- That all the above is co-ordinated with and where appropriate (ie where partnership working is required) facilitated through the establishment of a Quality Taxi Partnership (see appendix C for further details) for Middlesbrough that involves the Council, taxi operators (hackney and PHV),
organisations of and working for disabled people and other interested stakeholders (ie those required by the recommendations of the rank review undertaken).

- That progress with the above is monitored quarterly over the coming year and its impacts, both on disabled people and in terms of the mix of vehicles in the hackney and PHV fleet, are monitored through a comprehensive equality impact assessment at the end of 2010/11 and again at the end of 2012/13 and then, at least, every 3 years from then on.

- That Middlesbrough approach the DfT to offer to participate as a pilot authority for accessible taxi vehicles and also that the recommendations proposed are reviewed again once DfT has issued any further advice following its proposed taxi pilots.

- That the recommendations of this report are taken into account in the production of the next Local Transport Plan for Middlesbrough.
1.0 CONTEXT OF THE STUDY

Middlesbrough Council

1.1 Middlesbrough is a major centre with a population of 139,500 located at the centre of the Tees valley conurbation. The area is in a process of ongoing economic regeneration, with new developments particularly along the riverside. However, its economic decline in recent decades is reflected in high levels of unemployment, lower than average health and life expectancy; and low levels of car ownership. The town has a good public transport network and access to the town and local centres, hospital etc are relatively good for the majority.

1.2 Middlesbrough has an ambitious community strategy and well developed community engagement, which we seek to build on in this work. Key themes of the strategy are ensuring diversity, neighbourhood renewal, management; sustainability; community cohesion; and a transport network – of which taxis and private hire vehicles are a key part – that support these. In addition, the Council is seeking to ensure quality taxis and private hire vehicles play an appropriate role in supporting the Mayor’s raising hope agenda built on the four pillars of: clean and safe environment; physical regeneration; enterprise culture and a transport network that meets the needs of the town.

1.3 The precise number of taxis in Middlesbrough varies almost week by week as new operators register or others choose not to renew their license. A copy of the Hackney and PHV fleet database was provided to the consultant for analysis on January 14th 2010. This identified 362 hackney carriages licensed by the authority and 399 private hire vehicles. The hackney carriage fleet recorded on the database was made up of 191 saloon style vehicles and 171 wheelchair accessible vehicles. On completion of the report the Taxi Licensing Officer provided updated figures for the 3rd August 2010 of 349 Hackneys (190 saloons {permanently capped at this number} and 159 wheelchair accessible vehicles) and 416 PHV's.

1.4 Many of these licensed vehicles operate late at night serving the night time economy of Middlesbrough when there are peak demands on their services. There are currently rank spaces for 178 hackney carriages operational at evening / night times. A small proportion of these spaces are located outside the town centre.

1.5 At peak times demand for hackney carriages and private hire vehicles is extremely high, with hackney carriages frequently being flagged down by people seeking to jump the queues at ranks, ranks outside popular locations becoming overcrowded, over-ranking by hackneys waiting at ranks, and the formation of non-designated ranks in locations being established as a result of customer demand.

1.6 It has become the practice of the private hire trade to site vehicles in close proximity to town centre locations to enable quicker customer response. This was the case at a time when the Council required PHVs to return to base between jobs. However, this rule was removed by the Council in a decision made by their licensing committee at a meeting on the 25th May 2010. There have also been accusations made by the hackney trade of illegal plying for hire being encouraged by PHV operators.

1.7 The combination of current town centre traffic management, general on-street parking, location and operation of ranks creates adverse traffic conditions:
   - accessibility (including private hire pick-up / drop-off);
indiscriminate parking by general road users, hackney and private hire vehicles on lengths of road with traffic prohibitions;
traffic congestion and vehicle; and
vehicle and pedestrian conflicts.

1.8 The private hire trade have made requests for the Council to allow the formation of designated parking / waiting areas. Whilst the Council have expressed an interest in permitting this, it must be approached with caution to avoid the formation of illegal private hire ranks and associated plying for hire offences.

1.9 Reviews of rank provision in the town are carried out regularly to extend, relocate or develop new ranks. However, this has resulted in a plethora of small ranks in the town and this in turn has led to difficulties resourcing the enforcement requirements of so many ranks in different locations. Concern has been raised by the Police in the past about the volume of traffic in particular locations in the town centre and consideration has been given to restricting vehicular access to, what are considered, high risk locations.

1.10 Middlesbrough Council aims to provide the best service possible for the travelling public in relation to taxi and private hire services. However, alongside the above the Council have also been made aware of concerns amongst older and disabled people about the accessibility of taxi services in the area.

Aims and Objectives

1.11 To address the above issues Middlesbrough Council commissioned Transportation Planning (International) Ltd (TPi) to undertake an independent study focusing on its key aims and objectives.

1.12 The commission comprised two key elements of work:

1. Rank and Traffic Management Review - To undertake an assessment of the current night time taxi arrangements in the town centre and develop proposals to improve these based on the views of the travelling public and the trade.

2. Hackney Carriage Vehicle Audit - To undertake an assessment of the current hackney fleet serving Middlesbrough residents and make proposals to improve vehicle accessibility, in line with guidance and good practice elsewhere.

1.13 In the case of the former (1.) there are the following key objectives:

- An examination of rank provision in the town centre, including pedestrian and vehicle access routes and permeability;
- The establishment of customer needs;
- Examination of ‘pinch points’ (locations identified as having high volumes of traffic at night);
- Identification of parking/waiting locations for private hire vehicles and the potential implications of this;
- An assessment of the safety issues;
- Consideration of cost effective options for a centralised ranking arrangement;
- Examination of the opportunities and benefits of road closures;
- Identification of the potential for other traffic management measures;
Examination of the potential role of Taxi Marshall’s;
Ensuring solutions proposed accommodate all sectors of the taxi trade; and
Production of a final report detailing options and recommendations.

1.14 In the case of the latter (2.) there are the following key objectives:

- A review of current good practice and guidance in the provision of accessible taxis;
- An examination of current legislation, including the Disability Discrimination Act;
- An assessment of the needs of disabled people for accessible hackney carriages;
- An audit of the current vehicle mix in the hackney fleet, as a whole;
- An assessment of the benefits and disadvantages of rear loading wheelchair accessible vehicles;
- An assessment of the safety issues;
- Identification of the market opportunities; and
- Production of a final report detailing options and recommendations.

Structure of this Report

1.15 This Report details the study, its formulated options and recommendations. Following this section the overall study methodology is outlined. The Report is then divided into two parts, sections 3 to 5 outline the Rank Review undertaken and its findings, while sections 6 to 10 outline the Hackney Fleet Accessibility Audit and its findings. Each section is structured as follows:

Section 2: Summarises the overall study methodology.

Rank Review

Section 3: Details the rank and traffic management review and outlines the consultations that were undertaken to inform the study recommendations.

Section 4: Outlines the 4th March 2010 Stakeholder Consultation Day and the development of improvement options.

Section 5: Provides recommendations relative to the rank and traffic management audit.

Hackney Fleet Accessibility Audit

Section 6: Details the hackney fleet accessibility audit and outlines current legislation and guidance.

Section 7: Details the current licensing position in Middlesbrough.

Section 8: Details the consultations that were undertaken for the hackney fleet review.

Section 9: Details the current taxi market.

Section 10: Provides conclusions and recommendations relative to the hackney fleet review.
2.0 STUDY METHODOLOGY – A SUMMARY

Inception and data review

2.1 At the commencement of the study, inception meetings were held with Middlesbrough Council to clarify objectives, obtain a thorough understanding of the local context in which the study is being undertaken, to identify key contacts for consultation and relevant data that was currently available. The inception meetings also discussed and finalised the detail of the work required, reporting format, timetable and key dates. At inception it was agreed that the Hackney fleet review should also take into account accessibility within the PHV fleet.

2.2 The study brief as summarised in paragraphs 1.12 – 1.14 had an original objective of focusing on rank provision and traffic management within Middlesbrough town centre. During the study inception meetings the Council requested that the study brief should be extended to include the following locations within the rank and traffic management review element of the study:

- Southfield Road (between Southfield Road and Woodlands Road);
- Linthorpe Road;
- Linthorpe Village; and
- Newport Road.

Policy Review

2.3 A review of key policy documents and existing data was undertaken including:

- Recent reviews of taxi or rank provision, including the Taxi unmet demand study undertaken in 2008;
- Traffic flow data in the town centre;
- Traffic regulation orders in the town centre;
- Recent council decisions relating to taxis, local policies, standards and licensing conditions;
- The Council’s Corporate Plan, community plan, regeneration plans, and any relevant Service Agreements;
- The Local Transport Plan LTP 2006/11, taxi policy, accessibility strategy, bus strategy, environmental strategy, transport research and any other relevant transport or town centre plans;
- Socio demographic and economic data;
- Best practice established by other local authorities;
- Database of taxi operators and licensed vehicles; and
- Current national government guidance on town centre design and accessible public transport.

Town Centre Rank Review

Town Centre, Linthorpe Road, Linthorpe Village Southfield Road, Audit

2.4 An audit was undertaken on the town centre, Southfield Road, Linthorpe Road, Linthorpe Village and Newport Road to establish and examine the main pedestrian and road routes to taxi ranks and how these are currently used. The audit was undertaken during daylight hours and during hours of darkness to coincide with the night time economy. The audit examined the
infrastructure, signage, layout, accessibility, barriers to permeability, pedestrian and traffic flows and their respective behaviour within the town centre, Southfield Road, Linthorpe Road, Linthorpe Village and along access routes to ranks.

Rank Audit

2.5 Supplementing the audit, further rank and traffic management observations were collected through the use of CCTV cameras.

2.6 Working with our partners MHC Traffic a specialist in this area, CCTV cameras were installed at selected rank locations. These were used to monitor rank activity over two 8 hour periods, from 19.00 to 03.00 on a Friday night / Saturday morning and from 19.00 to 03.00 on a Saturday / Sunday morning. The results of the observations were used to establish the scale and balance of supply and demand at each rank for each hour during the 8 hour period, any key peaks in demand or limitations in supply and the nature of vehicle supply, including any potential illegal plying for hire by PHVs. In addition the CCTV footage was used to examine passenger, other pedestrian, taxi and other driver behaviour both at the rank itself and in its vicinity, including the manner passengers and drivers go about approaching the rank.

2.7 In addition further information was gathered relative to the town centre, Southfield Road, Linthorpe Road, Linthorpe Village audit and rank audit through the use of the Council’s CCTV Control Room and accompanying the Police on a standard shift with Middlesbrough Council licensing officers.

Traffic Counts

2.8 In order to obtain bespoke quantitative data on traffic flows within the town centre additional CCTV cameras were installed at 7 key town centre access points to the town centre. These locations were agreed with the Council’s traffic officers. This CCTV footage captured data on traffic flows over the same two 8 hour periods used for the Rank Audit. The combination of rank audit and access point traffic data was used to evaluate the overall traffic flows affecting rank access and in assessing the distribution of hackneys within these flows and between ranks.

Consultation

2.9 To complement the above, consultation was undertaken with key stakeholders and both the users and operators of hackney carriages and private hire vehicles. Consultation with key stakeholders was undertaken throughout the duration of the study. The information was used to inform the requirements and locations to be examined by the town centre audit, rank audit and traffic counts. Stakeholder consultations also provided an opportunity to explore in depth stakeholder views on the issues being faced and the potential options to resolve these. Consultations were based on a proforma based set of questions prepared and agreed with the client in advance and with open discussion at stakeholder meetings. Where possible face to face meetings with key stakeholders were held. Where this was not practical for some of those proposed, telephone or written consultation opportunities were offered. Where key stakeholder contact details were incorrect every effort was made by TPi and the Council to ensure that key stakeholders had the opportunity to contribute to the review.

2.10 Consultation with passengers and hackney drivers was undertaken directly at each of the Corporation Road (Central Pub / Walkabout), Wilson Street and Southfield Road ranks. The views of passengers were sought on the current level of service available at night, accessibility, safety, security and ease of use, infrastructure, barriers to use, other issues and
options to improve provision or address concerns. The views of drivers were sought on rank locations, road access and ‘pinch points’, safety and security issues, passenger behaviour, barriers to use, other key issues and options to improve provision or address concerns.

2.11 The survey took the form of an on street survey using interviewers to obtain views based on a written questionnaire, agreed in advance with the Council. Surveys took place at night between the hours of 19.00 and 22.30, with the aim of obtaining survey returns from as many as possible of the total drivers (70no.) found to be serving demands at this time and a total of at least 300 passengers. Both surveys were undertaken in tandem by the same interviewers speaking to passengers and drivers, available at each rank and willing to participate. It was not considered practical to seek surveys at later times when ranks were likely to be most busy and there were added personal security concerns for interviewers and interviewees.

Analysis and Reporting

2.12 The outputs of each of the above were brought together in order to evaluate and identify the key town centre issues to be addressed and potential solutions available, in line with the aim and objectives for the study. These were brought together into a long list of potential options and measures which formed the basis for further consultation. These options were presented to key stakeholders at a consultation forum arranged for the 4th March 2010 with the aim of narrowing down the long list to a preferred short list of options. Following this a draft report was produced and a further consultation forum arranged for the 27th May 2010 to receive feedback on this. Written responses on the draft report were also accepted up to 25th June 2010.

2.13 The outputs of the stakeholder consultations have been taken into account to formulate this final report which puts forward a co-ordinated package of recommendations to provide the best service possible for the travelling public in relation to taxi and private hire services in the town.

Hackney Fleet Review

Fleet Audit

2.14 A background review was undertaken to establish information on the overall fleet mix from the current Council database. Detailed analysis of this data followed to establish the range of vehicle types in the current fleet mix:

- By age;
- By size;
- By seating capacity;
- By engine capacity; and
- By access features (swivel seat, side ramp, rear loading ramp, signage).

2.15 The audit was supplemented by views on vehicle accessibility obtained from drivers and the general public as part of the driver and public consultation, identified above.

Consultation

2.16 Key stakeholders were consulted to inform the audits proposed and to obtain their views on the access issues faced. This included consideration of physical access to the vehicle, access to service and any psychological barriers faced. In the case of the former vehicle features such as wheelchair access, use of doors, step heights, seating, grab handles, highlighting, ride
comfort, etc were included within a specific vehicle audit. In addition, views on the access features available at ranks were sought.

2.17 Service issues were examined including booking, punctuality, responsiveness, driver assistance, communication, vehicle journey, charges, disability awareness, etc. To examine the psychological barriers that may exist the perceptions of the hackney trade, its attitude towards the market offered by mobility impaired people and towards improving the facilities it offers (i.e. through driver training) were explored.

2.18 Consultation was based on a proforma based set of questions prepared and agreed with the Council in advance.

*Vehicle Audit*

2.19 An event was organised at which mobility impaired individuals were given the opportunity to examine directly and comment on the various forms of vehicle available in the current taxi fleet and that may be sought in the future.

2.20 The views on accessibility expressed during the event were captured using a written questionnaire agreed with the Council in advance. This was be completed by TPi staff through accompanying participants.

*Analysis and Reporting*

2.21 The outputs of each of the above were drawn together and evaluated to identify the key issues to be addressed and potential solutions available, in line with the aim and objectives for the study. These were drawn together into a long list of potential options and measures which formed the basis for further consultation with the client. The Council’s views were sought to identify a shortlist of the preferred options from this list. This was subsequently used to produce a draft report which was subject to further consultation with stakeholders at the forum organised for the 27th May 2010 and to which written responses were received up to 25th June 2010.

2.22 The outputs of the above have been taken into account to formulate this final report which puts forward a co-ordinated package of recommendations to provide the best service possible for disabled people and the travelling public in general in relation to taxi and private hire services.
Rank, Road & Pedestrian Network Audit

3.1 An audit was undertaken on the town centre, Southfield Road, Linthorpe Road, Linthorpe Village and Newport Road to establish and examine:

- the main pedestrian routes;
- road routes through the town centre;
- routes serving the town centre, Southfield Road, Linthorpe Road, Linthorpe Village and Newport Road;
- routes serving taxi ranks;
- traffic flows and composition of hackney carriage and private hire vehicles;
- current usage of taxi ranks by both taxis, passengers and other vehicles;
- mobility conflict points;
- effects of on-street parking;
- vehicular parking behaviour;
- pedestrian behaviour;
- security and road safety of routes;
- geometrical design of ranks;
- level of indiscriminate on-street parking;
- level of abuse of traffic regulation orders;
- road signage; and
- barriers to permeability.

3.2 The audit was undertaken during daylight (off-peak and peak periods) and hours of darkness to coincide with the peak night time economy. The night time audit included accompanying the Police and enforcement officers on a normal shift.

3.3 Agreement was reached with the Council in identifying those ranks which would be audited. These are listed in Table 3.1. The criteria applied in identifying these ranks focused specifically on known problem locations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Spaces</th>
<th>Times of Operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert Road (Flares)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7pm – 6am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Road (HSBC)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7pm – 6am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Street West</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>At all times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation Road (The Central)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20 At all times. Increasing by 12 spaces midnight – 3am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation Road (Walkabout)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7pm – 6am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange Place (Uncle Alberts)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8pm – 4am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange Square</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8pm – 4am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linthorpe Road (Crown)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10pm – 4am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linthorpe Road (Rigatonis / The Keys)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7pm – 3am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linthorpe Road (Village)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>At all times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport Road (Arena)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8pm – 4am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport Road (Bus Station)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>At all times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southfield Road (Dickens Inn)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7pm – 4am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southfield Road (Star and Garter)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11pm – 4am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southfield Road (Star and Garter)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7pm – 4am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Street (Albert Road – Dundas Mews)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7pm – 4am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Street (Dundas Mews - Dundas Street)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7pm – 4am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Street (Dundas Street – Linthorpe Mews)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7pm – 4am</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 Rank Locations for Audit

3.4 To supplement the audit CCTV cameras were installed at selected rank and highway network locations. The CCTV cameras were used to monitor activity at each rank (listed in Table 3.1) over two 8 hour periods, from 19.00 to 03.00 on a Friday night / Saturday morning and from 19.00 to 03.00 on a Saturday / Sunday morning. CCTV cameras were installed at the following locations:

- Albert Road (various locations);
- Corporation Road (various locations);
- Exchange Place;
- Wilson Street;
- Newport Road;
- Linthorpe Road;
- Linthorpe Village;
- Southfield Road;
- Exchange Place;
- Marton Road / Southfield Road junction;
- Wilson Street Roundabout;
- Borough Road / Marton Road junction;
- Bridge Street West / Queens Square / Bridge Street East junction; and
- Newport Road / Harrington Road.
3.5 Tables 3.2 – 3.19 summarise the following for each CCTV camera location. Table 3.20 provides a comparison between year 2008 and 2010 rank demand data, for a similar 4 hour period, with data for the former drawn from the taxi unmet demand survey undertaken at that time:

- Hackney carriage maximum queue length;
- Total number of hackney carriages waiting;
- Total number passengers waiting for a hackney carriage;
- Total number of hackney carriage departures with passengers;
- Private hire vehicle maximum queue length;
- Total number of private hire vehicles waiting;
- Total number passengers waiting for a private hire vehicle; and
- Total number of private hire vehicle departures with passengers.
### Table 3.2 CCTV Location 1 Rank 1 Corporation Road (The Central) Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>CCTV Location 1 Rank 1 Corporation Road (The Central)</th>
<th>Hackney Carriage</th>
<th>Private Hire Vehicles</th>
<th>Total number of waiting private hire vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hackney Carriage</td>
<td>Private Hire Vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Passengers Departing</td>
<td>Vehicle Departures</td>
<td>Maximum Queue (vehicles)</td>
<td>Total number of waiting hackney carriages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Sat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:00 – 21:00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:00 – 22:00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:00 – 23:00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:00 – 00:00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:00 – 01:00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:00 – 02:00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:00 – 03:00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:00 – 04:00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.3 CCTV Location 2 Rank 2 Exchange Square (Uncle Albert’s) Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>CCTV Location 2. Rank 2 Exchange Square (Uncle Albert’s)</th>
<th>Hackney Carriage</th>
<th>Private Hire Vehicles</th>
<th>Total number of waiting private hire vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hackney Carriage</td>
<td>Private Hire Vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Passengers Departing</td>
<td>Vehicle Departures</td>
<td>Maximum Queue (vehicles)</td>
<td>Total number of waiting hackney carriages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Sat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:00 – 21:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:00 – 22:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:00 – 23:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:00 – 00:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:00 – 01:00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:00 – 02:00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:00 – 03:00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:00 – 04:00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>CCTV Location 3. Rank 3 Exchange Square</td>
<td>CCTV Location 4 Rank 4 Corporation Road (Walkabout)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Hackney Carriage</strong></td>
<td><strong>Private Hire Vehicles</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hackney Carriage</strong></td>
<td><strong>Private Hire Vehicles</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Passengers Departing</td>
<td>Vehicle Departures</td>
<td>Maximum Queue (vehicles)</td>
<td>Total number of waiting hackney carriages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Sat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:00 – 21:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:00 – 22:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:00 – 23:00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:00 – 00:00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:00 – 01:00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:00 – 02:00</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:00 – 03:00</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:00 – 04:00</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4 CCTV Location 3 Rank 3 Albert Road Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>CCTV Location 4 Rank 4 Corporation Road (Walkabout)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Hackney Carriage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Passengers Departing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:00 – 21:00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:00 – 22:00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:00 – 23:00</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:00 – 00:00</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:00 – 01:00</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:00 – 02:00</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:00 – 03:00</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:00 – 04:00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.5 CCTV Location 4 Rank 4 Corporation Road (Walkabout)
### Table 3.6 CCTV Location 5 Rank 5 Zetland Road (Brunswick Street / Last Orders)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Hackney Carriage</th>
<th>Private Hire Vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passengers</td>
<td>Vehicle Departures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Departing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:00 – 21:00</td>
<td>Fri 0 Sat 0</td>
<td>Fri 0 Sat 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:00 – 22:00</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:00 – 23:00</td>
<td>0 5</td>
<td>0 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:00 – 00:00</td>
<td>6 10</td>
<td>4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:00 – 01:00</td>
<td>46 10</td>
<td>19 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:00 – 02:00</td>
<td>34 7</td>
<td>18 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:00 – 03:00</td>
<td>6 0</td>
<td>2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:00 – 04:00</td>
<td>0 3</td>
<td>0 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.7 CCTV Location 6 Rank 6a Wilson Street (Dundas Mews – Albert Road)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Hackney Carriage</th>
<th>Private Hire Vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passengers</td>
<td>Vehicle Departures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Departing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:00 – 21:00</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:00 – 22:00</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:00 – 23:00</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:00 – 00:00</td>
<td>0 7</td>
<td>0 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:00 – 01:00</td>
<td>4 14</td>
<td>4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:00 – 02:00</td>
<td>18 26</td>
<td>9 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:00 – 03:00</td>
<td>32 29</td>
<td>21 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:00 – 04:00</td>
<td>40 83</td>
<td>22 36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>CCTV Location 6b Rank 6b Wilson Street (Dundas Mews – Linthorpe Road)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hackney Carriage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passengers Departing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Sat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:00 – 21:00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:00 – 22:00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:00 – 23:00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:00 – 00:00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:00 – 01:00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:00 – 02:00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:00 – 03:00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:00 – 04:00</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.8 CCTV Location 6b Rank 6b Wilson Street (Dundas Mews – Linthorpe Road)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>CCTV Location 7 Rank 7 Albert Road (Flares)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hackney Carriage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passengers Departing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Sat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:00 – 21:00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:00 – 22:00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:00 – 23:00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:00 – 00:00</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:00 – 01:00</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:00 – 02:00</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:00 – 03:00</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:00 – 04:00</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.9 CCTV Location 7 Rank 7 Albert Road (Flares)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Hackney Carriage</th>
<th>Private Hire Vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passengers</td>
<td>Vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Departing</td>
<td>Departures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri - Sat</td>
<td>Fri - Sat</td>
<td>Fri - Sat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:00 - 21:00</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:00 - 22:00</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:00 - 23:00</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:00 - 00:00</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:00 - 01:00</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:00 - 02:00</td>
<td>1 0 1 0</td>
<td>2 4 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:00 - 03:00</td>
<td>1 0 1 0</td>
<td>2 4 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:00 - 04:00</td>
<td>4 1 1 1</td>
<td>2 4 2 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.10 CCTV Location 8 Rank 8 Albert Road (HSBC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Hackney Carriage</th>
<th>Private Hire Vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passengers</td>
<td>Vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Departing</td>
<td>Departures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri - Sat</td>
<td>Fri - Sat</td>
<td>Fri - Sat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:00 - 21:00</td>
<td>32 24 21 12</td>
<td>6 6 56 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:00 - 22:00</td>
<td>11 9 6 5</td>
<td>5 6 47 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:00 - 23:00</td>
<td>12 10 6 4</td>
<td>6 6 38 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:00 - 00:00</td>
<td>9 9 4 3</td>
<td>5 4 12 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:00 - 01:00</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:00 - 02:00</td>
<td>5 2 2 1</td>
<td>1 3 2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:00 - 03:00</td>
<td>1 2 2 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:00 - 04:00</td>
<td>19 2 8 1</td>
<td>1 1 5 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.11 CCTV Location 9 Rank 9 Bridge Street
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>CCTV Location 10 Rank 10 Newport Road (Middlesbrough Bus Station)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hackney Carriage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Passengers Departing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:00 – 21:00</td>
<td>Fri 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:00 – 22:00</td>
<td>Fri 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:00 – 23:00</td>
<td>Fri 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:00 – 00:00</td>
<td>Fri 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:00 – 01:00</td>
<td>Fri 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:00 – 02:00</td>
<td>Fri 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:00 – 03:00</td>
<td>Fri 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:00 – 04:00</td>
<td>Fri 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.12 CCTV Location 10 Rank 10 Newport Road (Middlesbrough Bus Station)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>CCTV Location 11 Rank 11 Newport Road (Annie Street)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hackney Carriage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Passengers Departing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:00 – 21:00</td>
<td>Fri 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:00 – 22:00</td>
<td>Fri 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:00 – 23:00</td>
<td>Fri 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:00 – 00:00</td>
<td>Fri 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:00 – 01:00</td>
<td>Fri 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:00 – 02:00</td>
<td>Fri 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:00 – 03:00</td>
<td>Fri 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:00 – 04:00</td>
<td>Fri 44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.13 CCTV Location 11 Rank 11 Newport Road (Annie Street)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Passengers Departing</th>
<th>Vehicle Departures</th>
<th>Maximum Queue (vehicles)</th>
<th>Total number of waiting hackney carriages</th>
<th>Passengers Departing</th>
<th>Vehicle Departures</th>
<th>Maximum Queue (vehicles)</th>
<th>Total number of waiting private hire vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20:00 – 21:00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:00 – 22:00</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:00 – 23:00</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:00 – 00:00</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:00 – 01:00</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:00 – 02:00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:00 – 03:00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:00 – 04:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.14 CCTV Location 12 Rank 12 Linthorpe Road (Village)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Passengers Departing</th>
<th>Vehicle Departures</th>
<th>Maximum Queue (vehicles)</th>
<th>Total number of waiting hackney carriages</th>
<th>Passengers Departing</th>
<th>Vehicle Departures</th>
<th>Maximum Queue (vehicles)</th>
<th>Total number of waiting private hire vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20:00 – 21:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:00 – 22:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:00 – 23:00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:00 – 00:00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:00 – 01:00</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:00 – 02:00</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:00 – 03:00</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:00 – 04:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.15 CCTV Location 13 Rank 13 Linthorpe Road (Rigatonis)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>CCTV Location 14 Rank 14 Southfield Road (Dickens Inn)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Hackney Carriage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Passengers Departing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:00 – 21:00</td>
<td>Fri 1 Sat 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:00 – 22:00</td>
<td>Fri 14 Sat 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:00 – 23:00</td>
<td>Fri 34 Sat 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:00 – 00:00</td>
<td>Fri 61 Sat 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:00 – 01:00</td>
<td>Fri 48 Sat 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:00 – 02:00</td>
<td>Fri 9 Sat 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:00 – 03:00</td>
<td>Fri 0 Sat 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:00 – 04:00</td>
<td>Fri 0 Sat 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.16 CCTV Location 14 Rank 14 Southfield Road (Dickens Inn)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>CCTV Location 15 Rank 15 Southfield Road (Star &amp; Garter)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Hackney Carriage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Passengers Departing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:00 – 21:00</td>
<td>Fri 20 Sat 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:00 – 22:00</td>
<td>Fri 75 Sat 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:00 – 23:00</td>
<td>Fri 69 Sat 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:00 – 00:00</td>
<td>Fri 107 Sat 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:00 – 01:00</td>
<td>Fri 84 Sat 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:00 – 02:00</td>
<td>Fri 43 Sat 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:00 – 03:00</td>
<td>Fri 0 Sat 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:00 – 04:00</td>
<td>Fri 0 Sat 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.17 CCTV Location 15 Rank 15 Southfield Road (Star & Garter)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Hackney Carriage</th>
<th>Private Hire Vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passengers</td>
<td>Vehicle Departures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Departing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>Fri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:00 – 21:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:00 – 22:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:00 – 23:00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:00 – 00:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:00 – 01:00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:00 – 02:00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:00 – 03:00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:00 – 04:00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.18 CCTV Location 16 Rank 16 The Crown

**SUMMARY OF TOTALS WITHIN TIME FRAME 20:00 – 04:00**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Hackney Carriage</th>
<th>Private Hire Vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passengers</td>
<td>Vehicle Departures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Departing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>Fri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:00 – 04:00</td>
<td>2511</td>
<td>2622</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.19 CCTV Locations Summary of Total Taxi and Passenger Movements
### Table 3.20 Year 2008 – 2010 Rank Demand Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Year 2008</th>
<th>Year 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporation Road Central</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange Square</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Street</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport Rd Bus Station</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arena</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linthorpe Village</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linthorpe Rigatonis</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linthorpe The Crown</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southfield (Dickens Inn)</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson St</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,685</strong></td>
<td><strong>900</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 In addition a further 7 locations were surveyed through use of CCTV to establish vehicle accessibility into the town centre and composition of hackney carriage, private hire vehicle and all movements at the following access junctions:

- Bridge Street / A178;
- Wilson Street Roundabout;
- Borough Road / A172 Marton Road;
- A172 / Southfield Road;
- B1272 Linthorpe Road / Southfield Road;
- B1272 Borough Road / Union Street / B1272 Hartington Road; and
- B1272 Newport Road / B6541.

3.7 The CCTV footage was used to obtain traffic flow data for hackney carriage and private hire vehicle junction throughput. The junction throughputs are summarised in Table 3.20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Junction</th>
<th>Junction Throughput Friday (20:00 – 04:00)</th>
<th>Junction Throughput Saturday (20:00 – 04:00)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td>Private Hire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Street / A178</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Session Average (%)</em></td>
<td>78.81</td>
<td>21.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Street Roundabout</td>
<td>1544</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Session Average (%)</em></td>
<td>69.56</td>
<td>30.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough Road / A172 Marton Road</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Session Average (%)</em></td>
<td>55.60</td>
<td>44.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A172 / Southfield Road</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Session Average (%)</em></td>
<td>59.19</td>
<td>40.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1272 Linthorpe Road / Southfield Road</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Session Average (%)</em></td>
<td>70.09</td>
<td>29.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1272 Borough Road / Union Street / B1272 Hartington Road</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Session Average (%)</em></td>
<td>45.77</td>
<td>54.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1272 Newport Road / B6541</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Session Average (%)</em></td>
<td>41.37</td>
<td>58.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.21 Hackney Carriage & Private Hire Town Access Junction Throughput
Themes Arising from the Rank Audit

3.8 From the analysis of the various audits a number of issues and problem areas were identified. These are listed below in no particular order:

- Location of ranks appeared to be based on the principle of establishing a rank upon the opening of a new attraction (pub, bar, nightclub) with a consequential impact on available on-street parking and road safety;
- The design of a number of the ranks is based on a dual-use basis (rank and prohibited parking; rank and permitted on street parking) making it difficult for road users to read and obey the traffic regulation orders and for hackney carriages to use allocated ranks;
- The design of a standard rank space (per vehicle) does not provide a gap between vehicles large enough to allow ramps of rear loading wheelchair accessible vehicles to be used;
- The design of the Albert Road Rank (Flares) makes it difficult to judge where the rank commences giving rise to potential tensions between passengers;
- Due to the level of footfall along Albert Road, Albert Road is used as an informal pedestrianised street with pedestrians utilising the carriageway. With the level of on street parking, lack of kerb side facilities for vehicular / hackney carriage and private hire vehicle drop off / pick up Albert Road experiences a significant level of conflict between pedestrians and vehicles. During the night time audit a road traffic accident was observed involving a private hire vehicle (mini-bus) and a pedestrian;
- Significant level of footfall along Corporation Road, Albert Road, Wilson Street and Exchange Square during the night time economy with existing footways being unable to accommodate pedestrians resulting in pedestrians having to step out into adjacent carriageways;
- Based on the rank surveys whilst the overall number of rank spaces meets overall demand, a number of individual ranks are unable to meet demand whilst other ranks are under utilised. This has resulted in an imbalance between rank demand and supply;
- The availability of on-street parking within the town centre core is restricted. This has a consequential effect of hackney carriage and private hire vehicles having to pick up and drop off passengers whilst standing within the running lane of the carriageway. Conditions are particularly acute along Wilson Street and Albert Road. Similar problems are encountered along Southfield Road;
- There is significant traffic congestion and vehicular conflict at and in the vicinity of ranks particularly along Wilson Street, Albert Road, Corporation Road (Walkabout) and Southfield Road;
- General traffic, hackney carriage and private hire vehicles at first sight appear to abuse strict interpretation of traffic regulation orders. This is common in all areas of the town. However, it is understood that where double yellow lines (prohibition of waiting order) are in-force that it is legitimate for a vehicle to park upon these double yellow lines for a short period of time;
- Over-ranking by hackney carriage vehicles is common at locations where demand is greater than vehicle supply. This is particularly evident at the Corporation Road (The Walkabout) rank;
- Indiscriminate parking by general traffic, hackney carriage and private hire vehicles causes obstruction, congestion, road safety and traffic management issues throughout the town centre;
- Inconsistent levels of demand at all ranks results in migration of hackney carriage vehicles between ranks;
Formation of informal ranks (both hackney carriage and private hire) at inappropriate locations particularly outside the Walkabout; 
The scale of on street parking precludes kerb side hackney carriage and private hire drop off and pick ups; and 
Town centre car parks are under-utilised during the night-time.

Stakeholder Consultation – First Round

3.9 Consultations with key stakeholders were undertaken to establish views on:

- Current problems encountered by the taxi trade (hackney carriage and private hire);
- Existing traffic management and network constraints;
- Passenger accessibility and level of service;
- Private hire waiting locations;
- Rank provision;
- Safety; and
- What should be done to improve the taxi services within Middlesbrough.

3.10 The information gained from the stakeholder consultations was fed into the development of improvement options.

Consultation with Middlesbrough Council

3.11 Consultations were held with the Council’s Licensing, Road Safety & Traffic Officers at inception and various stages during the course of the study, including consultation to obtain their views on draft proposals as presented to the 4th March 2009 stakeholder consultation day.

Consultations with the Taxi Trade

3.12 Consultations were held with hackney carriage and private hire operators through:

- 27th February 2009 roadside interview of 70 hackney carriage drivers parked at ranks.
- 4th February 2010 Taxi Forum held at the Middlesbrough Teaching & Learning Centre (MTLC) attended by Middlesbrough Council where approximately 65 drivers and operators were informed of the study.
- 24th February 2010 face-to-face meetings with both hackney carriage and private hire operators were held at Middlesbrough Town Hall. Invitations were sent out to hackney carriage and private hire operators based on a list of operators provided by the Council. The list comprised ten private hire operators, the Hackney Carriage Association, the Middlesbrough Owner Driver Association (MODA) and the Private Hire Association. In addition this invitation also encouraged operators to attend a stakeholder consultation day 4th March 2010. In terms of attendance at the 24th February 2010 meetings the attendance comprised one private hire taxi operator, the former General Secretary of the Hackney Carriage Association and MODA.
- 4th March 2010 stakeholder consultation day at the MTLC. The stakeholder consultation day presented a long list of potential options improvements for discussion.
- 4th March 2010 Hackney Carriage Association meeting held with the Chairman and Secretary.
24th March 2010. TPi were invited to attend a general meeting of the Hackney Carriage Association held at the International Centre, Middlesbrough.

Open invitation to all key stakeholders to contact staff at TPi should they wish to put forward any additional observations, comments and recommendations.

27th May 2010 stakeholder forum. An invitation was circulated by the Council to all stakeholders to attend formal presentations of the final draft report covering both the town centre and hackney vehicle fleet review. In addition stakeholders were given the opportunity to arrange individual meetings with representatives from TPi on the same day. At the 27th May 2010 stakeholder day the attendees were invited to consider the report recommendations and to provide feedback.

Following the 27th May 2010 stakeholder forum the Council provided the opportunity to all stakeholders to submit written responses on the final draft report by a deadline of the 25th June 2010. To facilitate this they also delivered copies of the Final Draft Report to all Middlesbrough based private hire operators, who had chosen not to participate in any consultation opportunity up to that point, with an invitation to offer feedback.

Issues Drawn from the Taxi Trade Consultation – Hackney Carriage (Drivers)

3.13 A survey was undertaken to establish the views of hackney carriage drivers. The survey was undertaken at a number of town centre ranks with 70no. hackney carriage drivers being interviewed. The results of the hackney carriage driver survey are summarised in Tables 3.22–3.29.
Are there any locations you would like a new rank?

Yes: 58%
No: 42%

Table 3.23 Hackney Carriage Driver Survey – Rank Location

At what location would you like a new rank?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walkabout</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Cook Hospital</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pubs</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takeaways</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Centre</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Pizza Shops</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everywhere</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arena</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linthorpe Road</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Street</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Night Clubs</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrisons, North Ormsby</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.24 Hackney Carriage Driver Survey – New Rank Locations

Which locations can be identified as having high volumes of traffic at night?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smithfield Road</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Road</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everywhere</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Centre</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Street</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linthorpe Road</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-op</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvies</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkabout</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southfield Road</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation Street</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.25 Hackney Carriage Driver Survey – High Volume Locations
If you like a centralised rank arrangement, Why?

- More fights due to bigger crowds: 15%
- Been tried before and it didn’t work: 10%
- PHV drivers would take all the work: 10%
- It’s fine as it is: 8%
- It would be better if seen it work in other areas: 8%
- Passengers wouldn’t walk to the new rank arrangement: 15%
- Too many cars/taxis in the area: 18%
- Passengers wouldn’t know where the taxis are: 8%
- Marshalls would be able to control the taxis: 5%
- The area is too spread out: 3%

Table 3.26 Hackney Carriage Driver Survey – Centralised Rank Location

Where would you like the (centralised) ranks located?

- Pubs and takeaways: 16%
- Town Centre: 24%
- Night Clubs: 4%
- Fine as it is: 40%
- Everywhere: 4%
- Hospital: 8%
- Albert Road: 4%

Table 3.27 Hackney Carriage Driver Survey – Preferred Centralised Rank
How do you obtain the most work on a Friday / Saturday night?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagged</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Rank</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.28 Hackney Carriage Driver Survey – Work Arrangements

Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limit number of taxis</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough work</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many Vans / Minibus Buses</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many taxis</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCTV</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many PHV's</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undercutting of rates</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More parking spaces needed</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need Marshalls</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough ranks, more needed</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.29 Hackney Carriage Driver Survey – Further Comments

3.14 From the interviews with hackney carriage drivers the main issues can be summarised as follows:

- Demand on Friday and Saturday nights is almost equally split between that from ranks (48%) and that from flag downs (47%)
- 9% of drivers considered that unsocial behaviour was a problem;
- 42% of drivers considered that Middlesbrough has too many taxis;
- 40% of drivers thought rank arrangements were fine as they are
- 25% of drivers thought a new rank was required at James Cook Hospital
- 23% of drivers thought a new rank was required in Linthorpe Road
- 18% of drivers thought a centralised rank would attract to many taxis to the same area
- 15% of drivers thought passengers wouldn’t walk to one centralised rank
- 15% of drivers thought that when a centralised rank was tried before, it didn’t work
- 12% of drivers highlighted the use of ranks by private hire vehicles as a problem;
10% of drivers considered that there is too much traffic within Middlesbrough;
29% of drivers were of the opinion that there was a need for Taxi Marshall’s;
8% of drivers were of the opinion that there was an inadequate number of ranks; and
6% of drivers were of the opinion that more parking spaces were required.

Issues Drawn from the Taxi Trade Consultation – Hackney Carriage Association

3.15 TPi were invited to attend a Hackney Carriage Association meeting held on the 24th March 2010 to hear issues that were of importance to the Association in respect of the study.

3.16 A number of resolutions were made by the Association as listed below. (Only those items that are relevant to the study brief are listed).

1. The provision of a private hire rank(s) is not supported as under the relevant byelaws private hire vehicles are required to return to their base;
2. The provision of 1no. central super rank is not supported; and
3. The existing infrastructure and management should remain but in order for the ranks to operate efficiently effective enforcement is required.

Issues Drawn from the Taxi Trade Consultation – Private Hire

3.17 In addition to the hackney carriage consultations, the private hire trade were consulted. Although a number of private hire operators were invited to participate in the consultation process only one operator from the list of ten and the Private Hire Association provided inputs to the process. The comments and issues raised are listed below. This study only considers those comments / observations / recommendations that are related to the study brief:

- Lack of effective enforcement by the Council;
- Lack of awareness of the taxi industry by regulatory and policing authorities;
- Taxi Marshall’s should be appointed;
- Current penalties issued by the local authority do not act as sufficient deterrents;
- Too many ranks have been established at inappropriate locations resulting in difficulties for private hire vehicles to pick up / drop off passengers. This in turn is creating traffic congestion and road safety problems;
- Over-ranking by hackney carriage vehicles;
- Super ranks should be created but having regard to private hire pick up / drop off locations. Suggested locations included Corporation Road and Southfield Lane;
- Private hire vehicles are having to circulate through the town instead of travelling back to their office base in order to ensure that any booked fares are not taken by the hackney carriage trade;
- Irrespective of the study recommendations unless the Council is willing to enforce the recommendations together with better enforcement the situation will remain as is;
- Traffic congestion on certain roads including Southfield Road, Linthorpe Road, Albert Road and Wilson Street;
- Better traffic management is required;
- Ranks appear to be established on a piecemeal basis without any thought given to the implications;
- Private hire vehicles are having to compete for limited road space; and
- The private hire trade has no objection to working with the hackney carriage trade to provide the best taxi service possible in Middlesbrough.
Consultation with Passengers

3.18 300 roadside interviews were undertaken at a number of ranks within the town centre to gauge passenger opinion on issues including the existing level of taxi service provision, problems encountered, walking distances and location of ranks. From the surveys undertaken the following key items were revealed:

- The majority of passengers (91%) walk to ranks within a time period of 10 minutes or less;
- 85% of passengers use hackney carriages as opposed to 15% that utilise private hire vehicles;
- 28% of passengers telephone for a taxi;
- 50% of passengers flag taxis;
- 23% of passengers use ranks; and
- 93% of passengers don’t want new ranks

The results of the passenger survey are summarised in Tables 3.30 – 3.35.

![How far did you walk to this rank?

Table 3.30 Passenger Survey – Walking Time

![Do you have any problems getting into any model of taxi?

Table 3.31 Passenger Survey – Taxi Accessibility
Table 3.32 Passenger Survey – Method Used to Acquire Taxi

Table 3.33 Passenger Survey – Type of Taxi Used

Table 3.34 Passenger Survey – Opinion on Provision of New Ranks
If so, where would you like new ranks located?

Table 3.35 Passenger Survey – New Rank Locations

Consultation with the Police

3.19 Consultations were held with the Police regarding the study. The relevant points made by the Police are summarised as follows:

- All stakeholders need to work in partnership including the Police;
- The Police view the hackney carriage and private hire trade as one entity;
- Taxi Marshall’s would assist in the management of the taxi service;
- Traffic management problems are encountered particularly along Albert Road, Wilson Street and Corporation Road. Consideration should be given to transforming Albert Road into a pedestrianised street;
- A temporary closure of Wilson Street had previously been promoted but was not successful;
- Any proposals would need to take into account the efficient dispersal of people;
- The formation of any new super ranks need to taken into consideration pedestrian routes and the ability of those routes to accommodate the footfall without introducing tension between people.
- Consideration should be given to the closure of Brunswick Street.
- Improvements in the town centre environment will improve its attractiveness and therefore increase trade for all.

Consultations with Middlesbrough Town Centre Management

3.20 Consultations were held with the Town Centre Management regarding the study. The relevant points made are summarised as follows:

- The study could act as a catalyst for the enhancing the quality of the town centre;
- Consideration would need to be given to night time economy business parking particularly if roads are to be closed and or traffic routes modified;
- Town Centre Management would discuss with the Chamber of Commerce (although subsequently no comments were received from the Commerce of Chamber).

Consultations with Pub Watch

3.21 Pub Watch were invited to submit comments, observations and suggested recommendations for improvements. No comments have been received from Pub Watch.
Stakeholder Consultation – 4th March 2010 Stakeholder Consultation Day

3.22 A stakeholder consultation day was organised where a long list of options were tabled for discussion. The objective of the discussions was to develop a short list of these in order to formulate the detailed recommendations.

3.23 The stakeholder consultation day was attended by:

- Hackney Carriage Association (four representatives);
- Hackney carriage drivers (four drivers);
- Private Hire Operators (four representatives from one operator);
- Police (two officers);
- Middlesbrough Town Centre Management (one representative);
- Middlesbrough Council (one representative); and
- TPI.

3.24 The options developed are discussed in Section 4 to this Report.

Stakeholder Consultation – 27th May 2010 Stakeholder Consultation Forum

3.25 The consultation forum was undertaken twice on the same day, once at 11.30 and again at 17.00. Between these times a one to one meeting was held with the Hackney Carriage Association and another with Boro Taxis, the largest PHV operator in the town. The first forum meeting was attended by 12 representatives of the taxi trade, including both hackney and PHV operators, a representative of the Council and a representative of Shopmobility. The later forum was attended by 11 representatives of the taxi trade, including both hackney and PHV operators and a representative of the Town Centre Management.

3.26 The outcomes of this consultation relevant to the rank review are described at the end of section 4 of the report.
4.0 RANK REVIEW - OPTIONS DEVELOPMENT

Introduction

4.1 Following the completion of the audits and first round of stakeholder consultations a long list of options were identified for debate and short listing at the 4th March 2010 stakeholder consultation forum. These are summarised below together with the broad overall outcome of discussion on each at the forum. The options, apart from option (level) 1 – do nothing, are then detailed in the tables that follow.

Options

4.2 The development of options was based on a four-level approach:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Do Nothing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Low Key Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Infrastructure &amp; Soft Measure Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Town Centre Cordon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level 1 Do Nothing

4.3 This option simply maintains the existing situation. At the 4th March consultation forum this option was unanimously dismissed as untenable by those present.

Level 2 Low Key Improvements

4.4 Level 2 involves the introduction of a number of low key measures as outlined in Table 4.1. At the 4th March consultation forum this option was thought to offer only limited benefits and was not therefore the preferred option.

Level 3 Infrastructure & Soft Measure Improvements

4.5 Level 3 involves the introduction of a series of infrastructure and soft measures as outlined in Table 4.2 and indicated on Proposals Figure 1, Albert Road Options Figure 2 and Southfield Road / Linthorpe Road Figure 3. This was the preferred option of the majority of those present at the 4th March consultation forum.

Level 4 Town Centre Cordon

4.6 Level 4 involves the introduction of a series of infrastructure and soft measures and a town centre cordon as outlined in Table 4.3 and indicated on Town Centre Cordon Figure 4. A full cordon of the town centre was considered to restrictive and therefore this option was not favoured by those who attended the 4th March consultation forum.
## TABLE 4.1 LEVEL 2 LOW KEY IMPROVEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Indicative Cost * (Note 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality Taxi Partnership</td>
<td>Partnership agreement between taxi (hackney, private hire) operators, taxi drivers, licensing authority and other key partners such as the Police, town centre management, retailers, leisure facilities and bodies representing interests of other groups such the disabled. The objective of the partnership is to provide a framework for joint working on a range of measures appropriate to the area such as types of vehicles, maintenance, working ethics, public safety, ranks formation, booking systems and for all parties to work together to deliver the best possible taxi service. The partnership can also provide a tool to link taxi policy into broader transport and town centre policies such as LTP and Community Safety Strategies.</td>
<td>• Established framework for joint working between all stakeholders to improve taxi services.</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Enforcement</td>
<td>Introduction of an effective enforcement regime with penalties issued on a scale to act as a deterrent based on a points system. Introduction of a 'Ply for Hire' and 'Hackney' policy to be based on a points system or zero tolerance basis with licenses revoked for a period of 12 months for those that don’t comply. Will require a significant increase in Council staff and police resources to increase enforcement at all current locations.</td>
<td>• Clear policies for hackney and PHV activity.</td>
<td>Minimum x 4 current enforcement costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank Locations</td>
<td>Existing ranks remain unchanged with no additional ranks formed.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Network</td>
<td>The existing highway network remains unchanged.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note 1* Indicative costs are given on a provisional basis only and should not be used (in whole or part thereof) in allocating financial resources in formulation and implementation of any of the recommendations. Further detailed costs would need to be undertaken.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Indicative Cost * (Notes 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality Taxi Partnership</td>
<td>Partnership agreement between taxi (hackney, private hire) operators, taxi drivers, licensing authority and other key partners such as the Police, town centre management, retailers, leisure facilities and bodies representing interests of other groups such the disabled. The objective of the partnership is to provide a framework for joint working on a range of measures appropriate to the area such as types of vehicles, maintenance, working ethics, public safety, ranks formation, booking systems and for all parties to work together to deliver the best possible taxi service. The partnership can also provide a tool to link taxi policy into broader transport and town centre policies such as LTP and Community Safety Strategies.</td>
<td>• Established framework for joint working between all stakeholders to improve taxi services.</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Enforcement</td>
<td>Introduction of an effective enforcement regime with penalties issued on a scale to act as a deterrent based on a points system. Introduction of a ‘Ply for Hire’ and ‘Hackney’ policy to be based on a points system or zero tolerance basis with licenses revoked for a period of 12 months for those that don’t comply. No increase in current enforcement resources will be needed as a result of proposals (below) to introduce Marshall’s and rationalise ranks.</td>
<td>• Clear policies for hackney and PHV activity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Assisting road and public safety.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment of Taxi Marshall’s</td>
<td>Taxi Marshall’s to be appointed to manage and coordinate taxi demand and services within the town centre and at Southfield Road and Linthorpe Road</td>
<td>• Management of hackney ranks.</td>
<td>£40,000 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Enforce hackney and PHV policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Coordination of supply and demand.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Address anti-social behaviour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Benefit</td>
<td>Indicative Cost *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Creation of town centre super ranks (see Proposals Figure 1, Albert Road Options Figure 2)** | Rationalisation of town centre ranks and creation of a series of super ranks:  
- Exchange Square super rank – with hackney feeder lane(s) on either Zetland Road, Exchange Place (2 lanes) or Brunswick Street. Creation of vehicle turnaround area outside Last Orders or on Exchange Place.  
- Albert Road super rank (various options).  
- Albert Road super rank (in the vicinity of the big screen).  | Removal of existing ranks from known conflict points.  
- Provision of super ranks with feeder lanes providing ranks at town centre focal points with capacity.  
- Minimising hackney carriage / private hire conflicts.  
- Increasing drop off and pick up opportunities.  
- Focuses enforcement resources | £50,000 - £80,000 |
| ** Creation of town centre super ranks - Corporation Rd**                  | - Corporation Road – retention of existing rank arrangement (8 spaces at all times increasing to 20 spaces midnight – 3am).  
- Corporation Road super rank (east of Pine Street).  
- Optional feeder rank lane located on Albert Road (in vicinity of Cleveland Centre).  
- All other ranks removed apart from Newport Road (Bus Station), Bridge Street West (railway station) and The Grange. | - Formation of accessible ranks for passengers.  
- Enhancing the night time economy.  
- Focal points for passengers. | £1,000 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Indicative Cost * (Notes 1,2,3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Creation of Linthorpe Road and Southfield Road super ranks (see Southfield Road / Linthorpe Road Figure 4) | - Extension of Southfield Road (Dickens Inn) and Southfield Road (Star & Garter) rank.  
- Extension of The Crown rank (Linthorpe Road).  
- Creation of super rank on Southfield Lane.  
- Creation of super rank on Southfield Road (southern flank).  
- Creation of super rank on Linthorpe Road. | Similar benefits to those associated with town centre super ranks. | £5,000  
£3,000  
£10,000  
£15,000  
£10,000 |
| Modification to town centre routes – Albert Road (see Albert Road Options Figure 2) | - Rigatons rank and Linthorpe Road ranks (approved but not implemented 207 – 211 Linthorpe Road) removed.  
Creation of rank feeder lanes on Linthorpe Road in the vicinity Ayresone Gardens and North Park Road to serve ranks on Linthorpe Road and Southfield Road. | - Increasing drop off and pick up opportunities.  
- Focuses enforcement resources | £1,000  
£3,000 |
| Modification to town centre routes – Albert Road (see Albert Road Options Figure 2) | - Modification of traffic flows along Albert Road 20.00-04.00 interrelated with the creation of super ranks.  
- Super rank on eastern side of Albert Road. Traffic flows remain unchanged  
- Super rank on eastern side of Albert Road. Northbound all traffic. Southbound buses, emergency vehicles and hackneys only  
- Super rank on western side of Albert Road. Traffic flows remained unchanged.  
- Super rank on western side of Albert Road. Southbound all traffic. Northbound buses, emergency vehicles and hackney carriage only. | - Management of traffic.  
- Reduction in traffic flow along Albert Road.  
- Reduction in potential vehicle / pedestrian conflicts.  
- Removal of traffic from Albert Road creating a pedestrian friendly environment. | £5,000  
£5,000 - £8,000  
£5,000  
£5,000 - £8,000  
£5,000 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Indicative Cost *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrianisation of Albert Road (Corporation Road to Wilson Street). No traffic permitted except emergency vehicles (temporary or permanent closure)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction in traffic conflicts.</td>
<td>Temporary £20,000 Permanent £50,000 - 100,000 depending on public realm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Management – Wilson Street (one-way)</td>
<td>Modification of traffic flows along Wilson Street to form a one-way highway from Albert Road to Newport Road / Corporation Road junction. The system to become operational between the hours of 20:00 – 04:00 (Friday / Saturday, Saturday / Sunday).</td>
<td>• Reduction in traffic conflicts. • Management of traffic. • Further reduction in traffic flows and conflicts through the combination of the one-way system and relocation of the Wilson Street ranks.</td>
<td>£20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Management – Closure of Corporation Road (fronting the Walkabout)</td>
<td>Temporary closure of Corporation Road (outside the Walkabout) to all traffic 20:00 – 04:00 (Friday / Saturday, Saturday / Sunday). The closure to be managed through rising bollards with access managed through the Council's CCTV control room.</td>
<td>• Removal of traffic conflicts and congestion.</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Management – Introduction of Red Routes.</td>
<td>The principle of the red route prohibits general on street parking with exclusion for buses and taxis. Roads within Middlesbrough town centre and surrounding environs would be designated as red routes.</td>
<td>• Provides adequate opportunities for hackney and private hire pick up and drop off.</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Management – Southfield Road</td>
<td>Night time closure of Southfield Road (20:00-04:00 Friday / Saturday, Saturday / Sunday) between Linthorpe Road and Woodlands Road.</td>
<td>• Removal of all traffic.</td>
<td>£20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of Private Hire Vehicle Holding Areas</td>
<td>Provision of private hire vehicle holding areas on the fringe of the town centre at Station Street car park and or North Ormesby Road.</td>
<td>• Reduces private hire vehicular circulation. • Reduce ply for hire and facilitates enforcement. • Ensures that booked private hire fares are not transferred to the hackney carriage trade.</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Benefit</td>
<td>Indicative Cost *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Car Parks</td>
<td>Upgrade of the Gurney Street car park to Park Mark secure standard to encourage business users to utilise these car parks or encourage usage of the Buxton Street car park.</td>
<td>• Reduces the demand for on-street car parking.</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Introduces opportunities for additional super ranks and private hire drop off and pick ups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linthorpe Village – incorporation of extended rank (6 space lay-by) within the Council’s proposed traffic management scheme for the village</td>
<td>Over ranking occurs at the Linthorpe Village rank. The Council is currently promoting traffic management proposals for the village but upon inspection of the scheme no rank provision has been made. The Councils traffic management scheme should incorporate a rank for 6 spaces (at all times) within one lay-by.</td>
<td>Rank provision made to respond to demand.</td>
<td>Included within the Council’s scheme cost for Linthorpe Village.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Development and introduction of a Communications Strategy | • Taxi Marshall’s to be equipped with intercom/radio system linked to enforcement officers, CCTV and to direct hackneys from feeder lanes into ranks  
• Feeder ranks to provide real-queue information to drivers  
• Intelligent Transport System based on loops and detection informing hackney drivers of rank capacities.  
• Introduce Wayfinding throughout the town centre informing people of the location and routes to hackney ranks. All pedestrian routes to be well lit with footway way widths capable of accommodating pedestrian footfall. | • Improves traffic management.  
• Manages hackney carriage movements.  
• Reduces vehicular conflicts.  
• Informs the trade of relevant issues and enhances awareness of the taxi industry.                                                                                                                                                                                     | £1,000  
£5,000  
£30,000  
£20,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Indicative Cost * (Notes 1,2,3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Development of a dedicated Taxi website.</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identification of passengers – system could include text message, CCTV, GIS, link to Marshall’s, informal communications between drivers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>£5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note 1
Indicative costs are given on a provisional basis only and should not be used (in whole or part thereof) in allocating financial resources in formulation and implementation of any of the recommendations. Further detailed costs would need to be undertaken.

*Note 2
The formation of super ranks and removal of ranks will incur construction and carriageway / footway reinstatement costs. No preliminary and or detailed design has been undertaken including examination of statutory undertaker apparatus. Indicative costs are given on a provisional basis only and should not be used (in whole or part thereof) in allocating financial resources in formulation and implementation of any of the recommendations. Further detailed costs would need to be undertaken.

*Note 3
The formation of super ranks, removal of existing ranks and traffic management measures will necessitate the processing and implementation of appropriate traffic regulation orders, associated civil engineering works and design. Indicative costs are given on a provisional basis only and should not be used (in whole or part thereof) in allocating financial resources in formulation and implementation of any of the recommendations. Further detailed costs would need to be undertaken.
### TABLE 4.3 LEVEL 4 TOWN CENTRE CORDON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Indicative Cost * (Notes 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality Taxi Partnership</td>
<td>Partnership agreement between taxi (hackney, private hire) operators, taxi drivers, licensing authority and other key partners such as the Police, town centre management, retailers, leisure facilities and bodies representing interests of other groups such as the disabled. The objective of the partnership is to provide a framework for joint working on a range of measures appropriate to the area such as types of vehicles, maintenance, working ethics, public safety, ranks formation, booking systems and for all parties to work together to deliver the best possible taxi service. The partnership can also provide a tool to link taxi policy into broader transport and town centre policies such as LTP and Community Safety Strategies.</td>
<td>• Established framework for joint working between all stakeholders to improve taxi services.</td>
<td>As per table 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Enforcement</td>
<td>Introduction of an effective enforcement regime with penalties issued on a scale to act as a deterrent based on a points system. Introduction of a ‘Ply for Hire’ and ‘Hackney’ policy to be based on a points system or zero tolerance basis with licenses revoked for a period of 12 months for those that don’t comply. No increase in current enforcement resources will be needed as a result of proposals (below) to rationalise ranks.</td>
<td>• Clear policies for hackney and PHV activity.</td>
<td>• Assisting road and public safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Centre Cordon (See Town Centre Cordon Figure 3)</td>
<td>• Closure of the town centre to all traffic 20:00 – 04:00 Friday / Saturday, Saturday / Sunday within the town centre cordon zone.</td>
<td>• Removes all traffic from the town centre.</td>
<td>As per table 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Location of super ranks at key points along the cordon.</td>
<td>• Vehicular conflicts are removed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linthorpe Village</td>
<td>As for Level 3</td>
<td>As for Level 3</td>
<td>As for Level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linthorpe Road</td>
<td>As for Level 3</td>
<td>As for Level 3</td>
<td>As for Level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southfield Road</td>
<td>As for Level 3</td>
<td>As for Level 3</td>
<td>As for Level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Strategy</td>
<td>As for Level 3</td>
<td>As for Level 3</td>
<td>As for Level 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposals

Figure 1
Figure 4

Town Centre Cordon - No Vehicular Access From 2000 - 0400 Hours Except For Emergency Vehicles
27th May 2010 Stakeholder Consultation Forum

4.7 Following discussion and general agreement to the preferred option (Level 3 - Infrastructure & Soft Measure Improvements) at the forum on the 4th March 2010 a draft Final Report was produced by the consultant, including recommendations based on this option.

4.8 This report was subsequently presented and discussed at a second day of forums and one to one consultation meetings arranged for 27th May 2010. The following provides information on the key issues raised in each discussion on the day in relation to the findings and recommendations for the rank review. The opportunity was also provided for all stakeholders to provide written responses to the draft final report up to 25th June 2010. The written responses received and the consultants response to these is provided in the table provided in appendix A of this report.

Forum at 11.30 am

4.9 A number of key issues were comprehensively discussed at the first forum meeting of the day. The outcome of these discussions were as follows:

- A PHV operator present claimed to have deliberately escalated the issues in the town centre to force the hand of the Council in commissioning a study. However, he now expressed a will to work together with the hackney trade and other stakeholders to bring about improvements in town centre taxi arrangements.
- There was general agreement that partnership working between all stakeholders (taxi operators, Council, Police, Marshall’s, Businesses, Passengers) will be key to bringing about improvements.
- There are concerns regarding the use of ranks by PHVs and it was agreed that there should be no informal ranking by hackneys and no illegal plying for hire by PHVs.
- It was agreed that Marshall’s were absolutely necessary to manage passengers and operators at ranks and in principle it was accepted that costs may eventually need to be met for these from taxi license fees (hackney and PHV), although applications to any prospective funding sources would be welcomed that might mean this could be phased in.
- It was agreed that the report should emphasise the need for sanctions (Three strikes and out) to be taken against those who do not follow the proposed Rank and PHV policies.
- There were concerns that the Council/Police haven’t enforced policy in the past as robustly as is needed; ie they allow parking on double yellow lines.
- It was agreed that Wilson Street should remain open, that all ranks in its vicinity bar 1 (location to be agreed via the proposed Quality Taxi Partnership - QTP) should be removed, that double yellow lines should be provided along its length, that the proposed Exchange Square and Corporation Road Super Ranks should be retained but the proposed Albert Road Super Rank should be withdrawn and the new arrangements managed using Marshall’s.
- It was agreed that PHVs should encourage passengers seeking access to Exchange Square to allow pick up/drop off in Wilson Street.
- A second PHV holding area was sought on the opposite side of the town to that proposed; ie in Clairville.
- Concerns were raised that the Council had considered changes to License Conditions (ie the removal of the requirement for PHVs to return to base) at their Licensing Committee meeting on Tuesday 25th May that could impact on the report recommendations.
There was discussion regarding the Linthorpe Road/Southfield Road Area. It was agreed the super rank proposed should be extended as should the Crown Rank. Whether The Keys / Rigatonis Rank was long enough or on the correct side of the road was discussed. An additional issue was whether the proposed Harvey’s Rank was required and if so where should it be. The consensus was that the Southfield Lane super rank should be extended to 20 spaces, The Keys / Rigatonis rank extended, the Crown rank extended and the proposed Harveys Rank removed.

*Forum at 17.00 pm*

4.10 The second forum meeting, also following comprehensive discussions, more or less concurred with the outcomes of the first forum with regard to the Wilson Street and Exchange Square area, Taxi Marshall’s, the hackney and PHV town centre policies and the Linthorpe Road Southfield Road area proposals.

*One to one meeting with PHV operator*

4.11 The one to one meeting with the PHV operator reinforced their views that Taxi Marshall’s are required to manage the proposed arrangements, there has to be sanctions introduced for those that abuse policy, that there has to be no informal ranking by hackneys, if there is to be no illegal plying for hire by PHVs and that a second PHV holding area is required on the opposite side of the town to that proposed.

*One to one meeting with Hackney Association*

4.12 At the one to one meeting with the Hackney Association concerns were raised that only one PHV company was represented at the 11.30 forum meeting and that their views could not be taken as representative of the PHV trade as a whole. They also questioned whether it was possible for PHV and Hackney operators to establish the trust necessary to work together to improve town centre arrangements.

4.13 The Association suggested customers will be reluctant to walk to ranks and will flag down taxis where they are. Therefore proposals will need hackney drivers to refuse these flag downs and use ranks for the study recommendations to work (which they suggested they may be prepared to encourage, so long as PHVs stick to their part of the bargain).

4.14 They raised concerns that there are some minibus operators, operating illegally in the town (no ‘0’ licence and/or no PHV driver license) and recognise enforcement officers can’t deal with this but want to see the police take action.

4.15 The Association also believed it was necessary to keep at least one rank on Wilson St, preferably not that at its furthest point from Exchange Square.

*Summary*

4.16 The audits and stakeholder consultations have played a significant role in informing the development of the options and recommendations proposed to improve the arrangements for taxi service provision for the night time economy within Middlesbrough town centre.

4.17 It is clear from the audit and consultations undertaken that in Middlesbrough there is discord and tensions between the hackney carriage trade, private hire trade and for the Council itself in the management and enforcement activities of taxi arrangements for the town centre night time economy. This is contributing significantly to disorganisation on the ground which includes:
- Illegal ply for hire activities by some PHVs;
- Some hackney carriage vehicles and passengers seeking to jump queues at ranks by actively accepting/seeking flag downs ahead of these;
- Tensions between the hackney carriage trade and private hire trade and the Council licensing and enforcement officers; and
- Adverse traffic management and road safety conditions.

4.18 Amongst the Hackney trade the main points raised in consultations undertaken include:

- Arrangements should remain much the same as at present and the existing issues dealt with through increased enforcement activities;
- That there are too many taxis;
- Opposition to the creation of a one central super rank for the town centre;
- Opposition to working in partnership with the PHV sector;
- Mistrust/lack of faith with the licensing authority;
- Concern that if private hire vehicle holding areas are provided they will be used as a form of PHV rank;
- Concern that illegal plying for hire is taking place within Middlesbrough;
- Private hire vehicles are not returning to base;
- The extent of on street parking creates problems for dropping off and picking up passengers;
- Private hire vehicles use of ranks; and
- There is an inadequate number of ranks/rank spaces.

4.19 Amongst the PHV trade the main points raised in consultations undertaken include:

- A lack of effective enforcement undertaken by the Council;
- Hackneys taking PHV fares that have been pre-booked leading to private hire vehicles circulating or parking within the town centre to ensure that they are available to respond quickly to bookings;
- There are too many ranks;
- The extent of on street parking creates problems for dropping off and picking up passengers;
- A need for Taxi Marshall's;
- Over ranking by hackney carriage vehicles; and
- A desire for the provision of super ranks.

4.20 Amongst passengers consulted the majority are content with the current walking distance to ranks and do not see a need for additional ranks in the town. Many seek to flag down taxis rather than bother to walk to ranks. However, passengers flagging for a taxi has the consequential impact of indiscriminate on street parking, traffic conflict and undesirable vehicle manoeuvres resulting in conditions prejudicial to highway and pedestrian safety. This situation is exacerbated with competition for on street parking spaces, PHV and hackney carriage vehicles dropping-off passengers and the volume of pedestrian activity.

4.21 The Council and Cleveland Police have made it clear that their available resources cannot stretch to enforce the dispersed rank arrangements currently in place.

4.22 The piecemeal development of ranks that has taken place within Middlesbrough over the years increases the need for enforcement. In addition the dispersed nature of ranks creates
difficulties for both passengers and hackney carriage vehicles in choosing which may be best for them to use. In the case of hackney drivers this leads to them touring the ranks to seek out passengers.

4.23 Traffic conflict is evident in the town centre particularly at high volume locations such as Wilson Street, Albert Street, Corporation Road (outside Walkabout) and Southfield Lane.

4.24 There is a mis-match between rank provision and demand particularly at the Corporation Road (Walkabout), Wilson Street and Southfield Road where the demand is in excess of rank provision. The under provision of rank spaces creates congestion, blockage and errant driver behaviour. For example, a maximum queue length of 10 hackney carriage vehicles and 8 private hire vehicles was observed at the Walkabout Rank which has an official rank consisting of only 3 spaces.

4.25 There appears to be an unwillingness amongst taxi operators to work together to resolve the current discord and tensions. For example, at the 27th May 2010 forum a request was made by Boro Taxis to meet with the MHCA and MODA to discuss working together. However, despite initial indications they would agree to this, following an MHCA meeting both the HCA and MODA refused to meet. There has also been a reluctance by most PHV operators, apart from Boro axis, to respond to any of the consultation opportunities provided during the course of the review.

4.26 Throughout the duration of the study whilst progress has been made in achieving consensus between stakeholders at forum meetings such progress is short lived. For example, at the forum on the 4th March it was agreed that the option to provide a combination of infrastructure and soft measure improvements offered the preferred way forward. It was also agreed that partnership working was required to progress such measures. However, following this a meeting of MHCA decided that no change to the current infrastructure arrangements was required, just an increase in enforcement activity. At the same meeting the Association decided not to meet with Boro Taxis. Similarly, at the forum on 27th May 2010 those present discussed and agreed to proposals to rationalise rank arrangements. However, following the forum, in their written submission to consultation on the draft Final Report MHCA, supported by MODA, propose changes to the rank arrangements agreed that would run contrary to rationalisation. (see appendix A for details)
5.0 RANK REVIEW - RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

5.1 The existing rank and associated highway and pedestrian infrastructure is clearly not working and has resulted in vehicular conflict points and pedestrian safety problems.

5.2 The Council and Police have made it clear that they do not have additional resources to increase the enforcement activities they undertake and it is not considered practical to resolve the issues that exist through enforcement alone.

5.3 The effective management and operation of taxi services is dependent upon a number of key fundamentals including co-operation between all stakeholders, rationalisation of rank provision, provision of additional rank capacity, route accessibility, operation of the highway network, requirements of the night time economy, the needs of both the hackney carriage and private hire trade, passenger requirements, industry awareness and enforcement.

5.4 From the audits, observation and stakeholder consultation events undertaken it is clear that there is a lack of trust between the key stakeholders working in the town centre and this is compounding the difficulties with the current arrangements for taxi provision.

5.5 Cleveland Police strongly support the need for partnership working to bring about improvements in the current arrangements and it is considered highly unlikely that matters will be resolved if this is not achieved, regardless of other recommendations being progressed.

5.6 During consultation preferential suggestions have been made by parties, which is understandable. However, the implementation of preferential suggestions best suited to one party would work against the ethos of ‘working together’ and reasonable ‘compromise. A more balanced approach is needed that provides a co-ordinated package of measures which seek to be fair to all stakeholders without favouring one over others. The recommendations listed in this Final Report are based on this approach.

5.7 The recommendations put forward within this approach provide the framework for partnership working, ensure enforcement will be made manageable, highway and pedestrian safety will be improved and Middlesbrough Town Centre will become more attractive. This in turn will entice the expansion of the night time economy, including demand for taxis.

Recommended Improvements

5.8 Paragraphs 5.9 – 5.65 discuss the guiding principles in the development of the recommendations. Table 5.12 summarises the study recommendations in tabular format with indicative costs. The following flow chart summarises the various components of the overall package of recommendations. Figures 5.3, 5.4 and 5.5 illustrate the physical recommendations in plan format.
### Aims & Visions

The need to manage town centre demand for taxis through comprehensive partnership.

### Quality Taxi Partnership

#### Management
- Quality Taxi Partnership
- Targeted Enforcement
- Unlicensed PCV, Out of area, Existing & New Ranks, Hackney & PHV
- Town Centre policies
- Taxi Marshall’s
- Taxi Trade Website incorporating booking system for QTP members
- Monitoring
- Incorporate into LTP

#### Rank Infrastructure
- Rationalisation
- Creation of town centre super ranks at Exchange Square, Albert Road and Corporation Road
- Retention of town centre ranks, Corporation Road, The Grange & Wilson Street (tbc)
- Rationalisation of ranks at Southfield Road and creation of Southfield Lane super rank
- Retention of Linthorpe Road ranks – The Crown, Rigatonis and creation of rank
- Extension of The Village rank (Linthorpe Village to 6 spaces)

#### Traffic Management
- Wilson Street Pilot
- Night time closure of Corporation Road (outside Walkabout) with automated control via CCTV room
- Removal of build-outs along Albert Road to increase on street parking, drop-off and pick-up opportunities
- Traffic signing, new and modifications to existing traffic regulation orders
- Installation of pedestrian guard railing along Albert Road & The Empire
- PHV Holding Area at Zetland Street car park & Clairville Common
- Use of Buxton Street Car Park as a night time economy business car park

#### Communications
- Inter-Taxi Marshall’s and to Taxis, CCTV, Police, Enforcement Officers
- QTP to facilitate joint working for mutual and community benefit
- Key stakeholder marketing and awareness campaign for the introduction of changes
- General public marketing and awareness campaign for introduction of changes
Management and Enforcement

5.9 It is recommended that a co-ordinated set of measures are implemented in order to provide the Council with the ability to effectively manage the taxi trade:-

- Formation of the Quality Taxi Partnership;
- Rationalisation of ranks in order to remove the dispersed nature of ranks
- Implementation of a series of super ranks;
- Introduction of traffic management measures;
- Implementation of a Ply for Hire Policy;
- Implementation of a New Rank Policy (including the review and monitoring of existing ranks);
- Implementation of an Unlicensed PSV policy in liaison with Cleveland Police;
- Implementation of private hire holding areas subject to strict conditions on usage; and
- Appointment of Taxi Marshall’s.

Quality Taxi Partnership

5.10 In the context of Middlesbrough it is considered that infrastructure improvements and/or enforcement alone does not represent a sustainable solution to improving conditions. There is a need for stakeholders to “work together” to ensure such proposals are used appropriately. This requires the establishment of a Quality Taxi Partnership to provide a framework for joint working. The Quality Taxi Partnership would act as the mechanism to ensure that enforcement issues would be tackled at the root cause, guide appropriate use of infrastructure and target enforcement activity to where this was abused (see appendix B and C for further details).

Taxi Marshall’s

5.11 Recommendations are put forward to improve management and taxi enforcement of the taxi trade including the introduction of Taxi Marshall’s for Friday and Saturday nights. The role of the Taxi Marshall will be to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role of Taxi Marshall’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensure the throughput of hackney carriages serving the super ranks;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that hackney carriage vehicles do not over rank, block or obstruct access to ranks and adjacent highways;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To communicate with other Taxi Marshall’s to co-ordinate the supply of hackney carriages at super ranks;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To manage passenger queues at super ranks;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To address any issues of anti-social behaviour at ranks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure there is no illegal plying for hire by PHVs at or near ranks, in the PHV holding area or elsewhere in the town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To act as a help point for passengers in the event that no hackney carriages are available;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• To liaise with the CCTV control room, taxi enforcement officers and Police in the event of incidents;
• To participate in the Quality Taxi Partnership.
• Taxi Marshall’s to be registered with the Security Industry Authority and shall be appointed and trained by the Licensing Authority.

Table 5.1 Role of Taxi Marshall’s

5.12 It may be possible to identify sources of grant funding or other support to pilot the introduction of Taxi Marshall’s. However, possibly from the outset and almost certainly in the long term it will be necessary to establish funding support locally. The most obvious option for achieving this is to increase the taxi (Hackney and PHV) license fee to cover these costs. However, there are examples elsewhere of how this cost has been offset; ie by increasing the fares taxis can charge or extending the opportunity to generate income from advertising on taxis. In addition, if overtime the introduction of Taxi Marshall’s is shown to reduce other enforcement costs of the Council they have said they could be prepared to channel any savings into meeting the cost of employing these.

Operational Policies

5.13 The introduction of a number of policies is recommended to assist the management of taxi operations whilst at the same time benefiting the taxi trade, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Police policy for unlicensed PCVs (buses) and unlicensed PCV drivers | • Enforcing against unlicensed vehicles and/or drivers accessing Middlesbrough.  
• Ensuring passenger and road safety.  
• Maximising the market for the licensed trade. |
| Council policy for out of area vehicles | • Enforcing against unlicensed vehicles and/or drivers accessing Middlesbrough.  
• Ensuring passenger safety.  
• Maximising the market for the licensed trade. |
| Council policy for new ranks | • Continuing the co-ordination and rationalisation of rank arrangements by building on the package of recommendations proposed  
• Avoiding any further peace-meal development of ranks.  
• Maintaining appropriate rank provision through a programme of regular reviews.  
• Establish standard design principles and guidelines for ranks.  
• Establish consultation process for the removal |
and or development of new ranks.
- Ensuring enforcement remains manageable

| Town Centre PHV Policy | • Provision of specific guidance on the operation of PHV services within the town centre  
- Provision of specific guidance on the purpose and use of PHV holding areas  
- Implementation of an appropriate system to penalise operator and drivers that abuse terms and conditions of license, traffic regulation orders and policy guidance. |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Town Centre Hackney Policy | • Provision of specific guidance on the operation of hackney services within the town centre  
- Provision of specific guidance on the purpose and use of super ranks  
- Implementation of an appropriate system to penalise operators and drivers that abuse terms and conditions of license, traffic regulation orders and policy guidance. |
| Supplementary Planning Guidance | Refer to table 5.3 |

**Table 5.2 Recommended Policies**

**Private Hire Holding Areas**

5.14 A particular problem in Middlesbrough town centre is the volume of circulating private hire vehicles, their willingness to ignore regulations, now removed, requiring them to return to base following completion of a job and the potential this creates for illegal plying for hire. Where the latter occurs, either because drivers are approached by members of the public or in some cases may encourage it themselves, it not only impinges on the market for hackneys but also invalidates passenger insurance. There is the possibility this problem could increase now the requirement to return to base is no longer in place. It may also add to the general parking problems in the town, which are already significant.

5.15 In order to minimise the opportunity for illegal plying hire by PHVs, the risks to passengers this creates, the private hire vehicle and hackney carriage conflicts that can result and to improve general road safety and traffic management conditions a maximum of two private hire vehicle holding areas are recommended; one either side of the town centre. Discussions at the 27th May stakeholder forum formulated two options. These being:

- A holding area to the north of the town centre at Station Street; and
- A holding area to the south of the town centre at Park Vale Road (adjacent to Claireville Common).

5.16 Despite agreement to the above at the forum, concerns and opposition have been raised since by the hackney carriage trade regarding the private hire holding area. These relate in particular to the possibility of it being treated as a rank by prospective passengers and the private hire trade alike. This is not the intention of the proposal and it is set alongside other
recommendations such as the establishment of a PHV policy that includes guidance on how holding areas should be used with stringent penalties for those who do not comply and ensuring such areas are located some distance away from the main pedestrian flows and outside the main town centre boundaries. There is also a proposal that Taxi Marshall’s should tackle illegal plying for hire in the town and having a holding area available to PHVs will allow them to direct PHVs to this and enable them and other enforcement staff to focus their enforcement resources on the holding areas. In this context, it is further recommended that mystery passengers should be used to monitor the response of those using the holding areas to approaches from potential passengers.

5.17 Middlesbrough Council in removing the policy to return to base did so in light of the potential for creation and operation of a private hire vehicle holding area. The recommendation is therefore also compatible with existing Council policy.

5.18 The specific recommendations for the private hire vehicle holding areas are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private Hire Holding Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North of town centre - holding area at Station Street (car park);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of town centre - holding area at Park Vale Road (adjacent to Claireville Common). No part of the Common should form the holding area in part or in its entirety;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The use of holding areas should be incorporated into the terms and conditions of PHV operator and driver licenses, alongside reference to the PHV policy guidance proposed for them;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The holding areas must not be used by operators and/or drivers as an ‘informal rank’ for private hire vehicles and mystery passengers should be used to monitor this;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The private hire holding area must be located away from the town centre and the main pedestrian flows;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The private hire holding area must not be located within easy walking distance of any leisure facility, shopping centre, nightclub, restaurant and or public bar;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should development proposals be proposed within close proximity to the holding area the evaluation of the proposals will need to take into account the impacts and whether the resultant development will encourage the use of the private hire holding area as a private hire ‘rank’. A Council resolution will be required adopting this item as Supplementary Planning Guidance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3 Private Hire Holding Area

Working environment and Rank Provision

5.19 Unique to Middlesbrough is the working environment (rank provision, road layout, pedestrian footfall) within which the taxi trade has to operate.
5.20 To reduce conflicts the study recommendations seek to introduce a co-ordinated package of both physical and management measures to reduce conflicts, improve traffic management, improve road safety and to focus enforcement resources. This in turn will add to the attractiveness of the town centre environment and as a result potentially increase footfall and as such demand for both hackney carriage and private hire vehicle patronage. With a clear reduction in rank demand since 2008 this is a critical consideration.

5.21 The audits and stakeholder consultations revealed varying opinions on rank provision, road layout and adequacy. Appendix A provides specific details of the feedback to the Final Draft Report received from the Hackney Carriage Association, MODA (Middlesbrough Owner Driver Association) and Cleveland Police and the consultants response to these. In general our aim has been to strike a balance in the package of measure proposed that as far as possible accommodates the concerns and issues raised across all stakeholders without favouring any one agenda in particular and that is workable for all.

5.22 The study has given due consideration to stakeholder views. The conclusions drawn from our examination put forward the recommendation that all ranks within the study area should be rationalised with the retention of a number of existing ranks, introduction of a series of super ranks and relocation of a number of existing ranks to super ranks.

5.23 Due consideration has been given to the views of the hackney carriage trade in terms of rank locations at areas which attract high pedestrian footfall. Due consideration has also been given to the principle need of the private hire trade to drop off and pick up passengers as close as possible to the journey origin and or destination.

5.24 The objective of “working together” is to implement measures which permit both hackney and private hire trades to operate without adverse impact on the markets of each, traffic management and public safety taking into account the demand for space required by both the taxi trade, the general public and existing businesses.

5.25 From the town centre rank, traffic management audit and rank maximum queue length surveys it was revealed that the cumulative hackney carriage queue length for all town centre ranks was lower than the available supply. However, from the audits it is also clear a number of ranks are over utilised while others are underutilised. A large number of ranks within the town centre and Southfield Road have limited capacity in terms of available standing space for hackneys. It was also observed that a number of existing ranks do not have the capacity to meet passenger demand resulting in over ranking which is exacerbated by additional on – street parking attributable to the general public, businesses and private hire vehicles.

5.26 It is therefore considered that there is an imbalance between rank provision and demand at certain locations throughout the town centre particularly at Wilson Street and Corporation Road (Walkabout Rank). This imbalance is created by the location of low capacity ranks at high pedestrian volume locations. To address this, the study recommends that rank provision is rationalised in order to create efficient ranks. This in turn will benefit pedestrian and traffic management whilst providing adequate rank provision and facilitating enforcement. The rationalisation of ranks is also recommended to assist the Council in their management and enforcement of taxi operations.

5.27 The creation of super ranks would ensure that destination areas for the collecting of customers are established. This together with the introduction of taxi Marshall’s would ensure that customers are able to attend a clearly defined area, then be able to get a hackney carriage in an orderly manner close to the main amenities which in particular support the night time
economy. The location of the super ranks have taken into account acceptable pedestrian walking distances and the walking journey times as identified through the pedestrian surveys.

5.28 It is recommended that a series of super ranks are introduced within the town centre to increase hackney carriage standing capacity, including the utilisation of additional rank feeder lanes whilst enhancing traffic management and public safety. The creation of super ranks together with the need to focus available enforcement resources so these can be used effectively will necessitate the removal of a number of existing ranks. The study recommends that these super ranks are established at and near to locations with highest pedestrian volumes. Three town centre super rank locations are proposed for the night time economy. These are summarised in Table 5.4 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Super Rank Location</th>
<th>Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exchange Square</td>
<td>Provision of 34 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank formed from combining existing Exchange Square (6 spaces), Exchange Place (5 spaces), Wilson Street (9 spaces) and provision of an additional 19 spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Road</td>
<td>Provision of 12 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank formed from combining Albert Road (Flares) rank (5 spaces) and Albert Road (HSBC rank) resulting in a provision of 12 spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation Road</td>
<td>20 spaces (under existing arrangement)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4 Town Centre Super Rank Location

5.29 The Exchange Square super rank combines the Exchange Place, Exchange Square and Wilson Streets and introduces a super rank at a location that affords adequate vehicle manoeuvring space and a focal point for pedestrians.

5.30 The Albert Road super rank combines the two existing Albert Road ranks thereby allowing for better management and enforcement of the ranks to the benefit of highway and pedestrian safety.

5.31 The Corporation Road super rank formalises the current arrangement. Based on observations the Corporation Road has adequate capacity within which to accommodate the Walkabout Rank which is recommended for removal.

5.32 In addition to the 3 town centre super ranks a fourth super rank consisting of 20 spaces is recommended at Southfield Lane. The extension of the initially recommended (in the draft final report) 12 space to a 20 space super rank has been brought about by the Hackney Carriage Associations request for additional spaces along Southfield Road. The Southfield Lane super rank is formed from combining the Dickens Inn rank (3 spaces), Star and Garter rank (2
spaces) and Star and Garter rank (4 spaces). The creation of the Southfield Lane super rank provides an additional 11 spaces which could not otherwise be created on Southfield Road without resulting in an overall dis-benefit to parking and traffic management.

5.33 Due regard has been given to the location and length of each super rank proposed in terms of the provision of accessibility for existing businesses, parking, traffic flows, junction access and the need for pick-up and drop off capacity for all taxis. In terms of highway safety the provision of super ranks to each flank of a length of highway has been discounted. In particular it is necessary to discourage the current practice of taxis, PCVs and private cars picking up or dropping off passengers whilst standing in the highway.

5.34 The location of super ranks has taken into account private hire drop off and pick up requirements with locations established (as far as is reasonably practicable and having due regard to the guiding principles within this report) based on existing levels of on street parking, highway network conflict points, pedestrian walking distances, proposed modifications to town centre traffic management and destinations (pubs, bars, restaurants). No vehicle is afforded an automatic right to park on any length of adopted public highway at any location unless permitted under relevant traffic regulation orders. Therefore, if a section of road permits general on street parking, private hire vehicles could still encounter issues regarding drop off and pick issues irrespective of the existence of a hackney carriage rank at the same location. As for any vehicle they should drive to the nearest safe point to pull up.

5.35 The study has also examined the requirements of the night time economy, business car parking and servicing requirements in order to ensure that changes to rank provision and traffic do not unreasonably impinge on such requirements.

5.36 The creation of super ranks will necessitate highway works, the modification to existing traffic regulation orders and available on-street car parking provision during the timeline of the night time economy. To compensate for the displacement of on street car parking facilities the study recommends that the Buxton Street town centre car park is made available and that town centre visitors arriving by motorised vehicle are encouraged to use this facility.

5.37 In terms of the overall night time economy rank provision Table 5.5 summarises the existing town centre rank provision and those ranks that are to be removed and incorporated within the super ranks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Town Centre Rank</th>
<th>Spaces</th>
<th>Times of Operation</th>
<th>Rank Spaces to be Removed and Relocated to Super Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert Road (Flares)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7pm-6am</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Road (HSBC)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7pm-6am</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Street West</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>At all times</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation Road (The Central)</td>
<td>8 (20)</td>
<td>At all times midnight-3am</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation Road (Walkabout)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7pm-6am</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In terms of the overall night time economy rank provision Table 5.6 summarises the proposed town centre rank provision.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Town Centre Rank Provision</th>
<th>Spaces</th>
<th>Times of Operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exchange Square Super Rank (Central turnaround section)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>At all times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Exchange Square section)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>At all times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Exchange Place section)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7pm-6am (Friday and Saturday nights only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Road Super Rank</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7pm-4am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Street West</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>At all times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation Road (The Central) Super Rank</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>At all times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeder Lane (Albert Road)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>After last bus – 4am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grange Road</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>At all times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport Road (Bus Station)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>At all times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Rock Café (Bolckow Street)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Midnight-4am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SPACES FOR THE NIGHT TIME ECONOMY EXCLUDING FEEDER SPACES</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCREASE IN CAPACITY</strong></td>
<td><strong>13 spaces, plus Albert Road feeder lane</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.6 Proposed Town Centre Rank Provision

5.39 **Figures 5.1 and 5.2** show the locations of ranks pre and post-implementation of the report recommendations, respectively.
From the Southfield Road / Linthorpe Road rank, traffic management audit and rank maximum queue length surveys similar results were revealed to the town centre analyses. In order to improve conditions the same guiding improvement principles as applied for the town centre were adopted for the Southfield Road / Linthorpe Road area of Middlesbrough.

Due to the linear nature of the locality, current traffic conflicts, traffic flows, side road traffic flows, pedestrian accessibility, land constraints, road geometry constraints and rank usage a series of ranks (existing and proposed) is recommended to provide for the easier and safer dispersal of hackney carriage vehicles and their passenger demands, in the context of wider road safety benefits. The creation of a super rank, alone, was not considered appropriate or practical in Southfield and or Linthorpe Road.

In terms of the overall night time economy rank provision Table 5.7 summarises the existing Linthorpe Road / Southfield Road provision and those ranks that are to be removed and incorporated within the proposed Southfield Lane super rank and other ranks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Rank</th>
<th>Spaces</th>
<th>Times of Operation</th>
<th>Rank Spaces to be Removed and Relocated to Super Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linthorpe Road (The Crown)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10pm-6am</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linthorpe Road (Rigatonis)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7pm-4am</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linthorpe Road (Village)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>At all times</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linthorpe Road (Cleveland)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7pm-4am</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southfield Road (Dickens Inn)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7pm-4am</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southfield Road (Star and Garter)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11pm-4am</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southfield Road (Star and Garter)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7pm-4am</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SPACES</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPACES TO BE REMOVED / RELOCATED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.7 Existing Southfield Road / Linthorpe Road Rank Provision

In terms of the overall night time economy rank provision Table 5.8 summarises the proposed rank provision in the Southfield Road / Linthorpe Road area.
5.44 Due consideration has been given to requests for an additional rank to be located on Linthorpe Road in the vicinity of Garnet Street. Due to the close proximity of Garnet Street to the proposed Southfield Lane super rank and existing ranks being retained at The Crown and Rigatonis, all within a reasonable walking distance of Garnet Street, it is considered that the introduction of a further rank would result in:

- There being to many ranks in the area;
- Increase in competition for on-street parking on Linthorpe Road resulting in errant driver behaviour;
- Circulation of hackney carriage vehicles in deciding which rank to utilise;
- Increased potential for pick-up and drop-off of passengers within the carriageway due to a lack of kerb side parking opportunities creating road safety problems.

5.45 The study recommendations have taken into account the hackney carriage association’s requirement to increase rank spaces within the Southfield Road and Linthorpe Road area. Rather than introducing additional ranks the existing ranks at The Crown and Rigatonis / The keys have been extended, all of which are located within acceptable walking distance of the night time facilities in the area.

5.46 The provision of a 20 space super rank in Southfield Lane also further increases the number of rank spaces within the Southfield Road / Linthorpe Road area.

**Passenger accessibility**

5.47 Passenger accessibility is key to the provision of a level of taxi service that is expected by the general public, to encouraging the use of ranks and to discouraging illegal plying for hire.

5.48 The study has taken into account passenger requirements and accessibility to / from taxis to ensure that provisions encourage, appropriate, passenger usage of both hackney carriage and private hire services in a balanced manner.

5.49 The identification of locations for super and other ranks has taken into account acceptable pedestrian walking distances of 400m.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Rank Provision</th>
<th>Spaces</th>
<th>Times of Operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southfield Lane super rank</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7pm-4am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linthorpe Road (The Crown)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10pm-6am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linthorpe Road (Rigatonis)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7pm-4am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linthorpe Road (Village)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>At all times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SPACES</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.8 Proposed Southfield Road / Linthorpe Road Rank Provision**

---
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5.50 The audit of the highway network related to the night time economy revealed a number of highway safety and traffic management issues at various locations (conflict/pinch points). These conflict points coincide with locations of high volume pedestrian footfall and the traffic routes leading to these locations. Common issues at these locations include vehicular conflicts, undesirable vehicle manoeuvres, indiscriminate on-street parking and vehicle/pedestrian conflicts.

5.51 In order to enhance road safety within the town centre study area a range of traffic management options were suggested and considered to restrict traffic movements and to reduce the volume of circulating traffic.

5.52 From the conclusions drawn it is recommended that two vehicular routes within the town centre, specifically Wilson Street and Corporation Road (Walkabout), should be modified.

Wilson Street

5.53 Extensive discussions have taken place regarding Wilson Street (west of its junction with Albert Road). Wilson Street is problematical in terms of congestion, vehicle conflict, pedestrian – vehicle conflict and traffic management.

5.54 Three options were identified for Wilson Street as listed in Tables 5.9 - 5.11. These tables also outline the advantages and disadvantages of each option.

Option 1 - Closure of Wilson Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Removal of traffic and pedestrian conflicts</td>
<td>1. Accessibility issues for existing businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Creation of pedestrian area</td>
<td>2. Potential transfer of problem from Wilson Street to other areas (Albert Road) if no associated measures are proposed – super ranks, increase in parking opportunities on Albert Road, encourage use of Buxton Street car park as a business car park, QTP, taxi Marshall’s etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reinforces the creation of super ranks</td>
<td>3. Longer travel distances for taxis and other traffic:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Public order</td>
<td>Vehicles wishing to access the B1272 Hartington Road / B6541 junction travel a distance of 0.74km (1.19miles) from Dundas Mews along Wilson Street to the junction. If Wilson Street is closed the travel distance between the super rank at Exchange Square is increased to 1.26km (2.02miles). Difference = 0.83miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Increased travel distance resulting in increased fares.</td>
<td>Costs: Diesel – running cost per mile 16.04p based on a car costing £12k - £16k. Petrol – running cost per mile 18.33p based on</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a car costing £12k - £14k.
(Source: AA June 2010)

Increase in cost per trip:
Diesel: 13.31p; Petrol: 15.21p

Other routes are not affected.

Additional distance travelled = increase in tariff.

4. Closure needs to be manually managed resulting in manpower costs.

5. Removal of a town centre access/exit route and implications for late night buses.

6. Transfer of traffic onto Albert Road creating further conflicts.

7. Albert Road / Wilson Street junction could become a drop-off pick up point creating safety issues.

Table 5.9 Benefits and disadvantages associated with closure of Wilson Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ranks relocated to Exchange Square reducing HC and PHV conflicts</td>
<td>1. Pedestrian / traffic conflict would remain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Access to business retained</td>
<td>2. Potential for HC and PHV conflict would still exist albeit in a reduced form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Town centre vehicle dispersal routes remain unaffected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No additional outlay of costs to operate the closure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reduces traffic flows along Albert Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.10 Benefits and disadvantages associated with retention of Wilson Street (two-way)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ranks relocated to Exchange Square reducing HC and PHV conflicts</td>
<td>1. An element of pedestrian / traffic conflict would remain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Management of traffic on Wilson Street</td>
<td>2. Manpower will be required to enforce the one-way system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Out of town taxi journeys remain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
unaffected

4. Reduced traffic / pedestrian conflict

5. Businesses retain access

6. Reduces traffic flows along Albert Road and potential pick up, drop off within the Albert Road / Wilson Street junction.

7. Opposing traffic flows are removed from Wilson Street.

8. Pedestrian safety is enhanced as a result of one-way traffic flows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.11 Benefits and disadvantages associated with retention of Wilson Street (one-way)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Removal of town centre exit route and implications for late night buses (one way)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.55 Each option for Wilson Street offers different benefits and disadvantages with option 1 – full closure tending to offer the greatest impact on traffic management issues and therefore being that favoured by those responsible for this (the Council, the Police) and option 2 – retention tending to offer the greatest flexibility for taxi operations and therefore being that favoured by taxi operators. In seeking to maintain the principle of balancing the interests of all it is recommended that a three stage trial is undertaken to establish which scheme works the best for Wilson Street. The trial, proposed for Friday and Saturday nights only, is outlined as follows:

5.56 **Stage 1**

- Wilson Street is retained operating as a two-way road
- One rank along Wilson Street (to be decided by the QTP) is retained;
- All other recommendations are implemented prior to the commencement of the trial;
- The trial is undertaken over a period of three months and is monitored, based on criteria agreed between all stakeholders, through the QTP.
- The trial is reviewed. If it is considered to be successful based on the criteria set the recommendation is that Wilson Street is retained as a two-way road.

5.57 **Stage 2**

If Stage 1 proves to be unsuccessful a trial is to be undertaken on the basis of:

- Wilson Street operating under a one-way system (east – west), after the last late night bus and up to 04.00 am;
- The trial is undertaken over a period of three months and is monitored based on criteria agreed between all stakeholders, through the QTP.
- The trial is reviewed. If it is considered to be successful based on the criteria set the recommendation is that Wilson Street is retained as a one-way road during the times proposed.

Prior to the commencement of this trial measures will need to be identified and implemented relating to emergency vehicles and existing business access (subject to consultation to define
requirements), form of closure, road signing scheme and a public awareness campaign is undertaken to inform road users and businesses.

5.58 **Stage 3**

If Stage 2 proves to be unsuccessful a trial is to be undertaken on the basis of:

- Full closure of Wilson Street after the last late night bus and up to 04.00 am;
- The trial is undertaken over a period of three months and is monitored, based on criteria agreed between all stakeholders, through the QTP.
- The trial period is reviewed. If the trial is considered to be successful based on the criteria set the recommendation is that Wilson Street is closed on a permanent basis during the times proposed.

Prior to the commencement of this trial measures will need to be identified and implemented relating to emergency vehicles, buses and existing business access (subject to consultation to define requirements), form of closure, road signing scheme, provision of turning facilities at the western closure point and a public awareness campaign is undertaken to inform road users, bus users and businesses.

5.59 **Stage 4**

If Stage 4 proves to be unsuccessful the results of each stage should be revisited and reviewed to establish which trial proved the most successful and it is recommended that this option is the one implemented from there-on.

*Corporation Road*

5.60 It is recommended that Corporation Road (fronting the Walkabout) is closed 8pm – 4am (Friday and Saturday nights only) with either rising bollards or a barrier installed. Access rights will need to be given to the emergency services, buses and any businesses affected.

*Other Areas*

5.61 Within the Linthorpe Road and Southfield Road study area due to the interrelationship between existing land uses and requirements placed on the highway network traffic management improvement options are considered to be constrained.

5.62 Other traffic management options were considered to support the night time economy including Red Routes and a Town Centre Cordon. These options were discounted on grounds that (the former) would create difficulties for local business and (the latter) would transfer existing town centre problems to the boundary of the cordon with difficulties introduced for pedestrians in terms of walking distances, business accessibility into the town and enforcement.

5.63 A number of the options discussed with key stakeholders focused on stand-alone improvement measures which on their own may have had merit. However, in examining improvement options relative to traffic management it was necessary to analyse these in a wider context taking into account other road user and business requirements and consequential impacts.
Other Considerations

5.64 Various other points were raised by stakeholders during consultation which related to matters outside the scope of the study brief. These include:

- Open Issue;
- Operation of ranks at super markets outside the study area;
- Taxi operations at the Majestic; and
- License fees;
- Taxi MOT’s;
- Issue of licenses.

5.65 Whilst these issues have been recorded as they are outside the brief it is not appropriate for this study to put forward any recommendations relating to them.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Indicative Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Quality Taxi Partnership (QTP)</td>
<td>Establish a voluntary partnership (QTP) between taxi (hackney, private hire) operators, taxi drivers, licensing authority and other key stakeholders such as the Police, town centre management, retailers, leisure facilities, Taxi Marshall’s and bodies/community groups representing interests of passengers such as students, the disabled, etc. The objective of the partnership is to provide a framework for joint working on a range of measures appropriate to the area and for all parties to work together for mutual benefit. The partnership can also provide a tool to link taxi policy into broader transport and town centre policies such as LTP and Community Safety Strategies, etc. (see appendix B and C for further detail)</td>
<td>Establishes a framework for joint working and decision making between all stakeholders to improve taxi services.</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2   | Effective Council Management and Enforcement    | Licensing authority lead on the establishment of the Quality Taxi Partnership and use the framework this offers for consultation on management policies and marketing development. Introduction of policies, as follows: - Police policy for unlicensed PCVs (buses) and unlicensed - PCV drivers - Council policy for out of area vehicles - Council policy for new ranks - Town Centre PHV Policy - Town Centre Hackney Policy - Supplementary Planning Guidance Introduction of an effective enforcement regime with meaningful penalties issued on a scale to act as a deterrent. | • Efficient management and credibility of taxi services.  
• Enhanced policy and guidance on town centre taxi operations  
• Clear penalties for non compliance  
• Assisting road and public safety.  
• Supporting the night time economy.  
• To avoid piecemeal development of rank location.  
• Focus of enforcement resources through rank rationalisation |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Indicative Cost <em>(Note 1)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.  | (continued) | The licensing authority should examine the feasibility of developing a cross-border enforcement regime with neighbouring authorities to respond to ‘out of area’ private hire vehicles.  

Introduction of a taxi trade website to inform the trade of current issues. (This website could be adapted to incorporate taxi bookings and access to this provided to operators who are members of the Quality Taxi Partnership via a login registration system, as proposed by the hackney vehicle review - see below).  

Development of a “Policy for New Ranks” to include policy review, annual monitoring of taxi operations, design principles / standards for ranks. The “Policy for New Ranks” should link to DfT guidance and emerging DfT guidance “Manual for Streets 2”. |  |  |
| 3   | Appointment of Taxi Marshall’s | Taxi Marshall’s to be appointed (6no.) and become members of the Quality Taxi Partnership. Taxi Marshall’s to operate Friday and Saturday nights only.  

Link to each other and CCTV control room via Radio/Intercom and via latter to the police and enforcement officers | • Management of hackney ranks.  
• Coordination of hackney carriage movements.  
• Improve enforcement.  
• Assistance to passengers  
• Address anti-social behaviour at ranks | £40,000 / year |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Indicative Cost * (Note 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4   | Rationalisation of town centre ranks and creation of super ranks and rank feeder lanes | Rank Retention  
• Bridge Street (10 spaces) At all times  
• Grange Road (14 spaces) At all times  
• Corporation Road – The Central (8 spaces at all times increasing to 20 spaces following the last bus)  
• Wilson Street – Chicago Rock Café (Bolckow Street) 6 spaces midnight-3am  

Rank Removal / Relocation  
• Albert Road (Flares) - 5 spaces  
• Albert Road (HSBC) - 5 spaces  
• Walkabout - 3 spaces  
• Wilson Street – Albert Road to Dundas Mews – 3 spaces  
• Wilson Street – Dundas Mews to Dundas Street – spaces  
• Wilson Street – Dundas Street – Linthorpe Mews - 2 spaces  

Creation of Super Ranks:  
Exchange Square Super Rank  
(Exchange Square turnaround section 12 spaces at all times)  
(Exchange Square section 8 spaces at all times)  
(Exchange Place section 14 spaces 7pm-6am or can be used as a feeder lane into Exchange Place and Exchange Square, Friday and Saturday nights only)  

Corporation Road (The Central)  
• Corporation Road (The Central) rank to be retained under current operational length (8 spaces at all times increasing to 20 spaces after the last bus (Friday and Saturday nights only midnight – 4am).  
• 5 space feeder lane serving the Corporation Road | Existing rank provision retained.  
• Formation of super rank allows for the relocation of problem ranks.  
• Reduction in traffic at highway network conflict points.  
• Provision of super ranks with feeder lanes providing ranks at town centre focal points with appropriate capacity.  
• Minimising hackney carriage / private hire conflicts.  
• Increasing drop off and pick up opportunities.  
• Facilitating enforcement | £3000  
£50,000 - £80,000  
£1,000 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Indicative Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>super rank to be created on Albert Road in the vicinity of the Cleveland Centre (midnight – 4am Friday and Saturday nights only).</td>
<td>Introduction of new traffic and amendments to existing traffic regulation orders within the town centre to facilitate the new ranks and the removal of former ranks.</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Albert Road (eastern flank)</td>
<td>• Creation of super rank (12 spaces) on Albert Road (eastern flank) 7pm – 4am (Friday and Saturday nights only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Town Centre Traffic Management</td>
<td>Corporation Road (The Walkabout) Temporary closure of Corporation Road (outside the Walkabout) to all traffic 8pm - 4am (Friday and Saturday nights only). The closure to be managed through rising bollards with access for business and emergency vehicles to Corporation Road managed through the Council’s CCTV control room. Wilson Street Implementation of 4 stage trial and monitor success of each stage: Stage 1: Retention of Wilson Street as a two-way road. Stage 2: Operation of Wilson Street as a one-way street (east to west). Stage 3: Full closure of Wilson Street. Stage 4: Review</td>
<td>• Removal of traffic conflicts and congestion. • Removal of informal hackney and private hire ranks. • Replacement town centre parking. • Coordination of traffic to optimise the operational efficiency of the highway network. • Integral component of the QTP. • Pedestrian management. • Road safety.</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>Benefit</td>
<td>Indicative Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(Note 1)</em> (All ranks on Wilson Street apart from one are relocated to Exchange Square and or Albert Road super ranks). Refer to paragraphs 5.56 – 5.58 for details.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Albert Road</strong></td>
<td>On street parking to be maximised. Consideration should be given to the removal of build outs in order to maximise on-street car parking drop-off and pick-up opportunities or the taxi trade and to compensate for parking opportunities lost from Wilson Street.</td>
<td></td>
<td>£6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Albert Road (Spenseleys) and The Empire</strong></td>
<td>Installation of pedestrian guard railing along the Albert Road and Corporation Road frontage kerb lines.</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Buxton Street Car</strong></td>
<td>Buxton Street Car Park to be promoted as a secure night time economy car park in order to compensate for car parking opportunities lost as a result of the creation of the Exchange Square super rank and Wilson Street proposals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Traffic Signal Operations</strong></td>
<td>With the creation of the Exchange Square super rank and modifications proposed for Wilson Street consideration will need to be given to the operation of the traffic signals with changed traffic flows. Detailed design will need to be undertaken to assess whether an adaptive response system should be introduced, whether signal timings will need to be altered to ensure signal coordination and whether the Exchange Place / Albert Road junction traffic signals should be modified to provide taxi-priority through the junction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Traffic Regulation Orders Introduction</strong></td>
<td>Detailed design will determine intervention measures and subsequent costs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>£5,000 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>Benefit</td>
<td>Indicative Cost <em>(Note 1)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>amendments to existing traffic regulation orders within the town centre to facilitate the new ranks and the removal of former ranks.</td>
<td></td>
<td>£10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Linthorpe Village Rank Provision</td>
<td>Extension of the Linthorpe Village Rank to provide a capacity for 6no. hackney carriages (at all times) subject to detailed design. The rank should be provided within one linear length of road space rather than splitting the rank into more than one length.</td>
<td>• Providing for adequate rank provision at Linthorpe Village.</td>
<td>Costs to be absorbed within Council's traffic management scheme for Linthorpe Village.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 7   | Linthorpe Road Southfield Road Rank Provision | **Extension of Ranks**  
- Linthorpe Road (Rigatonis) – 8 spaces in total (7pm - 4am)  
- Linthorpe Road (The Crown) – 10 spaces in total (10pm – 6am)  
**Removal / Relocation of Ranks**  
- Southfield Road (Dickens Inn) – 3 spaces  
- Southfield Road (Star and Garter) – 2 spaces  
- Southfield Road (Star and Garter) – 4 spaces  
- Linthorpe Road Village (Cleveland) – 3 spaces  
**Creation of Super Rank**  
- Creation of super rank on Southfield Lane with capacity for 20 hackneys (7pm – 4am) with access to the rank from Woodlands Road.  
- Existing lay-bys fronting 'Centre House' to both flanks of Southfield Road to be removed and reinstated as footway.  
- Appropriate junction box marking to be laid at the Southfield Road / Southfield Lane junction.  
**Other Rank Provision**  
- Linthorpe Road (Village) – 6 spaces (At all times) | • Removal of traffic conflicts and congestion.  
• Removal of informal hackney and private hire ranks.  
• Provision of efficient ranks.  
• Facilitates enforcement | Absorbed within Council’s traffic management scheme costs. |

TP: Middlesbrough Taxi Review Final Report July 2010
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Indicative Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Introduction of Private Hire Holding Area</td>
<td>Private Hire Vehicle holdings areas should be introduced at Station Street (north of the town centre) and at Vale Park Road (adjacent to Clairville Common) to the south of the town centre. No part of Clairville Common should form the holding area in part or in its entirety. The use of holding areas should be incorporated into the terms and conditions of PHV operator and driver licenses, alongside reference to the PHV policy guidance proposed for them; The holding areas must not be used by operators and/or drivers as an ‘informal rank’ for private hire vehicles and mystery passengers should be used to monitor this; The private hire holding area must be located away from the town centre and the main pedestrian flows; The private hire holding area must not be located within easy walking distance of any leisure facility, shopping centre, nightclub, restaurant and or public bar; Should development proposals be proposed within close proximity to the holding area the evaluation of the proposals will need to take into account the impacts and whether the resultant development will encourage the use of the private hire holding area as a private hire ‘rank’. A Council resolution will be required adopting this item as Supplementary Planning Guidance.</td>
<td>• Reduced private hire vehicular circulation. • Reduce ply for hire. • Ensures that booked private hire fares are not transferred to the hackney carriage trade. • Facilitates enforcement</td>
<td>Taxi Marshall cost included within town centre cost. Mystery Passengers - £1/2,000 pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>Benefit</td>
<td>Indicative Cost <em>(Note 1)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9   | Communication & Marketing Strategy | • Joint marketing via Quality Taxi Partnership.  
• Coordination of taxi operations through Taxi Marshall’s via radio/intercom facility (as in 3 above).  
• Development of a dedicated taxi website administered by the Council with a dedicated QTP membership area (as in 2 above).  
• Effective business and taxi trade marketing awareness campaign with adequate lead-in time for the implementation of the recommendations.  
• Effective public awareness campaign with adequate lead-in time for the implementation of the recommendations. | • Communication between all stakeholders.  
• Management of hackney operations.  
• Industry, business and public awareness. | £10,000 |
| 10  | Monitoring  | • Progress with the above should be monitored quarterly over the coming year and then monitoring incorporated into the regular rank reviews proposed from then on | | |
| 11  | Local Transport Plan | • The recommendations of this report should be taken into account when producing the next Local Transport Plan for Middlesbrough | | |

*Note 1*

Indicative costs are given on a provisional basis only and should not be used (in whole or part thereof) in allocating financial resources in formulation and implementation of any of the recommendations. Further detailed costs would need to be undertaken.  
The formation of super ranks and removal of ranks will incur construction and carriageway / footway reinstatement costs. No preliminary and or detailed design has been undertaken including examination of statutory undertaker apparatus. Indicative costs are given on a provisional basis only and should not be used (in whole or part thereof) in allocating financial resources in formulation and implementation of any of the recommendations. Further detailed costs would need to be undertaken.  
The formation of super ranks, removal of existing ranks and traffic management measures will necessitate the processing and implementation of appropriate traffic regulation orders, associated civil engineering works and design. Indicative costs are given on a provisional basis only and should not be used (in whole or part thereof) in allocating financial resources in formulation and implementation of any of the recommendations.  
The implementation of physical recommendations will require modifications to traffic regulation orders. Processing costs could be reduced if a blanket traffic regulation order were to be processed for all modifications. Further detailed costs would need to be undertaken.
Figure 5.3

Recommendations
6.0 Hackney Fleet Review – Legislation and Guidance

Introduction

6.1 The objectives specified by Middlesbrough Council in the brief for the Vehicle Accessibility Audit are:

- A review of current good practice and guidance in the provision of accessible taxis;
- An examination of current legislation, including the Disability Discrimination Act;
- An assessment of the needs of disabled people for accessible hackney carriages;
- An audit of the current vehicle mix in the hackney fleet, as a whole;
- An assessment of the benefits and disadvantages of rear loading wheelchair accessible vehicles;
- An assessment of the safety issues;
- Identification of the market opportunities; and
- Production of a final report detailing options and recommendations.

Current Legislation

6.2 The Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) 2005 provides the current legislative framework. However, this will shortly be replaced by the Single Equalities Act, the bill for which is currently going through parliament and due to complete its passage in the autumn of 2010. It is not expected that this will be affected by the change of government that occurred as a result of the election May 2010. However, at this time, this cannot be guaranteed either in terms of timescale or the Act itself being adopted.

6.3 The Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) 2005 adopted section 32 of the DDA 1995 access to taxi vehicles. It also amended the DDA 1995 to enable the Government to lift the exemption for public transport services, including taxis and PHVs, from DDA Part 3 access to services. The regulations came into force on 4 December 2006 and since then licensing authorities and taxi operators are required to review any practices, policies and procedures that make it impossible or unreasonably difficult for a disabled person to use such services.

DDA, Part 5 – Access to Vehicles

6.4 DDA part 5 provides the Secretary of State with powers to specify the requirements for accessible taxi vehicles. However, to date these powers have not been used to introduce regulations for accessible taxis.

DDA Part 3 – Access to services

6.5 Part 3 of the Disability Discrimination Act places a legal duty on all service providers in Britain to make ‘reasonable adjustments’ to ensure that people are not prevented from using their services because they have a disability. It does not matter whether the services in question are being provided by a sole operator, firm, company or other organisation, or whether the person involved in providing the services is self-employed or an employee, volunteer, contractor or agent. When deciding whether an adjustment is reasonable, service providers can consider issues such as the cost of the adjustment, the practicality of making it, health and safety factors, the size of the organisation, and whether it will achieve the desired effect. All transport
providers and authorities have duties, for example, in relation to timetables, websites and infrastructure. Operators are obliged to make reasonable adjustments in the way they deliver their services to remove any barriers for disabled passengers, depending on the type of vehicles and the services they offer to the public. Public authorities have an additional duty to actively promote equality (rather than simply avoid discrimination).

6.6 The duty is ‘anticipatory’; i.e. transport providers should expect that people with accessibility problems, such as disabled people, will be using their services. They should consider what adjustments might be needed and put the necessary arrangements in place without waiting to be asked. However, they are not required to take any steps which would fundamentally alter the nature of their service, operation, trade, profession or business or where a change may compromise someone’s health or safety.

6.7 Part 3 of the Disability Discrimination Act requires transport providers to take reasonable steps to:

- Change a policy, practice or procedure which makes it impossible or very difficult for a disabled person to get on or off a vehicle, or to use any services on the vehicle (for example, a buffet car);
- Provide extra help or information to a disabled person so that they can get on, travel on and get off a vehicle or use any services on the vehicle.

Guide Dogs

6.8 In addition, since 31 March 2001 licensed hackney drivers in England and Wales have had a duty under s.37 of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 to carry guide, hearing and other prescribed assistance dogs in their taxis, without additional charge. Drivers who have a medical condition that is aggravated by exposure to dogs may apply to their licensing authority for exemption from the duty on medical grounds. Any other driver who fails to comply with the duty is guilty of a criminal offence and liable, on summary conviction, to a fine of up to £1,000. Similar duties covering PHV operators and drivers came into force on the 31st March 2004. Enforcement of the duties is the responsibility of local licensing authorities.

Single Equalities Act 2010

6.9 The proposed Single Equalities Act 2010 draws together a wide range of equality legislation, including the DDA 2005, into a single Act. The Single Equalities Bill which is currently progressing through parliament outlines the likely content (although this is still open to amendment) and there is also a Code of Practice drawn up by the Equality and Human Rights Commission.

6.10 The overall measures in the Bill include:

- Introducing a new public sector duty to consider reducing socio-economic inequalities;
- Putting a new Equality Duty on public bodies;
- Using public procurement to improve equality;
- Banning age discrimination outside the workplace;
- Introducing gender pay reports in 2013 if employers with over 250 employees do not take action by then;
- Extending the scope to use positive action;
- Strengthening the powers of employment tribunals;
• Protecting carers from discrimination;
• Offering new mothers stronger protection when breastfeeding;
• Banning discrimination in private clubs, and
• Strengthening protection from discrimination for disabled people.

6.11 The specific proposals for Taxis are outlined in section 12, chapter 1 of the Bill. For the most part these proposals reflect the current legislation as contained in the DDA 2005 and originate from DDA 1995.

6.12 Clause 159 (@ February 2010) provides powers for the Secretary of State to make regulations specifying the technical standards applying to licensed taxis and to impose requirements on taxi drivers, to enable disabled people to access taxis safely, even when seated in a wheelchair, and be carried in safety and reasonable comfort. It also makes it an offence, punishable by a fine of up to £1,000, for a driver of a regulated taxi to fail to comply with the requirements of the regulations.

6.13 The powers provide for the Secretary of State to make regulations to enable disabled people:

• to get into and out of taxis in safety;
• to do so while in wheelchairs;
• to travel in taxis in safety and reasonable comfort; and
• to do so while in wheelchairs.

6.14 The regulations are likely, in particular, to require a regulated taxi to conform with provision as to:

• the size of a door opening for the use of passengers;
• the floor area of the passenger compartment;
• the amount of headroom in the passenger compartment;
• the fitting of restraining devices designed to ensure the stability of a wheelchair while the taxi is moving.

6.15 They may also:

• require the driver of a regulated taxi which is plying for hire, or which has been hired, to comply with provisions as to the carrying of ramps or other devices designed to facilitate the loading and unloading of wheelchairs;
• require the driver of a regulated taxi in which a disabled person is being carried while in a wheelchair to comply with provisions as to the position in which the wheelchair is to be secured.

6.16 The Act provides for a licensing authority to seek an exemption to the regulations where they can demonstrate that the adoption of them will reduce the number of taxis operating to an unacceptable level. Where an exemption is granted the Secretary of State may still place conditions on this; for example that all taxis must be fitted with a swivel seat.

6.17 In addition to clause 159 and other clauses adopting DDA part 3 access to transport services an amendment to the Bill by the House of Lords (clause 160) provides for an exception to Section 16 of the Transport Act 1985 (which modifies the provisions of the Town Police Clauses Act 1847 about hackney carriages to allow a license to ply for hire to be refused in order to limit the number of licensed carriages). This will require a license to be issued for a
‘wheelchair accessible’ taxi regardless of any limit imposed, where the proportion of ‘wheelchair accessible’ licenses is less than any proportion that is prescribed by the Secretary of State.

6.18 Within the Act a taxi is defined as a vehicle which is licensed under section 37 of the Town Police Clauses Act 1847 or section 6 of the Metropolitan Public Carriage Act 1869 (i.e. a hackney carriage). There is no accessibility regulation of Private Hire Vehicles (PHV) proposed in the Act, except where these are operating under franchise or as a taxi bus. However, it’s possible they may be brought into the regulatory framework at a later date. It is also the case that the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976, the regulatory framework for PHV licensing, provides for licensing authorities to attach conditions “as they may consider reasonably necessary” to either a PHV vehicle or operators licence. This could include conditions relating to vehicle accessibility.

Current Department for Transport Guidance

6.19 In their most recent guidance to licensing officers, issued in March 2010, the Department for Transport (DfT) state that they will be “taking forward demonstration schemes in three local authority areas to research the needs of people with disabilities in order to produce guidance on the most appropriate provision.”

6.20 In addition DfT recognise that licensing authorities will want to make progress on enhancing accessible taxi provision and to this end highlight a number of options:

- That different accessibility considerations apply between taxis and PHVs and in this context, it is important that a disabled person should be able to hire a taxi on the spot with the minimum delay or inconvenience, and having accessible taxis available helps to make that possible;
- That for PHVs, it may be more appropriate for a local authority to license any type of saloon car, noting that some PHV operators offer accessible vehicles in their fleet;
- That licensing authorities should do what they can to work with operators, drivers and trade bodies to improve drivers’ awareness of the needs of disabled people, perhaps by encouraging them to undertake disability awareness training;
- That section 36 of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (DDA) requiring drivers to provide assistance to people in wheelchairs, to carry them in safety and not to charge extra for doing so was commenced for drivers of taxibuses (only) by enactment of the Local Transport Act 2008;
- That local authorities can take action against non-taxibus drivers who do not abide by their duties under section 36 of the DDA by, for example, using license conditions to implement training requirements or, ultimately, powers to suspend or revoke licenses;
- That the Equality Act (if passed) would extend the duties under section 36 of the DDA to drivers of taxis and PHVs whilst operating conventional taxi services using wheelchair accessible vehicles.

DfT Consultation on Accessible Taxis 2009

6.21 In February 2009 the DfT consulted on proposals to require vehicles used as taxis to be accessible to disabled people. The consultation recognised that the issue of taxi accessibility has been under consideration for several years and that it has proven difficult so far to deliver the needed changes while ensuring that the taxi industry remains viable.
6.22 In the consultation DfT identified two alternatives for the specification of Hackneys could be divided into two types; accessible vehicles (interim specification), suitable for carrying many (but not all) disabled people, including people that travelled in a ‘standard’ wheelchair and fully accessible vehicles (enhanced specification) suitable for carrying most disabled person, including many but not necessarily all using scooters, electric and other large or non standard wheelchairs. They also noted that a vehicle suitable for the latter category was not currently available in the UK. In the case of PHVs they suggested regulation was less likely citing the need for saloon style vehicles to be available to some disabled and older people, especially for door to door transport usually arranged by telephone booking.

6.23 The DfT outlines the following regulatory options for introducing one or the other of the specifications:

- All licensed taxis to meet the interim standard by 2025;
- All licensed taxis to meet the enhanced standard by 2025;
- A phased introduction between 2012 and 2020 according to, for example, whether an area is an urban authority or areas with high levels of limiting, long term illness.

6.24 In relation to the last regulatory option the DfT suggest they “have concluded that regulating for a certain proportion of the fleet being wheelchair accessible and a certain proportion being saloon cars would be unworkable, as it would be open to legal challenge and there would be practical implementation problems” (as it would need to amend the existing regulation making power through primary legislation to take this option forward). It is assumed this statement relates to the phasing of regulation UK wide rather than a mixed fleet within any single licensing area. This is supported by its positioning in the consultation document as part of the third option for regulation rather than as a stand alone paragraph, by the consultation suggesting elsewhere that the department want to continue to permit local licensing authorities to impose their own conditions to suit their own local circumstances and that the requirements of the interim specification do not need to be met in one vehicle, for example they could be applied separately to wheelchair accessible vehicles and saloon cars. Similarly, the Equalities Act 2010 makes reference to the Secretary of State having the powers to indicate a proportion for the wheelchair accessible vehicles to be provided.

6.25 In the consultation document the DfT also outline a number of concerns they have about using regulation to bring about accessible taxis, including cost and the effectiveness of regulation in achieving their aims.

6.26 The results of the consultation were published in August 2009. On average, across all questions, respondents were made up of:

- licensing authorities account for 62.7%
- disabled representatives 19.6%;
- operators 13.4%;
- vehicle manufacturers 4.6%; and
- other stakeholder 1.2%.

6.27 In summary key responses included:

- Of those who express a view, nearly nine-tenths of consultees are against ‘doing nothing’, identifying a wide range of impacts, costs and benefits associated with this option;
There are a wide range of views on the nature and style of any guidance, its intended audience, format, topics for inclusion and means of promoting take-up;

More than one-third of consultees express explicit support for the interim technical specification, but support for the enhanced specification is very mixed;

Four-fifths of consultees support, fully or cautiously, the idea of DfT-funded demonstration schemes;

Consultees propose a number of ways to effectively influence action by local licensing authorities, drivers and manufacturers, and two-thirds believe that drivers will respond better to 'carrots' than 'sticks';

Nearly one-half of consultees believe that DfT and local licensing authorities should improve access to taxis by improving taxi services at transport interchanges;

Views are fairly evenly split on how to improve the consistency and quality of information provided to disabled people about taxis; and

Just over half of respondents identify positive impacts that they would expect from a regulatory approach, but seven-tenths identify negative impacts.

Respondents were unclear whether accessibility should be brought about through guidance or regulation. There were 18% of respondents (to question 4 of the consultation) that suggested guidance alone would not be adequate, while 5% of respondents (to question 5) said the technical specifications proposed will only improve accessibility levels if they are enshrined in a regulation.

Asked “What do you think would be the most effective ways of influencing action by local licensing authorities, drivers and manufacturers?” Thirty respondents (31.2%) said that the most effective way to influence all three would be by regulation that makes it mandatory to use wheelchair accessible vehicles (WAV) by a set date. Advocates comprise of nine disabled representatives (including Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee - DiPTAC), 17 licensing authorities (including National Association of Licensing and Enforcement Officers - NALEO), all three manufacturers and one operator.

Nineteen respondents (19.8%; all licensing authorities, including NALEO, with the exception of DPTAC and two operators) specify possible ways in which to influence licensing authorities. Views were varied and there was no broad consensus on any option; indeed, no option had more than five supporters. In roughly decreasing order of support, the suggestions were as follows:

- provide guidance, including on how to set suitable targets for WAV provision;
- review and update obsolete legislation, including addressing the PHV trade;
- produce a Code of Practice that enjoys broad stakeholder agreement, and require licensing authorities to justify any departure from its provisions (a suggestion supported by NALEO);
- continue to allow local decision-making to address local needs;
- produce local demand surveys to provide a robust evidence base for local decisions; and
- use demonstration schemes astutely (a suggestion from DiPTAC).

Seventy-two respondents (75% of those who address Question 7; comprising 16 disabled representatives, 48 licensing authorities, two manufacturers, five operators and one individual) give their views on how to influence drivers. The suggested options include both 'carrots' and 'sticks'. Most consultees suggest a combination with half favouring financial incentives. There
is also significant support for driver training (half of all respondents to question 9 and a number answering question 10).

**Previous DfT Guidance**

6.32 Prior to this latest consultation, in 2003 government issued guidance suggesting that it intended to set standards for wheelchair accessible taxis and to introduce regulations that would require mainly urban local authority areas (so-called 'Phase 1' authorities, including Middlesbrough) to introduce an entirely wheelchair accessible hackney fleet by 2010 and all authorities by 2020. The intention was to target those areas where accessible taxis were likely to make the biggest impact in meeting the needs of disabled people and where additional cost would not have a major detrimental effect. However, following this the Department advised that it had received a number of representations making the case for a broader range of disabled people’s needs to be met in any regulations, rather than restricting the requirements only to wheelchair users.

**Other Guidance**

6.33 In March 2007 the standing conference of European Ministers of Transport (ECMT) issued guidance suggesting that there may be a case for considering a mixed fleet of: Type One: Wheelchair Accessible Taxis: accessible vehicles capable of carrying the majority, but not all, passengers who travel in their wheelchair as well as people with other disabilities; and Type Two: Standard Accessible Taxis: vehicles with features designed to make use by disabled people easier, but which would only be able to carry a wheelchair user who can transfer to a seat. They recommended that fleets used for regular services should be composed of a combination of these two types of vehicle and that the proportion of each type is likely to vary from place to place. This was followed in November 2007 by a note issued by the DfTs Mobility and Inclusion Unit (now dissolved), which also appeared to support this approach.

**Good Practice**

*Wheelchair Accessible Vehicles*

6.34 A supplement to Department for Transport, National Transport Statistics, in 2006/07 identified that there were around 69,000 licensed taxis in England at the end of March 2007. Of these 35,000 (51%) were purpose built taxis, designed to be wheelchair accessible with assistance from the driver. A further 5,000 (7%) taxis are of other body types, converted to be accessible for wheelchair users.

6.35 In the North East at this time there were around 4,500 licensed taxis of which around a quarter were wheelchair accessible vehicles. Of these 197 (4%) were purpose built taxis designed to be wheelchair accessible and just over 1,000 (22%) of other body types converted for wheelchair access.

6.36 In terms of what is defined as an accessible vehicle there has been substantial research into matters such as the gradient of ramps, step heights, door size, colour contrast requirements, etc. The current definitive guide is provided by the Department for Transport in the form of a leaflet and research study on the ergonomic requirements for accessible taxis that is available from: [http://www.dft.gov.uk/transportforyou/access/taxis/pubs/research](http://www.dft.gov.uk/transportforyou/access/taxis/pubs/research)
6.37 The research highlights that the floor height, door height and internal space (floor and head room) of current purpose built taxis represent significant barriers to accessibility. It recommends a maximum gradient for ramps of 7° and a maximum length of 1000mm. However, it makes no specific recommendations regards whether ramp access to the vehicle is best achieved through the rear or side door of a taxi and provides guidance for both.

6.38 Similarly, the DfT Interim and Enhanced vehicle specifications provided in their 2009 consultation document do not comment on the use of side or rear loading ramps. They also suggest a slightly less stringent specification for ramps than the DfT research, as follows:

- Interim Specification: Side entry from kerb 11° and from ground 17°, Rear entry from ground 11° (all max), maximum length 1600mm; and
- Enhanced Specification: Side entry from kerb 8° and from ground 17°, Rear entry from ground 8° (all max), maximum length 1200mm.

6.39 The OECD report “Improving Access to Taxis” prepared for the Standing Conference of Ministers of Transport in 2007 identified that throughout Europe most taxis, around 80%, are saloon or estate car style vehicles with the remainder being MPV or van conversions. However, it highlighted that the mix was somewhat different in the UK, Scandinavia and the Netherlands, with the UK at that time having the highest proportion of wheelchair accessible vehicles at 52%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>% of vehicles that are wheelchair accessible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia &amp; Herzegovina</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1.3-1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1 – Percentage of Wheelchair accessible Vehicles in Europe, OECD 2007

6.40 A study in Northern Ireland for a consortium of disability organisations in 2008 “Towards an Accessible Taxi Service for All” recommended a mix of wheelchair accessible to non wheelchair accessible vehicles in the taxi fleet of 1:5.
6.41 In the absence of regulation or definitive guidance in the UK various approaches to encourage increased availability of accessible vehicles have emerged in different licensing authorities. They include:

- Licensing authorities requiring all hackneys licensed to be London style black cabs and of an age that ensures these are all wheelchair accessible vehicles;
- Licensing authorities requiring all new hackney licenses issued to be for wheelchair accessible vehicles;
- Licensing authorities requiring all new hackney vehicles licensed to be wheelchair accessible vehicles;
- Licensing authorities providing user side subsidy to encourage operators to purchase wheelchair accessible taxis (i.e. reduced licensing fee, grant covering the difference between the cost of a non wheelchair accessible and wheelchair accessible vehicle);
- User side subsidy, in the form of a taxicard scheme or similar, offering a specific market to operators prepared to buy a wheelchair accessible vehicle;
- Provision of additional benefits to wheelchair accessible vehicle operators (i.e. increased vehicle lifespan, access to pedestrianised areas, access to disabled parking, access to dispatch centres);
- Use of contract conditions within the procurement process; and
- Quality Taxi Partnerships to promote the use of wheelchair accessible vehicles alongside other initiatives to improve access to taxis for disabled people (i.e. driver training, rank improvements, joint marketing of wheelchair accessible taxi availability, etc).

6.42 In terms of the success of these approaches, some have been more successful or successful more rapidly than others. For example the requirement that all are London Black Cab style vehicles has meant those with this policy were some of the first to establish 100% wheelchair accessible vehicle provision in the hackney fleet but have encountered the limitations of a ‘one size fits all’ approach as black cabs tend to suit only the ‘standard’ wheelchair user. Those that have required all new vehicles to be wheelchair accessible but allowed a number of different types of these have avoided some of the one size fits all issues and have only had to await the lifespan of non wheelchair accessible vehicles in the fleet to achieve 100% WAV. Those that have required all new hackney licenses issued to be for wheelchair accessible vehicles but given grandfather rights to existing license holders operating saloons are heading towards 100% WAV particularly slowly as they await those with grandfather rights at the time of the introduction of the policy to retire.

6.43 Provision of user side subsidy has not been particularly successful and neither has the provision of additional benefits. In both cases this is because the subsidy or benefit has to be of substantial size before it is perceived by operators to outweigh the additional financial burden of a wheelchair accessible vehicle over the purchase of a saloon. Use of contracts or persuasion through partnership working, similarly, has been found only to encourage a few to take up wheelchair accessible vehicles.

6.44 Those that have moved slowly are by default retaining a mixed hackney fleet for longer. Where there is the possibility of a license to retain a saloon car, granted via ‘grandfather rights’, being sold on, in locations where all new licenses issued are for WAV, these places may also find they retain a mixed fleet by default. However, there are few licensing authorities that declare this to be their aim and explicitly set a policy to ensure a mix of a wheelchair accessible and saloon cars in the hackney fleet. There are also some that have chosen not to act at all, preferring to await DfT guidance on the matter.
By capping the number of saloon cars they license as hackneys Middlesbrough (see Section 7 below) are one of those that have explicitly declared their desire to maintain a mix in the hackney fleet, as any licenses attached to saloon car operation that are returned can be reissued as a saloon car hackney license. East Riding has established two alternative specifications for hackneys, one for accessible saloon cars able to carry a wheelchair user that can transfer to a seat and carry their wheelchair in the boot and the other for a wheelchair accessible vehicle, allowing operators to choose that they require. Slough, East Staffs and Rugby are all known to have established much the same policy as Middlesbrough. There is also a proposal in Wiltshire to introduce, on April 1st 2010, a requirement for any operator with more than 4 hackney or PHV vehicles to obtain a wheelchair accessible vehicle if they seek a 5th vehicle license and so on in multiples of 5.

The DfT consultation on accessible taxis in 2009 identifies that 64 out of 342 local licensing authorities in England and Wales have implemented a policy of licensing only wheelchair accessible taxis. These include London, Liverpool, Manchester and Edinburgh. However, the consultation document makes it clear there is no direct correlation between the size of taxi fleet and the population of an area or how accessible its fleet is. There has not been any more comprehensive research to identify how other licensing authorities are addressing the issue of wheelchair accessible vehicles, if at all.

The consultation also suggests the cost of a typical accessible vehicle is between £20,000 and £30,000 and that vehicles have a typical life of around 12 years. Running costs of an accessible vehicle are said to be typically £1,000 per annum greater than a saloon car.

Wheelchair Access

In Middlesbrough there has been a long running debate about the use of rear loading wheelchair accessible vehicles. As a result the brief for this study makes specific reference to the need to examine the benefits and disadvantages of rear loading wheelchair accessible vehicles and to identify the safety issues.

Nationally the subject has also received attention from a number of different interested parties, especially in relation to hackney carriages:

- In 2006, the National Taxi Association adopted a policy of ‘No Rear Loading for Hackney Carriages’. They accept that private hire vehicles, using passenger lifts are suitable for hire purposes;
- The Spinal Injuries Association recently issued a manifesto entitled ‘Campaigning for Change 2009-2011’ in which they put forward an ‘Accessible Taxi Charter’. This Charter addresses the challenges currently facing taxi passengers who have disabilities and proposes that all taxis (hackney carriages) should be side loading wheelchair accessible vehicles and cater for every disabled person;
- The Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents (RoSPA) has no data or research on this topic, but have suggested that there can be a danger to both the passenger and driver in loading a wheelchair from the rear in a road. They point out that 1 in 5 of all traffic accidents (not just taxis) involves a rear collision;
- The Cab Trade section of the Transport and General Workers Union are also opposed to rear-loading hackney carriages. They express concerns about the space needed on taxi ranks and also the dangers involved in rear loading from the road rather than the kerb; and
The expressed policy of RADAR (The Disability Network) is that all new and transferred licenses for hackney carriages should be for side-loading, wheelchair accessible vehicles.

6.50 The following table illustrates the benefits and dis-benefits of side and rear loading vehicles based on an examination of various research documents published, including the above (X – indicates availability).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Features</th>
<th>Side Loading Vehicles</th>
<th>Rear Loading Vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folding or telescopic ramps or passenger lift</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Can be affected by the camber of the road on which they are deployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four point tension restraint system for wheelchair</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integral lap and diagonal passenger seat belt</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Roof for increased head room</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sliding doors for easy access</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated floor system</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Not always available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grab handles, safety notices, signage and colour contrast</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver training needed for secure loading</td>
<td>Driver Training</td>
<td>Driver Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry and Exit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelchair loading position</td>
<td>From footpath or raised platform – reduces height into vehicle and can offer level access</td>
<td>Difficult access (for passenger and assistant) where footpath is narrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to electric wheelchair users</td>
<td>X – depending on vehicle, ramp or lift payload</td>
<td>X - depending on vehicle, ramp or lift payload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative exit in case of an accident</td>
<td>From other side of vehicle</td>
<td>Only possible where access to side door not blocked by seats and/or space available for 90° turn (i.e. larger vehicles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility for flag downs</td>
<td>Access from footpath only where location of flag down allows</td>
<td>Access from road only where location of flag down allows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating location</td>
<td>Usually nearside or centre – protected from front &amp; rear impact</td>
<td>Potential danger in side impact accident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating position</td>
<td>Forward or rear facing</td>
<td>Wheel chair to be rotated 90° inside vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank Location</td>
<td>Rank can be located to near or off side of vehicle</td>
<td>Rank can be located to near or off side of vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to assist</td>
<td>Health and safety risk where pavement is narrow and ramp cannot be deployed correctly</td>
<td>Safety risk when in the road. Health risk from pushing wheelchair up a long ramp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2 – Benefits and Dis-benefits of Side and Rear Loading Taxis

6.51 In general there is more concern over hackneys than PHVs because by their nature it is far easier to control where the latter are deployed, in particular the pick up and drop off points that are used, than it is the former. There are also more concerns over vehicles fitted with ramps.
than those with passenger lifts, although it is recognised that the latter is usually a more expensive option.

6.52 There is also recognition that where vehicles are used to respond to contracts from bodies such special needs schools or adult care services there can be some passengers whose needs are best met by rear loading vehicles; i.e. those whose legs need to remain extended.

Other access improvements

6.53 In addition to technical standards for vehicle access many have recognised that access to taxis requires a range of other complementary initiatives to be put in place. These include:

Information

- Code of Practice for drivers providing information on how to address the needs of disabled people
- Accessible taxi guide (hard copy, web site) to make disabled people aware of where they can book an accessible vehicle with a driver that has received training, what type of vehicles are available and their suitability for different needs
- Joint marketing and promotion between operators, especially independents
- Information to drivers on the market available for services to disabled people
- Information about rank locations and use of taxis in access guides, etc
- Passenger charter in vehicle and on-line in accessible format (large print, in Braille, audio tape, on CD)
- Complaints procedure (document, by telephone) in vehicle and on-line in accessible format

Driver and Scheduler training

- Disability awareness training covering all aspects of disability (physical, learning, mental health, etc)
- Training in how to assist disabled people
- Training in use of vehicle equipment (i.e. ramps, wheelchair clamps, technology, etc)
- Training in how to access the market
- Training in legal requirements (i.e. carriage of guide dogs)
- Refresher training
- Training by and involving use of disabled people
- Use of multi media for training

Improvements to ranks

- Follow Diptac and or IHT best practice guidance on rank design
- Accessible (colour contrast, letter size, tactile, positioning and height) signage to ranks, especially from other transport interchange
- Accessible signage at ranks on how to obtain an accessible taxi when there is not one at the stand
- Audits to identify access improvements needed at existing ranks
- Provision of seating, shelter, telephone and emergency call button at ranks
- Provision of dropped kerbs and tactile indicators
- Accessible signage indicating the times of operation of the rank
- Call button/direct telephone at ranks to indicate to drivers a passenger is waiting
Hailing a cab

- Bright illuminated signs on vehicles to indicate available for hire
- Inclusion of a clear symbol on sign and vehicle to indicate a vehicle is accessible

Improvements to booking systems

- Provision of alternatives to telephone booking (i.e. text, e-mail, minicom, web based)
- Central booking system, especially for independents, supported by GPS tracking to identify nearest cab
- Call back to notify passengers vehicle has arrived for pick up, including use of password to notify disabled people it’s the cab booked
- Payment in advance option for fares

In vehicle technology

- Induction loop
- Talking meter with large digital display in passenger compartment that can also be used by driver to communicate to hard of hearing passenger
- Tactile vehicle plates with large print lettering and numbers both inside and outside vehicle
- Taxi fares clearly displayed on accessible signage in vehicle (and at ranks)
- Smartcard technology for fares
- Satellite navigation
- CCTV
- Retractable steps
- Signage indicating internal head height, door width, wheelchairs carried, etc

Quality marks

- To illustrate accessible vehicle, trained driver, good information, service quality, etc
- Ranking system (i.e. 1 fully accessible to 5 can carry wheelchair user that can transfer to seat, with access features (colour contrast, grab handles, in vehicle equipment) for other disabled people) to indicate the level of vehicle accessibility

Monitoring

- Mystery passengers
- Regular passenger/disabled user surveys and consultation
- Monitoring of complaints
- User friendly and conciliatory penalties
- Points system leading to severe penalties for persistent offenders

6.54 Guidance on accessible signage, rank design and many other aspects of accessible passenger transport infrastructure and facilities is available from a range of institutions (Diptac, IHT, DfT, etc). A useful guide on inclusive mobility is available from: http://www.dft.gov.uk/transportforyou/access/peti/inclusivemobility

Consultation with other licensing authorities

Stockport
6.55 Stockport proposed delimitation in February 2009. However, following receipt of an injunction they decided not to proceed, instead proposing controlled growth over 5 years averaging 3 new licenses a year, all of which will be for wheelchair accessible vehicles. This maintains their policy of all vehicles in the hackney fleet being required to be wheelchair accessible. The authority is currently reviewing the criteria on which licenses are issued via a quality impact assessment.

Stockton on Tees

6.56 Stockton on Tees introduced a policy to delimit in March 2009. At the same time they introduced a policy that any vehicle can be a hackney but any new license issued must be to a wheelchair accessible vehicle and the vehicle must meet Euro M4 standards. Their aim in this is to achieve at least 25% wheelchair accessible vehicles within the hackney fleet, over time. Monitoring is to be undertaken to ensure this is achieved.

6.57 Since March 2009 the authority have issued hardly any new licenses and found that in general trade concerns about the decision have reduced. Overall the change is considered by the trade and licensing authority to have been successful and good for the trade.

Thurrock

6.58 In 2008 Thurrock established a policy that all wheelchair accessible taxis (both Hackneys and PHVs) it licenses should be side loading vehicles. Subsequently they received representation from drivers about restrictions this condition places upon them. As a result they examined again the evidence and in the light of this concluded that the policy should be maintained.

Dover

6.59 Dover was considering introducing a requirement for hackneys to be fitted with swivel seats. In consultation it was found that passengers were generally in favour of this but some drivers raised concerns. In order to inform debate the Council sent an e-mail to all licensing authorities to establish their views.

6.60 The response was generally negative, as a number had been found in practice that the swivel seats were not robust enough in practice to stand up to the rigours of constant use in a private hire or taxi vehicle. In addition they were not popular with customers as the raised height of the seat meant restricted headroom for taller passengers and the operating controls were near the passenger’s feet, which caused difficulties for the drivers in operating the swivel mechanism.

6.61 Other problems also arose as many modern car seats are electronically linked to the computer management system of the vehicle and removing the seat and replacing it with a swivel seat can, in some cases, affect the operation of the car. Airbag equipped seats have to be removed and the swivel seats do not contain air bags.

6.62 Dover found that Scarborough Borough Council decided to remove its requirement for swivel seats for the above reasons having previously required them in hackney carriages. Dover decided not to proceed with a requirement to introduce swivel seats on the basis that any advantage to be gained was outweighed by their practical disadvantages.
7.0 Hackney Fleet Review – The Licensing Position in Middlesbrough

Regulation

7.1 In October 2007 the Council undertook an Unmet Taxi Demand Survey to assess the market for taxi provision in Middlesbrough. This survey was undertaken at the request of the trade who expressed concern about the excessive number of hackney carriage vehicles and the impact of this on their working hours and income. The report concluded that “significant unmet demand for hackney carriages in Middlesbrough does not exist at this time” and further that “as a result of there being no significant unmet demand, we can conclude that market forces are working and that the balance of supply and demand is optimised; i.e. it is the policy of delimitation which is allowing this to occur”.

7.2 Based on this analysis the report recommended that Middlesbrough Council had the discretion to consider the following options:

   i) introduce a limit at the current level of licenses (at the time 368);
   ii) issue that number of Hackney Carriage licenses as it sees fit; or
   iii) maintain the current de-limitation policy

7.3 In May 2008, the Council decided to impose a temporary restriction policy on the number of hackney carriage vehicles, whereby no additional hackney vehicle licenses would be issued. The policy was implemented subject to the taxi trade working with the Council to progress improvements in vehicles and driver standards, which had been identified as a need in the survey. The policy became effective in July 2008 and the number of hackney carriages was limited to 374 vehicles, the number of vehicles licensed at that time. It was also proposed that the policy would be reviewed after one year, when consideration would be given to maintaining the policy until March 2010. As this date has now passed the policy has reverted back to open issue.

7.4 Between 1989 and 2001 Middlesbrough had a policy of restricting the number of licensed hackney carriage vehicles, resulting in a fleet of 190 saloon vehicles. In April 2001 the authority decided to license an additional 20 hackney carriages, but restrict these to wheelchair accessible vehicles only. At the time applications for in excess of 100 vehicles were received, and in May 2001 the committee granted a further 20 licenses in chronological order of application date. This increased the total number of hackneys to 210, including the 20 wheelchair accessible vehicles.

7.5 Three of the unsuccessful applicants appealed to the Crown Court, with the appeal upheld, as the court was not satisfied that the needs of disabled people were being met and an additional 10 wheelchair accessible vehicle licenses were granted. The Council subsequently amended the policy to permit open issue in respect of approved wheelchair accessible vehicles, and over time licensed 184 wheelchair accessible vehicles, bringing the total number of hackneys to 374 in July 2008 when the temporary limit was imposed.

7.6 While the number of Hackney licenses was limited, there was an increase in the number of PHV licenses issued from a rate of around 20 to approximately 90 per year. At January 14th
2010 Middlesbrough licensed 362 hackney carriages (191 saloon and 171 wheelchair accessible vehicles) and 390 private hire vehicles (PHV) to operate in their licensing area. By March 19th 2010 the numbers licensed had changed to 360 Hackneys and 399 PHVs, the additional PHVs being new applicants and the reduction in Hackneys resulting from operators handing in their plates when their license expired. On completion of the report the Taxi Licensing Officer provided updated figures for the 3rd August 2010 of 349 Hackneys (190 saloons & the 159 wheelchair accessible vehicles) and 416 PHV’s.

7.7 The overall number of hackneys currently licensed offers a relatively high proportion of vehicles per capita. This is illustrated by the graph in appendix D which compares this with the position in over 100 other licensing authorities and places Middlesbrough well into the top quartile.

Standards

7.8 The guidance to licensing authorities issued by government makes it clear their aim should be to protect the public and to ensure the public have reasonable access to taxi and PHV services, because of the part they play in local transport provision. Licensing requirements should not be unduly stringent as to restrict the supply of taxi and PHV services. The licensing authority has the power to set criteria in relation to applications for the grant of licenses for hackney carriage and private hire vehicles. It also has the power to add reasonable conditions to the grant of licenses for hackney carriages and private hire vehicles. The authority should keep policies and conditions under regular review to ensure that they reflect current law and practice and are reasonable. It should also ensure that there is no conflict with other Council policies when setting such criteria.

7.9 Licensing criteria and conditions should conform with current law, reflect best practice and be seen as reasonable. The Council should, from time to time, review its policies, procedures and conditions to ensure that they are compliant and reasonable. Before making any changes, other than those required by law, the Council should be seen to be open and responsive to the views of the trade. It should also listen to the views of the public who use licensed vehicles and operators.

7.10 In Middlesbrough the following conditions are those currently in place for wheelchair accessible hackney operations:

- All hackney carriages licensed by this Council have to be either wheelchair accessible or fitted with a Council approved swivel seat to provide for the needs of people with disabilities. Drivers who want to drive wheelchair accessible taxis must undertake the disability awareness training course offered through the Council and sign an undertaking stating that they are competent in the correct use of the securing systems used in the particular wheelchair accessible hackney carriage they intend to drive.
- Hackney drivers must ensure that if they intend to work in a wheelchair accessible vehicle, they have received the correct training from the vehicle owner in relation to the correct and safe use of any ramps, wheelchair restraints or lifting equipment supplied with the vehicle to ensure the safe access, transportation and egress of any wheelchair bound passenger.
- Drivers of wheelchair accessible vehicles must have either a Council issued wheelchair accessible vehicle driver badge or an appropriate exemption notice. Drivers must also sign an undertaking stating that they are competent in the correct use of the securing systems used in the particular wheelchair accessible hackney they are intending to drive.
Prior to commencing work in a wheelchair accessible vehicle a hackney driver must ensure that the correct ramps and passenger restraints are available for use within the vehicle. If such fittings are not available for use and in good working order, then the vehicle must be returned to its owner as the vehicle is not considered fit for use as a hackney carriage.

When conveying a passenger using a wheelchair in a wheelchair accessible vehicle, a hackney driver must use any lifts, ramps etc. supplied with the vehicle, to afford easy and safe access into and out of the vehicle. The driver must give every assistance to the passenger and should secure the wheelchair by means of the restraints in the manner prescribed by the vehicle manufacturer.

Wheelchair accessible vehicles must at all times be fitted with ramps, lifts, wheelchair restraints and any other device supplied by the vehicle manufacturer for the safe loading/unloading/carriage of a person in a wheelchair. Any equipment such as ramps or restraining straps must be marked in a permanent manner, with the plate number of the hackney carriage e.g. HV 999. The proprietor of a HC must ensure that the driver of their vehicle has had proper training in the use of all equipment within the vehicle associated with the loading and safe securing of wheelchairs.

7.11 If the vehicle is adapted to carry wheelchairs it must also comply with the following:

- It must be new when first presented for licensing;
- Wheelchair accessible vehicles used for hackney carriage hire purposes must be either purpose built or converted prior to first registration and have as a minimum inspection standard the Vehicle Certification Agency, Ministers Approval Certificate for a Low Volume Motor Vehicle or European Small Series Type Approval;
- The proprietor of such a vehicle must insure that all drivers of the vehicle have undertaken a disability awareness training course approved by the Council and hold the appropriate (W) driver badge;
- All equipment required to safely carry a wheelchair must be present in the vehicle at all times and in good working order. If such equipment is not present or is not in good working order, then the vehicle is not considered to be fit for purpose and the vehicle license will be suspended;
- Pushchairs or buggies carried in such vehicles must be collapsed and the child carried in accordance with the law in relation to seat belts. Pushchairs or buggies must not be carried if not collapsed; and
- An appropriate disabled accessibility sticker must be displayed.

7.12 The only significant difference to the above for PHVs is that these are not required to be fitted with a swivel seat if they are not a wheelchair accessible vehicle.

**Vehicle Database**

**Hackney Carriages**

7.13 A database of hackney vehicles held by the licensing authority and provided by them on the 14th January 2010 was examined to provide further details of the fleet. The database at this time contained details of 362 vehicles (191 saloons and 171 wheelchair accessible vehicles).
### Table 7.1 – The Hackney Fleet in Middlesbrough

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saloon</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAV</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>362</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.14 All saloon cars are fitted with a swivel seat in the front passenger compartment intended to assist those with disabilities to access the vehicle. Of the wheelchair accessible vehicles 108 (all Fiat Doblo’s) have a ramp at the rear to provide access to wheelchair users and 63 have a ramp enabling access to the vehicle through a side door.

### Table 7.2 - Access Features of Hackney Carriages in Middlesbrough

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swivel Seat</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Load</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Load</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>362</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.15 By far the majority of vehicles have a carrying capacity for 4 passengers. This includes all saloon cars. There are 10% of vehicles that have 7 passenger seats. All wheelchair accessible vehicles will reduce in capacity when carrying a passenger travelling in their wheelchair. Only those vehicles with a capacity to carry 7 or more passengers are likely to be able to carry more than 1 passenger travelling in a wheelchair.

### Table 7.3 – Seating Capacity of Hackney Carriages in Middlesbrough

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seats</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Seats</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Seats</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Seats</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Seats</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Seats</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>362</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.16 There are 34 different vehicle models in the hackney fleet. Fiat Doblo’s all of which are wheelchair accessible vehicles are the single largest vehicle type. There are also significant numbers of Vauxhall Vectra, Skoda Octavia, Ford Focus and Vauxhall Astra all of which are saloon cars. The second largest wheelchair accessible vehicle type is the Peugeot Euro 7. There are a total of 6 Black/London cab style vehicles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>Mondeo</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accord</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>Octavia</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astra</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>Passat</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>Scudo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>Shuttle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City 7 S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>Superb</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>Tourneo</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispatch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>Town Cab</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doblo</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>Trafic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>Transporter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elegance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>TW200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euro 7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>TX1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euro Taxi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>TX2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert E7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>TX4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>Unique Cab</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>Vectra</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibiza</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>Vito</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.4 – Vehicle Models in the Hackney Fleet in Middlesbrough

7.17 The date vehicles were first registered ranges from 2001 to 2009 (i.e. between 8 and just under 1 year old). Wheelchair accessible vehicles are in general more evenly spread over this age band than saloons with both a greater proportion of the former registered in 2003, 2007, 2008 and 2009. There are no saloons that were first registered in 2002 and 2001.
### Table 7.5 – Age of the Hackney Fleet in Middlesbrough

7.18 Postcodes at which vehicles are registered were plotted on a map, see below. This gives an indication of from where vehicles operate, although it cannot be certain that all vehicles are kept at the postcode they are registered and most will not operate in this area. They will operate from ranks and/or offices elsewhere.

7.19 The majority of saloon cars are registered at addresses in the town centre and to the West with a small number in Thornaby on Tees and one as far West as the Western side of Stockton on Tees. The majority of wheelchair accessible vehicles are registered at addresses in the town and to the South as far as Hemlington or East as far as Lazenby.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Saloon</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>WAV</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As identified above at January 2010, the time the study commenced, there were 390 PHVs licensed. A database of these vehicles held by the licensing authority and provided by them on the 14th January 2010 was examined to provide further details of the fleet. The database at this time contained details of 391 vehicles. Only two of the 391 PHVs are identified as wheelchair accessible vehicles. Each of these provide access to a wheelchair user via a ramp at a side door.

There are around 10 operating companies in Middlesbrough providing significant numbers of PHVs, with one of these operating nearly 50% of all PHVs in the Borough. A number of these operators are understood to work in partnership with hackney operators, in order to provide them access to wheelchair accessible vehicles, when requested.

By far the majority of PHVs are saloon car style vehicles (94.9%) with 4 passenger seats. None of these are known to be fitted with a swivel seat. There are 20 (5.1%) vehicles that have a greater capacity, including the two wheelchair accessible vehicles, one of which has capacity to carry 6 and the other 7 passengers. There are 12 PHVs that can carry 8 passengers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seats</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Seats</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>94.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Seats</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Seats</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Seats</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Seats</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>391</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.6 - Seating Capacity of PHVs in Middlesbrough
7.23 There are 42 different vehicle models in the PHV fleet. Skoda Octavia are by far the most popular vehicle type. There are also significant numbers of Vauxhall Vectra, Ford Focus, Vauxhall Astra, Ford Mondeo and VW Passat models all of which are saloon cars.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>Octavia</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>55.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
<td>Passat</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800 Style CRDI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>Primera</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300C SRT Design</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>Rio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407 SE HDI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>Rio GS CRDI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>S80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
<td>S80 D5 SE LUX</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astra</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.37%</td>
<td>S80 SE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avensis</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.53%</td>
<td>Sharan (WAV)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carens</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>Superb</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>Tourneo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ducato</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>Trafic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert E7 S (WAV)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>Transit Tourneo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galaxy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>Transporter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Voyager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>V70 SE Sports</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jetta</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
<td>Vectra</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>Vectra SRI CDTI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>Vito</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>Vivaro</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mondeo</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.86%</td>
<td>Xsara Picasso</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.7 – Vehicle Models in the PHV Fleet in Middlesbrough

7.24 The date vehicles were first registered ranges from 2003 to 2009 (i.e. between 6 and just under 1 year old) with the majority first registered in 2005, 2006 or 2007. The two Wheelchair accessible vehicles were first registered in 2007 (Sharran) and 2009 (Peugeot E7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.8 – Age of the PHV in Middlesbrough

7.25 Postcodes at which vehicles are registered were plotted on a map, see below. This gives an indication of from where vehicles operate, although it cannot be certain that all vehicles are kept at the postcode they are registered and many will not operate in this area. They will operate from offices elsewhere.
The majority are registered at addresses in the town centre and to the South as far as Eldham. To the West there are a small number of vehicles registered in Thornaby on Tees and two as far West as the Western side of Stockton on Tees. There is also one vehicle registered as far West as Darlington and another as far South as Hutton Rudby.

Figure 7.2 – Locations of PHVs Registered in Middlesbrough
8.0 Hackney Fleet Review – Consultation

Consultation on Accessible Taxi Provision in Middlesbrough

8.1 To establish views towards wheelchair accessible taxi provision in Middlesbrough a number of research tasks were undertaken:

- Rank passenger survey;
- Consultation with key stakeholders;
- Consultation with taxi operators;
- Consultation with disabled people; and
- Vehicle audit.

8.2 The following section outlines the findings from each of the above.

Rank Passenger Survey

8.3 A survey of passengers waiting at ranks in the town centre was undertaken that combined a question on access to taxis with others relating to the rank review undertaken at the same time as this study. The main focus of the survey was the latter. There were a total of 313 respondents to the survey. The majority of respondents (85%) said they mainly used hackney style vehicles.

8.4 The survey asked all respondents if they had any problems getting into any model of taxi and if so why. Of 304 that responded to this question there were 291 (96%) who did not and only 13 (4%) who did have an access problem. There were 9 of the 13 that gave reasons for the problem with 8 (2.6%) of these indicating they had some form of disability or mobility problem. Of these 4 (1.3%) indicated the problem related to wheelchair access and two step height. The individual responses are listed below:

- always bang my head;
- disability;
- have a walking stick;
- have difficulty getting into high vehicle;
- wheelchair;
- wheelchair;
- wheelchair;
- wheelchair accessible vehicles are too high, prefer saloon (Hackney).

Key Stakeholders

8.5 Key stakeholders consulted during the course of the study included:

- Director of Environment;
- Senior Licensing Officers of Middlesbrough Council;
- Middlesbrough Taxi Licensing Officer;
- Service Manager for the Disabled, Middlesbrough Council;
- Middlesbrough Council, Development Manager Shopmobility;
Senior Citizens’ Reference Group Officer; and
Middlesbrough Council Access Officer.

8.6 The Council is seeking proposals on accessibility from the review that will link in with the
guidance ‘expected’ from DfT following the outcome of their recent consultation on accessible
taxis; i.e. what’s the right direction to be DDA (soon to be Single Equalities Act) compliant.

8.7 In discussions with the Director of Environment and Senior Licensing Officers it was
recognised that the expected lifting of the temporary cap on the issue of hackney licenses was
impacting on consideration of the requirements for accessible vehicles. However, the study
brief and these discussions made it absolutely clear that quantity control of licenses was not
within the brief for this study. The point was made that having a split limit; i.e. a limit on saloon
cars but no limit on the number of wheelchair accessible vehicles (as had been the case before
the introduction of the temporary cap) was not considered ideal but was thought preferable to
their being no limit at all as this could lead to an increasing number of saloons being licensed,
unless the Council phased out licensing of these all together.

8.8 The possibility of introducing constraints on PHV operators entering the Hackney market, if the
cap was lifted, by requiring an agreed mix of vehicles in their fleet as a condition of their PHV
operators license was discussed. This couldn’t be done for hackney operators as they do not
require an operator’s license – just a driver and a vehicle license.

8.9 There has been recent discussion with the trade on the issue of vehicle accessibility as part of
the wide ranging discussions on improved standards that followed publication of the 2008
unmet demand study and implementation of a temporary cap on licenses. These discussions
came close to an agreement to phase out vehicles with a rear loading ramp in return for an
increase in the accepted lifespan of wheelchair accessible vehicles. However, eventually
agreement was not achieved and this led to the commissioning of the current study to provide
an independent and objective view.

8.10 The Council’s proposal was to phase out over 7 years (i.e. the current agreed vehicle life) of
rear loading WAV together with an increase in vehicle life to 10 years. In the past the
requirement that all new hackneys licensed had to be WAV was only applied to the life of the
initial vehicle licensed. This led to some obtaining the license and then when it came to time to
replace the vehicle buying a non WAV with some then selling on the license (There is believed
to be a significant ‘grey market’ for non WAV licenses in Middlesbrough – thought by the
Council to be valued at up to £15k). To overcome this, in the future all new hackney licenses
issued will not be time limited – they will always have to be used with a WAV vehicle.

8.11 There is frustration that government is slow in providing guidance on licensing in general and
DDA/accessible taxis specifically. The Council believe they need to grasp/take a lead on
addressing the issues, decide what it is they should do and then use existing legislation as
best they can to achieve this. They want a decent quality service and to give disabled people
the service they desire. However, they have questions about what is the right mix of vehicles in
the fleet and how best can they bring this about.

8.12 It is thought the Fiat Doblo has become the vehicle of choice of many operators simply
because of it is cheaper than other wheelchair accessible vehicles. The trade have suggested
the economic downturn is affecting taxi use and that this adds to the reasons for allowing the
continued use of rear loading WAVs. Fiat are due to release an upgrade of the Diablo in the
near future. However, as a result, at present, the existing version is in short supply.
8.13 The Middlesbrough Council Service Manager for the Disabled outlined that the Disabled Services department of the Council uses taxis a lot to provide journeys to their clients. In general they do not encounter any difficulties obtaining the vehicles and quality of service they require. As most of their clients are wheelchair users in the main they require wheelchair accessible vehicles. Their preference is for vehicles that offer access via the side door of the vehicle as they find these best suit their client needs.

8.14 They obtain, mainly taxis that can carry up to 7 passengers, from 1 or 2 providers who they regard as “wheelchair friendly”. These include Borough Cars, Royal Taxis and Peters Taxis. The latter being a dedicated wheelchair accessible vehicle provider. They don’t have much call for saloon style vehicles because of the nature of their clients and so don’t have a view on the need for these in the fleet.

8.15 For people with hearing difficulties a service has been set which allows text communications between the client and taxi company which is said to work well with the companies used.

8.16 The Council Development Manager Shopmobility confirmed their views on accessible taxis had not changed since they were consulted during the course of the 2008 unmet demand survey (see comments from Shopmobility in section 9 below). They also raised the following specific concerns about the inclusion of rear loading accessible vehicles in the taxi fleet.

8.17 Where do the Council stand legally if they approve and continue to allow rear loading taxis and an incident occurs which results in injury. Do they then have a responsibility as the Council had the opportunity to prevent such an incident. Can any drivers produce on request the risk assessment documentation regarding the rear loading.

8.18 Also, if the Council continue to allow such taxis, what message is it sending to the disabled community especially as increasing number of authorities are declining their use. In the built environment access ramps are required to be no greater than a 1:12 gradient. For the safety of the customer a kerb side loading taxi will more easily achieve this 1:12 than a rear road loading taxi. It’s also the case that all other public transport modes are all fitted with side loading ramps.

8.19 To illustrate her concerns the Officer provided a couple of comments from service users:

Client M340 - "why should I be taken onto the road and enter the taxi at the back like a piece of luggage, am I not equal because I use a wheelchair. An able person would never be asked to do that!"

Client C137  - "Often when I use a rear loading taxi the driver can’t find a gap big enough to give the distance for me to exit safely. This normally means I either get dropped off nowhere near my requested destination or the taxi driver will stop in the carriageway put on his hazards and exit me on the road then try and find a drop kerb somewhere nearby. I can always see the drivers of the cars been held up glaring at me making me feel uncomfortable and reminding me that I am disabled".

8.20 The Officer suggested the equality comment made by M340 is a valid point. “Under DDA transport services (buses) are required to make costly adjustments and changes to their vehicle fleet by 2015 without access to any subsidy or incentive. Can the Council really put a cost on equality as I feel this will be the argument we will encounter".
8.21 The Councils Senior Citizens’ Reference Group Officer confirmed their views on accessible taxis had not changed since they were consulted during the course of the 2008 unmet demand survey (see comments in section 9 below).

8.22 The Councils Access Officer had not come across any issues relating to taxi provision since they took up post and therefore felt unable to comment. Their work to date had focussed primarily on access within the home and they had not been called on by Officers in licensing or transport planning/policy to examine issues of accessibility. They considered this was the main reason for any lack of knowledge in the area of taxis rather than there not being access issues worthy of consideration. They would welcome greater involvement in the area of transport and taxi licensing in the future.

**Taxi Trade**

8.23 The taxi trade were consulted in various ways during the course of the study. There was discussion with the Taxi Forum members, discussion with representatives of the various trade associations (hackney and PHV), discussion with senior representatives of taxi operating companies and discussion with drivers of wheelchair accessible vehicles who attended the vehicle audit organised (the audit itself is described in 8.23 onwards, below).

8.24 The main issues raised by the operators consulted included:

- A number of PHV operators raising concerns about the difficulties for wheelchair users accessing rear entry hackneys when these are parked at ranks or hailed in the street.
- All 5 Hackney operators attending the vehicle audit raising concerns over the cost of other wheelchair accessible vehicles (estimated at approx £25,000 for black cab/E7) compared to the Fiat Doblo (estimated at approx £12/14,000), especially at a time of economic recession and when demand is believed to be reducing.
- The Hackney Drivers Association suggested that they don’t accept the proposal of the Council to extend the lifespan of vehicles to 10 years is adequate compensation for the removal of type approval for the Fiat Doblo. This is based on calculating the financial cost of depreciation of an alternative vehicle at £2,500 per annum over 3 years (£7,500) and comparing this with the difference in vehicle cost, estimated at £12,000.
- The drivers of wheelchair accessible vehicles attending the vehicle audit suggested they tended to focus on other markets than the night time leisure and general rank/flag down market. In particular they sought a mixture of contract work, airport runs and niche markets of regular individual disabled users and operated primarily in the daytime.

8.25 At a consultation forum held on the 27th May 2010 following production of the draft final report for this study the following additional issues were raised:

- Hackney drivers are finding it increasingly difficult to obtain insurance to cover modifications for swivel seats (and Stockton Council were said to be phasing out swivel seats because of this issue
- There is a concern that the height of swivel seat affects proper function of air bag
- That most hackney drivers held the view that nobody ever asks to use the swivel seat and they hardly ever get a wheelchair passenger at the rank. It was suggested that hackney operators have tried training, improved knowledge and accepted the need for CRB checks in order to develop the market for accessible taxis but this has not worked. However, in discussion about this it was accepted that there may be an issue about
how they go about marketing to this group in the population and that they would be willing to work with local disability organisations in an effort to address this.

- PHV operators were concerned at the cost implications of a proposal that every 5th vehicle they licensed should be wheelchair accessible and expressed doubt about the legality of the licensing authority imposing such a requirement on them as a provider of a private (as opposed to public) service.

### Disabled People

![Survey Responses from Disabled People in Middlesbrough](image)

**Figure 8.1 – Survey Responses from Disabled People in Middlesbrough**

8.25 A number of individual disabled people were asked to complete a short survey to provide their views on taxi accessibility. Surveys were distributed by local organisations working with or for disabled people. A total of 19 responses were received and these are summarised below:

- Just over 68% of respondents considered they had to wait longer than average at ranks to obtain a suitable accessible Hackney Carriage vehicle;
- 79% of respondents believed rank facilities for Hackney Carriages were not well suited to disabled people;
- 42% of the respondents said that Hackney Carriage drivers do not stop when they flag them down compared to 53% of PHV drivers;
- Amongst all respondents 32% said they had difficulty booking a Hackney Carriage by phone and 42% had difficulty booking a PHV vehicle;
- There were 47% of respondents that had experienced some difficulty when trying to book a hackney for the time they wanted and this rose to 53% for a PHV;
- In the case of both Hackneys and PHVs, 47% and 63% respectively considered they often or always arrived late;
- Nearly 68% experienced difficulty obtaining the type of hackney vehicle they required and 58% the required type of PHV;
- There were 37% of respondents that found hackney drivers to be reluctant to deploy ramps compared to 32% who encountered this difficulty with PHV drivers;
- Just over 40% of respondents experienced difficulty getting in or out of a hackney and just under 60% had difficulty accessing a PHV;
42% experienced a difficulty with the seat being too high or low in a hackney and 58% for a PHV; and
There were 37% who considered the seat in a hackney difficult to reach and this increased to 42% for a PHV.
Just over 89% of respondents wanted more help from the driver to access a hackney and 63% wanted more help from the driver to access a PHV.
Safety when travelling alone in a hackney was considered an issue by 37% of respondents and by 42% when travelling by PHV.
There were 74% of respondents that considered hackneys expensive but this reduced to 42% for PHVs.
Hackneys were considered uncomfortable to travel in by 53% of respondents compared to 47% for PHVs.
Of the survey respondents who indicated that they used a wheelchair, one user preferred to access hackneys via the rear entrance, and two preferred to use a side entrance.

8.26 Other comments provided by respondents included:
- “Being a wheelchair user I’m restricted to which taxi’s I can use; and the amount of cabs I can fit into is very limited.”
- “Drivers need to be more helpful.”
- “Drivers will not get out to help you at all; surly, indifferent to your needs; won’t help with any luggage etc.”
- “Some drivers can be very helpful but like everything else, some are not.”
- “(name omitted) Taxis – always arrive on time and are especially helpful.”
- “Don’t use taxi ranks, always pre-book. Don’t know if you can book a certain taxi, just use what turns up.”
- “Didn’t know the seat turned in a Hackney.”
- “The standard varies with different taxi companies.”
- “Most drivers aren’t very helpful and seem reluctant to leave the driving seat.”
- “Drivers never know how to use (fold) my wheelchair and just fling it in any which way.”
- “Usually can’t stop near to where I want to exit”
- “Hackneys are not easy to find if you have a wheelchair.”

Vehicle Audit

8.27 A vehicle audit was undertaken to establish the views of disabled people towards a selection of the different types of hackney carriage vehicles operated in Middlesbrough. The hackney vehicles were provided on the day by their individual owners, all of whom were the regular driver of the vehicle. It had been planned to include the following vehicles: Fiat Doblo (Doblo), Peugeot E7 (E7), Mercedes long wheel base (Merc), Volkswagen Transporter unique (VW), Ford Connect (Ford), TX - London Style Cab (Cab) and a saloon car. Unfortunately on the day the TX (London Style Cab) and the Ford Connect were unable to be present, due to work commitments.

8.28 We are also grateful for the assistance of the Development Manager Shopmobility of Middlesbrough Council who encouraged disabled people to attend and give their views. Prior to the event the Development & Shop Mobility Officer had spoken to a number of organisations for the disabled to encourage participation. As a result they had expected between 20 and 30 people to attend including:
8.29 On the day, unfortunately, only seven people were able to attend including the Development Manager Shopmobility and the Senior Citizens’ Reference Group Officer. Nevertheless, the range of disabled people identified above were still represented by this group. Each member of the group chose which vehicles they wished to comment on. Not all members looked at all vehicles or answered each question. Their views on specific aspects of each vehicle (Vehicle Key – as in brackets above) are identified in the tables and graphs below. In addition various comments were made in response to each question which are presented following each table and graph and in the case of general comments, at the end of this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What do you think of the look of the vehicle?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8.1– Views of Disabled People on Hackney Carriage Vehicles**

8.30 Asked about the general look of the vehicle all but 1 of the participants thought all vehicles looked good and they would be willing to use them if they came across them at a rank or they presented when booked by telephone. One participant thought the Fiat Doblo did not look as attractive as the other vehicles.
Table 8.2 – Views of Disabled People on opening the door of Hackney Carriages

8.31 Each participant was encouraged to try opening the door they would normally choose to enter the vehicle. This was not a practical proposition for one participant who was a wheelchair user. All others tried the rear passenger nearside door apart from one who always sought to travel in the front passenger seat as they experienced travel sickness if they travelled in the rear of a vehicle. Two participants experienced some difficulty opening the door to the Mercedes and the Doblo, while one had some difficulty with the door to the VW. All of these were sliding doors. Difficulties were with grasping the door handle, operating the sliding mechanism (i.e. to pull outwards before sliding back the door) and finding the door difficult to slide because of its weight.

8.32 All drivers suggested they would normally offer to open the door for passengers seeking to access or exit the vehicle.
8.33 The door space for all vehicles was considered wide enough to allow easy access by all but one person in the case of the Mercedes and to a lesser extent, by one person in the case of the Doblo.

Table 8.3 – Views of Disabled People on the door space of Hackney Carriages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E7</th>
<th>Merc</th>
<th>VW</th>
<th>Saloon</th>
<th>Doblo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Was the door space wide enough?</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merc</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saloon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doblo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.34 Steps into the vehicle were different for each. The E7, Mercedes and VW all have a step to aid access into the rear passenger compartment (i.e. the passenger steps onto a step and then into the vehicle). The E7 has a retractable step which is operated by the driver. The Mercedes and VW have a retractable step which operates automatically when the door is opened. The saloon and Doblo do not have a step to aid access, the passenger steps straight into the passenger compartment.
8.35 The wheelchair user always remains in their wheelchair to travel in a taxi and therefore relies on ramp (or lift) access rather than steps to get into the vehicle. The saloon car was therefore not appropriate for them.

8.36 None of the ambulant participants experienced any difficulty stepping into the saloon car. One person found the E7 steps easy to use but 2 people found the step height from the retractable step into the vehicle a little high. One person found the Mercedes steps easy to use but 2 people found the retractable step a little difficult to use and one very difficult. These latter commented that the difficulty they had was the step was to narrow meaning they had to twist their foot to use it. Three people found the VW steps easy to use but 1 person found the step height from the retractable step into the vehicle difficult to negotiate. All 3 people that tried the step into the Doblo found the step height very difficult to manage. One person said it was just too high for them and was unable to get into the vehicle as a result.

If you used a ramp/lift did you feel safe?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E7</th>
<th>Merc</th>
<th>VW</th>
<th>Saloon</th>
<th>Doblo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.5 – Views of Disabled People on using ramps of Hackney Carriages

8.37 Wheelchair access, enabling a wheelchair user to travel in their wheelchair, was available to all vehicles apart from the saloon car. In the case of the E7, Mercedes and VW this was via a ramp at the side door and the Doblo a ramp to the rear.

8.38 The wheelchair user present was relatively tall and their disability required them to be supported sitting upright in their wheelchair. They examined access to all vehicles that offered this for wheelchair users. However, they were unable to enter either the E7 or Mercedes vehicles because the roof was not high enough to accommodate them. They thought the roof in the VW might just have been high enough for them but considered the ramp gradient too steep to attempt in their electric wheelchair. Only the Doblo offered them the roof height they required and they were able to negotiate the ramp to get into the vehicle, although they did not feel very secure in doing so. In particular they thought the ramp somewhat flimsy for the combined weight of them and their electric wheelchair.
8.39 One non wheelchair user unable to manage the step into the Doblo tried walking up the ramp as an alternative means of access. However, they found it difficult and turned back without entering the vehicle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E7</th>
<th>Merc</th>
<th>VW</th>
<th>Saloon</th>
<th>Doblo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Was it easy to get into the seat?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.6 – Views of Disabled People on reaching the seat of Hackney Carriages

8.40 All found the saloon car seat they chose to access, easy to get to as they slid directly into this as they stepped into the vehicle. Two people tried the swivel seat located in the front passenger compartment, including the participant that always travelled in the front of the taxi. The latter found this particularly useful and although they had not used (or been offered it) in the past stated they would now always ask for it when using taxis in the future. The other participant did not find the swivel seat at all easy or comfortable to use, the latter possibly in part as the driver encroached on their personal space in trying to assist them with its use.

8.41 One participant who had some difficulty walking and used a walking stick found it difficult managing the distance from the door entry to the seat in the Mercedes and VW taxis. These were the two vehicles where the distance to the passenger seat was greatest. Two participants able to manage the step into the Doblo found it a little difficult to reach the passenger seat and the third very difficult. None experienced problems getting to their passenger seat of choice in the E7.
Table 8.7 – Views of Disabled People on seat comfort in Hackney Carriages

8.42 All found the seat they chose comfortable in all vehicles apart from one participant who felt a little cramped in the Doblo when sharing the rear passenger seat with another person.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What do you think of the vehicle interior?</th>
<th>E7</th>
<th>Merc</th>
<th>VW</th>
<th>Saloon</th>
<th>Doblo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.8 – Views of Disabled People on the vehicle interior of Hackney Carriages
8.43 None of the participants encountered any difficulty with the vehicle interior of the E7 and VW taxis. One participant found the interior height in the rear passenger compartment of the Mercedes a little low as it sloped down towards the passenger seat, making it feel a little cramped and required them to bend beyond what was comfortable as they approached the seat. One person found the rear passenger compartment of the saloon car a little cramped, as did two of the participants in the case of the Doblo. One person found the interior of the Doblo both cramped and unattractive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E7</th>
<th>Merc</th>
<th>VW</th>
<th>Saloon</th>
<th>Doblo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.9 – Views of Disabled People on getting out of Hackney Carriages

8.44 No participant had difficulties getting out of the VW. Two participants found it difficult stepping out of the saloon car as the vehicle seat was low and there was nothing available to them to help lever themselves upright. One person found the rear passenger door of the E7 very difficult to open when trying to get out of the vehicle and similarly two people the rear passenger door of the Mercedes. One of the latter again mentioned the narrow step making it difficult to manoeuvre their footing as they stepped out. One participant found the height of the step out of the Doblo difficult to manage.

8.45 A number of other more general comments were made by participants, as follows:

- All commented on the mix of different types of vehicle available, stating they were not aware there was such a range of different types of taxi to choose from;
- All considered it important that this mix of vehicles was retained, suggesting different vehicles suited the different disabilities that people had;
- All also thought it was important to do more to raise awareness amongst disabled people of the different access features taxis could offer;
- Two participants who normally used saloon car style taxis by choice said having now tried the larger MPV style vehicles that they may well choose these in the future as they liked the greater space they offered;
• None of the participants was aware that all saloon style hackneys were fitted with a swivel seat until they attended the audit, including the person that always travelled in the front passenger seat. All thought this facility should be publicised more widely;
• None had ever been offered this facility by a driver of a saloon style hackney;
• The Doblo taxi was disliked most by all participants apart from the wheelchair user who, because of their height, found it to be the only wheelchair accessible vehicle they could get into reasonably easily;
• A number of participants suggested they felt much better informed about how to use taxis as a result of attending the audit with a couple suggesting they would now know how to open a sliding door if they needed to, whereas they didn’t know before; and
• A couple of the participants stated that they were rarely offered the assistance they would like by taxi drivers, in particular in terms of getting to/from the vehicle or carrying shopping/baggage.
9.0 Hackney Fleet Review – The Taxi Market

The Taxi Market

9.1 Research for the Office of Fair Trading in 2003 identified that on average in England and Wales people make 12 trips by taxi per year, and that this is one of the fastest growing transport sectors in UK in recent years. Considerable research has been done both at the local and national level, and it is understood that the level of Hackney Carriage and PHV use is inversely related to income with those on low income making most trips. For example, the disabled make 67% more trips than average (i.e. around 20 trips p.a.) and households without a car make on average 30 trips p.a. compared to only 9 taxi trips for those with a car.

9.2 The most significant users of taxis are found in the 16 to 24 year age group. The second biggest users are those aged over 60, especially women. Use of taxis is concentrated around the morning peak and late evenings, with 21% of all trips being made on Saturdays. Nationally, almost a third of taxi trips are made from a rank, the majority are pre booked.

9.3 In Middlesbrough there are 10.4% of people or 70 and 19.6% of people over 60 compared to 11.5% and 20.7% respectively in England as a whole. There are also almost a quarter of people (22.3%) reported as having a limiting long term illness compared with less than 18% for England overall. In the other age group that use taxis most, 16 to 24 year olds, there are 14.5% in Middlesbrough compared to 12.1% for England as a whole. More than 40% of Middlesbrough households have no car or van compared with an average of 26.8% in England.

Disabled People

9.4 For some years DfT has accepted that 10% of the population is a reasonable rule of thumb for the proportion of people in any area that have some form of mobility impairment as a result of disability. This was confirmed by a survey of the Office of Population and Census Statistics in
1999 which identified that 16% of the population have a disability and 9.9% have a mobility impairment as a result of their disability. Of all disabled people 7% were identified as wheelchair users.

9.5 Extrapolating these figures to Middlesbrough, with its population of about 135,000, would suggest there are around 13,500 people that have some form of mobility impairment as a result of a disability and about 1,500 people who are wheelchair users. Combining these figures with that for taxi trips undertaken suggest there could be a potential demand for around 270,000 taxi trips per annum from people with a mobility impairment in Middlesbrough, including around 30,000 p.a. from wheelchair users.

9.6 A study, “Attitudes of Disabled People to Public Transport”, by MORI on behalf of Diptac in 2001/02 identified that:

- Disabled people travel a third less often than the general public. However, while they drive far less often, they use taxis/minicabs and buses more often;
- The most frequently used mode of transport overall is a car driven by someone else;
- Despite disabled people not using the car as frequently as the general public and the majority having no car in the household, many consider private cars to be the only form of transport that is convenient and accessible;
- Almost half of disabled people use some initiative for disabled people to make travel easier.
- In many respects the transport priorities of disabled people differ very little from the general population as a whole – frequent and reliable services;
- However, in addition to more frequent services, more comfortable services and lower cost services, improving access for disabled people is a key priority;
- Many priorities also relate to the ‘softer’ aspects – the way in which services are delivered rather than the actual services themselves. In particular, improving attitudes of transport staff is perceived as a key issue;
- In terms of convenience and ease of use, taxis and minicabs are rated the most highly with rail services the worst; and
- If transport services accessible to disabled people are to be effective, disabled people need to be aware of the existence and operational details. Disabled people also need to receive the right messages to ensure that they take advantage of new travel opportunities they provide. There are still many misperceptions.

9.7 A study by DfT, “Older People: Their Transport Needs and Requirements” in 1999 identified that:

- Like non-disabled people and their younger counterparts, older and disabled people need to travel to fulfil a whole variety of elements of their life. For the majority, work, entertainment, shopping and socialising all depend on being able to get to and from a variety of destinations.
- Research by Schlag and Schwenkhagen (1996)(7) concluded that mobility is of great importance to older people; adequate mobility is related to greater life satisfaction and is an important contributor to perceived quality of life. Access to transportation is also crucial to maintaining social relationships and independence, and hence maintaining mobility for older people is essential.
- A paper by Ling and Mannion was said to illustrate the social and psychological need for travel very well. It also highlighted that, perhaps, a key difference between some older public transport users and their younger counterparts is that their travel patterns
have changed as a result of changing circumstances, such as retirement, reduced income, loss of the ability to use a car (either as a driver or a passenger) or increased health impairments.

9.8 Based on consultation with disabled people during the course of the many (over 100) taxi unmet demand studies undertaken by TPI in recent years it is apparent that most, especially in the older age groups, have a preference for using PHVs. This is in part a result of their perception that PHVs provide a cheaper service but also because many of the journeys they require originate from home and are door to door, meaning they are usually pre-booked by telephone. Use of hackneys from ranks or by flag down is far less common and often people are found to be uncertain how they can go about pre-booking a hackney. In particular they are unsure where they might find a telephone number, while numbers for PHV operators are relatively easily identified. Once a “good” operator has been found many disabled people stay loyal to this operator and will always call them for their journeys, often asking for a driver they have got to know and trust by name.

2008 Middlesbrough Taxi Unmet Demand Study

9.9 The above was clearly reflected in the consultation with disabled people for the unmet demand study undertaken by TPI for Middlesbrough in 2008. In this study feedback included the following comments:

By Shopmobility

- That their users nearly always use PHVs to get to the scheme because they are cheaper and easier to obtain by telephone;
- That shopmobility will usually contact a Hackney operator for the users return journey as they believe they provide a better quality of service to disabled people. Shopmobility believe this stems from all hackney drivers, including all those employed by the company used by Shopmobility, being required to undertake disability awareness training;
- Some drivers are thought to be better than others at assisting passengers to/from and in/out of the taxi. Once a ‘good one’ has been found passengers will use them for all their journeys, often asking for the driver by name when booking; and
- That it was sometimes difficult to obtain a taxi in the afternoon peak.

By Disability Reference Group members

- That there were concerns at the difference in standards between operators and most agreed that Hackney operators offered a better quality of assistance/care to disabled people. However, cost was often the deciding factor and this often led to use of PHVs rather than Hackneys;
- That most telephone to book when they want a taxi, often using a company/driver known to them;
- That not all drivers get out of their cab to help the passenger on arrival. Similarly help was not always given with shopping, etc on the return journey;
- When a taxi from a rank is required there are usually found to be plenty of wheelchair accessible vehicles available and drivers are responsive to the needs of a disabled person;
- That taxi schedulers should use a checklist to ask prospective passengers if they have any special requirements;
• Taxi marketing is considered poor with no central point available where telephone numbers of more than one company can be obtained;
• That wheelchair users were not always properly ‘strapped in’ when travelling in their wheelchair; and
• That it was sometimes difficult to obtain a taxi in the afternoon peak

By Senior Citizens' Reference Group members

• That there were concerns about the quality and standards of service provided by operators, especially Private Hire Vehicles (PHV). Hackneys were considered better but expensive;
• That marketing information was poor with uncertainty about where to obtain a Hackney style taxi or which operators offered wheelchair accessible vehicles or different styles of vehicle;
• That many use the same company for all their journeys, once they have found a good one;
• There was a reported lack of assistance from taxi drivers for passengers needing help to get to, from and into the vehicle. Better training (in customer relations, passenger handling, and disability awareness) was thought necessary;
• There were suspicions that some drivers would make excuses not to carry/assist wheelchair users;
• That wheelchair users were not always properly ‘strapped in’ when travelling in their wheelchair;
• That taxis sometimes do not turn up for a short journey;
• That it was sometimes difficult to obtain a taxi in the morning peak; and
• That some experienced difficulties getting in and out of People Carrier style vehicles, because of the high step. There were also difficulties reaching the seat in these vehicles for some not so good on their feet.

9.10 The limited use of ranks to obtain a taxi by disabled people is also confirmed by the rank observations undertaken for the 100+ recent unmet demand studies undertaken by TPi. It is rare for these observations to identify more than 1 or 2 people, amongst the many who are observed, who are obviously disabled people, waiting at ranks for a hackney. In the survey of passengers in Middlesbrough waiting at ranks, undertaken for this study, the 8 people who indicated they had difficulty accessing a taxi as a result of their disability represent 2.6% of those surveyed at ranks, half of these being wheelchair users.

9.11 Extrapolating this to the estimated number of passengers’ departures (9,117) from ranks each week in Middlesbrough, as identified in the 2008 unmet demand study suggests 237 rank departures a week or 12,324 a year may be by disabled people. Half of these, 6,162 rank departures a year, are potentially by wheelchair users.
Conclusions

10.1 In Middlesbrough there is a significant potential market for accessible taxi services. While estimates of this market provided below need to be treated with some caution as they are based on extrapolation, rather than detailed market research, they nevertheless give a useful illustration of the potential scale of the demand. In general in the fields of passenger and public transport there is a need for a better understanding of the market potential offered by disabled people and in particular, how to go about developing this market. The Taxi sector is no exception to this. The following table provides a summary of the estimates provided for Middlesbrough:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Disabled People</th>
<th>Wheelchair Users</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total in Middlesbrough</td>
<td>21,600</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total with a Mobility Impairment</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>With a Limiting Long Term Illness – 29,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total potential demand for taxi trips (one way) per annum; ie all taxis &amp; including latent demand</td>
<td>270,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>1,620,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total current demand for taxi trips (one way) from hackney ranks per annum; ie for hackneys from ranks only &amp; excluding latent demand</td>
<td>12,324</td>
<td>6,162</td>
<td>474,084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.1 Market for accessible taxis services

10.2 There is currently no government regulation of the type of taxi or specifically hackney vehicles that should be provided to meet the needs of disabled people. However, there is provision for the Secretary of State to make regulation if they so wish. This has received substantial consideration since the DDA was first introduced in 1995 but to date government has been unable to reconcile its desire for accessibility with concerns that this could have a substantial impact on the viability of taxi operations and hence cause a reduction in the fleet available.

10.3 Most recently the DfT undertook a consultation exercise in 2009 to elicit views on a range of options for the introduction of either an interim or enhanced specification for hackney vehicles. However the results of this consultation were inconclusive and as a result government proposed undertaking 3 pilot studies to obtain further information before coming to a decision on the best way forward. This means there is unlikely to be regulation or guidance emerging from government at least in the near future, until these pilots have taken place, their results have been evaluated and government has had the opportunity to consider the evidence they provide. Even then any change is likely to be phased in over time with dates in the consultation for this suggesting it could be 2020 at least before any government led change will finally be put in place.

10.4 In the meantime government advise that each licensing authority should decide what is best for their area and there is legal provision for licensing authorities to attach conditions to both
hackney or PHV vehicle licenses and to the operators licence for PHVs, which can be used to require vehicles to be accessible. In Middlesbrough the current policy for hackneys is to provide a mixed fleet, made up of saloons fitted with swivel seats and wheelchair accessible vehicles. This has been achieved by capping at 190 the number of saloon style vehicles licensed while allowing market entry for those seeking licenses for wheelchair accessible hackneys. A temporary cap was introduced on the latter in 2008 but this was lifted at the end of March 2010, when the situation reverted to the previous policy. There are currently no accessibility requirements placed on the PHVs licensed in Middlesbrough.

10.5 The policy for hackneys has worked well for Middlesbrough achieving an almost 50/50 split in the fleet between saloon and wheelchair accessible vehicles. It also fits well with evidence from this study and the taxi unmet demand study undertaken in 2008 that disabled people in the town welcome a mix of vehicle types in the hackney fleet as this best meets the different needs of disabled people. In particular older people and disabled people with difficulty walking tend to favour the use of saloon cars as they can most easily get into the seat of these without negotiating a step or having to walk, bent over, to reach the passenger seat, whereas wheelchair users and some other disabled people prefer wheelchair accessible vehicles. This is also an approach that is supported by ECMT in their considerations of the needs for accessible taxis for Europe as a whole and by some in England who responded to the recent DfT consultation.

10.6 However, it is not clear this approach is entirely consistent with DfT who in their 2009 consultation document and also prior to this appear to express a preference for all hackneys being wheelchair accessible vehicles. Their view is that hackneys should be vehicles that can meet the needs of most if not all disabled people while the PHV fleet will usually include some wheelchair accessible vehicles and can also meet the needs of those who require saloon cars, as these are most likely to book a taxi by telephone. The debate arises primarily because there is no vehicle yet available that is suitable to meet the needs of all. The DfT has set out their aspirations for this in the enhanced specification provided with their consultation but recognise introducing this would have significant cost implications on the trade, hence their decision to introduce pilots to look further at the matter.

10.7 In this context it does not seem unreasonable for Middlesbrough to maintain their current policy approach until the matter is resolved. It would appear to be in the public interest to have a choice of vehicles at the rank or that can be flagged down, as well as that can be booked by telephone. There hasn’t been a court challenge to this in Middlesbrough or any other licensing authority that have adopted the approach so there is no precedent. However, if there were to be, a defence that DfT have not concluded their deliberations and until they do their advice is for local circumstances to prevail would seem reasonable.

10.8 The concern with the current approach is that it can be viewed as providing those hackney drivers holding saloon car licenses with an unfair advantage over those who don’t. Saloon cars are generally cheaper to buy and to run and where their numbers are capped there is also a potential premium (grey market value) available to the license holder that is not available to holders of wheelchair accessible vehicle licenses, if these are not capped. However, ultimately, any decision of the court would be likely to focus on the public interest; ie the weight of evidence that a mixed fleet is required in Middlesbrough.

10.9 This review and the unmet taxi demand study before it have gone some way to providing this weight of evidence. It is certainly clear that those consulted at ranks, as stakeholders, directly through questionnaires and at the vehicle audit identify a variety of needs that are currently only possible to meet by different vehicles. Also that they welcome there being a mix of vehicle
alternatives available and currently want to see this retained. However, there are limitations in the numbers of people represented without undertaking a comprehensive market research study and therefore whether this alone can be considered the weight of evidence required will only become apparent if tested in a court of law.

10.10 There are of course other alternatives to maintaining the current approach that can be considered. For example Middlesbrough could decide:

- That they can achieve the requirements for a mixed fleet through a combination of all wheelchair accessible hackneys and saloon car style private hire vehicles. This would mean there were no saloons available for those needing them at ranks or to be flagged down. However, it is clear from this review and the previous unmet taxi demand study that there is a tendency for many disabled people to use PHVs because they are considered cheaper than hackneys, because their journeys often originate from home and therefore they do usually phone to book and because many are uncertain how they can go about booking a hackney by telephone, anyway. This has to be set against the fact that most regard hackneys as able to provide a better quality of service, although for many the lower fare currently outweighs the issue of quality.

- That, like a number of other licensing authorities, the Council can achieve a mixed fleet for some time to come by working towards a fleet of entirely wheelchair accessible hackneys, over time, either by only licensing new vehicles that are of this type or by giving grandfather rights to those currently operating saloons and requiring only new entrants to provide wheelchair accessible vehicles. Either would steadily reduce the numbers of saloon style vehicles in the fleet. The former as all vehicles came to the end of their life span, currently 7 years in Middlesbrough, although the Council could choose to extend this. As things stand this would mean there remained at least some saloon cars in the hackney fleet until at least 2017 by which time the decisions of government should have become clear. In the case of the latter it would take even longer to get to a point all hackneys were wheelchair accessible as a number of those with grandfather rights are likely to continue working longer than 7 years before they retire. There is a court precedent that backs up this approach, Mr. James Wilson v Aberdeen City Council [2008] CSIH 8, precisely because it does eventually lead to full wheelchair accessibility, without prejudicing those who entered the trade prior to it becoming a requirement.

- There are also some less commonly applied alternatives to maintaining a mixed fleet on an ongoing basis that may be considered:
  - Capping or delimiting the number of all hackneys and letting the market decide the vehicles that make up the fleet – the risk in this being that all or most may revert to the cheaper option of licensing saloon cars, so reducing the proportion of wheelchair accessible vehicles in the fleet;
  - Capping or delimiting the number of all hackneys but requiring a certain proportion (say 50%) to be wheelchair accessible vehicles. This would have the effect of first evening out the proportion to that desired and from then on tying together the issue of saloon car licenses to those for wheelchair accessible vehicles such that a saloon license could only be issued if there were an equal number of wheelchair accessible licenses also issued and vice versa - the risk in this, whether capped or delimited, would be a stagnation or reduction in the issue of licenses while applicants either waited for someone else to license the more expensive wheelchair accessible vehicle so they could license a saloon or for someone to give up their saloon car licence;
  - Managing the growth of the hackney fleet by setting a number for the additional new saloon and/or wheelchair accessible licenses to be issued each year and if both the
proportion of each – the risk of this being a court challenge to the number set, as has occurred in Middlesbrough in the past;

- Providing other incentives instead or alongside one of the above to encourage wheelchair accessible provision in the fleet, such as grants to support their purchase, a taxicard scheme or similar, a longer lifespan to offset the difference in purchase costs, access to contract work or additional benefits (access to disabled parking, reduced license fees, etc) to operators of such vehicles – the risks in this are the costs of the incentives to the Council and/or that they won’t be considered of enough value by operators to achieve their aim.

10.11 While there is no government regulation or guidance on the taxi vehicle, taxi services are subject to the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act (soon to be superseded by the Single Equalities Act 2010). This in itself provides the Council with the opportunity to address some of the other issues affecting accessibility to taxis that arise from this review.

10.12 The most common of these issues identified by those consulted in Middlesbrough are listed below:

- Concerns amongst disabled people about the cost of using hackney vehicles
- That disabled people are not aware of the access features that are available from hackneys or are unfamiliar with how to use these; ie that saloon style hackneys have a swivel seat or how to go about opening a sliding door
- That disabled people are uncertain how or where to go to book a hackney by telephone or how find out about the accessibility features available from different vehicles
- That some drivers do not provide assistance to disabled people when required or appear reluctant to respond to journey demands from this group
- That taxi schedulers are not always responsive to the needs of disabled people
- That there is a need to improve infrastructure at ranks; ie dropped kerbs, signage, seating, shelter

10.13 The vehicle audit and consultation undertaken also identified specific difficulties for some ambulant disabled people:

- Getting out of saloon style hackneys because of the lack of a handle to lever themselves upright;
- Managing the step height from the 1st step into wheelchair accessible vehicles;
- Using the narrow first step available on some wheelchair accessible vehicles;
- Getting to seats in wheelchair accessible vehicles because of the roof height reducing as they approached them.

10.14 There are concerns over the use of rear loading wheelchair accessible hackneys, in Middlesbrough particularly the Fiat Doblo which makes up nearly 2/3 of all wheelchair accessible vehicles in the hackney fleet. These include difficulties using rear loading vehicles safely at ranks, there being no dropped kerb at ranks to facilitate access to the road (and therefore ramp), that deploying ramps safely and without blocking traffic for flag downs and drop offs cannot be guaranteed, that rear loading ramps require more room than the individual vehicle space provided at ranks or to extend to a length to achieve a reasonable gradient from the road (as opposed to the kerb), the impacts of the camber in the road on the stability of ramps and potential impacts on drivers health from having to push a person in a wheelchair up the ramp. These are primarily safety concerns and as such, especially in the case of hackneys where it is not possible to control where the vehicle may be required to stop for a flag down or
has to stand at a rank, have to be taken very seriously. The seriousness of these safety issues has already led to a number of significant interest groups, the National Taxi Association, the Taxi Trade Union, Radar, and the Spinal Injuries association calling for rear loading vehicles not to be licensed as hackneys.

10.15 In terms of the Fiat Doblo specifically there are also particular issues for some ambulant disabled people accessing the vehicle due to the height of the side step, reaching the passenger seats in the vehicle and with the comfort of the seats. This lack of suitability was confirmed by the vehicle audit undertaken where the Fiat Doblo proved to be the least popular vehicle of all those examined, although it must also be recognised that it was the only vehicle the person in a wheelchair that attended the audit could access, due to their height and the lower roof height of other vehicles.

10.16 The trade have been reluctant to agree to proposals in the past and continue to express this reluctance in their response to consultation for this study, to remove these vehicles from the hackney fleet due to the cost of the alternatives, especially at a time of recession and perceived reduction in demand. To replace all 108 does have a potential total cost of nearly £3m assuming a replacement cost at new of around £25,000 per vehicle, approximately £10,000 or just over £1m in total, more than the cost of replacing like for like. However, this increase in costs can be compensated for by increasing the life cycle for a more expensive vehicle. It is also the case that costs can be spread by considering vehicle leasing as opposed to outright purchase.

10.17 There has also been written feedback (see appendix A) from one driver following publication of the final draft report suggesting that rear loading taxis are the only vehicle that offer 4 point clamps enabling a wheelchair to be harnessed at each corner, are the only vehicle in which the passenger travels facing forwards causing less nausea for passengers with motion sickness and the only vehicle with plenty of head space. However, where a converted as opposed to a purpose built vehicle (such as a London style Black Cab) is concerned each of the above are simply down to vehicle specification and available floor space for manoeuvring of the wheelchair. It is equally possible to specify a side loading vehicle that incorporates each of the above features ie the current Peugeot E7 or Mercedes M8.

10.18 There are some concerns raised by hackney operators consulted about the need to offer a swivel seat in their saloon style vehicles and some examples of licensing authorities elsewhere that have withdrawn their requirement for vehicles to be fitted with these as a result of such concerns. However, as long as swivel seats are fitted correctly by an authorised company that follows the vehicle and seat manufacturers guidance, that provide certification to demonstrate this and to appropriate vehicles; ie those that don’t have a passenger airbag in the seat itself, the concerns raised by those consulted can be dealt with. Also if this approach is followed, based on consultation with insurers offering taxi policies, we understand there will not be any difficulty obtaining insurance and the practice identified by some drivers of not telling their insurance company they have a swivel seat fitted because they are concerned they will be refused cover, need not continue. In terms of the ability of such seats to stand up to the wear and tear of regular use this has not been tested in Middlesbrough as passengers being unaware they are available has meant they are hardly ever used. If promoting their availability caused such an issue it would have to be looked at then, perhaps in conjunction with manufacturers.

10.19 It is notable that there are currently only 2 wheelchair accessible vehicles licensed within the PHV fleet. This does not match with the view of the DfT that PHV operators have a propensity to make these vehicles available. Also, while it is the case that a number of PHV operators
draw on wheelchair accessible vehicles from hackney operators to address this shortcoming in their fleet in order to respond to requests for journeys from people who need to travel in their wheelchair it cannot be guaranteed that these will always be available or available to respond immediately to such demands. To address this by over time phasing in additional wheelchair accessible vehicles to the PHV fleet, the draft final report proposed that PHV operators with 5 or more vehicles should be required to provide every 5th new or replacement vehicle in their fleet as a wheelchair accessible vehicle. This prompted concerns from those consulted at the forum held on the 27th May following production of the draft report and led to a discussion with Boro Cars in the one to one meeting with them on the same day where they argued for a reduction in this from every 5th vehicle to every 10th vehicle or greater. No other PHV operator has responded to the extensive consultation opportunities provided to them so their view on this is not known.

10.20 While operators themselves show no signs of doing so it is considered important to address this issue. Many disabled people, including wheelchair users, choose to seek journeys from PHVs because of the lower fares they offer compared to hackneys and also because they have a preference or need to book a taxi by telephone but find it hard to identify how to obtain hackneys in this way. In doing so they sometimes encounter difficulties obtaining the response they require or as quickly as they would like, including from PHV operators. It also goes against the principles of equity and taking a balanced approach to the hackney and PHV sectors to make recommendations that require one sector to provide for Disabled people but not the other. It is therefore considered a decision about to what extent and how quickly accessible vehicles should be introduced to the PHV fleet rather than a decision about whether they should be required or not.

**Recommendations**

10.16 To address the findings of the review and in particular its main conclusion the following balanced and co-ordinated package of recommendations are made. The package of measures proposed is also summarised in the diagram that follows these recommendations:

R.1 That it is in the public interest that Middlesbrough retain their current policy of capping hackneys that are saloon style vehicles at 190 while requiring all new hackney licenses issued to be for wheelchair accessible vehicles.

R.2 That in consultation with the trade, disabled people and other interested stakeholders via the Quality Taxi Partnership proposed (see R18) Middlesbrough establish two detailed vehicle specifications one for wheelchair accessible vehicles that can carry (most) disabled people that need to travel in their wheelchair and the other for accessible saloon cars that can accommodate wheelchair users that can transfer to a passenger seat and carry the persons wheelchair in the boot.

R.3 That both vehicle specifications should be based on the interim specification provided by the DfT in their 2009 consultation document, ensuring they address the issues of step and roof height, seating, door opening, need for grab handles, driver communication, WAV identification, colour contrast, etc identified in the vehicle audit, consultation undertaken and by good practice elsewhere.

R.4 That the vehicle specifications, once agreed, should be applied to all new and replacement vehicles (hackney and PHV) at the time all current vehicles become due for replacement according to their currently agreed lifespan and the further recommendations below.
R.5 That the wheelchair accessible specification for hackneys should accept only vehicles with a side loading ramp or passenger lift while that for PHVs should allow for rear loading as an alternative.

R.6 That the saloon car specification for hackneys should continue to require these to be fitted with a swivel seat but that this should not be required of PHV saloons.

R.7 That PHV operators with 10 or more vehicles (owned or operated) should be required to replace every 10th vehicle (when it comes up for replacement or from new if moving from operating 9 to 10 vehicles) in their fleet as a wheelchair accessible vehicle and should also continue to build and formalise their partnership working with wheelchair accessible hackney operators to supplement the available wheelchair accessible fleet they offer to provide an immediate response to demands from disabled people.

R.8 That if this does not achieve at least a 30:70 percent mix of wheelchair accessible to accessible saloon type vehicles in the overall fleet each offer for immediate response within a period of 2 years the requirement to replace vehicles with wheelchair accessible vehicles should be increased from every 10th vehicle to every 9th vehicle and so on every 2 years until either the 30:70 percent mix is achieved or a minimum of every 5th vehicle is required to be wheelchair accessible. This to be monitored as part of the monitoring proposed in R19 below, in part by the use of mystery passengers and by operators demonstrating to their fleet to the Council using copies of the agreements they have established with hackney operators and the specifications of vehicles they operate directly.

R.9 That the lifespan for all new and replacement vehicles is extended to a maximum of 12 years where these are Euro 4 compliant and have a purchase cost new of £24,000 or more, 10 years (if Euro 4 and have a purchase cost of between £20,000 and £23,999.99) and 8 years (if Euro 4 and have a purchase cost of less than £20,000). Where the vehicle is not new when it's first licensed as a taxi the lifespan should be adjusted downwards based on the age of the vehicle.

R.10 That all new and replacement vehicles licensed as taxis must be less than 3 years old (from the time they were 1st registered with DVLA) and that vehicles which are not, at least, Euro 4 compliant should not be accepted as new or replacement vehicles.

R.11 That all taxi drivers (hackney and PHV) should be required to receive disability awareness and passenger handling training or if this is already in place refresher training now and at least every 4 years from now on before they are allowed to renew their license and all drivers of wheelchair accessible vehicles should be required to receive training in use of wheelchair equipment and providing assistance to wheelchair users, or if this is already in place refresher training now at least every 4 years from now on before they are allowed to renew their license.

R.12 That the Council should establish a simple, 1 to 5, ranking system for taxi vehicles where 1 identifies a wheelchair accessible vehicle that exceeds (in terms of wheelchair accessibility) the minimum wheelchair accessible specification the Council adopt, 2 meets this specification, 3 meets or exceeds the minimum accessible saloon vehicle specification adopted, 4 meets the current wheelchair accessible vehicle specification and 5 the current saloon car specification.
R.13 That the Council should make information available on their taxi licensing website, as well as in documented and audio format, on where and how to book wheelchair accessible vehicles (hackney and PHV) together with their ranking and other specific details of the access features available from different vehicles; ie swivel seats.

R.14 That the Council should ensure any super ranks established and over time all ranks comply with guidance on accessibility of taxi ranks as issued by DfT.

R.15 That the Council and Taxi operators should work together, through the Quality Taxi Partnership, to promote and raise awareness amongst disabled people of the availability of accessible taxis, how to book them, where to obtain information on accessible taxis and what access features they offer in general, in terms of the ranking system (ie R 12) developed and specifically in terms of swivel seats, fares, taxi sharing opportunities, etc. Also that the Council and taxi operators should work with organisations of and for disabled, older and mobility impaired people to better understand how to develop the taxi market from amongst these groups.

R.16 That the Council and hackney operators should work together to encourage fare negotiation with passengers and medium to longer term establish a taxi sharing scheme to enable disabled people (and others) to travel together in order to reduce the costs of hackney use. For pre-booking this may require a central booking point (web and/or telephone based) to be established which could be based on a shared radio circuit for hackney operators or an existing booking and scheduling system offered by one or more existing PHV operators or bought in from an external call centre operator (including the Council).

R.17 That medium to longer term any central web based booking point established should be used as the basis for establishing a facility for those (individuals or organisations) seeking to procure taxis on a spot hire or possibly longer term contract basis. At this point it will need to facilitate competitive bidding by operators for the booking requests received.

R.18 That all the above is co-ordinated with and where appropriate (ie where partnership working is required) facilitated through the establishment of a Quality Taxi Partnership (see appendix C for further details) for Middlesbrough that involves the Council, taxi operators (hackney and PHV), organisations of and working for disabled people and other interested stakeholders (ie those required by the recommendations of the rank review undertaken).

R.19 That progress with the above is monitored quarterly over the coming year and its impacts, both on disabled people and in terms of the mix of vehicles in the hackney and PHV fleet, are monitored through a comprehensive equality impact assessment at the end of 2010/11 and again at the end of 2012/13 and then, at least, every 3 years from then on.

R.20 That Middlesbrough approach the DfT to offer to participate as a pilot authority for accessible taxi vehicles and also that the recommendations proposed are reviewed again once DfT has issued any further advice following its proposed taxi pilots.

R.21 That the recommendations of this report are taken into account in the production of the next Local Transport Plan for Middlesbrough.
Aim: To provide a co-ordinated package of accessibility initiatives across the Taxi Fleet

2 x Vehicle Specifications

1. Vehicle Spec. Wheelchair Accessible Vehicle (WAV)
2. Vehicle Spec - Saloon
3. Vehicle Entry – No more than 3yr old
5. Euro 4 Compliant

To apply to all new & replacement vehicles

QTP

Variations

Vehicle Life: 8-12yrs, Depending on purchase cost

WAV Hackney. Lift/Ramp – Side loading only
WAV PHV. Lift/Ramp – Side or rear loading

Saloons – Include swivel seat
Saloons PHV – No swivel seat required

Hackney – Retain current policy 50/50
PHV – Every 10th vehicle = WAV 30/70
* Partner Hackney operators

Complimentary Initiatives

Taxi Sharing
Driver Training

Vehicle Classification 1-5

Promotion
Information
Web Portal
Market Development
Monitoring
Pilot Authority

Improvement to rank infrastructure

Monitoring
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APPENDIX A
Written Feedback to Final Draft Report received from: Middlesbrough Hackney Carriage Association (MHCA), Middlesbrough Hackney Owner Drivers Association (MODA), 2 Hackney Carriage Operators and Cleveland Police.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Feedback Received</th>
<th>TPi Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality Taxi Partnership</strong></td>
<td>It is clear from our consultations, including some of the written responses listed in this table, that there has been a breakdown of mutual respect and trust between the key stakeholders in Middlesbrough and this contributes significantly to the issues facing taxi operations, especially in the town centre. Unless this is addressed the recommendations made by this report (or indeed any other proposals) are unlikely to work. The QTP provides the means to achieve this and is therefore regarded as a critical framework within which to take forward the package of proposals for improving both the town centre arrangements and access for disabled people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MCHA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The MHCA feel that the QTP would not make any difference to the other recommendations included in the survey. The MHCA feel that enforcement rules are already in place, this is in relation to the “three strikes and out system”, and if these were enforced then many of the problems would be solved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not wish to meet with Private Hire, particularly Boro Cars – Lack of Trust</td>
<td>There are simply not the resources available for enforcement alone to deal with the issues that exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hackney Carriage Driver 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have proposed that PHV and Hackneys sign up to an agreement with sanction. May I remind you that when drivers apply for a badge or operators license they sign up to agree that they will follow the rules. But it seems these rules only apply to a driver. In the past we have complained to official but no action has been taken, so drivers feel it is a waste of time agreeing or signing up to any agreement....I have found that when it comes to enforcement the Local Authority have failed us.</td>
<td>A voluntary agreement to joint working for the mutual benefit of stakeholders and the wider community is proposed as part of the QTP. However, no sanctions are proposed in relation to this and any partner will be able to easily leave the partnership if they believe others are not taking upholding their responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cleveland Police</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Police support the establishment of the QTP. It is vital that a clear understanding of how by working in partnership it improves the delivery of the service and maintains standards. This supports all areas of the community and lays clear foundations on what is acceptable.</td>
<td>In addition separate policies are proposed for hackneys and PHVs to provide guidance specifically on town centre operation. This guidance does not exist within the current terms and conditions of licensing of either drivers or operators. Our proposal is that the sanctions that currently exist should also be applied to these policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The QTP enhances the coordination between all aspects of the trade, enforcement and the local community.</td>
<td>In previous consultations with the trade they have made it clear that the application of sanctions for those who do not keep to the existing terms and conditions or follow policy is regarded as a critical element of enforcement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The overall aim is to ensure that those who</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Feedback Received</td>
<td>TPi Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work live and attend Middlesbrough do so in a safe environment which supports all areas of activity, increasing the right footfall and offering professional services which support local business and the long term community strategy ensuring diversity, neighbourhood renewal and community cohesion.</td>
<td>The options for funding Taxi Marshall's are outlined in paragraph 5.12 of this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi Marshall's</td>
<td>The role of the Taxi Marshall's was identified in paragraph 5.16 of the draft Final Report. To ensure this is clear the role has now been highlighted in Table 5.1 of the Final Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHCA</td>
<td>Taxi Marshall's have been deployed in a number of cities throughout the UK with significant success. The Taxi Marshall becomes an integral part of taxi operations seeking to ensure the efficient and safe usage of ranks, safety of the highway network and passenger management. The Taxi Marshall provides a frontline service as a liaison between drivers, passengers, the Police and Licensing in the event of an incident. The Taxi Marshall raises the attractiveness of a centre which in turn influences the influx of people and can lead to a subsequent increase in taxi customers. Information on Good Practice elsewhere using Taxi Marshall's is provided in the appendix B to this report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODA consider that Taxi Marshall's are a waste of money and are concerned about the cost compared to benefit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The introduction of Taxi Marshall's is supported during times of high usage of services in the town centre. Those employed should be registered with the Security Industry Authority and that best practice is identified from other authorities who have successfully introduced such a scheme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buxton Street car park</td>
<td>TPi agree with this comment and our recommendation reflects this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCHA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHCA agree to the car park being used as a night time business car park.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important that those who deliver services within the town centre and in particular the night time economy have the opportunity of having the protection of business parking area. It would also benefit such an area if consideration was given for this to be monitored by staff and that those staff be registered by the Security Industry Authority.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The location suggested is centrally located and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Written Feedback Received

has the ability to have routes from which provide the security to the users both on arrival and departure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town Centre Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MHCA:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MCHA disagrees to the closure of Wilson Street after the last bus has departed, as this is a major access, and shortest route across town for taxis, police and other services. The MHCA would like the existing ranks to remain and, if possible, extended.

| Exchange Square   |
The MHCA agree that a super rank be provided, to alleviate the problem of taxis ranking up illegally within the area, provided that the area is to be policed by Taxi Marshall’s.

| Albert Road       |
The rank under the railway bridge to be retained and used as a feeder rank for the super rank on Exchange Square. The MHCA agree to the closure of Corporation Road outside Walkabout and recommend a new rank to be created adjacent to HSBC on the eastern side to accommodate for this closure. The rank recommended as a super rank opposite Central Square to be brought forward outside the night club opposite the Town Hall and the plinths be removed so that the rank can be extended to accommodate more taxis.

| Cleveland Police:|
Rationalisation of ranks:
It would ensure that clear identified areas for the collecting of customers are established. This together with the introduction of taxi Marshall’s would ensure that customers are able to attend a clearly defined area, then be able to get a hackney carriage in an orderly manner close to the main amenities which in

| TPi Comment       |
Our recommendations aim to rationalise ranks in order to create a better environment, manage traffic and pedestrians, reduce conflicts and facilitate enforcement. The retention of all existing and creation of additional ranks will exacerbate existing problems.

In coming to the recommendations made we have tried to achieve a balance in accommodating the needs of all stakeholders. Within this there is inevitably a need for compromise to provide for the needs of the hackney trade for rank space and the needs of PHVs for space to drop off and pick up their passengers. For this reason we do not agree with the changes to the locations of ranks in Albert Road proposed by MHCA.

Much debate has taken place regarding the issue of Wilson Street. Paragraphs 5.56 – 5.59 outline proposals for a pilot to test the various options put forward starting with Wilson Street being retained and leading in stages to its full closure. Our recommendation is that whichever of these options is found to work best in practice is that which should be adopted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Feedback Received</th>
<th>TPi Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>particular. support the night time economy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wilson Street</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Street has over a number of years been the scene of disorder which has been</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compounded by vehicular traffic using the area. The area has a number of late night</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refreshment establishments which result in customers on foot traffic mixing with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vehicular traffic in an environment which is confined and congested. The area is also</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>used by vehicles including hackney carriages and private hire vehicles to access other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>areas of the town. The closure would ensure that other safer routes are utilised, leading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the super ranks and areas in which customers who have pre-booked private hire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vehicles are able to access in a safe manner without the loss of trade or disruption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the night time economy. It is believed that the introduction of the closure, the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>re-design of Albert Road and the introduction of both super ranks and a holding area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for private hire vehicles would enhance the trade, improve safety and reduce areas of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conflict which lead to disorder within the night time economy. Cleveland Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>together with all its partners wishes to promote the positive sides of Middlesbrough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and in particular its night time economy, by doing this it will increase footfall to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all types of business and continue to develop an environment which supports a wide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>variety of users.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian Guard Railing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MHCA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The MHCA agree to the erection of pedestrian railing outside Spenceleys, providing they</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are policed by Taxi Marshall’s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cleveland Police</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This was suggested by Cleveland Police in response to disorder at that location and the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continual arrival of hackney carriages and private hire vehicles plying for trade at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Feedback Received</td>
<td>TPi Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provision of the guard rail would allow the dispersal of patrons would ensure road safety at the location and assist in the overall management of the area. Cleveland Police would also recommend that similar guard rails be considered for installations outside the Empire on Corporation Road for all the above reasons.</td>
<td>Our recommendations aim to rationalise ranks in order to create a better environment, manage traffic and pedestrians, reduce conflicts and facilitate enforcement. The retention of all existing and creation of additional ranks will exacerbate existing problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Southfield Road / Linthorpe Road Ranks

**MHCA:**

**Southfield Road**

MHCA disagree with the introduction of a super rank on Southfield Lane and would like to see the existing ranks on Southfield Road extended with a view of a new rank being provided outside the Southfield.

**Linthorpe Road**

The rank outside The Crown nightclub to be extended, and the rank recommended near Garnet Street to be deployed further south outside KFC and to be extended as far as possible to Harvey’s.

A new rank to be provided on the western side, adjacent the rank outside Rigatonis, for seven cars and to be used as a feeder rank for the rank outside Harvey’s.

The rank outside Rigatonis to be retained.

**Cleveland Police:**

**Linthorpe Road / Southfield Road**

Cleveland Police support the recommendations for similar reasons stated above, it also enhances public safety in an area in which congestion occurs during the night time economy.

**Private Hire Holding Areas**

**MHCA**

In addition we believe that due to the number of side roads, the geometrical layout of Southfield Road and competition for road space the extension of the Southfield Road ranks would create difficulties in establishing useable ranks.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Feedback Received</th>
<th>TPi Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The MHCA is totally against the idea of a holding rank for P/H vehicles. The conditions</td>
<td>On May 25th 2010 Middlesbrough Council Licensing Committee withdrew the requirement for PHVs to return to base between jobs. Holding areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of their license states that they should return to their base when they are empty and</td>
<td>are therefore proposed in order to provide a location for PHVs to park up, away from the Town Centre, in order they don’t congregate in or drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the MHCA feel that this should be enforced. The MHCA also feel that having a holding</td>
<td>around the town until they receive their next job. This, coupled with other proposals such as the introduction of Taxi Marshall’s, a policy for PHV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rank gives the P/H vehicles an excuse for driving through the town centre empty to go to</td>
<td>town centre operation, sanctions if this is not complied with and the monitoring of this through use of mystery passengers, etc (see Table 5.3) will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the holding rank, thus giving them the opportunity to tout for fares.</td>
<td>make the job of ensuring they don’t undertake illegal plying for hire within the town easier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODA do not support PHV ranks and are worried by the idea. MODA consider that the PHV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ranks are just for Boro Cars.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney Carriage Driver 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you be able to explain to me the difference between a holding area and a pick up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>point as, far as I am aware the role of a hackney carriage is to provide a service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immediately from ranks which Middlesbrough Council has failed to provide but has decided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or is suggesting to provide PHV firms with holding area – seems so strange….I do not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believe for one minute if PHV firms were given a holding area that they would not abuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this…..Drivers feel that these are not holding areas but PHV ranks…..PHVs can wait at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the base where they are licensed from.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Police support this recommendation. There is an ongoing conflict relating to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>private hire vehicles picking up customers in breach of the regulations, this appears to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be driven to some degree in the requirement to return to base between fares. A holding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area in the location suggested answers many of present problems, it allows a practical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approach, does not establish a rank where customers would walk to in order to gain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>access to private hire vehicles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If established, then good working practices could be established with the private hire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>companies in relation to the areas in which customer are able to be picked up. This is a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Feedback Received</td>
<td>TPi Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive approach to an area which has caused conflict in the trade. The majority of customers when ordering a private hire vehicle want to be picked up at a particular location, however with careful planning many would go to a particular focal points which are identified with the trade were safe pickups are made to the benefit of the trade and the customer. The holding area would also ensure with good management that private hire vehicles do not cause disruption at the super rank areas. It is possible for both parts of the trade to work closely together to enjoy a strong customer base and increase the use of both hackney carriages and private hire vehicles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional feedback from Cleveland Police</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHV Policy for Town Centre operations (called Ply for Hire Policy - in draft Final Report)</strong></td>
<td>TPi agree with these comments and our recommendations reflect this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Police support this policy. the need to ensure that a clear policy is developed in relation to a ‘Ply for Hire Policy’, it is vital that a policy is clear and that the enforcement is carried out to support the industry as a whole, at the present time breaches cause conflict in the industry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Out of area vehicles policy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of a management system to deal with ‘out of area’ private vehicles would assist in ensuring that the trade in Middlesbrough is seen as a priority, however this needs to be achieved in a manner which ensures that no breach of the ability to have free trade and does not restrict those from outside Middlesbrough coming to support the economy as a whole.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy for New Ranks</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Police support this recommendation for the introduction of this policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rear Loading Vehicles</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MHCA</strong></td>
<td>TPi believe that issues of safety outweigh all other...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Feedback Received</td>
<td>TPI Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The MHCA feels that rear loading vehicles should be retained. They give a wider choice of vehicle at the disposal for the public, especially for the disabled as to the choice of vehicle needed for different needs.</td>
<td>issues with regard to rear loading wheelchair accessible hackneys and to persist with these having identified the risks could leave the Council and operators open to liability in the case of an accident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODA Not agree with side loading vehicle specification. At the vehicle testing some customers / passengers preferred the rear loading vehicle. Can TPI comment on this to confirm their view that the side loading vehicle is better.</td>
<td>At the vehicle audit the Fiat Doblo was the least preferred vehicle amongst all those present bar one and proved impossible for some semi ambulant disabled people to access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney Driver 2 I was at the meeting (vehicle audit) when we had several wheelchair accessible vehicles that got tested by various disabled people. I seem to remember that almost everybody there said the Fiat Doblo was a better Vehicle for wheelchair access, safety of securing the wheelchair in and most importantly people with motion sickness who cannot travel in a backward motion.</td>
<td>While, because of its high roof, it was the preferred vehicle of the one wheelchair user present, there are side loading vehicles available that would also meet this (and similar) persons needs and that offer a better ramp for access (the concern this person raised about the vehicle). This is coupled with other recommendations to compensate hackney operators having to purchase a more expensive vehicle to replace a Fiat Doblo at the time such vehicles come up for renewal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Driver Consultation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MHCA The MHCA is concerned to the claims of consultation taken with H/C drivers on rank. It is claimed that a survey was undertaken with 70no at a number of town centre ranks. At our last Association meeting, which was attended by approx 80no, the committee asked if any member had been consulted with these particular questions, the response was that no member was asked these questions, therefore the MHCA are concerned and confused with these claims and disagree with the findings of the survey. The MHCA also feel that the questions should have been sent to every H/C driver and feel that the results of the findings would have turned out different.</td>
<td>Consultation with drivers at ranks was undertaken by independent surveyors sub contracted by TPI. Each of these surveyors is required to provide TPI with a signed undertaking stating that surveys have been undertaken with those from whom they are required. TPI are in possession of these undertakings together with a written undertaking from the supervisor of the survey team stating that he personally visited surveyors at the ranks to check surveys were being properly carried out. Furthermore TPI have records of contact from the survey team supervisor raising questions from his surveyors that they have been asked by the drivers spoken to. It is also clear to TPI that the detailed nature of some of the responses to the survey could only have been obtained by asking drivers for their comments. All drivers surveyed were given an assurance that their response would be treated as confidential. In these circumstances it is possible they would not feel obliged to say they participated in the survey when asked either independently or in the context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney Driver 2 After going through your report I tend to agree with other members of the trade that this report is totally one sided and in many places false, for example I have not spoke to any one (and I’ve asked many) who said you have spoke to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Feedback Received</td>
<td>TPi Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>them although your report gives a figure of 70 drivers</td>
<td>of an open meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other general comments by Taxi Trade respondents</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hackney Driver 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be very grateful if you could tell me who authorised this survey at what cost....I am grateful to you for taking the time to read my letter and for you to understand how hackney carriage drivers feel towards Middlesbrough Council licensing department and private hire firms who think they are above the law. I am enclosing a picture of a data a PHV firm sending a message to drivers to park on hackney ranks and shout the job in. This was shown to the authority and nothing was done</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hackney Driver 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think this report is full of false information and inconsistencies and does not cover the full picture. You seem to be more interested in how things work in other towns and cities but other towns and cities don't have the problems we have with licensing officers who just don't give a damn and don't even stick by their own by-laws, private hire companies doing what they want cos they know they will get away with it and the Mayor who has much to say about things that he knows nothing about. In the current economic climate I think the cost of this survey could have been spent elsewhere as the survey is an absolute waste of time and money.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TPi are an established, professional, transport consultancy who have undertaken transport studies for over 1,000 separate clients, including taxi studies for over 100 different licensing authorities. We make every effort to present an independent, objective, balanced and accurate view of the findings of our research, in the conclusions we come to and the recommendations we make. We also do our utmost to provide value for money in all the work we are commissioned to undertake. This is the case in this study for Middlesbrough Council as much as it is for any other study.
Appendix B – Good Practice Elsewhere

Good Practice

1. Partnership Working

There are a number of licensing authority areas that are utilising partnership working to assist in bringing about improvements in the taxi sector. Partnerships in these areas take various forms and tackle a wide range of different issues. The following outlines a number of these partnerships and the issues they are addressing.

1.1 Birmingham BID

Broad Street in Birmingham is the main thoroughfare for Birmingham’s night time leisure district. In 2005 it was established as a Business Improvement District (BID) by local businesses to improve the area through better marketing and the introduction of a cleaner business environment. Broad Street Partnership Limited manage the BID with a board of directors who represent local businesses, property owners and developers, West Midlands Police, Birmingham City Council, the Leisure Forum (representing bars and clubs) and the City Centre Neighbourhood Forum.

Since the start of the BID, a number of changes have happened on Broad Street, the first of which, the introduction of a team of Street Wardens, commenced in July 2005. The wardens work closely in partnership with West Midlands Police, venue door supervisors, taxi companies and other agencies to prevent crime and to reduce the fear of crime. There is also a late night Taxi Marshal scheme in operation on Friday and Saturday evenings from 10pm to 4am which was set up alongside the introduction of super ranks for hackneys serving Broad Street. Together this has had a significant impact in improving access to taxi services for visitors to the district.

The activities of the BID are funded through the BID levy, which is a small percentage of a businesses’ rateable value, typically around 1%. The BID levy is collected by the local authority into a ring-fenced account (called the BID Revenue Account) and passed to the BID Company for use on projects and services which are set out in the initial BID proposal.

1.2 Essex

Essex County Council have been working to establish Quality Taxi Partnerships (QTP) in each of the 13 District Council Licensing Authority areas in the County since 2004. They have established capital funds, for taxi infrastructure improvements, through the Local Transport Plan to support the work and overtime 6 of the 13 Districts have agreed to participate and further 4 are considering doing so.

Each existing partnership includes the County Council, the District Council, the Police, the Fire and Rescue service, members of the taxi trade and other stakeholders (PCT’s, Town Centre Managers, Community Groups, representatives of night time Leisure facilities, etc) according to the issues they aim to address. There is no prescribed formula with each District identifying a slightly different range of issues in their area that they want the QTP to tackle. However, there is overlap between many in terms of addressing night time security and anti-social behaviour at ranks, driver training, access for the disabled and generally improving the quality of the offer available from taxis.
The first QTP was established in Basildon supported by a grant from the Urban Bus Challenge Fund. This provided significant financial resources to pilot the QTP and therefore enabled it to trial a wide range initiatives. The objectives established for the Basildon QTP were:

- To improve the customer care skills of Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle drivers
- To improve on-street waiting facilities for customers
- To provide priority access through the use of selected bus lanes within the Basildon District
- To improve working relationships and understanding between the partners
- To assist in developing locally deliverable training packages for drivers on passenger care, disability awareness, licensing, legal matters, safe driving skills, etc
- To provide a subsidised travel scheme
- To liaise regularly with all Taxi Operators in Basildon
- To improve quality of service, customer care and assistance for people with special needs

Some of the initiatives pursued in order to achieve these objectives include:

**Taxi Liaison Officer** – Funds enabled a Taxi Liaison Officer (TLO) to be employed and located within the local Council, Community Economic and Development section. The officer, an ex Taxi and Security Driver, acted as an independent negotiator between all members of the partnership and other external organisations.

**Marketing** – Various marketing material was produced including a QTP Taxi logo – tax disc sized window (non stick) ‘sticker’ for display by QTP operators in each of their vehicles to indicate to prospective passengers it and its driver meet QTP standards, a QTP Pocket Guide – credit card sized, fold out leaflet, explaining what the QTP and its operators provide and listing QTP members and contact numbers, a QTP Window Sticker – ‘We support the QTP’ sticker for facilities that hold a stock of the QTP Pocket Guide to display to customers, a QTP Poster Series – 4 posters illustrating the different groups the QTP is targeting as the basis for poster campaigns to promote the QTP in places where hard to reach and excluded groups may be found (i.e. surgeries, community organisations, job centres, etc), a QTP Web Site – a web site has been established as part of Basildon Councils site and Press Releases – use of the County and District Council marketing teams to issue press releases at key development stages

**Staff Training** – Funds available enabled the QTP to offer all existing drivers licensed at the time it was implemented and also some schedulers the opportunity to undertake the Passenger Assistance Training Scheme (PATS). This is a nationally recognised scheme developed by the Community Transport Association. An in house training programme was also devised. The Licensing Officer provided training on licensing and legal issues, the Police on driving techniques and safety and the local Disability Information and Advice Line (DIAL) provided disability awareness training. Finally a third phase of training was devised on fire evacuation procedures and endorsed by the Essex Fire and Rescue Service.

**Taxi Infrastructure Improvements** – New ranks, new shelters, improved information at ranks, improved access routes to ranks, improved lighting, improved signage and markings, opening up of bus lanes to taxi/PHVs. Included in this were improvements at Festival Leisure Park the main centre of night time activity in the town. Alongside improvements to the approach to queuing at ranks serving the Park links were made...
with security staff of the facilities there to better manage taxi demand and address anti-social behaviour.

**Police Liaison Officers** – Each of the main operators/radio circuits in Basildon have been allocated a liaison officer by the Police in order they can raise issues and report incidents on the road to them and receive relevant police information (traffic, crime, safety, etc) from them.

**Drivers Map** – The TLO was approached by a number of operators who encountered difficulties finding some roads in Basildon that did not appear on most maps available. The TLO was able to work with the Council to identify a road map that included these and make this available to operators.

**Public Meetings/Events/Community Groups, etc** – The TLO attended various public events and community group meetings to raise awareness of the QTP and the service provided by its operators in presentations, by answering questions, distributing QTP literature, demonstrating training, etc.

**Public Information** – Arrangements were made with operators to distribute literature to passengers on home security measures and the need for a fire alarm, on behalf of the Police and Fire service. They have also helped to identify older people eligible to receive a free fire alarm/smoke detector.

**Community Networks** – Articles about the QTP were placed in community newsletters, on web sites of community organisations, on hospital TV and internal advertising screens, in RADAR handbook, etc to raise awareness of the QTP and the transport services available from operators.

**Assistance to the Police/Licensing Officers** – The TLO and Operators have been able to assist the Police and Licensing officers to identify unlicensed or ‘rogue’ drivers/vehicles or deal quickly and more easily with passenger complaints.

**Driver Information** – The QTP disseminated information to drivers on behalf of stakeholders, for example: information from the Department for Transport on the Disability Discrimination Act requirements; ECC guidance on working with people with learning difficulties; and information from the police on vigilance on terrorism.

**CCTV pilot** – Working in conjunction with a number of partners the QTP supported a pilot by Basildon Council to examine the benefits of CCTV in both hackney and PHV vehicles.

**Tackling Drink Drivers** – The QTP organised a promotional campaign, in conjunction with the Police and local pubs, to raise awareness of the dangers of drink driving and of QTP operators as an alternative transport solution. A ‘we support the’ QTP sticker is displayed by all pubs that have a stock of QTP pocket guides available and these can be used to identify contact numbers for QTP operators.

**Subsidised Taxi Scheme (STS)** - STS works by partners (PCTs, Hospitals, the Council, Connexions, Job Centre plus, etc and individuals) who register to use the scheme, each being given secure access to a web based transport order request system. They can then go on-line and post journey requests as and when these are required. Each journey request is ‘published’ to all Taxi/PHV providers who need to be QTP members to participate in the scheme. These operators quote competitively for transport requests and receive confirmation of any quotes accepted via the web site and by text. On this basis STS operates solely as a broker of transport.
Bus Lanes – the County Council is in the process of finalising plans to extend the use of bus lanes to taxis on an incremental basis, starting in Basildon with a lane alongside the bus station that taxi operators have asked to be able to use.

QTP Passenger Charter – a document for each QTP member to display in their vehicles explaining to passengers what can be expected from a QTP operator and also what is expected of the passenger. Information on who passengers can contact if they are not satisfied with the service is also provided.

QTP Partner Agreement – a signed agreement between all partners that make up the QTP management group and each operator joining the QTP, outlining what is expected of each as a QTP partner.

QTP Certificate – a certificate presented to each operator joining the QTP.

STS Partner Agreement – a signed agreement between an STS partner and STS outlining the term and conditions for use of the scheme.

The logo, branding, documents and publicity material produced for the QTP in Basildon have been rolled out for use in other parts of the County and the County Council are preparing to consider sharing these with other licensing areas, on request. This can offer significant savings to other areas who can simply substitute their name on the material for that used in Essex. Some examples of the materials produced are attached at the end of this appendix.

1.3 Bournemouth

TAXI drivers in Bournemouth have recently been allowed to drop off and pick up fares at bus stops without being fined. Following consultation with the trade the council have agreed that a taxi can park at a bus stop providing it is reasonable for them to set down customers. Discussions are ongoing with drivers about the use of other locations around the town such as the disabled bays and locations for drop-offs in the area of schools. There is also a proposal being considered to create a formal quality taxi partnership, which will establish a Code of Conduct for the use of designated locations that will be binding on both parties.

1.4 Stockton on Tees

Stockton on Tees established a Quality Taxi Partnership to consider the introduction of CCTV cameras in taxis and driver shields in order to address concerns about personal safety expressed by both drivers and passengers. Through the partnership the Council are also working with the trade to improve standards and make taxis easier to use by elderly residents and people with disabilities.

1.5 Portsmouth

The police in Portsmouth formed a partnership with the trade to tackle taxi crime following a survey of tax drivers in the City. Of the 397 who completed the survey, nearly 60% had been a victim of crime whilst working as a taxi driver in the previous 12 months. However, nearly 70% admitted to not reporting incidents to police. There were various reasons given for not reporting incidents, but most said that they did not think the police would be interested.
The majority of drivers surveyed said that making off without payment was the most common offence, with criminal damage, verbal or racial abuse, and assault also featuring in the responses. The partnership aims to build confidence in the police to be able to report these incidents and know they will be dealt with properly. Each driver taking part in the project displays a yellow car sticker to promote their involvement.

1.6 Leeds

Leeds have introduced a Quality Taxi Partnership alongside the use of Marshal’s to address issues of enforcement at ranks in the City. Marshals are connected by radio to the police and taxi drivers and use these to inform drivers when people are waiting at ranks and which ranks have spaces available.

1.7 Sheffield

Sheffield have established a partnership to encourage drivers to work together and use their radios to tell each other when people are waiting at ranks.

1.8 Others

In addition to the above the following Quality Taxi Partnerships have been identified in other parts of the UK. They are listed below together with what is understood to be their main areas of focus.

- Bognor Regis – Forum for liaison
- Brent – Women’s safe taxi
- Derwent – Steering group
- Eastbourne – Trust card and night watch
- Fylde, Lancashire – Forum for liaison
- Milton Keynes – Subsidised taxi scheme
- Sandwell – Integration with Borough wide transport co-ordination initiative
- Southampton – Forum for liaison and Driver training
- Welwyn Garden City, Hertfordshire – Quality standards
- Wiltshire – LTP proposals

2. Taxi Marshall’s

2.1 Manchester

During a pilot scheme Manchester's Taxi Marshals were backed by an overwhelming majority of taxi drivers and their passengers. As a result they have become a permanent feature in the City. The aim of the Taxi Marshals is to make it safer for people travelling home from the City Centre between 10pm and 3am on Friday and Saturday nights. They are financed by an increase in hackney carriage fares which in turn has enabled an increase to the hackney carriage vehicle license fee of about £3 per week.

The Marshals, all wear distinctive uniforms, and maintain order and prevent crime and anti-social behaviour at four of Manchester's busiest taxi ranks - Albert Square, Piccadilly Gardens, the Printworks and Deansgate Locks. Each Marshal has radio contact with the city's CCTV Control Centre and Police. Consideration is also being given to extending their duties so that they can take action against vehicles illegally plying for hire.
2.2 Nottinghamshire

On Fridays and Saturdays between 2200hrs and 0300 hrs two taxi marshals operate in both Worksop and Retford Town Centres. The purpose of the service is to ensure that people waiting for taxis queue in an orderly way and do not jump the queue. If any situations develop that they are unable to control, they are in radio contact with the Police and will call for help. The CCTV control room and the street pastors are also aware that the Marshals are in place. The scheme was introduced by Bassetlaw and Newark & Sherwood Community Safety Partnership using funds obtained from the Home Office’s Fund for tackling issues related to the Night Time Economy. The marshals all wear high visibility jackets marked with the Partnership logo.

2.3 London

The Safer City Partnership runs a marshalled taxi rank on Liverpool Street, outside the train station. The rank operates on Wednesday, Thursday and Friday evenings from 10.00pm to 2.00am. During these times two marshals, who are licensed taxi drivers supported by police officers, aid passengers to get a taxi to their destination and provide a safe waiting environment. The aim is to address concerns of people who feel anxious about using public transport at night when transport options are more limited.

2.4 Llandudno

Llandudno launched a taxi marshal project aimed at helping revellers to get home after a night out. The trained marshals run taxi stands on Friday and Saturday nights from 2100 BST until 0100 BST. The project is supported by Conwy council, North Wales Police, Pubwatch, Llandudno Town Council, and Conwy Community Safety Partnership.

The marshals’ main function is to provide re-assurance, in conjunction with the police, and provide a focal point to help the public to disperse from the town centre. They are trained and hold licenses issued by Security Industry Authority. Each has a radio link to North Wales Police, Conwy’s CCTV network control room, taxi drivers and venues around the town. In addition to helping to ensure passengers queues are safe and orderly, the marshals’ also aim to reduce antisocial behaviour and report unlicensed and uninsured vehicles.

2.5 Brighton

Brighton, have four security guards patrolling city centre taxi ranks in the city between midnight and 4am on Saturday and Sunday mornings. The scheme is funded by the Home Office’s Fund for tackling issues related to the Night Time Economy. It has been welcomed by taxi drivers, police and councillors as the latest step in controlling late-night disorder in the city.

Unite Security provides the guards to patrol West Street and East Street taxi ranks. They are briefed to keep queues orderly, stop people too drunk to travel from getting in cabs and stop people carrying food and drink on board. They are equipped with NightSafe radios to link them up to police CCTV operators, police officers and other security firms. They also have the power to issue “yellow cards” for antisocial behaviour, which can lead to people being banned from the city centre.

2.6 St Helier, Jersey
In order to maintain the £25,000 per annum needed to support the St Helier taxi marshals scheme it has been agreed that Cabs can now carry advertising for the first time. It is hoped that the cash raised from will be enough to keep the taxi marshals, established initially by Safer St Helier Community Partnership with States funding, in place.

2.7 Havering

The Havering Taxi Marshall Scheme:

- Provides a safe waiting area until a taxi arrives and safe transport home for people using city centre facilities late at night
- Reduces the risk of disorder arising from those using the selected taxi points
- Enhances security for the drivers of hackney carriage and private hire vehicles
- Promotes pro-active partnership working between those with a role to play in the evening economy
- Helps to disperse people from the town centre quickly and safely

Marshall’s operate at the main rank in the town on a Friday and Saturday Night between 10.30pm and 3.30am. The Marshall’s role is to help maintain an orderly queue. People looking for a cab home will join the queue and marshals will direct them into the first available taxi. The aim is to allow people to catch licensed vehicles in a controlled and safe environment. They work in two’s, wear hi visibility fluorescent jackets, and each have a radio which has a direct link to all venues in the town centre and the CCTV control room. If disorder occurs Marshal’s can call on the police for support.

2.8 Greenwich, 02 Arena

Transport for London (TfL) and AEG Europe, the owners and operators of The O2 have agreed to provide a marshalled taxi rank service at North Greenwich station between 9.30pm and 12.30am on Thursday to Sunday nights when ever there is an event at the arena. The Marshal’s will manage passenger queues and ensure people get a taxi quickly and safely. Taxi marshals have been used at North Greenwich taxi rank in the past and proven successful and popular with drivers and passengers alike.

2.9 Oldham

Oldham Council is proposing the implementation of a Hackney Carriage and Bus Only Zone during the periods on Friday and Saturday nights when there is the greatest risk of disorder. Private hire and other private vehicles will be prevented from entering the Zone. However, drop-off zones will be created for both these to ensure customer access to the centre of the Zone. There will also be a revised taxi queuing system and a Private Hire Dispersal point introduced, operated by Taxi Marshall’s employed by the Council. These Marshall’s will be able to take bookings for PHVs, as an overflow, if hackneys are not available. The aim of this is to enable members of the public to get home safely after an evening out in the town and minimise the risk of them being enticed to use unlicensed vehicles and drivers.
Basildon Quality Taxi Partnership Agreement

This voluntary agreement is made between Basildon District Council, Essex County Council, Essex Police and Taxi/Private Hire Operators to improve the quality of the taxi service available in the Basildon District geographical area.

The Agreement will operate for a period of two years from the date of signature. At the end of two years the Agreement may be extended for a further period subject to the concurrence of all parties. The Agreement may be terminated by any party subject to a minimum notice period of 3 months. If an operator is found to grossly abuse the status inferred by membership of the partnership or fails to meet the terms of their license this agreement may be terminated without notice.

Basildon District Council will undertake regular monitoring of the elements contained within this Agreement during the two year period and will make recommendations for changing the Agreement subject to consensus by the signatories.

The Agreement fits with the Local Transport Plan objectives to:
- Promote accessibility to everyday facilities for all.
- Meet the needs of people without access to a car.
- Reduce crime and fear of crime on the transport system.
- Improve the quality and quantity of transport services.
- Support services for people who cannot use conventional services.

The objectives of the partnership are:
- To improve the customer care skills of drivers.
- To improve on-street waiting facilities for customers.
- To provide priority access through the use of selected bus lanes throughout the district.
- To provide a subsidised travel scheme for identified groups within the Basildon district.
- To improve working relationships and understanding between partners.
- To assist in developing a locally deliverable training package.

None of the parties to this Agreement can work alone to achieve their common goal. Each recognises the essential need to work together to achieve a better future for taxi services in the Basildon area.

This partnership Agreement sets out the principles for all parties to actively pursue delivery of real improvements in the taxi user experience.
Partner Responsibilities
Essex County Council accepts responsibility for improving priority access through the use of new and existing bus lanes and undertaking necessary highway requirements for provision of permanent taxi ranks in Basildon, Pitsea and Wickford. We accept responsibility for the reimbursement of fares through a subsidised travel system for those users who qualify, for the first 2 years of the scheme or the duration of funding (whichever is the shorter). We will promote the Quality Taxi Partnership through use of appropriate media including the Council’s website.

Basildon District Council subject to receiving appropriate funding from the County Council, accepts responsibility for informing all operators of the availability of training for existing licence holders and for making this a basic requirement of licence holders. We will provide, as necessary, through a third party, hardware and software to operators to operate the subsidised travel system. We will promote the availability of free driver training to all licensed drivers as at 31st December 2004. We take responsibility for the regular maintenance and repairs required to taxi rank infrastructure. We will promote the Taxi Quality Partnership through use of appropriate media including the Council’s website. We will publish a Passenger Charter in consultation with our Partners, which will include details of how to complain and provide feedback on the Quality Taxi Partnership. With our partners we will monitor the effectiveness of the Quality Taxi Partnership. To achieve this we will appoint a Liaison Officer for a fixed 2 year period and organise regular meetings of the partnership.

The Operator accepts responsibility for ensuring all their drivers undertake Passenger Assistance Training (PATS) or Driver Training to NVQ level 2 through an approved organisation and attend sessions on Licensing and Legal matters, Safer Driving Skills and Disability Awareness Training. The Operator will undertake to ensure drivers take pride in themselves and their workplace by ensuring that they and their vehicles are clean and tidy and project a professional image at all times. To maintain a high standard of on-street infrastructure provision the Operator through their drivers will have a responsibility to report details of any damage observed.

Operators will be expected to indicate their membership of the Partnership by including the Partnership logo on their vehicles, letterhead, advertising literature and other publications. Where Operators so wish they may adopt the partnership livery. Operators can obtain further information on the use of the Partnership logo from the QTP Liaison Officer.

Essex Police in Basildon are committed to working with partners to improve the provision of taxi services in the district.

Early Projects and Commitments
Essex County Council have successfully obtained funding through the Urban Bus Challenge Bid to commence each element of the Quality Taxi Partnership. This funding will allow for PATS to be available to all drivers licensed before 31st December 2004 from 2004/5 onwards, for the purchase and implementation of a subsidised travel system for predetermined groups. Additionally three shelters will be installed during 2005/6 and 2006/7 and thereafter maintained by the District Council.

Operators will be expected to ensure all drivers licensed after 31st December 2004 also receive training.

Signed: John Gault
on behalf of Essex County Council

Signed: Leah Douglas
on behalf of Basildon District Council

Signed: Glenn Coton
on behalf of Essex Police

Signed: Martin Trewilton
Community Safety Liaison Officer/ Essex County Fire and Rescue Service

Signed:
Operator name:
Passenger Charter

Passengers can expect taxi operators to:
- provide a presentable, courteous, helpful driver who wears their identity badge
- drive safely in accordance with the Law
- take you to your destination by the most direct route
- be punctual and be a reliable transport service
- provide clean and well-maintained vehicles, inside and out appropriate to the needs of the customer
- show a clearly displayed fare chart
- charge fares at an agreed price
- provide a driver who does not smoke or use a mobile phone whilst driving
- provide trained drivers to assist passengers with their mobility needs
- provide clean, safe and well-maintained waiting facilities at taxi ranks

Licensed taxi operators can expect passengers to:
- treat licensed vehicles and drivers with respect
- be in a fit state to travel, if not they may be refused carriage
- have sufficient means to pay for the journey about to be undertaken
- wear a seatbelt and ensure any child travelling with them also wears a seatbelt
- not smoke whilst in a licensed vehicle
Customer Priorities

The taxi operators opposite have signed up to provide all the benefits listed in this section.

User 101 driver have excellent training in legal and safety issues and how to assist people with a variety of mobility problems.

Should you have any concern about the service you receive, you should contact the operating company direct. If you are not happy with the service obtained, you should contact your local Licensing Officer.

Licensing Officer: The Buildings Centre, St Mary’s Square, Basildon SS14 2DL.
Tel: 01375 294424

Taxi Operators

– Working in partnership for your community

The companies listed below are part of this scheme.

A & B Taxis | 01268 555555 | Julian Gill | 07899 972962
A-Taxis | 01268 277575 | Fonda Cox | 07840 432363
Brewers Taxis | 01268 471111 | Ian Smith | 07965 441625
Mayflower Cars | 01268 624900 | John Burton | 07767 822095
Nichols | 01268 454511 | John Nicklow | 07809 406090
One to One Cars | 01268 737283 | Simon Stevens | 07827 992828
Sutton Cars | 01268 411941 | Mark Everitt | 07975 377317
Swift Cars | 01277 274775 | Mark Shefton | 07809 858222
Vella Cars | 01268 444488 | Martin Smith | 07856 744805

Amit Chauhan | 07774 199821
Anil Ali | 01268 545578
Bish Cumberbatch | 07855 566093
Biren Javali | 01268 490103
Biren Javali | 01268 651221
David Blackwell | 01268 555555

David Yates | 07798 174299

Providing you with a quality taxi service

To find out how this can benefit you and for your FREE taxi information guide

call 01268 294341
Email qtp@basildon.gov.uk

TPi: Middlesbrough Taxi Review Final Report
- 163 -
July 2010
Certificate

This is to certify that

Allied Radio Taxis Limited

is a member of the Basildon Quality Taxi Partnership

Leah Douglas
Basildon District Council
November 2006

Glenn Caton
Essex Police
November 2006

Fran Garthwaite
Essex County Council
November 2006
Appendix C – Outline Proposal for a Middlesbrough Quality Taxi Partnership

Introduction: The following outlines a potential structure for a Middlesbrough Quality Taxi Partnership. However, ultimately, the structure, documentation and activities adopted should be that which is acceptable and decided by consultation between all potential partners. In so doing and within the functioning of the partnership once formed, all partners should have equal status.

Aim: To provide a framework to facilitate joint working between all parties seeking to improve the provision of Taxi services in Middlesbrough

Objectives:

- To improve the provision of Taxi services serving the night time economy in Middlesbrough Town Centre
- To improve the provision of Taxi services for Disabled and Mobility Impaired people
- To advise on “hot spots” requiring enforcement attention
- To undertake other Taxi based initiatives for mutual benefit of stakeholders and the wider community in Middlesbrough

Potential Participants:

- Taxi and PHV Associations
- Taxi Operators (Hackney and PHV)
- Middlesbrough Council, Licensing Officer/s
- Town Centre Manager
- Transportation Department (Planning & Public Transport)
- Chamber of Commerce
- Leisure and Retail Facilities
- Police
- Taxi Marshall’s
- Interested Community Organisations (that can represent the interest of users and/or potential users)
- Others (to be decided)

Documentation:

- Simple Voluntary Agreement, outlining broadly the role, responsibilities and expectations of the main participants (time limited & including the means to walk away from the QTP if any partner does not meet their responsibilities)
- Membership Certificate
- Passenger Charter, including complaints procedure
- Joint Marketing Material (ie Posters, Credit Card sized fold out leaflet, Web Site)
- Logo and Branding
- Vehicle Window Sticker
- Monitoring Forms (ie Customer Satisfaction Form)
- Others (to be decided)

The Voluntary Agreement could seek the following broad commitments from the main QTP participants

Middlesbrough Council
- To administer the QTP
- To employ Taxi Marshall’s
- To co-ordinate enforcement activities with the Police, Taxi Marshall’s, Taxi operators and the business community
- To undertake regular reviews of ranks and PHV holding areas
- To promote the QTP and Taxi services in general

Middlesbrough Police
- To establish and enforce a PCV policy
- To assist Middlesbrough Council with enforcement
- To work with all partners to address issues of security and anti social behaviour relating to the Taxi sector

Taxi Operators
- To follow (as appropriate) Town Centre Hackney and/or PHV policy guidance
- To assist Middlesbrough Council with enforcement
- To take up driver training opportunities
- To improve the accessibility of taxi services for disabled people
- To ensure a high standard of taxi services and infrastructure are available to the people of Middlesbrough at all times

Town Centre Management
- To ensure the needs of taxi services are taken into account in all aspects of Town Centre development
- To promote the QTP

Leisure and Retail Facilities
- To assist Middlesbrough Council with enforcement
- To promote the QTP to customers
- To encourage customers to use taxi services in an appropriate and safe manner

Membership:

Associate Member – Any organisation or individual prepared to sign up to the voluntary agreement can join the basic QTP.

Full Member - Will be required to meet the following conditions to obtain vehicle sticker/s and certificate:
- Be committed to providing Driver Training
- Have conformed to Accessible Vehicle requirements
- Demonstrate how they intend to follow Hackney or PHV town centre policy guidance
- Agree to participate in monitoring

Management:

Administered by Middlesbrough Council in conjunction with a small management and decision making group, made up of at least 1 representative nominated by each of the following:
- Hackney operators
- PHV operators
- Licensing Authority
- Police
- Taxi Marshall’s
- Leisure Outlets
- Community (User) Groups

Management group to meet around 4/6 times a year
All QTP partners to receive meeting agendas and minutes of meetings
In addition full partnership to meet once a year

Initial Management Team Activities:

- Promote the recommendations of this report, accepted or as amended by Middlesbrough Council
- Establish Taxi Vehicle Specifications
- Establish Hackney and PHV Town Centre policies
- Establish QTP logo and branding
- Establish QTP Documents
- Identify and promote responses to "hot spots" requiring enforcement attention
- Fundraising
- Receive, consider and comment on the outputs of monitoring and reviews
- Develop Taxi Marketing initiatives
- Consider proposals for further QTP initiatives
- Consider 'membership applications'
Appendix D – Population per Hackney in Middlesbrough compared to other Licensing Authorities – 364:1