



Licensing and Public Safety Committee

Agenda and Reports

For consideration on

Wednesday, 12th September
2012

In the Council Chamber, Town Hall, Chorley

At 2.00 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

Dear Councillor

LICENSING AND PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE - WEDNESDAY, 12TH SEPTEMBER 2012

You are invited to attend a meeting of the Licensing and Public Safety Committee to be held in the Council Chamber, Town Hall, Chorley on Wednesday, 12th September 2012 commencing at 2.00 pm.

AGENDA

1. **Apologies for absence**

2. **Declarations of Any Interests**

Members are reminded of their responsibility to declare any personal interest in respect of matters contained in this agenda. If the interest arises **only** as result of your membership of another public body or one to which you have been appointed by the Council then you only need to declare it if you intend to speak.

If the personal interest is a prejudicial interest, you must withdraw from the meeting. Normally you should leave the room before the business starts to be discussed. You do, however, have the same right to speak as a member of the public and may remain in the room to enable you to exercise that right and then leave immediately. In either case you must not seek to improperly influence a decision on the matter.

3. **Minutes (Pages 1 - 2)**

To confirm the enclosed minutes of the Licensing and Public Safety Committee held on 20 June 2012.

4. **Minutes of the Licensing Act 2003 sub Committee's**

- a) Minutes of meeting Thursday, 14 June 2012 of Licensing Act 2003 Sub-Committee
(Pages 3 - 4)

To consider for approval the enclosed minutes.

- b) Minutes of meeting Wednesday, 8 August 2012 of Licensing Act 2003 Sub-Committee (Pages 5 - 6)

To consider for approval the enclosed minutes.

5. **Hackney Carriage Service - Unmet Demand Survey (Pages 7 - 108)**

Report of the Director of People and Places (enclosed)

6. **Any other item(s) that the Chair decides is/are urgent**

Yours sincerely



Gary Hall
Chief Executive

Dianne Scambler
Democratic and Member Services Officer
E-mail: dianne.scambler@chorley.gov.uk
Tel: (01257) 515034
Fax: (01257) 515150

Distribution

1. Agenda and reports to all Members of the Licensing and Public Safety Committee (Councillor Marion Lowe (Chair), Councillor Anthony Gee (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Jean Cronshaw, Matthew Crow, David Dickinson, Doreen Dickinson, Graham Dunn, Keith Iddon, Hasina Khan, Paul Leadbetter, Adrian Lowe, Mick Muncaster, Steve Murfitt, Pauline Phipps, Alan Platt, Ralph Snape and John Walker for attendance.
2. Agenda and reports to Simon Clark (Head of Environment), Paul Carter (Public Protection Co-ordinator), Legal Services and Dianne Scambler for attendance.
3. Agenda and reports to Licensing and Public Safety Committee reserves (Councillors Julia Berry and Danny Gee) for information.

**This information can be made available to you in larger print
or on audio tape, or translated into your own language.
Please telephone 01257 515118 to access this service.**

આ માહિતીનો અનુવાદ આપની પોતાની ભાષામાં કરી શકાય છે. આ સેવા સરળતાથી મેળવવા માટે કૃપા કરી, આ નંબર પર ફોન કરો: 01257 515822

ان معلومات کا ترجمہ آپ کی اپنی زبان میں بھی کیا جاسکتا ہے۔ یہ خدمت استعمال کرنے کیلئے براہ مہربانی اس نمبر پر ٹیلیفون

01257 515823

کیجئے:

Licensing and Public Safety Committee**Wednesday, 20 June 2012**

Present: Councillor Marion Lowe (Chair), Councillor Anthony Gee (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Jean Cronshaw, Matthew Crow, David Dickinson, Doreen Dickinson, Graham Dunn, Keith Iddon, Hasina Khan, Paul Leadbetter, Adrian Lowe, Steve Murfitt, Alan Platt, Ralph Snape and John Walker

Substitutes: Councillor Danny Gee

Also in attendance: Zeynab Patel (Solicitor), Paul Carter (Public Protection Co-ordinator) and Dianne Scambler (Democratic and Member Services Officer)

12.LPS.41 WELCOME

The new Chair, welcomed all the new Members to the Licensing and Public Safety Committee for 2012/13.

12.LPS.42 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mick Muncaster and Pauline Phipps.

12.LPS.43 DECLARATIONS OF ANY INTERESTS

No declarations of any interest were received.

12.LPS.44 MINUTES

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the Licensing and Public Safety Committee held on 7 March 2012 be held as a correct record for signing by the Chair.

12.LPS.45 MINUTES OF THE GENERAL LICENSING SUB COMMITTEE'S

RESOLVED – That the meetings of the General Licensing Sub Committee's held on 7 March, 4 April and 23 May 2012 be held as a correct record.

12.LPS.46 LICENSING ACT 2003 REFORMS

The Director of People and Places submitted a report informing Members of the recent changes to the Licensing Act 2003 and sought approval of their implementation.

The Committee were informed that recent changes to the Licensing Act 2003 that came in to effect in April 2012 would enable some greater scope for representations to be made at licensing application stage and suspend licences where payment has not been received. To allow these changes to be implemented Members were asked to grant delegated powers to the Director of People and Places.

Members were also asked to note additional changes in relation to the following processes:

- Changes to Temporary Event Notices (TENs)
- Lowering evidential thresholds
- Removing the 'vicinity test' and publicity of applications
- Health bodies as Responsible Authorities
- Licensing Policies
- Sales of alcohol to children
- Relevant offences

RESOLVED

1. **That delegated authority be granted to the Director of People and Places to act on behalf of the Licensing Authority when required under the Licensing Act 2003.**
2. **That delegated authority be granted to the Director of People to suspend premises licences where fee payment is not received.**

12.LPS.47 LICENSING PERFORMANCE AND ACTIVITY REPORT

Members of the Committee received a report of the Director of People and Places which detailed performance of the Councils licensing function between the period 1 April to 31 May 2012.

Information was shown against each of the following categories:

- General Licensing
- Taxi Licensing
- Licensing Act 2003
- Gambling Act 2005
- House to house collections

Members requested that in future this information be provided for all Members of the Council through use of intheknow.

RESOLVED – That the information contained within the report be noted.

Chair

Licensing Act 2003 Sub-Committee**Thursday, 14 June 2012**

Present: Councillor Anthony Gee (Chair) and Councillors Paul Leadbetter and John Walker

Also in attendance: Councillors Harold Heaton (Chisnall Ward)

12.LAS.13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

12.LAS.14 DECLARATIONS OF ANY INTERESTS

No declarations of any interest were received.

12.LAS.15 DETERMINATION OF APPLICATION FOR A PREMISES LICENCE MADE UNDER SECTION 17 OF THE LICENSING ACT 2003, FOR THE PREMISES BAKU LOUNGE.

The Licensing Sub Committee considered the application for the granting of a premises licence made by Mr Martin Jones of Baku Lounges Limited, Charter House, Pittman Way, Preston PR2 9ZD in respect of Baku Lounge, Preston Road, Charnock Richard, Chorley in light of representations made towards the application under Section 18 of the Licensing Act 2003.

The Council had received an application on 18 April 2012 and officers were invited by the applicant to discuss the application prior to its submission to provide clarity to the proposed application as the premises from a whole benefits from an existing premises licence for the Hunters Lodge Hotel.

The applicant, Mr Jones was explicit in that he was providing a new venture and did not want to be seen in any way to be associated with the licensable activities that are established at Hunters Lodge Hotel. Mr Hunt, the premises licence holder at the Hunters Lodge Hotel had agreed to apply to vary his premises licence to remove from the plan of his premises licence the area being applied for within this application.

Lancashire Constabulary, along with officers from the Council met with Mr Jones to discuss the proposed operating schedule and Mr Jones agreed to a number of additional conditions being attached to the licence..

The Licensing Sub Committee has carefully considered the applicant's written and verbal representations for the application for the granting of a premises licence and have also taken into account all the representations both written and verbal that had been made by local residents who were objecting to the proposals.

Members noted that no responsible authorities had made representations about the application. Members considered that the concerns expressed about highway safety and the issues reported regarding the current premises, held by a different premises licence holder, which has not been in use for some time are not grounds for refusing the application or for imposing further conditions.

Members also considered that the conditions proposed by the applicant subject to the amendments below are sufficient to meeting the licensing objectives.

The Sub Committee have considered the amended guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act, together with the Council's Statement of Licensing Policy, in particular those paragraphs referred to within the report. The Sub Committee also considered Human Rights implications, in particular Article 6, Article 8 and Article 1 of the First Protocol of the Proportionality Principle and the changes to the Act that have been made by the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011.

The Sub Committee **RESOLVED (2:1) to grant the application as set out in the report subject to two amendments:**

The condition at paragraph 6(a) of the report shall read "To close all doors and windows at 22.00 when regulated entertainment is being provided, save for access and egress.

The condition at paragraph 6(c) shall read "to provide signage to the exits for the premises, around the decking area and in the smoking area to 1) alert patrons to proceed with care when leaving the premises 2) to please leave quietly having respect for neighbours when leaving the premises.

Those persons who made relevant representations within the statutory period have the right to appeal to the local magistrates' court within 21 days of receiving notice of this decision.

The applicant has the right of appeal against the imposition of conditions on the licence within the same period.

Chair

Licensing Act 2003 Sub-Committee**Wednesday, 8 August 2012****Present:** Councillor Marion Lowe (Chair) and Councillors Jean Cronshaw and Alan Platt**12.LAS.16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

12.LAS.17 DECLARATIONS OF ANY INTERESTS

No declarations of any interests were received.

12.LAS.18 APPLICATION TO VARY A PREMISES LICENCE UNDER SECTION OF THE LICENSING ACT FOR THE CARDWELL ARMS, CHORLEY ROAD, ADLINGTON, CHORLEY PR6 9LH

The Licensing Act 2003 Sub Committee considered the application from Ford & Warren Solicitors on behalf of Punch Taverns Plc., under Section 34 of the Licensing Act 2003, for The Cardwell Arms, Chorley Road, Adlington.

The application sought to vary the existing licensable provisions as shown in the report. A number of conditions were attached to the licence that were already deemed appropriate for the proposed variations to the licence.

The Sub Committee considered the verbal representations made by the Applicant at the meeting and the relevant written representation received by the licensing authority.

The written representation had been received from a member of the public who opposed the granting of the variation. The person did not give his address in his initial email dated 4 July 2012 or when he responded on 9 July 2012 to an email from Public Protection Officers to obtain more details about his representation. It was inferred by the Sub Committee that s/he is a local resident, given his knowledge of the area. The representation was chiefly concerned with the licensing objectives of, the prevention of public nuisance and crime and disorder and therefore, it was treated as a "relevant" representation.

Where representations have been received by the Council within the prescribed time, the person making the representation is invited to contact the Public Protection Team to discuss the application and offer any remedies they believe would alleviate their concerns. The local resident contacted the team to state that he had nothing further to add.

Members however noted, that no responsible authorities had made any representations

The Sub Committee also took into account the amended licensing guidance, the statement of licensing policy, the licensing objectives and any human rights implications.

The Sub Committee **RESOLVED** to grant the application to vary the premises licence subject to the amended conditions as follows:

WHERE THERE IS NO CHILDRENS CERTIFICATE

Page 3 - Delete 1, A, B, C, D

Page 3 – Delete Licensed Premises – Credit Sales section

AMMENDMENTS TO ANNEX 2 CONDITIONS CONSITENT WITH THE OPERATING SCHEDULE

Page 4 - Amend point 4 to replace licence holder with designated premises supervisor.

Page 5 - Deletion of point 6

The Sub Committee are of the view that the licensing objectives of

- **The Prevention of Public Nuisance**
- **The Prevention of Crime and Disorder, and**

The other licensing objectives would not be undermined by the granting of the application.

The Sub Committee consider the amended conditions are sufficient to meeting the licensing objectives.

Chair



Report of	Meeting	Date
Director of People and Places	Licensing and Public Safety Committee	12 Sept 2012

HACKNEY CARRIAGE SERVICE – UNMET DEMAND SURVEY

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. To advise Members of the outcome and recommendations arising from the recently commissioned unmet demand survey relating to hackney carriage taxi provision.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

2. It is recommended that Members note the report and determine which of the three outcomes with regard the Hackney Carriage taxi provision highlighted in the report and reproduced at paragraph 9 below should be adopted by the Council.
3. It is further recommended that Members approve the recommendations of the report insofar as exploring the provision of a taxi rank at Chorley Railway Station and Chorley hospital. Members should note that any proximate provision of a rank at the railway station would need the consent and cooperation of Network Rail and the Hospital Trust as land owners of each likely site for such provision.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF REPORT

4. At the meeting of the Licensing and Public Safety Committee on 7 March 2012, Members instructed the Director of People and Places to proceed with an unmet demand survey of hackney carriage taxi provision in the Borough.
5. Tenders for the survey were received and reported to Members and Halcrow were awarded the contract to undertake the survey.
6. The survey has now been completed and Members can access the report at:

www.chorley.gov.uk/hackneycarriage

7. A summary of the main recommendations arising out of the survey are reproduced below and Members will be given a presentation by a representative from Halcrow on the survey findings as part of the submission of this report.

Confidential report Please bold as appropriate	Yes	No
--	-----	----

CORPORATE PRIORITIES

8. This report relates to the following Strategic Objectives:

Strong Family Support		Education and Jobs	
Being Healthy		Pride in Quality Homes and Clean Neighbourhoods	
Safe Respectful Communities		Quality Community Services and Spaces	✓
Vibrant Local Economy		Thriving Town Centre, Local Attractions and Villages	✓
A Council that is a consistently Top Performing Organisation and Delivers Excellent Value for Money			

BACKGROUND

9. The unmet demand survey, undertaken during June, July and August 2012 by Halcrow has resulted in the following broad recommendations:

“10.4 Recommendations

The 2012 study has identified that there is NO evidence of significant unmet demand for hackney carriages in Chorley. This conclusion covers both patent and latent/suppressed demand and is based on an assessment of the implications of case law that has emerged since 2000, and the results of Halcrow's analysis.

On this basis the authority has discretion in its hackney licensing policy and may either:

- Maintain the current limit of 36 hackney carriage licences;*
- Issue any number of additional plates as it sees fit, either in one allocation or a series of allocations; or*
- Remove the numerical limit.*

Further recommendations based on the outcome of the consultation exercises include:

- The feasibility of a rank at Chorley Station should be investigated with Northern Rail. The trade, stakeholders and members of the public all expressed a desire for a rank in this location, therefore if one were to be introduced it is likely it would be viable and used by both passengers and drivers.*
- Further investigation should be undertaken into the provision of taxi services at Chorley Hospital. Some 68% of public respondents believed a hackney carriage rank should be introduced here. However only 2 of the hackney carriage trade respondents stated they would use a rank in this location if one were provided meaning it is unlikely a traditional rank would be viable unless the trade could see a clear demand for their services.”*

IMPLICATIONS OF REPORT

10. This report has implications in the following areas and the relevant Directors' comments are included:

Finance	✓	Customer Services	
Human Resources		Equality and Diversity	
Legal	✓	Integrated Impact Assessment required?	
No significant implications in this area		Policy and Communications	

COMMENTS OF THE STATUTORY FINANCE OFFICER

11. The results of the survey recommend adoption of one of three options:
- (1) Maintain the current limit of 36 Hackney Carriage licences.
 - (2) Issue any number of additional plates.
 - (3) Remove the numerical limit.

Option one, to maintain the current limit, will have no impact on the budget.

Options two and three will lead to an increase in income (the current fee is between £145 and £288 per three year licence dependent on the type issued).

However it must be noted that, under statute, as the fees received for the licensing of taxis should not exceed the cost of providing the licensing service itself there would be no net effect on the Licensing service budget; the additional income being offset by additional staff time in processing applications and monitoring the function. In summary this means that there would be no overall change to the department's bottom line budget.

The provision of new taxi ranks may require a capital investment by the council although at this stage budget provision is not required. At any stage that this becomes applicable a report will be made to request approval for any costs that could not be met from existing budgets.

The results of the survey recommend adoption of one of three options:

- (1) Maintain the current limit of 36 Hackney Carriage licences.
- (2) Issue any number of additional plates.
- (3) Remove the numerical limit.

Option one, to maintain the current limit, will have no impact on the budget.

Options two and three will lead to an increase in income (the current fee is between £145 and £288 per three year licence dependent on the type issued).

However it must be noted that, under statute, as the fees received for the licensing of taxis should not exceed the cost of providing the licensing service itself there would be no net effect on the Licensing service budget; the additional income being offset by additional staff time in processing applications and monitoring the function. In summary this means that there would be no overall change to the department's bottom line budget.

The provision of new taxi ranks may require a capital investment by the council although at this stage budget provision is not required. At any stage that this becomes applicable a report will be made to request approval for any costs that could not be met from existing budgets.

COMMENTS OF THE MONITORING OFFICER

12. If the Council is to continue its policy of limiting the number of hackney carriage licences then it could rely on the unmet demand survey if a legal challenge were made to the refusal to issue further vehicle licences. However notwithstanding that no significant unmet demand has been identified the Council is not obliged to continue with the limitation policy and could pursue the alternative options identified in paragraph 9.

JAMIE CARSON
DIRECTOR OF PEOPLE AND PLACES

There are no background papers to this report.

Report Author	Ext	Date	Doc ID
Simon Clark	5732	Sept 2012	Unmetdemand2012



Chorley Hackney Carriage Unmet Demand Survey

Final Report

Chorley Borough Council

August 2012



Chorley Hackney Carriage Unmet Demand Survey

Final Report

Chorley Borough Council

August 2012

Halcrow Group Limited
Arndale House, Otley Road, Headingley, Leeds
LS6 2UL
tel 0113 220 8220 fax 0113 274 2924
halcrow.com

Halcrow Group Limited is a CH2M HILL company
Halcrow Group Limited has prepared this report in accordance with
the instructions of client Chorley Borough Council for the client's sole and specific use.
Any other persons who use any information contained herein do so at their own risk.

© Halcrow Group Limited 2012

Document history

Chorley Hackney Carriage Unmet Demand Survey

Final Report

Chorley Borough Council

This document has been issued and amended as follows:

Version	Date	Description	Created by	Verified by	Approved by
1.0	Aug 12	Draft Report	Katie Dixon	Katie Dixon	Liz Richardson
1.1	Aug 12	Revised Draft Report	Katie Dixon	Katie Dixon	Liz Richardson
		Final Report			Liz Richardson

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	General	1
2	Background	3
2.1	General	3
2.2	Chorley Borough	3
2.3	Background to the Hackney Carriage Market in Chorley	3
2.4	Provision of Hackney Carriage Stands	3
2.5	Hackney Carriage Fares and Licence Premiums	3
3	Benchmarking	6
3.1	Introduction	6
3.2	Fleet Composition	6
3.3	Entry Control	11
3.4	Fares	12
4	Definition, Measurement and Removal of Significant Unmet Demand	14
4.1	Introduction	14
4.2	Overview	14
4.3	Defining Significant Unmet Demand	14
4.4	Measuring Patent Significant Unmet Demand	15
4.5	Determining the Number of New Licences Required to Eliminate Significant Unmet Demand	17
4.6	Note on Scope of Assessing Significant Unmet Demand	19
5	Evidence of Patent Unmet Demand – Rank Observation Results	20
5.1	Introduction	20
5.2	The Balance of Supply and Demand	20
5.3	Average Delays and Total Demand	21
5.4	The Delay / Demand Profile	22
5.5	The General Incidence of Passenger Delay	23
5.6	The Effective Supply of Vehicles	23
5.7	Comparing the results for Chorley with those of other unmet demand studies	23
5.8	Summary	24

6	Evidence of Suppressed Demand - Public Attitude Pedestrian Survey Results	27
6.1	Introduction	27
6.2	General Information	27
6.3	Attempted method of hire	30
6.4	Service provision	31
6.5	Safety	32
6.6	Ranks	32
6.7	Summary	33
7	Consultation	34
7.1	Introduction	34
7.2	Direct (Face to Face) Consultation	34
7.3	Indirect (Written and Telephone) Consultation	38
8	Trade Survey	40
8.1	Introduction	40
8.2	Survey Administration	40
8.3	General Operational Issues	40
8.4	Driving	40
8.5	Safety and Security	42
8.6	Ranks	42
8.7	Fares	43
8.8	Vehicle Conditions	43
8.9	Training	43
8.10	Taxi market in Chorley	43
8.11	Summary	48
9	Deriving the Significant Unmet Demand Index Value	49
9.1	Introduction	49
10	Summary and Conclusions	50
10.1	Introduction	50
10.2	Significant Unmet Demand	50
10.3	Public Perception	50
10.4	Recommendations	50

Appendices

- A.1 **Appendix 1: Summary of Rank Observation Data**
- A.2 **Appendix 2: Public Attitude Survey and Results**
- A.3 **Appendix 3: Trade Survey and Results**

1 Introduction

1.1 General

This study has been conducted by Halcrow on behalf of Chorley Borough Council (CBC). CBC requires an independent survey of demand for hackney carriages across Chorley. The purpose of the study is to determine:

- Whether there is any evidence of significant unmet demand for hackney carriage services in Chorley; and
- If significant unmet demand is found, recommend how many licences would be required to meet this.

In 2010 the Department for Transport (DfT) re issued Best Practice Guidance for Taxi and Private Hire licensing. The Guidance restates the DfT's position regarding quantity restrictions. Essentially, the DfT stated that the assessment of significant unmet demand, as set out in Section 16 of the 1985 Act, is still necessary but not sufficient in itself to justify continued entry control. The Guidance provides local authorities with assistance in local decision making when they are determining the licensing policies for their local area. Guidance is provided on a range of issues including: flexible taxi services, vehicle licensing, driver licensing and training.

The Equality Act 2010 provides a new cross-cutting legislative framework to protect the rights of individuals and advance equality of opportunity for all; to update, simplify and strengthen the previous legislation; and to deliver a simple, modern and accessible framework of discrimination law which protects individuals from unfair treatment and promotes a fair and more equal society.

The provisions in the Equality Act will come into force at different times to allow time for the people and organisations affected by the new laws to prepare for them. The Government is considering how the different provisions will be commenced so that the Act is implemented in an effective and proportionate way. Some provisions came into force on the 1st October 2010 and some are still waiting to be implemented.

Sections 165, 166 and 167 of the Equality Act 2010 are concerned with the provision of wheelchair accessible vehicles and place obligations on drivers of registered vehicles to carry out certain duties unless granted an exemption by the licensing authority on the grounds of medical or physical condition. From 1 October 2010, Section 166 allows taxi drivers to apply to their licensing authority for an exemption from Section 165 of the Equality Act 2010.

Section 161 of the Equality Act 2010 qualifies the law in relation to unmet demand, to ensure licensing authorities that have 'relatively few' wheelchair accessible taxis operating in their area, do not refuse licences to such vehicles for the purposes of controlling taxi numbers. For section 161 to have effect, the Secretary of State must make regulations specifying:

- the proportion of wheelchair accessible taxis that must operate in an area before the respective licensing authority is lawfully able to refuse to license such a vehicle on the grounds of controlling taxi numbers; and

- the dimensions of a wheelchair that a wheelchair accessible vehicle must be capable of carrying in order for it to fall within this provision.

The DfT plans to consult on the content of regulations before section 161 comes in to force and to date has not set a timetable to do so.

The Law Commission are currently looking into reform of the taxi and private hire industry. In May 2012 a series of proposals were published for people to consult on. This consultation period runs until September 2012. Proposed changes include national minimum safety standards for all vehicles, improving provision for persons with disabilities, quantity restrictions and enforcement.

2 Background

2.1 General

This section of the report provides a general background to the taxi market in Chorley and the relevant legislation governing the market.

2.2 Chorley Borough

Chorley is a predominately rural district covering some 78 square miles and located in Lancashire, in the north west of England. Chorley's resident population is estimated at 107,200 (Office for National Statistics, 2012). In addition to the main market town of Chorley, the borough covers a number of other settlements including Adlington, Buckshaw, Euxton and Croston.

2.3 Background to the Hackney Carriage Market in Chorley

Chorley Borough Council currently licences 36 full-time hackney carriage vehicles, seven of which are designated for wheelchair accessible vehicles. This provides Chorley with a hackney carriage provision of one hackney per 2,978 resident population. The most common type of hackney carriage in Chorley are white saloon vehicles which display a roof sign with the word 'Taxi'.

Chorley Borough Council also licence approximately 140 private hire vehicles. Two of these are wheelchair accessible but they are generally utilised on contracted services and not available for general hire.

The hackney carriages operate predominantly in Chorley town centre whilst private hire vehicles serve the surrounding settlements and rural areas.

2.4 Provision of Hackney Carriage Stands

There are currently five official taxi ranks located across the Chorley licensing area. There are two 24 hour ranks on High Street which operate as one rank (split by the junction with Cleveland Street). In addition there are two designated night time ranks on Cleveland Street and Market Street. There is a further 2 car 24 hour rank at the bus station on Clifford Street.

2.5 Hackney Carriage Fares and Licence Premiums

Hackney carriage fares are regulated by the Local Authority. There are three tariffs across the following periods;

- Daytime (06:00 – 22:00)
- Night time (22:00-06:00), Bank Holidays, 18:00-00:00 on Christmas Eve and New Year's Eve and 06:00-00:00 Boxing Day
- Christmas (00:00 on 24th December – 06:00 on 26th December, 00:00 31st December – 06:00 2nd January)

The standard charge tariff is made up of two elements; an initial fee (or "drop") for entering the vehicle, and a fixed price addition for each mile or uncompleted part thereof travelled, plus fixed additions for waiting time. A standard two-mile daytime

fare undertaken by one individual would therefore be £4.90. Table 2.1 outlines the fare structure in more detail.

Table 2.1 Chorley Hackney Carriage Fare Tariff 2012

Tariff Details	Cost
Tariff 1 (Standard Charge). For the first ½ mile (805m) Each subsequent 1/17 th mile (94.6m)	£2.30 £0.10
Tariff 2: For hirings between the hours of 6pm – 12 midnight Christmas Eve 6am – 12 midnight Boxing day 6pm – 12 midnight New Years Eve 10pm – 6am all other days All Public holidays including Easter Sunday (24 hours) For the first ½ mile (805m) Each subsequent 1/17 th mile (94.6m)	Additional 50% on standard charge. £3.45 £0.15
Tariff 3 For hirings between 12 midnight Christmas Eve – 6am Boxing Day 12 midnight New Year's Eve – 6am 2nd January For the first ½ mile (805m) Each subsequent 1/17 th mile (94.6m)	Additional 100% on standard charge. £4.60 £0.20
Additional Charges Vehicles licensed to carry 5 or more passengers (when carrying 5 or more passengers only) Waiting time: Each period of 30 seconds or part thereof Carriage of an animal (except guide dogs) Soiling Charge	50% on applicable tariff £0.10 £1:00 £45:00

Source: Chorley Borough Council

The Private Hire and Taxi Monthly magazine publish monthly league tables of the fares for 363 authorities over a two mile journey. Each journey is ranked with one being the most expensive, the July 2012 tables show Chorley rated 279th in the table – therefore Chorley has below average fares. Table 2.3 provides a comparison of where other surrounding authorities rank in terms of fares. It shows that fares in Chorley are average for the area.

Table 2.3 Comparison of Neighbouring Authorities in Terms of Fares (figures are ranked out of a total of 363 Authorities with 1 being the most expensive)

Local Authority	Rank
Wyre	151
Fylde	160
South Ribble	193
Ribble Valley	209
Bolton	219
Wigan	250
Chorley	279
Rossendale	288
Lancaster	305
Preston	310
Blackburn with Darwen	320
Hyndburn	325
West Lancashire	328
Burnley	337
Pendle	349

Source: Private Hire and Taxi Monthly, July 2012

Anecdotally it is reported that there is a premium of approximately £40,000 associated with hackney carriage licences within Chorley Borough.

3 Benchmarking

3.1 Introduction

In order to assess the current level of taxi provision in Chorley, the authority has been benchmarked against other authorities which are classified by CIPFA (Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accounting) as it's statistically nearest neighbours.

The Statistically nearest neighbours are authorities which are of similar socio-economic standing to Chorley and can be used for comparison purposes. They include; High Peak, North Warwickshire, West Lancashire, Kettering, South Staffordshire, Hinckley & Bosworth, Newcastle-under-Lyme, South Ribble, Lichfield, Rugby, North West Leicestershire, Newark & Sherwood, Charnwood, East Staffordshire and Amber Valley.

In addition, at the request of Chorley Borough Council the immediate surrounding authorities have also been included in the benchmarking exercise. These include; Ribble Valley, Preston, South Ribble, West Lancashire, Wigan, Bolton, Blackburn with Darwen, Hyndburn and Rossendale¹.

Chorley has been benchmarked against these authorities on the following characteristics;

- Fleet composition;
- Population per hackney;
- Population per taxi;
- Entry control policy; and
- Fares

3.2 Fleet Composition

Figure 3.1 documents the fleet size for Chorley's nearest neighbouring licensing authorities in the UK. Preston and Amber Valley have the largest fleets of hackney carriage vehicles (187 and 168 vehicles respectively), while Bolton has the largest combined (hackney carriage and private hire vehicles) fleet at 1,332 vehicles. Of the nearest neighbours Newcastle-under-Lyme has the largest fleet at 487 vehicles. South Staffordshire has the smallest hackney carriage fleet (5 vehicles) whilst Rossendale and Hinckley & Bosworth have the smallest private hire fleets at 7 and 12 vehicles.


Chorley has the second smallest hackney carriage fleet and the twelfth smallest private hire fleet, placing it at the lower end of the comparable authorities in terms of its overall fleet size.

Figure 3.2 shows hackney carriage per capita provision in each authority. This demonstrates that Rossendale has lowest number of people per hackney carriage, thereby indicating that it has the best provision of the authorities shown. South

¹ South Ribble and West Lancashire are already a "nearest neighbour".


Staffordshire has the highest number of people per hackney carriage, and therefore the worst provision. Chorley has the second worst hackney carriage provision per capita. Figure 3.3 shows provision per capita in more detail (excluding the outlying values from South Staffordshire. If per capita provision is looked at in terms of the whole 'taxi' fleet as in Figure 3.4, it shows that Chorley has the fifth highest number of people per vehicle therefore demonstrating Chorley has lower than average provision in relation to the other comparable authorities.

Figure 3.1 Fleet Composition




Source: Department for Transport Statistics, Table TAXI0104, 2011

Figure 3.2 Population per hackney across the different licensing authorities




Source: Department for Transport Statistics and Office for National Statistics 2012

Figure 3.3 Population per hackney across the different licensing authorities (excluding South Staffordshire outlier)



Source: Department for Transport Statistics and Office for National Statistics 2012

Figure 3.4 Fleet provision per capita



Source: Department for Transport Statistics and Office for National Statistics 2012

3.3 Entry Control

Table 3.1 documents the entry control policies for the 23 authorities. Chorley is one of nine authorities which impose a numerical limit on the number of hackney carriages licensed. Of the nearest neighbours only two other authorities limit the number of hackney carriage licences.


Table 3.1 Entry Control Policy for the Authorities

Authority	Control Policy
Amber Valley	Derestricted
Blackburn	Restricted
Bolton	Restricted
Charnwood	Derestricted
Chorley	Restricted
East Staffordshire	Derestricted
High Peak	Restricted
Hinckley & Bosworth	Derestricted
Hyndburn	Restricted
Kettering	Derestricted
Lichfield	Derestricted
Newark & Sherwood	Derestricted
Newcastle-under-Lyme	Restricted
North Warwickshire	Derestricted
North West Leicestershire	Derestricted
Preston	Restricted
Ribble Valley	Restricted
Rossendale	Derestricted
Rugby	Derestricted
South Ribble	Derestricted
South Staffordshire	Derestricted
West Lancashire	Derestricted
Wigan	Restricted

3.4 Fares

Figure 3.5 details the average fare for a two mile journey across the statistically nearest neighbouring authorities and the geographic neighbours. The average cost of a two mile journey is £5.14, thereby highlighting that fares in Chorley are cheaper than the average at £4.90. Of the authorities included in this benchmarking exercise, fares are most expensive in Kettering at £6.00 and lowest in Newcastle-under-Lyme at £4.20.

Figure 3.4 Cost of a two mile journey



Source: Derived from Private Hire and Taxi Monthly, June 2012

4 Definition, Measurement and Removal of Significant Unmet Demand

4.1 Introduction

Section 4 provides a definition of significant unmet demand derived from experience of over 100 unmet demand studies since 1987. This leads to an objective measure of significant unmet demand that allows clear conclusions regarding the presence or absence of this phenomenon to be drawn. Following this, a description is provided of the SUDSIM model which is a tool developed to determine the number of additional hackney licences required to eliminate significant unmet demand, where such unmet demand is found to exist. This method has been applied to numerous local authorities and has been tested in the courts as a way of determining if there is unmet demand for Hackney Carriages.

4.2 Overview

Significant Unmet Demand (SUD) has two components:

- patent demand – that which is directly observable; and
- “suppressed” demand – that which is released by additional supply.

Patent demand is measured using rank observation data. Suppressed (or latent) demand is assessed using data from the rank observations and public attitude interview survey. Both are brought together in a single measure of unmet demand, ISUD (Index of Significant Unmet Demand).

4.3 Defining Significant Unmet Demand

The provision of evidence to aid licensing authorities in making decisions about hackney carriage provision requires that surveys of demand be carried out. Results based on observations of activity at hackney ranks have become the generally accepted minimum requirement.

The definition of significant unmet demand is informed by two Court of Appeal judgements:

- R v Great Yarmouth Borough Council ex p Sawyer (1987); and
- R v Castle Point Borough Council ex p Maude (2002).

The Sawyer case provides an indication of the way in which an Authority may interpret the findings of survey work. In the case of Sawyer v. Yarmouth City Council, 16 June 1987, Lord Justice Woolf ruled that an Authority is entitled to consider the situation from a temporal point of view as a whole. It does not have to condescend into a detailed consideration as to what may be the position in every limited part of the Authority in relation to the particular time of day. The authority is required to give effect to the language used by the Section (Section 16) and can ask itself with regard to the area as a whole whether or not it is satisfied that there is no significant unmet demand.

The term “suppressed” or “latent” demand has caused some confusion over the years. It should be pointed out that following Maude v Castle Point Borough Council,

heard in the Court of Appeal in October 2002, the term is now interpreted to relate purely to that demand that is measurable. Following Maude, there are two components to what Lord Justice Keene prefers to refer to as “suppressed demand”:

- what can be termed inappropriately met demand. This is current observable demand that is being met by, for example, private hire cars illegally ranking up; and
- that which arises if people are forced to use some less satisfactory method of travel due to the unavailability of a hackney carriage.

If demand remained at a constant level throughout the day and week, the identification and treatment of significant unmet demand would be more straightforward. If there were more cabs than required to meet the existing demand there would be queues of cabs on ranks throughout the day and night and passenger waiting times would be zero. Conversely, if too few cabs were available there would tend to be queues of passengers throughout the day. In such a case it would, in principle, be a simple matter to estimate the increase in supply of cabs necessary to just eliminate passenger queues.

Demand for hackney carriages varies throughout the day and on different days. The problem, introduced by variable demand, becomes clear when driver earnings are considered. If demand is much higher late at night than it is during the day, an increase in cab supply large enough to eliminate peak delays will have a disproportionate effect on the occupation rate of cabs at all other times. Earnings will fall and fares might have to be increased sharply to sustain the supply of cabs at or near its new level.

The main implication of the present discussion is that it is necessary, when considering whether significant unmet demand exists, to take account of the practicability of improving the standard of service through increasing supply.

4.4 Measuring Patent Significant Unmet Demand

Taking into account the economic, administrative and legal considerations, the identification of this important aspect of significant unmet demand should be treated as a three stage process as follows:

- identify the demand profile;
- estimate passenger and cab delays; and
- compare estimated delays to the demand profile.

The broad interpretation to be given to the results of this comparison are summarised in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 Existence of Significant Unmet Demand (SUD) Determined by Comparing Demand and Delay Profiles

	Delays during peak only	Delays during peak and other times
Demand is:		
Highly Peaked	No SUD	Possibly a SUD
Not Highly Peaked	Possibly a SUD	Possibly a SUD

It is clear from the content of the table that the simple descriptive approach fails to provide the necessary degree of clarity to support the decision making process in cases where the unambiguous conclusion is not achievable. However, it does provide the basis of a robust assessment of the principal component of significant unmet demand. The analysis is therefore extended to provide a more formal numerical measure of significant unmet demand. This is based on the principles contained in the descriptive approach but provides greater clarity. A description follows.

The measure feeds directly off the results of observations of activity at the ranks. In particular it takes account of:

- case law that suggests an authority should take a broad view of the market;
- the effect of different levels of supply during different periods at the rank on service quality;
- the need for consistent treatment of different authorities, and the same authority over time.

The Index of Significant Unmet Demand (ISUD) was developed in the early 1990's and is based on the following formula. The SF element was introduced in 2003 and the LDF element was introduced in 2006 to reflect the increased emphasis on latent demand in DfT Guidance.

$$\text{ISUD} = \text{APD} \times \text{PF} \times \text{GID} \times \text{SSP} \times \text{SF} \times \text{LDF}$$

Where:

- APD = Average Passenger Delay calculated across the entire week in minutes.
- PF = Peaking Factor. If passenger demand is highly peaked at night the factor takes the value of 0.5. If it is not peaked the value is 1. Following case law this provides dispensation for the effects of peaked demand on the ability of the Trade to meet that demand. To identify high peaking we are generally looking for demand at night (at weekends) to be substantially higher than demand at other times.
- GID = General Incidence of Delay. This is measured as the proportion of passengers who travel in hours where the delay exceeds one minute.
- SSP = Steady State Performance. The corollary of providing dispensation during the peaks in demand is that it is necessary to focus on

performance during “normal” hours. This is measured by the proportion of hours during weekday daytimes when the market exhibits excess demand conditions (i.e. passenger queues form at ranks).

SF = Seasonality factor. Due to the nature of these surveys it is not possible to collect information throughout an entire year to assess the effects of seasonality. Experience has suggested that hackney demand does exhibit a degree of seasonality and this is allowed for by the inclusion of a seasonality factor. The factor is set at a level to ensure that a marginal decision either way obtained in an “untypical” month will be reversed. This factor takes a value of 1 for surveys conducted in September to November and March to June, i.e. “typical” months. It takes a value of 1.2 for surveys conducted in January and February and the longer school holidays, where low demand the absence of contract work will bias the results in favour of the hackney trade, and a value of 0.8 for surveys conducted in December during the pre Christmas rush of activity. Generally, surveys in these atypical months, and in school holidays, should be avoided.

LDF = Latent Demand Factor. This is derived from the public attitude survey results and provides a measure of the proportion of the public who have given up trying to obtain a hackney carriage at either a rank or by flagdown during the previous three months. It is measured as 1+ proportion giving up waiting. The inclusion of this factor is a tactical response to the latest DfT guidance.

The product of these six measures provides an index value. The index is exponential and values above the 80 mark have been found to indicate significant unmet demand. This benchmark was defined by applying the factor to the 25 or so studies that had been conducted at the point it was developed. These earlier studies had used the same principles but in a less structured manner. The highest ISUD value for a study where a conclusion of no significant unmet demand had been found was 72. The threshold was therefore set at 80. The ISUD factor has been applied to over 80 studies by Halcrow and has been adopted by others working in the field. It has proved to be a robust, intuitively appealing and reliable measure.

Suppressed/latent demand is explicitly included in the above analysis by the inclusion of the LDF factor and because any known illegal plying for hire by the private hire trade is included in the rank observation data. This covers both elements of suppressed/latent demand resulting from the Maude case referred to above and is intended to provide a ‘belt and braces’ approach. A consideration of latent demand is also included where there is a need to increase the number of hackney carriage licences following a finding of significant unmet demand. This is discussed in the next section.

4.5 Determining the Number of New Licences Required to Eliminate Significant Unmet Demand

To provide advice on the increase in licences required to eliminate significant unmet demand, Halcrow has developed a predictive model. SUDSIM is a product of 20

years experience of analysing hackney carriage demand. It is a mathematical model, which predicts the number of additional licences required to eliminate significant unmet demand as a function of key market characteristics.


SUDSIM represents a synthesis of a queue simulation work that was previously used (1989 to 2002) to predict the alleviation of significant unmet demand and the ISUD factor described above (hence the term SUDSIM). The benefit of this approach is that it provides a direct relationship between the scale of the ISUD factor and the number of new hackney licences required.

SUDSIM was developed taking the recommendations from 14 previous studies that resulted in an increase in licences, and using these data to calibrate an econometric model. The model provides a relationship between the recommended increase in licences and three key market indicators:

- the population of the licensing Authority;
- the number of hackneys already licensed by the licensing Authority; and
- the size of the SUD factor.

The main implications of the model are illustrated in Figure 4.1 below. The figure shows that the percentage increase in a hackney fleet required to eliminate significant unmet demand is positively related to the population per hackney (PPH) and the value of the ISUD factor over the expected range of these two variables.

Figure 4-1: Forecast Increase in Hackney Fleet Size as a Function of Population Per Hackney (PPH) and the ISUD Value



Where significant unmet demand is identified, the recommended increase in licences is therefore determined by the following formula:

New Licences = SUDSIM x Latent Demand Factor

Where:

Latent Demand Factor = (1 + proportion giving up waiting for a hackney at either a rank or via flagdown)

4.6 Note on Scope of Assessing Significant Unmet Demand

It is useful to note the extent to which a licensing authority is required to consider peripheral matters when establishing the existence or otherwise of significant unmet demand. This issue is informed by *R v Brighton Borough Council, exp p Bunch* 1989². This case set the precedent that it is only those services that are exclusive to hackney carriages that need concern a licensing authority when considering significant unmet demand. Telephone booked trips, trips booked in advance or indeed the provision of bus type services are not exclusive to hackney carriages and have therefore been excluded from consideration.

² See Button JH 'Taxis – Licensing Law and Practice' 2nd edition Tottel 2006 P226-7

5 Evidence of Patent Unmet Demand – Rank Observation Results

5.1 Introduction

This section of the report highlights the results of the rank observation survey. The rank observation programme covered a period of 92 hours during May 2012. Some 2,763 passengers and 2,060 cab departures were recorded. A summary of the rank observation programme is provided in Appendix 1.

The results presented in this Section summarise the information and draw out its implications. This is achieved by using five indicators:

- The Balance of Supply and Demand – this indicates the proportion of the time that the market exhibits excess demand, equilibrium and excess supply;
- Average Delays and Total Demand – this indicates the overall level of passengers and cab delays and provides estimates of total demand;
- The Demand/Delay Profile – this provides the key information required to determine the existence or otherwise of significant unmet demand;
- The Proportions of Passengers Experiencing Given Levels of Delay – this provides a guide to the generality of passenger delay; and
- The Effective Supply of Vehicles – this indicates the proportion of the fleet that was off the road during the survey.

5.2 The Balance of Supply and Demand

The results of the analysis are presented in Table 5.1 below. The predominant market state is one of equilibrium. Excess supply (queues of cabs) was experienced during 40% of the hours observed while excess demand (queues of passengers) was experienced 1% of the hours observed. Conditions are favourable to customers at all times of day with the most favourable time being the weekday and weekday night periods.

Table 5.1 The Balance of Supply and Demand in the Chorley Rank-Based Hackney Carriage Market (Percentage of hours observed)

Period		Excess Demand (Maximum Passenger Queue ≥ 3)	Equilibrium	Excess Supply (Minimum Cab Queue ≥ 3)
Weekday	Day	0	35	65
	Night	0	54	46
Weekend	Day	0	84	16
	Night	4	61	36
Sunday	Day	0	50	50
Total 2012		1	59	40

NB – Excess Demand = Maximum Passenger Queue ≥ 3 . Excess Supply = Minimum Cab Queue ≥ 3 – values derived over 12 time periods within an hour.

5.3 Average Delays and Total Demand

The following estimates of average delays and throughput were produced for each rank in Chorley (Table 5.2).

The survey suggests some 2,763 passenger departures occur per week from ranks in Chorley involving some 2,060 cab departures. The taxi trade is concentrated at the rank on High Street accounting for 100% of the total passenger departures. On average cabs wait 15.9 minutes for a passenger. On average passengers wait 0.02 minutes for a cab.

No passengers were observed at any of the other ranks.


Table 5.2 Average Delays and Total Demand (Delays in Minutes i.e. 0.22 minutes is 13.2 seconds)

Rank	Passenger Departures	Cab Departures	Average Passenger Delay in minutes	Average Cab Delay in minutes
High Street	2,763	2,006	0.02	16.11
Market Street	0	54	0.00	7.92
Cleveland Street	0	0	0.00	0.00
Bus Station	0	0	0.00	0.00
Total 2012	2,763	2,060	0.02	15.90

5.4 The Delay / Demand Profile

Figure 5.1 provides a graphical illustration of passenger demand for the Monday to Saturday period between the hours of 07:00 and 04:00.

Figure 5.1 Passenger Demand by Time of Day in 2012 (Monday to Saturday)



The profile of demand shows peaks in demand at 11:00, 15:00 and late at night at midnight. We therefore conclude that this is a 'highly peaked' demand profile. This has implications for the interpretation of the results (see Chapter 9 below).

Figure 5.2 Passenger Delay by Time of Day in 2012 (Monday to Saturday)




Figure 5.2 provides an illustration of passenger delay by the time of day for the weekday and weekend periods. It shows the only period where any delay is present is on a weekend at midnight where delay peaks to 0.1 minutes.

5.5 The General Incidence of Passenger Delay

The rank observation data can be used to provide a simple assessment of the likelihood of passengers encountering delay at ranks. The results are presented in Table 5.3 below.

Table 5.3 General Incidence of Passenger Delay (percentage of Passengers travelling in hours where delay exceeds one minute)

Year	Delay > 0	Delay > 1 minute	Delay > 5 minutes
2012	5.96	0	0

In 2012 no passengers are likely to experience more than a minute of delay. It is this proportion (0%) that is used within the ISUD as the 'Generality of Passenger Delay'.

5.6 The Effective Supply of Vehicles

Observers were required to record the hackney carriage licence plate number of vehicles departing from ranks. In this way we are able to ascertain the proportion of the fleet that was operating during the survey.

During the daytime period (0700 to 1800) some 31 (86%) of the hackney fleet were observed at least once during the period of the study. During the evening/night-time period (1800 to 0700) some 33 (92%) of the hackney fleet were also observed at least once during the rank observations. In total 92% of the trade was observed at least once.

5.7 Comparing the results for Chorley with those of other unmet demand studies

Comparable statistics are available from 64 local authorities that Halcrow have recently conducted studies in and these are listed in Table 5.4. The table highlights a number of key results including:

- population per hackney carriage at the time of the study (column one);
- the proportion of rank users travelling in hours in which delays of greater than zero, greater than one minute and greater than five minutes occurred (columns two to four);
- average passenger and cab delay calculated from the rank observations (columns five to six);
- the proportion of Monday to Thursday daytime hours in which excess demand was observed (column seven);
- the judgement on whether rank demand is highly peaked (column eleven); and
- a numerical indicator of significant unmet demand.

5.8 Summary

The following points (obtained from the rank observations) may be made about the results in Chorley compared to other areas studied:

- population per hackney carriage is lower than the average overall value i.e. provision is worse;
- the proportion of passengers, who travel in hours where some delay occurs, is zero, which is much lower than the average (21%) for the districts analysed;
- overall average passenger delay at 0.02 minutes is lower than the average value (1 minute);
- overall average cab delay at 15.90 minutes is higher than the average for the districts shown (14 minutes); and
- the proportion of weekday daytime hours with excess demand conditions observed was zero which is lower than the average of 6%.

Table 5.4 A Comparison of Chorley with Other Authorities Studied (values in italics make up ISUD)									
District and Year of Survey	Population per Hackney	Proportion Waiting at Ranks	Proportion Waiting >= 1 Min	Proportion Waiting >= 5 Mins	Average Passenger Delay	Average Cab Delay	% Excess Demand	Demand Peaked, Yes=0.5 No=1	ISUD Indicator Value
Chorley 12	2,978	6	0	0	0.02	15.90	0	1	0
Torridge 12	1,306	3	0	0	0.11	16.76	0	1	0
Braintree 12	1,714	3	0.63	0.05	0.09	22.57	0	1	0
Torbay 11	777	3	1.42	0.1	0.16	21.45	0	0.5	0
Wirral 11 *	1,080	4	0.41	0.16	0.12	20.19	0	0.5	0
Carrick 11	1,145	9	5.55	0	0.39	9.92	4	0.5	5
Penwith 11	1,261	14	6.66	2.29	0.96	7.98	12	0.5	41
Restormel 11	1,408	4	3.41	0	0.26	13.54	0	0.5	0
York 11	1,118	14	5.96	0.77	0.93	8.25	9	1	59.1
Crawley 11	924	6	6.28	0.64	0.18	21.88	5	1	6
Liverpool 11	308	5	2.13	0.37	0.14	20.64	1	1	0
West Berkshire 10 *	741	5	3.84	0.92	0.37	22.78	3	0.5	4
Sefton 10	1,015	7	4.25	0.55	0.38	19.15	4	0.5	2
Pendle 10	1,257	1	0.03	0.03	0.03	33.1	0	0.5	0
Oxford 09	1,266	10	3.08	0.07	0.24	10.43	5	1	4
Brighton & Hove 09	474	11	5.67	1.19	0.72	8.91	7	0.5	16.2
Leicester 09	880	10	9.53	2.58	1.52	19.02	0	1	0
Blackpool 09	556	4	1	0	0.05	18.96	2	0.5	1
Hull 09	1,465	12	8.54	0.99	1.72	9.34	2	0.5	18
Rochdale 09	1,937	3	1.18	0	0.14	12.92	5	1	1
North Tyneside 08	971	16	1.18	0.03	0.38	10.72	8	0.5	2
Rotherham 08	5,192	0	0.09	0	0.01	27.29	0	1	0
Preston 08	677	12	5.28	0	0.61	11.13	7	1.0	21
Scarborough 08	1,111	12	5	1.06	0.49	7.74	7	0.5	0
York 08	1,146	31	11.5	6.74	3.21	5.42	31	0.5	645
Barrow 08	474	14	12.52	0	0.5	6.85	0	0.5	0
Stirling 08	1,265	25	18	0.3	0.7	10.94	2	0.5	38
Torridge 08	1,202	7	0.94	0	0.12	14.99	0	1	0
Richmondshire 08	723	5	1	0.07	0.22	34.32	1	0.5	0.4
Exeter 07/08	1,883	7	4	0.6	0.33	15.27	6	1	9
Manchester 07	394	21	6	2.28	1.59	10.24	14	1	174
Bradford 07	1,630	18	2	0.03	0.23	17.64	5	1	2
Barnsley 07	3,254	5	8	0.22	1.32	11.93	5	1	58
Blackpool 06	556	31	10	0.34	0.42	10.34	5	0.5	11
Broadstairs 06	1,000	13	13	10	3.25	23.97	4	1	177
Margate 06	1,622	4	1	0	0.05	33.14	0	1	0
Ramsgate 06	1,026	2	2	2	0.49	19.57	13	1	13
Plymouth 06	669	7	3	1	0.52	11.58	1	1	2
Brighton 06	508	52	23	6	0.73	7.64	6	0.5	50
Thurrock 06	1,590	32	13	1	0.22	15.27	0	1	0
Trafford 06	2,039	55	38	6	1.09	13.15	5	1	249
Leicester05	880	21	11	1	0.35	19.36	3	1	12
Bournemouth 05	656	20	11	2	0.37	12.25	1	0.5	2

KEY

* Derestricted Authorities

District and Year of Survey	Population per Hackney	Proportion Waiting at Ranks	Proportion Waiting >= 1 Min	Proportion Waiting >= 5 Mins	Average Passenger Delay	Average Cab Delay	% Excess Demand	Demand Peaked, Yes=0.5 No=1	ISUD Indicator Value
Bradford 03	2,171	19	6	0.77	0.25	14.89	6	1.0	9
Oldham 03	2,558	30	12	0.79	0.48	14.8	7	1.0	40
Thurrock 03	1,607	43	14	1.01	0.50	12.5	2	1.0	14
Blackpool 03	556	21	4	0.3	0.13	12.4	6	1.0	3
Wolverhampton 03	3,113	50	31	7.39	1.49	11.18	14	1.0	647
Carrick 02	1,335	28	18	7	0.61	10.53	9	1.0	99
Bournemouth 02	702	25	15	2	0.67	9.97	1	0.5	5
Brighton 02	540	60	35	12	1.11	8.31	5	0.5	97
Exeter 02	2,353	47	18	3	0.71	10.12	20	1.0	256
Wigan 02	2,279	28	10	0	1.17	11.98	6	1.0	70
Cardiff 01	656	51	29	6	0.83	8.77	14	0.5	168
Edinburgh 01	373	47	29	9	1.27	8.77	13	1.0	479
Torridge 01	1,298	25	21	0	0.51	9.32	8	0.5	43
Worcester 01*	941	40	4	1	0.46	12.3	8	0.5	7
Ellesmere Port 01	2,527	80	48	17	2.49	4.23	49	0.5	2,928
Southend 00	895	46	29	8	1.92	8.08	4	1.0	223
South Ribble 00 *	485	12	0.25	0.25	0.07	11.27	0	1.0	0
Leeds 00	1,693	83	61	33	5.03	7.92	36	1.0	11,046
Sefton 00	1,069	18	8	0.6	0.28	12.95	6	1.0	13
Leicester 00 *	956	10	7	3	1.17	20.19	1	1.0	8
Castle Point 00	2,286	28	12	3	0.74	8.6	2	0.5	9
AVERAGE	1,320	21	11	3	1	14	6		

KEY

* Derestricted Authorities

6 Evidence of Suppressed Demand - Public Attitude Pedestrian Survey Results

6.1 Introduction

A public attitude survey was designed with the aim of collecting information regarding opinions on the taxi market in Chorley. In particular, the survey allowed an assessment of flagdown, telephone and rank delays, the satisfaction with delays and general use information.


Some 358 on-street and telephone public attitude surveys were carried out in May, June and July 2012. The surveys were conducted across a range of locations within the Chorley licensing area. Some 29% of surveys were completed in the outlying areas of Chorley Borough. It should be noted that in the tables and figures that follow the totals do not always add up to the same amount. This is due to one of two reasons. First, not all respondents were required to answer all questions; and second, some respondents failed to answer some questions that were asked.

A full breakdown and analysis of the results are provided in Appendix 2.

6.2 General Information


Respondents were each asked if they had made a journey by taxi in Chorley within the last three months. The survey found that 38.4% had used a taxi within this period. The results are displayed in Figure 6.1.

Figure 6.1 Have you made a trip by hackney carriage or private hire vehicle in the last three months?



Trip makers were asked how they obtained their hackney carriage or private hire vehicle. Some 24.3% of trip makers stated that they hired their taxi at a rank. Some 73.5% of hirings were achieved by telephone, with 2.2% of trip makers obtaining a taxi by on-street flagdown. Figure 6.2 reveals the patterns of hire.

Figure 6.2 Method of hire for last trip




However when the results are split between Chorley Town centre and the outlying areas only 10% of people hired their vehicle at a rank, with the remaining 90% prebooking their vehicle by telephone.

Those respondents hiring their vehicle by telephone were asked which company they used. Coopers was the most used taxi company.

Respondents were asked if they were satisfied with the time taken and the promptness of the vehicles arrival. The majority of people were satisfied with the time taken to obtain their vehicle (94.7%). This figure was slightly lower when only the outlying areas were analysed (89.7%).

Figure 6.3 shows that for each method of obtaining a vehicle, the majority were satisfied with the length of time they had to wait. Those obtaining their taxi by on street flagdown provided the highest levels of satisfaction.

Out of the seven people who weren't satisfied with the length of time that they had to wait three required a minibus.

Figure 6.3 Satisfaction with delay on last trip by method of hire


Trip makers were asked when they obtained their taxi. Nearly half (49.3%) hired their vehicle during the day (before 6pm), with 26.5% hiring during the evening (6pm – 10pm) and 24.3% hiring after 10pm.

Respondents were asked to rate two elements from their last taxi journey on a scale from very poor to very good. The results in Figure 6.4 show that the respondents generally consider vehicle quality and driver quality to be good or very good.

However those stating that quality was poor or very poor gave the following reasons:

- 'cars not very well maintained'
- 'drivers cant drive and cant speak English'
- 'not clean'
- 'rude'
- 'drivers don't help with luggage'


Figure 6.4 Rating of Last Journey



6.3 Attempted method of hire

In order to measure demand suppression, respondents were asked to identify whether or not they had given up waiting for a hackney carriage or private hire vehicle at a rank, on the street or by telephone in Chorley in the last three months. The results are documented in Figure 6.5.

Figure 6.5 Latent demand by method of hire – Given up trying to make a hiring?



As indicated in Figure 6.5, some 9.1% of respondents (32 respondents out of 352 answering this question) had given up waiting for a hackney at a rank and/or by flagdown in the last three months. This has implications for the interpretation of the results (see Chapter 9 below).

Respondents who had given up trying to obtain a taxi in the last three months were asked the location where they had given up waiting for a taxi. The most common area was Chorley Town centre.

Those who had given up trying to obtain a taxi were asked at what time this occurred. Some 48% had occurred during the day (before 6pm), with 36% occurring after 10pm,

6.4 Service provision

Participants were asked whether they thought there were sufficient hackney carriages in Chorley. Some 39.4% of all the respondents commented that there are sufficient in Chorley Town Centre and 28.4% felt there were sufficient in the outer areas of the Borough. However over half of respondents simply did not know.

When considering respondents from central Chorley only, 42.2% believed there were sufficient in the centre while 7.2% believed there were NOT sufficient. When considering respondents from outer areas of the borough only, 19% believed there were sufficient in outlying areas, while 16.4% believed there were NOT sufficient.


The difference between a hackney carriage and private hire vehicle was explained to each respondent prior to asking if there were sufficient hackney carriages. However the finding that a fifth of respondents from outlying areas believe there are sufficient hackneys in outlying areas when there are no ranks may indicate either a general lack of understanding of what a hackney carriage is, or may indicate that respondents simply do not believe more hackney carriages are required to serve existing demand in these areas.

The survey then asked respondents whether taxi services in Chorley could be improved. Some 41.2% felt that they could be improved and were consequently asked how they could be improved. The results are displayed in Figure 6.6.

The graph shows that 57.4% of those whom felt services could be improved felt they should be cheaper. Of those stipulating 'other' suggestions included:

- 'more courteous drivers'
- 'list of taxi numbers in phone box'
- 'fares vary a lot'
- 'always late'
- 'more friendly drivers'

Figure 6.6 How could taxi services in Chorley be improved? (multiple responses)



6.5 Safety

Respondents were asked whether they felt safe when using hackney carriage and private hire services in Chorley. The majority of respondents felt safe using them during the day (74.2%) and at night (63.9%) in Chorley. Those respondents who commented that they did not feel safe all or some of the time were asked what would make them feel safer. The most common responses included;

- 'usual taxi driver';
- 'cctv and panic button';
- 'driver and vehicle licence clearly visible';
- 'screen between driver and passenger';
- 'female drivers';

6.6 Ranks

Respondents were provided with a list of locations and asked whether a taxi rank should be provided there. Although a number of respondents did not know where ranks would be beneficial over two thirds of respondents (68.2%) felt that a rank should be provided at Chorley Hospital.

Table 6.1 Do you think a rank should be provided at...?

	Yes	No	Don't know
Chorley Station	65.4	5.5	29.1
Adlington Village/Station	40.7	8.3	51
Buckshaw Parkway	49.3	6	44.7
Euxton Village/Station	51.6	8.1	40.3
Croston Village/Station	42.4	7.5	49.8
Eccleston Village	38.4	10.3	51.4
Chorley Hospital	68.2	6.1	25.8

Respondents were also asked if there were any locations in Chorley where new ranks were needed. Over half of respondents (51.2%) said that no new ranks were needed in Chorley. However the 13.3% of respondents who stated they would like to see a new rank were subsequently asked to provide a location. The most common locations included;

- Supermarkets;
- Buckshaw Station;
- Bus Station

6.7 Summary

Key points from the public attitude survey can be summarised as:

- Some 73.5% of hiring's are by telephone;
- High levels of satisfaction with delay on last trip – flag down hiring's providing the highest levels;
- Some 9.1% of people had given up trying to obtain a taxi at a rank or by flagdown;
- Some 41.2% of people felt that taxi services could be improved – need to be cheaper
- Some 51.2% of people felt that new ranks were not needed.

7 Consultation

7.1 Introduction

Guidelines issued by the Department for Transport state that consultation should be undertaken with the following organisations and stakeholders:

- All those working in the market;
- Consumer and passenger (including disabled) groups;
- Groups which represent those passengers with special needs;
- The Police;
- Local interest groups such as hospitals or visitor attractions; and
- A wide range of transport stakeholders such as rail/bus/coach providers and transport managers.

In order to consult with relevant stakeholders across Chorley Borough, face to face meetings, telephone interviews and written consultation was undertaken.

7.2 Direct (Face to Face) Consultation

A number of stakeholders were invited to attend a face to face consultation session at Chorley Town Hall. This assured the DfT guidelines were fulfilled and all relevant organisations and bodies were provided with an opportunity to comment.

A summary of the responses received are provided below and in Appendix 3.

Development / Regeneration

There were two attendees to the focus group; The Town Centre and Markets Manager, and the Group Passenger Facilities Manager for Chorley Interchange.

The attendees noted that the main rank in Chorley is rarely empty, suggesting that there are enough hackney carriages operation in the area. It was felt derestriction wouldn't increase usage at the interchange by hackney carriages, and if the limit on the number of hackney carriages were removed, this would need to link with other local policies to ensure other ranks were used, and prevent everyone only using the Market Street Rank. With regard to the supply of vehicles, it was stated that the need for wheelchair accessible vehicles is increasing, as is the case with other public transport including buses requiring low floors. It was suggested that taxi drivers operating wheelchair accessible vehicles could link up with Shopmobility.

At the current time there is one rank that is utilised in Chorley, which is on High Street. There is a rank at the interchange for two vehicles, however, this was mainly used for parking vehicles as opposed to waiting for a fare at the rank. It was reported there was reluctance from the trade to move from the main rank in the centre. It is felt there is demand for taxis services at the interchange at certain times of day. Currently people will either opt to book a private hire vehicle from the interchange, or walk/get directions to the main rank in town.

In terms of potential new ranks it was suggested that one way to change the mindset of customers and drivers as to where to obtain a taxi is to test a new rank for a couple of months. It was noted some form of subsidy would be required to ensure drivers who use this rank do not incur loss of earnings and have an incentive to give the rank a chance whilst people get used to the new location.

Safety

There were two attendees at the focus group from the Police and Chorley and South Ribble Crime and Disorder Partnership. They believed there were sufficient taxis with private hire covering surrounding areas well as there isn't the demand for ranks in these areas. With regard to maintaining a limit on vehicles it was felt there are pros and cons. If there were more vehicles this would be good for getting people out of town at busy times, however, obviously this may lead to a greater number of taxis circulating around the centre during the daytime.

Both felt that there were no major safety issues with regard to violence or disorder at the main rank. This area is reviewed regularly and if there are any issues they are very sporadic and not significant. There are passenger queues on evenings and weekends, however, it is not felt that there has ever been a requirement for marshals. There is very little hailing of cabs within Chorley, business is mainly just conducted from the ranks. The nighttime economy in Chorley is declining and as such waiting times for passengers have reduced.

The central rank is covered by CCTV therefore it is in a sensible place and any further ranks should be covered by CCTV. Attendees were unsure if there is the demand for an extra rank believed it may stretch resources ensuring safety at another nighttime rank. However they recognised that everyone may not want to go to the central area of town to get a taxi as there are a lot of people who have been drinking. People may feel intimidated or have the perception of being unsafe in this area. Vehicles do rank unofficially outside Applejazz nightclub but generally illegal ranking or plying is not an issue.

The police would like to engage more with the trade, to understand the issues they are encountering and to work together to resolve issues occurring in and around the vehicles.

Disability Representatives

There was one deaf attendee at the meeting from Disability Equality North West. Much of the discussion related to the accessibility of taxis for all disabilities, not just those with physical disabilities. The attendee stated that often when accessibility is discussed it is associated with a physical disability, however, it is important to consider the needs of other disability types as well when forming policy. It was suggested that many wheelchair users have preferred drivers, and use the same firms each time they travel.

In terms of accessibility to the deaf, the attendee referenced one firm which has implemented an online booking system, with a Facebook page and website. The operator will then talk to users by text once a taxi has been booked, and this system has worked well. The attendee cited one instance where when using a taxi they had been asked to travel with their hearing dog on their lap, and in doing so did not have a chance to put on their seatbelt. They had also heard reports from other members of

the group where dogs have been refused or the customer charged a luggage fee when travelling with an assistance dog.

It was felt that extra training could be provided prior to being given a licence and that this is important for anyone in a public facing role. Hearing loops in taxis would be very useful, as many of the deaf in the UK have a hearing aid.

The representative was currently planning some disability awareness days in Chorley and South Ribble, and it was suggested that it may be useful for members of the trade to attend to increase their awareness of the issues that people with disabilities face. It would also be useful to have more communication from the council via websites including Facebook or Twitter, to ensure people understand their rights as a user of taxi services, and how to report issues, should they occur, on any particular journey.

Hackney Carriage Representatives

The trade were all of the opinion that there are more than enough hackney carriages at all times of the day, and it was reported drivers will sit for 30 minutes to an hour waiting for a fare. As such the existing entry control policy should remain in place.

It was felt that more rank space is required at Market Street as this is the correct location close to the shops, and this has previously been requested. They suggested that the night time rank in operation around the corner from the main rank could be converted to a full time rank and a rank at the rail station would also be useful. The trade felt that there was no need for ranks outside the centre of Chorley, and that there is not the demand to justify ranks at outlying rail stations in more rural areas.

When the old bus station moved the trade representatives stated they assumed the rank would move with it, however, as planning commenced it became apparent that the taxi provision had not been considered. The trade were provided with two spaces at the back of the new bus station, which they state they initially did try to use. They said people didn't use the rank as they couldn't see it, and on some occasions cars were parked up in the rank. They stated that the rank no longer exists and that the bus station won't let them use the spaces, however, as people now know where the main rank is this is not really an issue. It was suggested that if there were spaces provided at the bus station then the area would need to look like a rank with proper signage in place and more than two spaces. The hackney carriage association have previously requested that taxis are considered at the planning stages of any new developments, however they state Chorley Borough Council have not yet done so.

Vehicle quality was considered good, and the current mix of vehicles, which includes 9 wheelchair accessible vehicles, is felt to be adequate. Some customers prefer to use saloon vehicles as opposed to the Eurocabs and so maintaining a mixed fleet is important. The trade state there is very little wheelchair demand from the rank.

The trade did not feel that there is a need for any further training and having worked in the trade they feel they are all polite and have good customer service skills. It was not felt that the NVQ training furthered the knowledge of any of the drivers, nor made them better taxi drivers. It was also suggested that the more requirements there are for drivers prior to being issued with a licence, the more it is likely to impact on price. Fares were considered to be too low; however, it was acknowledged that they have to be at this level to compete with the private hire trade, and also to maintain the balance of demand to ensure that customers will still use the service, whilst drivers are still able to earn a living.

The trade representatives did not consider there to be any major night time safety issues. Any issues that do arise are generally alcohol related, and due to licensed establishments serving customers who should have been turned away due to the level of alcohol they had already consumed. The Friday and Saturday trade patterns have changed with the representatives stating the peaks in demand have disappeared due to later closing times. This also has the knock on effect of the trade having to work later, but not making any more money in doing so.

Private Hire Representatives

The majority of the private hire representatives felt that there was an adequate supply of hackney carriage vehicles in Chorley. One respondent felt that there were enough in Chorley town but felt that there were not enough across the whole borough, and that if people knew there were ranks in other areas (if they were implemented) then this would be beneficial to users. Representatives felt the general pattern of trade was that private hire vehicles bring customers into town from outlying areas, while hackney carriages take customers back out to these areas from the centre. School contract times were highlighted as a pressured time of day however, it was suggested that congestion is one of the issues, not just availability or taxis, meaning vehicles can't get between jobs as quickly.

The supply of wheelchair accessible vehicles was considered adequate, and overall it was felt that there is very little demand for such services in the Chorley area. The trade would strongly object if all private hire vehicles had to be wheelchair accessible, and also raised issues of safety for the drivers and that there are no risk assessments in place to allow drivers to refuse passengers if they considered it unsafe to transit or move a passenger. Vehicles standards and criteria were considered to be good though it was felt the removal of the age limit meant some of the older cars did not portray such a good image. It was also suggested a greater variety of vehicles could be accepted for licence. The testing regime was considered to be good however, there was a consensus that there are too many random checks, and when these random stops/ checks are being completed the hackney carriage vehicles disappear.

The private hire trade did not feel there was a need for any extra training though noted that the existing test is not strict enough and those issued with private hire driver licences should have good local knowledge. All of the attendees had completed the NVQ but felt it is about knowing the job and what customers need which you gain on the job and through years working in the trade. It was suggested however, wheelchair training should be undertaken by those who have licences for wheelchair accessible vehicles.

With regard to fares the trade realise the need to balance fares to maintain demand, as if they are too expensive this may put the public off using these services. However, it was noted that there have been numerous cost increases including fuel, insurance premiums and licence premiums, and the trade have to absorb these. It was suggested that South Ribble hackney carriages do cross-boarder trade and this has an effect on the private hire trade in Chorley, they don't undercut prices, but do take some of the available trade.

The trade felt there are some safety issues at night; however, this is more verbal abuse rather than physical. Some drivers have CCTV fitted in their vehicles for safety reasons.

The trade felt that communications with the council could be improved, particularly with regard to changes in regulations, so that the trade are involved in the process rather than being told after new regulations have been passed at committee. The paperwork from the licensing office, such as reminders about licence expiration dates used to be sent out 6 weeks prior to this date, whereas now the letters seem to arrive much later, in some cases after the licence renewal is due, therefore the consensus was that the efficiency of dealing with paperwork needs to be increased.

7.3 Indirect (Written and Telephone) Consultation

A number of stakeholders were contacted by letter and telephone. This assured the DfT guidelines were fulfilled and all relevant organisations and bodies were provided with an opportunity to comment.

In accordance with advice issued by the DfT the following organisations were contacted;

- Lancashire County Council;
- user/disability groups representing those passengers with special needs;
- local interest groups including hospitals, visitor attractions, entertainment outlets and education establishments; and
- rail, bus and coach operators.

A summary of the responses received are provided below.

Lancashire County Council Highways

A representative of Lancashire County Council (LCC) Highways Team undertook a telephone interview. They felt in principle a numerical limit on the number of hackney carriage licences issued was acceptable as long as the limit was periodically reviewed to ensure it was at the correct level and there were sufficient vehicles to meet demand.

They noted requests for new ranks would normally come directly from Chorley Borough Council. If a request was made directly from a member of the public the enquiry would be forwarded to Chorley Borough Council prior to being investigated. There is no specific policy on the prioritisation of kerb space in Chorley Borough for particular uses and each request for new rank space is assessed on its own merits. There have been no requests made from any sources for additional rank space over the last 12 months either in the town centre or in any of the outlying areas or village centres.

LCC Highways attend Chorley Town Centre Working Group and a regular Traffic Liaison Meeting where taxi and rank issues could be discussed. Over the last 12 months no issues relating to taxis, rank issues or safety issues have been raised therefore Highways believe there are no major issues with either rank or taxi provision in Chorley Borough and that they are operating safely. If further ranks were required in Chorley town centre, Highways believe suitable kerb space could be found – perhaps at the opposite side of the town from the current day time rank.

The Highways team are consulted on new planning applications in Chorley Borough. Their key focus is to consider the traffic and safety impacts arising as a direct result of

the development, and the implications that has on current traffic rather than taxi ranks and drop off points. The public transport team at LCC would be responsible for assessing the need for new bus /rail services as a result of a new development and it is possible they would consider the need for a taxi rank or drop off/pick up point in any development proposal.

Adlington Town Council

The town council feel Adlington is poorly served by taxi services, having only one private hire company and no taxi rank. The Town Council feels that Adlington would benefit from the provision of a permanent hackney carriage taxi rank somewhere within the village.

The local taxis do not provide "local run" services in the village and the provision of low-cost short journeys would be particularly helpful for the elderly or disabled residents. It was felt the Chorley area does not have many of the large traditional hackney carriages for hire, and it can sometimes be cheaper to call a taxi from the Horwich/Bolton area.

In general it was felt the village was not well served and taxi services are not well promoted.

Eccleston Parish Council

The only comment the Parish Council wished to make was the lack of a rank at Chorley Station. It was felt a rank should be provided in this location.

Wheelton Parish Council

The parish council feel most villagers have cars or use public transport if they live on the main route. They report that no one has had issues being able to access private hire provision and this seems to be adequate but as the area has an aging population it would seem 36 hackney carriages for the whole of Chorley is inadequate.

They feel some licensed vehicles appear past their sell buy date but the mix of vehicles and level of accessible vehicles is generally OK. In terms of drivers, they feel their attitude and approach is generally ok, but some drive too fast through the village. It was noted that many private hire cards are left in telephone boxes in the parish. This is considered a negative as generally most people in the area know who to contact to book a taxi.

In Chorley town centre the parish council believe ranks are generally in the correct area, there are no ranks in the rural areas of the borough but they feel there is no need for one. Ranks should be more available on new developments and at the Railway Station the siting of the rank is not as accessible as it could be³. The parish council feel there are generally no safety issues when using taxis but many residents in the parish would be unsure about waiting at taxi ranks especially on evening/night times at the weekend.

Fares are considered to be acceptable in the day time but excessive during night -time hours. The council also noted that on Market day there can appear to be a disproportionate amount of competition for trade.

³ There is no formal rank at Chorley Station though it is reported some illegal plying occurs at this location.

8 Trade Survey

8.1 Introduction

A trade survey was designed with the aim of collecting information and views from both trades. In particular the survey allowed an assessment of operational issues and views of the hackney carriage market to supplement the rank observations, as well as covering enforcement and disability issues. The following Section summarises the results of the trade survey and full results are presented in Appendix 4.

8.2 Survey Administration

The survey was conducted through a self completion questionnaire. These were sent to all licensed hackney and private hire drivers and operators in Chorley. A total of 42 questionnaire forms were completed and returned, giving a response rate of around 15%. Of those respondents 55% were hackney carriage respondents and 45% were from the private hire trade.

It should be noted that not all totals sum to the total number of respondents per trade group as some respondents failed to answer all of the questions.

8.3 General Operational Issues

The responses have been disaggregated on a hackney carriage and private hire trade basis. Both trades were asked how long they have been involved in the taxi trade in Chorley. Some 74% of the hackney carriage respondents have been involved for under 10 years, while 61% of the private hire respondents have been involved for over 10 years.

8.4 Driving

Respondents were asked what type of vehicle they drive most frequently. Some 71% of the hackney carriage trade and 84% of the private hire trade generally drive saloon vehicles.

Respondents were asked the average number of hours they work in a typical week. The hackney carriage trade stated they worked on average 45.26 hours per week, whilst the private hire trade stated they worked on average 43.84 hours per week. Respondents were then asked to state how many hours they work at different times of the day during a typical week. Figure 8.1 documents the average hours worked during the day time period (06:00-18:00) for each day of the week. On average, it shows that the private hire trade work more hours than the hackney carriage trade during the day. Figure 8.2 shows the average number of hours worked during the evening/night period (18:00-06:00). During the night time period both trades work longer on a Friday and Saturday night compared with other nights during the week.

Respondents were asked to state the number of times they carry wheelchair bound passengers on a weekly basis. Figure 8.3 shows the results. Some 67% of hackney carriage respondents and 78% of private hire respondents stated that they never carry wheelchair bound passengers.

Figure 8.1 Average daytime hours worked




Figure 8.2 Average night time hours worked





Figure 8.3 Frequency of Transport of Wheelchair Bound Persons




8.5 Safety and Security

Respondents were asked whether they had ever been attacked by a passenger in the last year. Some 74% of hackney respondents and 63% of private hire respondents stated that they had been verbally attacked with 17% of hackney respondents and 16% of private hire respondents individual stating they had been physically attacked.

The respondents were asked if they felt safe whilst working as a taxi driver in Chorley. The results of which are shown in Figure 8.4. None of the hackney carriage respondents felt safe all of the time. Some 20% of private hire respondents felt safe all of the time.

Figure 8.4 Do you feel safe whilst working as a taxi driver in Chorley?



Of those that did feel unsafe working in Chorley, 18.2% of the hackney carriage respondents and 26.3% of private hire respondents stated that they felt unsafe whilst working at night in Chorley Borough. Some 27.3% of hackney carriage respondents and 26.3% of the private hire respondents felt unsafe working in certain areas of Chorley. The area suggested as being unsafe was the town centre.

8.6 Ranks

Members of both trades were asked whether they believe there is sufficient rank space in Chorley. Almost two thirds (64%) of the hackney carriage and private hire trade (63%) did not feel there was enough rank space in Chorley Borough.


The trade were asked whether there were any areas where a new rank should be located. The most frequent suggestion was Chorley railway station. Other suggestions included: Church Street, Market Street, Balshaw Lane, Chorley Hospital, St Georges Street and generally in Chorley Town Centre. In addition some 68% of the hackney carriage respondents felt the High Street rank needed extending.

Respondents were asked if there was a rank at a number of locations would they use it. The locations included; Chorley Station, Adlington Village / Station, Buckshaw Station / Village, Euxton Station /Village, Croston Station/Village, Chorley Hospital and Eccleston Village. Some 78% of hackney carriage respondents felt they would use a rank at Chorley Railway Station. Just 2 hackney carriage respondents stated they would use a rank at the hospital and 1 the remaining locations.

8.7 Fares

Members of both trades were asked for their opinions regarding the current level of hackney carriage fares. Figure 8.5 indicates the responses. The majority of hackney carriage respondents (96%) considered hackney carriage fares to be 'about right'. Of the private hire respondents, some 42% believe they are too low with 26% believing they are 'about right'. Respondents were then asked how often they thought the fare tariff should be increased. The results indicate the majority of the private hire trade believe fares should be increased in line with fuel prices. While the hackney carriage trade were split with 43.5% believing fares should be increased annually and 43.5% every two years.

Figure 8.5 Opinions relating to hackney carriage fares



8.8 Vehicle Conditions

The trade were asked their opinion on the current hackney carriage and private hire vehicle testing conditions. Just one hackney carriage and one private hire respondent felt the hackney carriage conditions were unsatisfactory. The comments provided stated that there should be an age limit for hackney carriage vehicles with ten years suggested. When considering the private hire vehicle conditions, three respondents believed they were unsatisfactory. Comments again included the need for an age limit with ten years suggested. A further comment was that if new cars are licensed, MOT style testing every six months in the first two years is not justified.

8.9 Training

Before being granted a driving licence all new applicants are required to pass the Driving Standards Agency practical test. An enhanced test is required if the application is to drive a wheelchair accessible vehicle. Both trades were asked whether they felt sufficient driver training was in place before being granted a licence. The results show 87% of the hackney carriage respondents and 63% of the private hire respondents believe the training/testing is satisfactory.

8.10 Taxi market in Chorley

Members of both trades were asked whether they consider there to be sufficient hackney carriages to meet the current level of demand in Chorley town centre and the wider Borough. The results are shown in Figure 8.6 and Figure 8.7. Over half of

hackney carriage respondents believe there are too many hackney carriages in Chorley Town Centre, whereas almost a half of private hire respondents believe there are not sufficient hackney carriages available at all times of day. When considering the outer areas of the borough, the results show that the hackney trade believed there were sufficient or too many vehicles (79%), while over a half of private hire respondents believed there were not sufficient during all periods of the day.

Figure 8.6 Are there sufficient hackney carriages in Chorley Town Centre?





Figure 8.7 Are there sufficient hackney carriages in Chorley Borough (outlying areas)?




All respondents were asked to state how many hackney carriages there should be in the Chorley fleet. The average ideal size of hackney carriage fleet for the Chorley was considered to be 36 for the hackney carriage respondents compared with 41 (with a further 5 stating deregulate/unlimited) cited by the private hire respondents. The majority of respondents from the hackney carriage trade (91%) felt that the numerical limit should not be removed in Chorley. In contrast 63% of the private hire respondents were of the opinion the limit should be removed.

Some of Chorley Borough Council's neighbouring authorities have removed the numerical limit on the number of hackney carriage vehicle licences. Respondents were asked if this had impacted on the hackney carriage market in Chorley. The results in Figure 8.8 show that 48% of the hackney carriage and 53% of the private

hire respondents feel there has been a negative or very negative impact on the hackney carriage market in Chorley. Respondent's comments that increased competition through more vehicles coming into the borough has caused price wars, there is no longer enough work, and drivers are working more hours to compete.

Figure 8.8 Impact of neighbouring authorities licensing policy




Views were sought regarding the likely impact on a series of factors if Chorley Borough Council were to remove the limit on hackney carriage licences. The findings are summarised below and presented in detail in Appendix 3:

- Some 82% of the hackney carriage trade believe congestion would increase in Chorley, whereas 74% of the private hire trade felt that there would be no effect.
- Some 82% of the hackney carriage trade and 58% of the private hire trade felt that removing the numerical limit would have no impact on fares.
- The majority of hackney carriage trade respondents felt that there would be no effect on the passenger waiting times at ranks, by flag down or by telephone. In contrast the majority of private hire respondents felt waiting times would reduce.
- The hackney carriage trade felt there would be a negative impact on the quality of hackney carriages. The private hire trade felt vehicle quality would be unaffected.
- Some 56% of the hackney carriage trade felt there would be a negative impact on the effectiveness of enforcement in Chorley. Just 17% of the private hire trade agreed that this would be the case.
- The hackney carriage trade felt that over ranking would increase. The private hire respondents were divided with 42% believing this would increase.
- Almost half of the hackney carriage trade felt that customer satisfaction would reduce (48%) as a result of the limit being removed, whilst 63% of the private hire trade felt that it would increase.

All respondents were asked their response to the statement *“there is not enough work to support the current number of hackney carriages”*. The results in Figure 8.9 show


that 48% of hackney carriage respondents strongly agree or agree with the statement that there is not enough work to support the current number of hackney carriages. In contrast 55 % of the private hire respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed. Some of the most common responses agreeing with the statement included; Drivers wait hours to get a fare, the recession has badly effected the trade in Chorley and people can easily get a taxi at all times of day. Other comments included; there is plenty of work out there if you want it, and if the hackney drivers were not making any money they would not be there.

Figure 8.9 Opinion on “there is not enough work.”




The survey then asked opinions of the following statement; ‘I have been affected by vehicles from neighbouring authorities working within Chorley Borough’. The results in Figure 8.10 show that 61% of private hire respondents strongly agreed or agreed that they have been affected by vehicles from neighbouring authorities. Just over a third of hackney carriage respondents agreed this was the case. Some of the most common responses agreeing with the statement included; more hackneys from other boroughs are working in Chorley, and we see Rossendale and Wigan plates in Chorley. Other comments included that although vehicles licensed in other areas have been seen in Chorley they are always undertaking school contracts or a legal telephone booking, not plying.

Figure 8.10 Affected by vehicles from neighbouring authorities




The survey then asked for opinions on the following statement; *“Removing the limit on the number of hackney carriages in Chorley would benefit the public by reducing waiting times at ranks”*. Figure 8.11 shows that 81% of hackney carriage drivers strongly disagreed or disagreed that removing the limit on the number of hackney carriages in Torridge would reduce public waiting times at ranks, compared with just 17% of the private hire trade.

Figure 8.11 Opinion of “removing the limit on the number of hackney carriages in Chorley would benefit the public by reducing waiting times at ranks”




The survey then asked opinions of the following statement, *‘There are special circumstances in Chorley that made the retention of the numerical limit essential’*. Figure 8.12 shows that 55% of the hackney carriage trade agree or strongly agree that there are special circumstances in Chorley that make the retention of a numerical limit essential, compared with 6% of private hire respondents. Comments included, because Chorley is small more taxis would be devastating and more taxis would cause congestion and parking problems. Comments opposing the statement included; the small hackney fleet is only benefiting plate owners not the people of Chorley, and there are no special circumstances.

Figure 8.12 Opinion of “there are special circumstances in Chorley that make the retention of the numerical limit essential”



Finally, the trade were asked what effect they thought it would have on them if the authority removed the numerical limit on hackney carriages. The results in Figure 8.13 indicate that 48% of hackney carriage respondents cited they would work longer hours and 61% claim they would leave the trade. Some 68% of private hire drivers said they would switch from private hire to hackney carriage.

Figure 8.13 Effect if the numerical limit was removed (multiple responses)



8.11 Summary

The key results of the trade survey can be summarised as follows:

- Some 67% of hackney carriage respondents and 78% of private hire respondents stated that they never carry wheelchair bound passengers.
- Some 74% of hackney respondents and 63% of private hire respondents stated that they had been verbally attacked with 17% of hackney respondents and 16% of private hire respondents stating they had been physically attacked.
- When working as a taxi driver in Chorley, none of the hackney carriage respondents felt safe all of the time.
- Almost two thirds (64%) of the hackney carriage and private hire trade (63%) did not feel there was enough rank space in Chorley Borough.
- Over half of hackney carriage respondents believe there are too many hackney carriages in Chorley Town Centre, whereas almost a half of private hire respondents believe there are not sufficient hackney carriages available at all times of day.
- Some 79% of hackney respondents believed there were sufficient hackney carriages to cover the whole borough, while over a half of private hire respondents believed there were not sufficient during all periods of the day.
- The majority of respondents from the hackney carriage trade (91%) felt that the numerical limit should not be removed in Chorley. In contrast 63% of the private hire respondents were of the opinion the limit should be removed.

9 Deriving the Significant Unmet Demand Index Value

9.1 Introduction

The data provided in the previous chapters can be summarised using Halcrow's ISUD factor described in Section 4.

The component parts of the index, their source and their values are given below;

Average Passenger Delay (Table 5.2)	0.02
Peak Factor (Figure 5.1)	0.5
General Incidence of Delay (Table 5.3)	0
Steady State Performance (Table 5.1)	0
Seasonality Factor (Section 4.4)	1
Latent Demand Factor (Section 6.3)	1.091
ISUD (0.02*0.5*0*0*1*1.091)	0

The cut off level for a significant unmet demand is 80. It is clear that Chorley is well below this cut off point as the ISUD is 0, indicating that there is **NO significant unmet demand**. This conclusion covers both patent and latent/suppressed demand.

10 Summary and Conclusions

10.1 Introduction

Halcrow has conducted a study of the hackney carriage and private hire market on behalf of Chorley Borough Council. The present study has been conducted in pursuit of the following objectives. To determine;

- whether or not there is a significant unmet demand for Hackney Carriage services within Chorley as defined in Section 16 of the Transport Act 1985; and
- how many additional taxis are required to eliminate any significant unmet demand.

This section provides a brief description of the work undertaken and summarises the conclusions.

10.2 Significant Unmet Demand

The 2012 study has identified that there is NO evidence of significant unmet demand for hackney carriages in Chorley. This conclusion is based on an assessment of the implications of case law that has emerged since 2000, and the results of Halcrow's analysis.

10.3 Public Perception

Public perception of the service was obtained through the undertaking of 358 surveys. Overall the public were generally satisfied with the service – key points included;

- Some 73.5% of hiring's are by telephone;
- High levels of satisfaction with delay on last trip – flag down hiring's providing the highest levels;
- Some 9.1% of people had given up trying to obtain a taxi at a rank or by flagdown;
- Some 41.2% of people felt that taxi services could be improved – need to be cheaper
- Some 51.2% of people felt that new ranks were not needed.

10.4 Recommendations

The 2012 study has identified that there is NO evidence of significant unmet demand for hackney carriages in Chorley. This conclusion covers both patent and latent/suppressed demand and is based on an assessment of the implications of case law that has emerged since 2000, and the results of Halcrow's analysis.

On this basis the authority has discretion in its hackney licensing policy and may either:

- Maintain the current limit of 36 hackney carriage licences;
- issue any number of additional plates as it sees fit, either in one allocation or a series of allocations; or
- remove the numerical limit

Further recommendations based on the outcome of the consultation exercises include:

- The feasibility of a rank at Chorley Station should be investigated with Northern Rail. The trade, stakeholders and members of the public all expressed a desire for a rank in this location, therefore if one were to be introduced it is likely it would be viable and used by both passengers and drivers.
- Further investigation should be undertaken into the provision of taxi services at Chorley Hospital. Some 68% of public respondents believed a hackney carriage rank should be introduced here. However only 2 of the hackney carriage trade respondents stated they would use a rank in this location if one were provided meaning it is unlikely a traditional rank would be viable unless the trade could see a clear demand for their services.

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 1: Chorley Rank Observations

High Street

Friday 18/05/2012 0700-1500

	Rank Throughput		Queue 'Snap-Shot' Totals		Service Quality		Queue Extremes		Market Conditions		
Hour	Passengers	Cabs	Passenger Queue	Cab Queue	Average Passenger Delay	Average Cab Delay	Maximum Passenger Queue	Minimum Cab Queue	Excess Demand	Equilibrium	Excess Supply
0700-0800	1	3	0	19	0.00	31.67	0	0	0	1	0
0800-0900	1	1	0	24	0.00	120.00	0	1	0	1	0
0900-1000	7	8	0	33	0.00	20.63	0	2	0	1	0
1000-1100	15	15	0	99	0.00	33.00	0	6	0	0	1
1100-1200	29	22	0	109	0.00	24.77	0	6	0	0	1
1200-1300	24	20	0	99	0.00	24.75	0	7	0	0	1
1300-1400	22	16	0	38	0.00	11.88	0	5	0	0	1
1400-1500	29	25	0	95	0.00	19.00	0	5	0	0	1
Total	128	110	0	516	0.00	23.45			0	3	5

Tuesday 15/05/2012 1000-1700

	Rank Throughput		Queue 'Snap-Shot' Totals		Service Quality		Queue Extremes		Market Conditions		
Hour	Passengers	Cabs	Passenger Queue	Cab Queue	Average Passenger Delay	Average Cab Delay	Maximum Passenger Queue	Minimum Cab Queue	Excess Demand	Equilibrium	Excess Supply
1000-1100	30	23	0	95	0.00	20.65	0	5	0	0	1
1100-1200	42	28	0	108	0.00	19.29	0	5	0	0	1
1200-1300	34	22	0	128	0.00	29.09	0	8	0	0	1
1300-1400	19	17	0	53	0.00	15.59	0	3	0	0	1
1400-1500	24	18	0	52	0.00	14.44	0	3	0	0	1
1500-1600	28	24	0	80	0.00	16.67	0	2	0	1	0
1600-1700	23	18	0	106	0.00	29.44	0	8	0	0	1
Total	200	150	0	622	0.00	20.73			0	1	6

Wednesday 16/05/2012 1600-1800

	Rank Throughput		Queue 'Snap-Shot' Totals		Service Quality		Queue Extremes		Market Conditions		
Hour	Passengers	Cabs	Passenger Queue	Cab Queue	Average Passenger Delay	Average Cab Delay	Maximum Passenger Queue	Minimum Cab Queue	Excess Demand	Equilibrium	Excess Supply
1600-1700	25	17	0	97	0.00	28.53	0	6	0	0	1
1700-1800	15	11	0	121	0.00	55.00	0	9	0	0	1
Total	40	28	0	218	0.00	38.93			0	0	2

Wednesday 16/05/2012 1800-2000

	Rank Throughput		Queue 'Snap-Shot' Totals		Service Quality		Queue Extremes		Market Conditions		
Hour	Passengers	Cabs	Passenger Queue	Cab Queue	Average Passenger Delay	Average Cab Delay	Maximum Passenger Queue	Minimum Cab Queue	Excess Demand	Equilibrium	Excess Supply
1800-1900	9	8	0	113	0.00	70.63	0	7	0	0	1
1900-2000	2	2	0	125	0.00	312.50	0	10	0	0	1
Total	11	10	0	238	0.00	119.00			0	0	2

Thursday 17/05/2011 1800-0200

	Rank Throughput		Queue 'Snap-Shot' Totals		Service Quality		Queue Extremes		Market Conditions		
Hour	Passengers	Cabs	Passenger Queue	Cab Queue	Average Passenger Delay	Average Cab Delay	Maximum Passenger Queue	Minimum Cab Queue	Excess Demand	Equilibrium	Excess Supply
1800-1900	9	10	0	79	0.00	39.50	0	2	0	1	0
1900-2000	7	9	0	94	0.00	52.22	0	5	0	0	1
2000-2100	8	8	0	102	0.00	63.75	0	6	0	0	1
2100-2200	9	11	0	88	0.00	40.00	0	6	0	0	1
2200-2300	8	8	0	99	0.00	61.88	0	5	0	0	1
2300-0000	29	25	0	83	0.00	16.60	0	3	0	0	1
0000-0100	36	25	0	113	0.00	22.60	0	7	0	0	1
0100-0200	10	9	0	128	0.00	71.11	0	9	0	0	1
Total	116	105	0	786	0.00	37.43			0	1	7

Saturday 12/05/2012 1000-1800

	Rank Throughput		Queue 'Snap-Shot' Totals		Service Quality		Queue Extremes		Market Conditions		
Hour	Passengers	Cabs	Passenger Queue	Cab Queue	Average Passenger Delay	Average Cab Delay	Maximum Passenger Queue	Minimum Cab Queue	Excess Demand	Equilibrium	Excess Supply
1000-1100	11	13	0	49	0.00	18.85	0	5	0	0	1
1100-1200	20	14	0	50	0.00	17.86	0	4	0	0	1
1200-1300	26	20	0	63	0.00	15.75	0	2	0	1	0
1300-1400	10	10	0	50	0.00	25.00	0	1	0	1	0
1400-1500	27	18	0	30	0.00	8.33	0	1	0	1	0
1500-1600	33	21	0	46	0.00	10.95	0	2	0	1	0
1600-1700	26	20	0	66	0.00	16.50	0	1	0	1	0
1700-1800	17	14	0	81	0.00	28.93	0	4	0	0	1
Total	170	130	0	435	0.00	16.73			0	5	3

Friday 18/05/2012 2000-0400

	Rank Throughput		Queue 'Snap-Shot' Totals		Service Quality		Queue Extremes		Market Conditions		
Hour	Passengers	Cabs	Passenger Queue	Cab Queue	Average Passenger Delay	Average Cab Delay	Maximum Passenger Queue	Minimum Cab Queue	Excess Demand	Equilibrium	Excess Supply
2000-2100	15	13	0	89	0.00	34.23	0	3	0	0	1
2100-2200	29	19	0	79	0.00	20.79	0	1	0	1	0
2200-2300	26	19	0	96	0.00	25.26	0	3	0	0	1
2300-0000	52	34	0	121	0.00	17.79	0	6	0	0	1
0000-0100	68	38	0	119	0.00	15.66	0	7	0	0	1
0100-0200	51	30	0	126	0.00	21.00	0	9	0	0	1
0200-0300	45	26	0	111	0.00	21.35	0	4	0	0	1
0300-0400	27	22	0	76	0.00	17.27	0	1	0	1	0
Total	313	201	0	817	0.00	20.32			0	2	6

Saturday 19/05/2012 2000-0400

	Rank Throughput		Queue 'Snap-Shot' Totals		Service Quality		Queue Extremes		Market Conditions		
Hour	Passengers	Cabs	Passenger Queue	Cab Queue	Average Passenger Delay	Average Cab Delay	Maximum Passenger Queue	Minimum Cab Queue	Excess Demand	Equilibrium	Excess Supply
2000-2100	32	20	0	72	0.00	18.00	0	3	0	0	1
2100-2200	21	16	0	95	0.00	29.69	0	5	0	0	1
2200-2300	52	35	0	74	0.00	10.57	0	1	0	1	0
2300-0000	102	58	0	98	0.00	8.45	0	2	0	1	0
0000-0100	165	107	11	52	0.33	2.43	4	0	1	0	0
0100-0200	114	68	0	71	0.00	5.22	0	1	0	1	0
0200-0300	164	95	0	50	0.00	2.63	0	2	0	1	0
0300-0400	57	33	0	107	0.00	16.21	0	4	0	0	1
Total	707	432	11	619	0.08	7.16			1	4	3

Sunday 13/05/2012 1400-1800

	Rank Throughput		Queue 'Snap-Shot' Totals		Service Quality		Queue Extremes		Market Conditions		
Hour	Passengers	Cabs	Passenger Queue	Cab Queue	Average Passenger Delay	Average Cab Delay	Maximum Passenger Queue	Minimum Cab Queue	Excess Demand	Equilibrium	Excess Supply
1400-1500	10	7	0	22	0.00	15.71	0	0	0	1	0
1500-1600	3	5	0	33	0.00	33.00	0	1	0	1	0
1600-1700	3	9	0	55	0.00	30.56	0	4	0	0	1
1700-1800	26	23	0	98	0.00	21.30	0	3	0	0	1
Total	42	44	0	208	0.00	23.64			0	2	2

Market Street

Thursday 24/05/2012 2200-0200

	Rank Throughput		Queue 'Snap-Shot' Totals		Service Quality		Queue Extremes		Market Conditions		
Hour	Passengers	Cabs	Passenger Queue	Cab Queue	Average Passenger Delay	Average Cab Delay	Maximum Passenger Queue	Minimum Cab Queue	Excess Demand	Equilibrium	Excess Supply
2200-2300	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1	0
2300-2400	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1	0
2400-0100	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1	0
0100-0200	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1	0
Total	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00			0	4	0

Friday 25/05/2012 2200-0200

	Rank Throughput		Queue 'Snap-Shot' Totals		Service Quality		Queue Extremes		Market Conditions		
Hour	Passengers	Cabs	Passenger Queue	Cab Queue	Average Passenger Delay	Average Cab Delay	Maximum Passenger Queue	Minimum Cab Queue	Excess Demand	Equilibrium	Excess Supply
2200-2300	0	1	0	1	0.00	5.00	0	1	0	1	0
2300-2400	0	5	0	10	0.00	10.00	0	3	0	0	1
2400-0100	0	6	0	8	0.00	6.67	0	2	0	1	0
0100-0200	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1	0
Total	0	12	0	19	0.00	7.92			0	3	1

Cleveland Street

Thursday 17/05/2012 1800-0200

	Rank Throughput		Queue 'Snap-Shot' Totals		Service Quality		Queue Extremes		Market Conditions		
Hour	Passengers	Cabs	Passenger Queue	Cab Queue	Average Passenger Delay	Average Cab Delay	Maximum Passenger Queue	Minimum Cab Queue	Excess Demand	Equilibrium	Excess Supply
1800-1900	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1	0
1900-2000	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1	0
2000-2100	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1	0
2100-2200	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1	0
2200-2300	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1	0
2300-0000	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1	0
0000-0100	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1	0
0100-0200	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1	0
Total	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00			0	8	0

Friday 18/05/2012 2000-0400

	Rank Throughput		Queue 'Snap-Shot' Totals		Service Quality		Queue Extremes		Market Conditions		
Hour	Passengers	Cabs	Passenger Queue	Cab Queue	Average Passenger Delay	Average Cab Delay	Maximum Passenger Queue	Minimum Cab Queue	Excess Demand	Equilibrium	Excess Supply
2000-2100	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1	0
2100-2200	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1	0
2200-2300	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1	0
2300-0000	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1	0
0000-0100	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1	0
0100-0200	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1	0
0200-0300	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1	0
0300-0400	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1	0
Total	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00			0	8	0

Friday 19/05/2012 2000-0400

	Rank Throughput		Queue 'Snap-Shot' Totals		Service Quality		Queue Extremes		Market Conditions		
Hour	Passengers	Cabs	Passenger Queue	Cab Queue	Average Passenger Delay	Average Cab Delay	Maximum Passenger Queue	Minimum Cab Queue	Excess Demand	Equilibrium	Excess Supply
2000-2100	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1	0
2100-2200	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1	0
2200-2300	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1	0
2300-0000	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1	0
0000-0100	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1	0
0100-0200	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1	0
0200-0300	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1	0
0300-0400	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1	0
Total	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00			0	8	0

Bus Station*

Friday 18/05/2012 1600 - 1800

	Rank Throughput		Queue 'Snap-Shot' Totals		Service Quality		Queue Extremes		Market Conditions		
Hour	Passengers	Cabs	Passenger Queue	Cab Queue	Average Passenger Delay	Average Cab Delay	Maximum Passenger Queue	Minimum Cab Queue	Excess Demand	Equilibrium	Excess Supply
1600-1700	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1	0
1700-18-00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1	0
Total	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00			0	2	0

Saturday 19/05/2012 1500-1800

Hour	Rank Throughput		Queue 'Snap-Shot' Totals		Service Quality		Queue Extremes		Market Conditions		
	Passengers	Cabs	Passenger Queue	Cab Queue	Average Passenger Delay	Average Cab Delay	Maximum Passenger Queue	Minimum Cab Queue	Excess Demand	Equilibrium	Excess Supply
1500-1600	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1	0
1600-1700	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1	0
1700-1800	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	1	0
Total	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00			0	3	0

* In addition to the observations listed above the bus station rank was observed during spot checks at the start and finish of the majority of each observation above.
At no time were any taxis or passengers observed waiting at the rank.

Rail Station*

* The rail station was highlighted as a location without a rank where taxis have been observed plying.
The forecourt was observed during spot checks at the start and finish of the majority of each observation above. At no time were any passengers observed waiting for a taxi.
On two occasions hackney carriages were observed waiting in front of the rail station. Two vehicles Thursday 17th May 17:45 - 17:55
 One vehicle Friday 18th May 19:45 - 19:55
These spot checks were undertaken at the request of the council and are for information only. They do not form part of the analysis of unmet demand.

Chorley Borough Council Public Attitude Survey

Area Survey Completed	Surveyor Name	Date																		
1 Have you made a trip by taxi in Chorley Borough in the last 3 months? <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; margin-top: 10px;"> Yes <input style="width: 40px;" type="text"/> No <input style="width: 40px;" type="text"/> </div> <p>IF "NO" GO TO QUESTION 9</p>																				
2 On your last trip how did you obtain your taxi? <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; margin-top: 10px;"> At a rank <input style="width: 40px;" type="text"/> Waved down in the street <input style="width: 40px;" type="text"/> By telephone <input style="width: 40px;" type="text"/> </div>																				
3 If the taxi was obtained by telephone, which taxi company did you use? _____																				
4 What type of vehicle was it? <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; margin-top: 10px;"> Purpose built cab <input style="width: 40px;" type="text"/> Saloon <input style="width: 40px;" type="text"/> Minibus/people carrier <input style="width: 40px;" type="text"/> </div>																				
5 However you obtained your vehicle, were you satisfied with the time taken and promptness of its arrival? <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; margin-top: 10px;"> Yes <input style="width: 40px;" type="text"/> No <input style="width: 40px;" type="text"/> </div>																				
6 If you had to wait longer than expected was this due to the type of vehicle you required? <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; margin-top: 10px;"> No wait <input style="width: 40px;" type="text"/> Yes, I required a purpose built cab <input style="width: 40px;" type="text"/> Yes, I required a minibus <input style="width: 40px;" type="text"/> </div>																				
7 When did you obtain your taxi? <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; margin-top: 10px;"> Day (before 6pm) <input style="width: 40px;" type="text"/> Evening (6pm-10pm) <input style="width: 40px;" type="text"/> Night (after 10pm) <input style="width: 40px;" type="text"/> </div>																				
8 Thinking of the last journey when you travelled in a taxi in Chorley Borough, how would you rate the following? <p>(please tick one rating per line)</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin-top: 10px;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;">Very Good</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Good</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Average</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Poor</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Very Poor</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Vehicle Quality</td> <td style="text-align: center;">[]</td> <td style="text-align: center;">[]</td> <td style="text-align: center;">[]</td> <td style="text-align: center;">[]</td> <td style="text-align: center;">[]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Driver Quality</td> <td style="text-align: center;">[]</td> <td style="text-align: center;">[]</td> <td style="text-align: center;">[]</td> <td style="text-align: center;">[]</td> <td style="text-align: center;">[]</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>If you have rated any of the above aspects as Poor or Very Poor please explain your reasons why?</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 40px; margin-top: 10px;"></div>				Very Good	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor	Vehicle Quality	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	Driver Quality	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
	Very Good	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor															
Vehicle Quality	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]															
Driver Quality	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]															
9 In the last 3 months, have you given up waiting for a taxi at a rank in Chorley Borough? <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; margin-top: 10px;"> Yes <input style="width: 40px;" type="text"/> No <input style="width: 40px;" type="text"/> </div>																				
10 In the last 3 months, have you given up searching for a taxi by flagdown/on the street in Chorley Borough? <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; margin-top: 10px;"> Yes <input style="width: 40px;" type="text"/> No <input style="width: 40px;" type="text"/> </div>																				
11 In the last 3 months, have you given up trying to obtain a taxi in Chorley Borough by telephone? <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; margin-top: 10px;"> Yes <input style="width: 40px;" type="text"/> No <input style="width: 40px;" type="text"/> </div>																				
<p><u>IF YOU ANSWERED YES TO Q9, Q10 OR Q11 ANSWER Q12. IF NO GO TO Q13.</u></p>																				
12a Thinking about the last time you gave up waiting for a taxi, which area of Chorley Borough were you waiting in? <div style="margin-top: 10px;"> _____ (Please specify e.g. Chorley Centre, Adlington, Euxton etc) </div>																				
12b What time was this? _____ : _____ (please use 24hr clock e.g. 20:00)																				
12c What type of vehicle did you need? <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; margin-top: 10px;"> Any <input style="width: 40px;" type="text"/> Wheelchair Accessible <input style="width: 40px;" type="text"/> Minibus/ People Carrier <input style="width: 40px;" type="text"/> </div>																				

Please explain to respondent:

There are 2 types of taxis in the Borough of Chorley

1. Hackney Carriages are white, have a roof sign and can pick up at a rank or be flagged down on the street.

2. Private hire vehicles are *not* white in colour, have signs on the doors with details of their operator and must be prebooked.

13 Do you think there are sufficient HACKNEY CARRIAGES in Chorley Borough?

Chorley Town Centre	Yes	<input type="text"/>	No	<input type="text"/>	Don't know	<input type="text"/>
Chorley Borough (outer areas)	Yes	<input type="text"/>	No	<input type="text"/>	Don't know	<input type="text"/>

14a Could hackney and/or private hire services in Chorley Borough be improved?

Yes	<input type="text"/>	No	<input type="text"/>
-----	----------------------	----	----------------------

14b IF YES, how could they be improved? (Circle as many as apply)

More of them	<input type="text"/>	Better Drivers	<input type="text"/>	More ranks	<input type="text"/>
Shared Taxis	<input type="text"/>	Cheaper	<input type="text"/>	Better Vehicles	<input type="text"/>
More wheelchair accessible/disabled access vehicles			<input type="text"/>	Other (please state)	<input type="text"/>

15a Do you feel safe using hackneys and private hire vehicles in Chorley Borough?

During the day	Yes	<input type="text"/>	No	<input type="text"/>	At times	<input type="text"/>	Don't know	<input type="text"/>
At night	Yes	<input type="text"/>	No	<input type="text"/>	At times	<input type="text"/>	Don't know	<input type="text"/>

15b If you do not feel safe all, or some of the time, what would make you feel safer using taxis in Chorley Borough?

16a Currently taxi ranks are only provided in Chorley Town Centre. No outlying villages or railway stations in the Borough of Chorley provide a taxi rank. Do you think it is important that hackney carriage ranks are provided at:

Chorley Station	Yes	<input type="text"/>	No	<input type="text"/>	Don't know	<input type="text"/>
Adlington Village / Station	Yes	<input type="text"/>	No	<input type="text"/>	Don't know	<input type="text"/>
Buckshaw Parkway	Yes	<input type="text"/>	No	<input type="text"/>	Don't know	<input type="text"/>
Euxton Village / Station	Yes	<input type="text"/>	No	<input type="text"/>	Don't know	<input type="text"/>
Croston Village / Station	Yes	<input type="text"/>	No	<input type="text"/>	Don't know	<input type="text"/>
Eccleston Village	Yes	<input type="text"/>	No	<input type="text"/>	Don't know	<input type="text"/>
Chorley Hospital	Yes	<input type="text"/>	No	<input type="text"/>	Don't know	<input type="text"/>

16b Are there any specific locations (either in Chorley Centre or elsewhere in the Borough) where you would like to see a new taxi rank?

Yes	<input type="text"/>	No	<input type="text"/>	Don't know	<input type="text"/>
-----	----------------------	----	----------------------	------------	----------------------

16c IF "YES" please state location Street/Landmark

17 Age	16-34	<input type="text"/>	35-64	<input type="text"/>	65+	<input type="text"/>
--------	-------	----------------------	-------	----------------------	-----	----------------------

18 Gender	Male	<input type="text"/>	Female	<input type="text"/>
-----------	------	----------------------	--------	----------------------

19 Circumstances	Full-time employed	<input type="text"/>	Part-time employed	<input type="text"/>
	Unemployed	<input type="text"/>	Student/pupil	<input type="text"/>
	Retired	<input type="text"/>	Housewife/husband	<input type="text"/>
			Other	<input type="text"/>

20 Do you consider yourself mobility impaired?	Yes	<input type="text"/>	No	<input type="text"/>
--	-----	----------------------	----	----------------------

21 IF "YES" are you a wheelchair user?	Yes	<input type="text"/>	No	<input type="text"/>
--	-----	----------------------	----	----------------------

22 Residency	Permanent Resident	<input type="text"/>	Visitor	<input type="text"/>	Student	<input type="text"/>
--------------	--------------------	----------------------	---------	----------------------	---------	----------------------

A proportion of respondents will be contacted to ensure that the information collected above is accurate. Please provide your contact details to enable us to quality check the data collected. Your details will not be stored or passed onto a third party.

Name: _____ Contact Number: _____

If the respondent is reluctant to provide their contact details, please ask them to sign the form to confirm that they have taken part in the survey.

Signature _____



Technical note

Project Chorley Unmet Demand Survey 2012

Date 15 August 2012

Subject Public Attitude Survey

Ref GTXCHO 000

Author Liz Richardson / Katie Dixon

1 Introduction

The purpose of this technical note is to present the results of a public attitude survey undertaken by Halcrow on behalf of Chorley Borough Council.

The public attitude interview was designed with the aim of collecting information regarding opinions on the taxi market in Chorley. In particular, the survey allowed an assessment of flagdown, telephone and rank delays, the satisfaction with delays and general use information.

Some 358 on-street and telephone public attitude surveys were carried out in May, June and July 2012. The surveys were conducted across a range of locations within the Chorley licensing area. Some 29% of surveys were completed in the outlying areas of Chorley Borough and the analysis has been split to consider the views of respondents in outlying areas of the borough and Chorley town in addition to the overall results. It should be noted that in the tables and figures that follow the totals do not always add up to the same amount. This is due to one of two reasons. First, not all respondents were required to answer all questions; and second, some respondents failed to answer some questions that were asked.

The public attitude interview was designed with the aim of collecting information regarding opinions on the taxi market in Chorley. In particular, the survey allowed an assessment of flagdown, telephone and rank delays, the satisfaction with delays, and general use information across Chorley.

2 Survey Administration

Some 358 public attitude surveys were carried out across May, June and July 2012 both on the street and via telephone. The surveys were conducted during the day across a range of locations within the Chorley Licensing District. The age and gender samples are given in Table 1 below. The sample of 358 interviews provides a robust basis for assessment.

Table 1: Target and Actual Samples for Interview Surveys by Age and Gender

Category	Chorley	Outlying Areas	Total
16-34	21.1%	15.6%	19.9%
35-64	39.6%	37.7%	39.2%
65+	39.3%	46.7%	40.9%
Total	100%	100%	100.0%
Male	48.3%	39.5%	46.2%
Female	51.7%	60.5%	53.8%
Total	100%	100%	100.0

The respondents were asked to give their economic status. The results are displayed in Table 2.

Table 2: Economic Status

	Chorley	Outlying Areas	Total
Full-time employed	20.0%	26.7%	21.5%
Part-time Employed	12.3%	6.7%	11.0%
Unemployed	5.4%	2.7%	4.7%
Student/Pupil	7.3%	0.0%	5.7%
Retired	46.9%	57.3%	49.3%
Housewife/Husband	5.0%	4.0%	4.8%
Other	3.1%	2.7%	30.0%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Respondents were asked to specify their residency. The results are shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Residency

	Chorley	Outlying Areas	Total
Permanent Resident	85.7%	90.9%	86.6%
Visitor	4.6%	9.1%	5.5%
University Student	9.7%	0.0%	7.9%
Total	100%	100%	100%

3 Characteristics of Last Trip

Respondents were each asked if they had made a journey by taxi in Chorley within the last three months. The survey found that 38.4% had used a taxi within this period. The results are displayed in Table 4.

Table 4: Have you made a trip by taxi in the past three months?

	Chorley	Outlying Areas	Total
Yes	38.1	38.0%	38.4%
No	61.5%	62.0%	61.6%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Respondents who had hired a taxi in the last three months were asked further questions about their experience. Some 24.3% of trip makers stated that they hired a taxi at a rank. Some 73.5% of hirings were achieved by telephone with 2.2% of trip makers obtaining a taxi by on-street flagdown. Table 5 reveals the pattern of taxi hire.

Table 5: Method of hire for last trip

Trip Type	Chorley	Outlying Areas	Total
Rank	27.6%	10.0%	24.3%
Flagdown	2.9%	0.0%	2.2%
Telephone	69.5%	90%	73.5%
Total	100%	100%	100.0

Those respondents hiring their vehicle by telephone were asked which company they used. Coopers was the most used taxi company followed by A2B and 6666. Others used included Chorley Taxis, Starcars, Millers and Eccleston Private Hire. Many respondents were unable to remember the company used.

Respondents were asked what type of vehicle they hired. The most common type of vehicle used was a saloon car (57.4%) with 30.9% of respondents hiring a purpose built cab and 11.8% travelling by minibus or people carrier.

Table 6: Vehicle type for last trip

Vehicle Type	Chorley	Outlying Areas	Total
Purpose Built Cab	34.0%	20.7%	30.9
Saloon car	52.8%	72.4%	57.4
Minibus / people carrier	13.2%	6.9%	11.8
Total	100%	100%	100.0

Respondents were asked if they were satisfied with the time taken and the promptness of the taxis arrival. The majority of people were satisfied with the time taken to obtain their vehicle (94.7%). This figure was slightly lower when only the outlying areas were analysed (89.7%). The results are shown in Table 7. Table 7 shows that for each method of obtaining a taxi, the majority were satisfied with the length of time they had to wait. Those obtaining their taxi by on street flagdown provided the highest levels of satisfaction.

Table 7: Satisfaction with delay on last trip (multiple responses)

	Chorley	Outlying Areas	Total
Rank	88.9%	100%	90%
Flagdown	100%	100%	100%
Telephone	100%	88.5%	96.9%
All Trip Makers	96.1%	89.7%	94.7%

Out of the seven people who weren't satisfied with the length of time that they had to wait three required a minibus.

Respondents were asked what time of day they hired their taxi, the results are shown in Table 8 below. The majority of respondents hired their vehicle before 6pm.

Table 8: Time of hire

	Chorley	Outlying Areas	Total
Day (before 6pm)	46.7%	60.0%	49.3%
Evening (6pm-10pm)	26.7%	26.7%	26.5%
Night (after 10pm)	26.7%	13.3%	24.3%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Respondents were asked to rate two of elements from their last taxi journey on a scale from very poor to very good. The results are shown in Tables 9, 10 and 11 and indicate that respondents generally consider vehicle quality and driver quality to be good or very good.

Table 9: Service rating (all areas)

Characteristic	Very good	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor
Vehicle quality	40.7%	36.3%	19.3%	2.2%	1.5%
Driver quality	41.9%	30.9%	19.1%	4.4%	3.7%

Table 10: Service rating (Chorley Town Centre)

Characteristic	Very good	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor
Vehicle quality	36.5	37.5	21.2	2.9	1.9
Driver quality	37.1	31.4	21.9	5.7	3.8

Table 11: Service rating (Chorley Borough (Outer areas))

Characteristic	Very good	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor
Vehicle quality	53.3	33.3	13.3	0	0
Driver quality	60.0	26.7	10.0	0	3.3

Those stating that quality was poor or very poor gave the following reasons:

- 'cars not very well maintained';
- 'drivers can't drive and can't speak English';
- 'not clean';
- 'rude'; and
- 'drivers don't help with luggage'.

4 Attempted Method of Hire

To provide evidence of suppressed demand in the event of finding significant patent unmet demand, all respondents were asked to identify whether or not they had given up waiting for a taxi at a rank, on the street, or by telephone in Chorley in the last three months. The results are summarised in Table 12.

Table 12: Given up attempting to hire a taxi by method of hire in the last three months

	Chorley		Outlying Areas		Total	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Given up at a rank	5.1	94.9	3.8	96.2	4.8	95.2
Given up flagdown	7.7	92.3	5.1	94.9	7.1	92.9
Given up telephone	3.6	96.4	7.6	92.4	4.5	95.5

The majority of respondents replied that they had not given up waiting for a taxi in the last three months. Some 9.1% (32/352 respondents) had given up waiting for a taxi by rank and/or flagdown.

Respondents who had given up trying to obtain a taxi in the last three months at a rank, by flagdown and/or by telephone were asked the location where they had given up waiting for a taxi. The most common area was Chorley Town Centre.

Those who had given up trying to obtain a taxi were asked at what time this occurred. Some 48% occurred during the day (before 6pm), with 36% occurring after 10pm.

Respondents were also asked what type of vehicle they required, the results of which are shown in Table 13.

Table 13: Type of vehicle required?

Vehicle Type	Chorley	Outlying Areas	Total
Any	95.2	87.5	87.5
Wheelchair accessible	0	0	0
Minibus/people carrier	4.8	12.5	12.5
Total			100.0

5 Service Provision

Respondents were asked whether they feel there are enough hackney carriages in Chorley Town Centre and across the borough at the current time, the results of which are shown in Table's 14 and 15. Some 39.4% of the total number of respondents commented that there are sufficient in the town centre, 28.4% felt there were sufficient in the outer areas of the Borough, whilst the majority were unsure. When considering respondents from central Chorley only, 42.2% believed there were sufficient in the centre while 7.2% believed there were NOT sufficient. When considering respondents from outer areas of the borough only, 19% believed there were sufficient in outlying areas, while 16.4% believed there were NOT sufficient.

Table 14: Are there enough hackney carriages in Chorley Town Centre?

	Respondents in Chorley	Respondents in Outlying Areas	Total Respondents
Yes	42.2%	30.0%	39.4%
No	7.2%	15.0%	9.0%
Don't know	50.6%	55.0%	51.6%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Table 15: Are there enough hackney carriages in Chorley Borough (outer areas)?

	Respondents in Chorley	Respondents in Outlying Areas	Total Respondents
Yes	31.2%	19.0%	28.4%
No	10.6%	16.4%	12.0%
Don't know	58.2%	64.6%	59.6%
Total	100%	100%	100%

The survey asked respondents whether taxi services in Chorley could be improved. Some 41.2% felt that they could be improved and the results are shown in Table 16. These respondents were then asked what could be done to improve the service. The results are shown in Table 17.

Table 16: Could services be improved?

	Respondents in Chorley	Respondents in Outlying Areas	Total Respondents
Yes	43.5%	33.8%	41.2%
No	56.5%	66.2%	58.8%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Table 17: Service improvements (multiple responses)

	Chorley	Outlying Areas	Total
More of them	30.9	30.8	30.9
Better drivers	24.5	26.9	25.0
More ranks	17.3	7.7	15.4
Shared taxis	2.7	0.0	0.1
Cheaper	66.4	23.1	57.4
Better vehicles	14.5	3.8	12.5
More Wheelchair accessible vehicles	14.5	0.0	11.8
Other	10.1	34.6	15.4

Of those that stated other, the most common improvements requested were;

- 'more courteous drivers';
- 'list of taxi numbers in phone box';
- 'fares vary a lot';
- 'always late'; and
- 'more friendly drivers'.

6 Safety

Respondents were asked whether they feel safe whilst using taxis both during the day and at night. The results are shown in Table 18.

Table 18: Safety using taxis

	Day			Night		
	Chorley	Outlying Areas	Total	Chorley	Outlying Areas	Total
Yes	73.5%	76.4%	74.2%	66.4%	55.6%	63.9%
No	2.7%	4.2%	3.0%	8.1%	12.5%	9.1%
At times	5.4%	2.8%	4.9%	6.9%	5.6%	6.6%
Don't know	18.6%	16.7%	17.9%	18.6%	26.4%	20.4%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Those respondents who commented that they do not feel safe all or some of the time, were asked what would make them feel safer. The most common responses included;

- 'usual taxi driver';
- 'cctv and panic button';
- 'driver and vehicle licence clearly visible';
- 'screen between driver and passenger'; and
- 'female drivers'.

7 Ranks

Respondents were provided with a list of locations and asked whether a taxi rank should be provided there. Although a number of respondents did not know where ranks would be beneficial over two thirds of respondents (68.2%) felt that a rank should be provided at Chorley Hospital. The results are shown in Table 19.

Table 19: Do you think a rank should be provided at...?

	Yes	No	Don't know
Chorley Station	65.4%	5.5%	29.1%
Adlington Village/Station	40.7%	8.3%	51%
Buckshaw Parkway	49.3%	6%	44.7%
Euxton Village/Station	51.6%	8.1%	40.3%
Croston Village/Station	42.4%	7.5%	49.8%
Eccleston Village	38.4%	10.3%	51.4%
Chorley Hospital	68.2%	6.1%	25.8%

Respondents were subsequently also asked if there were any further locations in Chorley where new ranks were needed. Over half of respondents (51.2%) commented that no further new ranks were needed. The results are shown in Table 20.

Table 20: Are new ranks required in Chorley?

	Chorley	Outlying Areas	Total
Yes	12.7%	15.4%	13.3%
No	51.2%	51.3%	51.2%
Don't know	36.1%	33.3%	35.5%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Those respondents who stated they would like to see a new rank were subsequently asked to provide a location. A variety of locations were provided including:

- Supermarkets (7 respondents)
- Other end of town / Chapel St/ St Georges / Pall Mall (5 respondents)
- Coppull (4 respondents)
- Bus station (3 respondents)
- Buckshaw Station (2 respondents) *was a location in previous question
- Chorley Station (2 respondents) *was a location in previous question
- MacDonalds Chorley (1 respondent)
- Leisure Centre, Water Lane (1 respondent)
- Astley Village (1 respondent)
- Any Village (1 respondent)
- Euxton Station (1 respondent) *was a location in previous question
- All Stations (1 respondent) *were locations in previous question
- Botany Bay (1 respondent)

Halcrow has been commissioned by Chorley Borough Council to conduct a hackney carriage unmet demand survey. As part of this study we aim to collect information and views from both trades in order to ensure that we are fully aware of all relevant issues. We would be grateful therefore if you would take the time to complete the following questionnaire and return it to us in the freepost envelope provided. In order for us to incorporate your response in our report we need to receive your completed questionnaire form no later than **6th July 2012**

1 GENERAL OPERATIONAL ISSUES

1a Which of the following categories describe your involvement in the taxi market? (Please tick ALL appropriate)

Hackney Carriage Driver	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hackney Carriage Operator	<input type="checkbox"/>	Private Hire Car Driver	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hackney Carriage Vehicle Plate Owner	<input type="checkbox"/>	Private Hire Car Operator	<input type="checkbox"/>	Private Hire Car Plate Owner	<input type="checkbox"/>

1b How many years have you been involved with the Hackney/Private Hire Trade in Chorley Borough? (Please tick ONE only)

0 - 2 years	<input type="checkbox"/>	6 - 10 years	<input type="checkbox"/>	16 - 20 years	<input type="checkbox"/>
3 - 5 years	<input type="checkbox"/>	11 - 15 years	<input type="checkbox"/>	over 20 years	<input type="checkbox"/>

IF YOU DRIVE A VEHICLE PLEASE ANSWER SECTION 2 AND 3 OTHERWISE GO STRAIGHT TO SECTION 4

2 DRIVING

2a Which of the following vehicles do you drive most frequently? (Please tick ONE only)

Purpose Built Cab	<input type="checkbox"/>	Minibus/People carrier (Wheelchair accessible)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Saloon car	<input type="checkbox"/>	Minibus/People carrier (Not wheelchair accessible)	<input type="checkbox"/>

2b How many hours do you work in a TYPICAL WEEK?

2c Approximately how many hours do you drive during the following times of the day during a TYPICAL WEEK?

(Please enter hours in the relevant boxes. This should add up to the total number of hours you work in a typical week.)

	MON	TUES	WED	THURS	FRI	SAT	SUN
Day 0600-1800							
Night 1800-0600							

2d Do you subscribe to a radio circuit? Yes ☐ No ☐

2e Typically how many times a week do you carry wheelchair bound passengers? (Please tick ONE only)

Never	<input type="checkbox"/>	6 to 10	<input type="checkbox"/>	more than 20	<input type="checkbox"/>
1 to 5	<input type="checkbox"/>	11 to 20	<input type="checkbox"/>		

3 SAFETY AND SECURITY

3a Have you been attacked by a passenger within the last year? (please tick ALL that are appropriate)

Physically attacked	<input type="checkbox"/>	Verbally attacked	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not attacked	<input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------	--------------------------	-------------------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------

3b Do you feel safe whilst working as a taxi driver in the Borough of Chorley? (Please tick ONE only)

Yes all of the time	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some of the time	<input type="checkbox"/>	None of the time	<input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------	--------------------------	------------------	--------------------------	------------------	--------------------------

3c If you feel unsafe at any time is this: (please tick ALL that are appropriate)

In the daytime	<input type="checkbox"/>	In certain areas	<input type="checkbox"/>
At night time	<input type="checkbox"/>	Please specify areas	<input type="text"/>

4 RANKS

4a Do you believe there is sufficient rank space available for hackneys to use in Chorley Borough?(Please choose ONE only)

Yes

 1

No

 2

4b Are there any areas in Chorley Borough where you consider there should be new hackney carriage ranks?

Yes

 1

No

 2

If Yes to 4b, please specify where any new ranks should be. (Please be specific and use BLOCK CAPITALS)

Road Name: _____

Area: _____

4c Are there any ranks in Chorley Borough that you consider should be longer / have more spaces?(Please tick ONE only)

Yes

 1

No

 2

If Yes to 4c, please specify which ranks should be longer. (Please be specific and use BLOCK CAPITALS).

Road Name: _____

Area: _____

4d If a rank was provided at the following locations, would you use it? (Tick not applicable if you are not a hackney carriage driver)

Chorley Station

Yes

 1

No

 2

Don't know

 3

Not Applicable

 4

Adlington Station / Village

Yes

 1

No

 2

Don't know

 3

Not Applicable

 4

Buckshaw Parkway / Village

Yes

 1

No

 2

Don't know

 3

Not Applicable

 4

Euxton Station / Village

Yes

 1

No

 2

Don't know

 3

Not Applicable

 4

Croston Station / Village

Yes

 1

No

 2

Don't know

 3

Not Applicable

 4

Chorley Hospital

Yes

 1

No

 2

Don't know

 3

Not Applicable

 4

Eccleston Village

Yes

 1

No

 2

Don't know

 3

Not Applicable

 4

If No, why not? _____

5 FARES

5a Which of the following statements do you agree with: (Please tick ONE only)

Hackney carriage fares are too high

 1

Hackney carriage fares are too low

 2

Hackney carriage fares are about right

 3

None of the above/ no opinion

 4

5b How often do you think the hackney carriage fare tariff should be increased?

Annually

 1

Every 2 years

 2

In line with fuel prices

 3

Other (please state) _____ 4

6 VEHICLES

6a The current hackney carriage licence conditions requires licensed vehicles to pass a 6 monthly mechanical test set by the Council. There are no vehicle age limits. Do you consider this to be:

Satisfactory

 1

Unsatisfactory

 2

If Unsatisfactory, please provide your reasons in the box below

6b The current private hire licence conditions requires licensed vehicles to pass a 6 monthly mechanical test set by the Council. There are no vehicle age limits. Do you consider this to be:

Satisfactory

 1

Unsatisfactory

 2

If Unsatisfactory, please provide your reasons in the box below

7 **TRAINING**

- 7a Before being granted a driving licence, all new applicants are required to pass the Driving Standards Agency practical test. If the application is for a wheelchair accessible vehicle applicants are required to pass the DSA enhanced test.
Do you consider this to be:

Satisfactory Unsatisfactory

If Unsatisfactory, please provide your reasons in the box below

8 **TAXI MARKET IN CHORLEY BOROUGH**

- 8a Do you consider there to be sufficient hackney carriages to meet the current level of demand in Chorley Borough?
(Please tick ONE per area only)

	Yes, there are too many	Yes, there are generally sufficient	No, not during all periods of the day	Don't Know
Chorley Centre	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text" value="2"/>	<input type="text" value="3"/>	<input type="text" value="4"/>
Borough (outer areas)	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text" value="2"/>	<input type="text" value="3"/>	<input type="text" value="4"/>

- 8b If no, when are more hackney carriages required? (Please tick one)

During the daytime During the evening / night All day and night

- 8c What size hackney carriage fleet do you consider Chorley Borough should have? There are currently 36.

hackney carriages

- 8d Do you think Chorley Borough Council should remove its numerical limit on the number of hackney vehicle licences and allow market forces to determine the number of hackney carriages?

Yes No No Opinion

- 8e Some of Chorley Borough Council's neighbouring authorities have chosen to remove the numerical limit on the number of hackney vehicle licences. To what extent do you believe this has impacted on the hackney carriage market in Chorley?

Very Positive Impact	Positive Impact	Neither Positive nor Negative	Negative Impact	Very Negative Impact
<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text" value="2"/>	<input type="text" value="3"/>	<input type="text" value="4"/>	<input type="text" value="5"/>

If negative or very negative please provide the reasons you believe this is the case in the box below

- 8f If Chorley Borough Council removed the limit on the number of hackney carriages, what do you think would happen to each of the following in Chorley? (please tick ONE box on each row)

	Increase	No effect	Decrease
Traffic congestion	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text" value="2"/>	<input type="text" value="3"/>
Fares	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text" value="2"/>	<input type="text" value="3"/>
Passenger Waiting time at hackney ranks	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text" value="2"/>	<input type="text" value="3"/>
Passenger waiting time when flagging hackneys	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text" value="2"/>	<input type="text" value="3"/>
Passenger waiting time when pre booked by telephone	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text" value="2"/>	<input type="text" value="3"/>
Hackney Vehicle Quality	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text" value="2"/>	<input type="text" value="3"/>
Private Hire Vehicle Quality	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text" value="2"/>	<input type="text" value="3"/>
Effectiveness of Enforcement	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text" value="2"/>	<input type="text" value="3"/>
Illegal plying for hire - private hire	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text" value="2"/>	<input type="text" value="3"/>
Illegal plying for hire -unlicensed vehicles	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text" value="2"/>	<input type="text" value="3"/>
Over ranking	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text" value="2"/>	<input type="text" value="3"/>
Customer satisfaction	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text" value="2"/>	<input type="text" value="3"/>

Please respond to the following statements by indicating the extent to which you agree/disagree, please be as specific as you can, continue on a separate sheet if necessary.

8g **"There is not enough work to support the current number of hackney carriages"**

(Circle the number under the response you agree with most)
Please explain your response in the box below (use block capitals)

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

8h **"I have been affected by vehicles from neighbouring authorities working within Chorley Borough"**

(Circle the number under the response you agree with most)
Please explain your response in the box below (use block capitals)

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

8i **"Removing the limit on the number of hackney carriages in Chorley would benefit the public by reducing waiting times at ranks"**

(Circle the number under the response you agree with most)
Please explain your response (use block capitals)

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

8j **"There are special circumstances in Chorley that make the retention of the numerical limit essential"**

(Circle the number under the response you agree with most)
Please explain your response (use block capitals)

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

8k **If the authority removed the numerical limit the effect on me would be** (Please tick as appropriate)

I would continue as normal (no change)

☐ 1

I would expect to work more hours

☐ 2

I would expect to work fewer hours

☐ 3

I would acquire a hackney vehicle licence

☐ 4

I would acquire more than one hackney vehicle licence

☐ 5

I would switch from hackney to private hire

☐ 6

I would switch from private hire to hackney

☐ 7

I would leave the trade

☐ 8

Other (please tick and specify below)

☐ 9

Many thanks for your time in completing this questionnaire.
Please return in the pre-paid envelope by 6th July 2012



Technical note

Project Chorley Unmet Demand Study 2012
Subject Trade Survey Results
Author Katie Dixon/Pam Murray

Date 04 August 2012
Ref GTXCHO000

1 Introduction

A hackney carriage and private hire trade survey was designed with the aim of collecting information and views from both trades. In particular the survey allowed an assessment of operational issues and views of the hackney carriage market to supplement the rank observations, as well as covering enforcement and disability issues.

2 Survey Administration

The survey was conducted through a self completion questionnaire. These were sent to 281 licensed hackney carriage and private hire operators. A total of 42 questionnaire forms were completed and returned, giving a response rate of around 14.95%, a typical response rate for this type of survey. It should be noted that not all totals sum to the total number of respondents per trade group as some respondents failed to answer all of the questions.

3 General Operational Issues

The responses have been disaggregated on a hackney carriage and private hire trade basis as shown in Table 3.1 below.

Table 3.1 Breakdown of responses between trades

	Frequency	Percent
Hackney Carriage Trade	23	54.8
Private Hire Trade	19	45.2
Total	42	100.0

It should be noted that 3 (13.0%) of the 23 hackney respondents were also private hire car drivers.

Both trades were asked how long they have been involved in the taxi trade in Chorley Borough. The results in Table 3.2 below show for the hackney carriage trade, almost a half (47.8%) had been involved for between 6-10 years. Of the private hire respondents the majority (61.2%) had been involved in the trade for over 10 years.

Table 3.2 Involvement in the taxi trade in Chorley Borough

Years	Hackney Trade		Private Hire Trade	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
0-2	2	8.7	1	5.6
3-5	4	17.4	3	16.7
6-10	11	47.8	3	16.7
11-15	1	4.3	5	27.8
16-20	1	4.3	1	5.6
Over 20	4	17.4	5	27.8
Total	23	100.0	18	100.0

4 Driving

Respondents were asked what type of vehicle they drive most frequently. The results are shown in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 Vehicle type driven most often

	Hackney Trade		Private Hire Trade	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Purpose built cab	2	9.5	0	0.0
Saloon car	15	71.4	16	84.2
Minibus/People carrier (wheelchair accessible)	4	19.0	1	5.3
Minibus/People carrier (not wheelchair accessible)	0	0.0	2	10.5
Total	21	100.0	19	100.0

Respondents were asked the average number of hours they worked in a typical week. The hackney carriage trade stated they worked on average 45.26 hours per week, whilst the private hire trade stated they worked on average 43.84 hours per week.

Respondents were asked to state how many hours they worked at different times of day during a typical week. Table 4.2 documents the average hours worked during the daytime period (0600 – 1800) for each day of the week. It must be noted that the figures given by respondents for the different time periods did not necessarily total the figure they provided for an average week. The results must also be treated with caution due to the relatively low response rate for this question. On average, it shows that the private hire trade work more hours than the hackney carriage trade during the day.

Table 4.2 Average daytime hours worked

	Hackney Trade		Private Hire Trade	
	Weekday	Weekend	Weekday	Weekend
Minimum	3	2	3	5
Average (mean)	5.61	4.83	6.91	7.00
Maximum	8	8	10	10

Table 4.3 shows the average number of hours worked during the evening/night period (1800-0600). During the night time period both hackney carriage and private hire trades worked more hours at the weekend than during the week.

Table 4.3 Average night time hours worked

	Hackney Trade		Private Hire Trade	
	Weekday	Weekend	Weekday	Weekend
Minimum	2	3	4	2
Average (mean)	3.58	6.15	6.21	7.73
Maximum	8	12	10	12

Table 4.4 indicates the proportion of the trade who subscribe to a radio circuit. A quarter of hackney carriage respondents subscribe to a radio circuit, while 59% of private hire trade respondents did so.

Table 4.4 Do you subscribe to a radio circuit?

	Hackney Trade		Private Hire Trade	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	5	25.0	10	58.8
No	15	75.0	7	41.2
Total	20	100.0	17	100.0

Respondents were asked to state the number of times they carry wheelchair bound passengers on a weekly basis, Table 4.5 shows the results. Over three quarters (77.8%) of private hire respondents stated that they never carry wheelchair bound passengers in comparison to two thirds (66.7%) of hackney carriage respondents.

Table 4.5 Frequency of transport of wheelchair bound passengers

	Hackney Trade		Private Hire Trade	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Never	14	66.7	14	77.8
1 to 5	5	23.8	4	22.2
6 to 10	0	0.0	0	0.0
11 to 20	2	9.5	0	0.0
More than 20	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	21	100.0	18	100.0

5 Safety and Security

Respondents were asked whether they had been attacked by a passenger in the last year. Table 5.1 details the results.

Table 5.1 Frequency of attacks by passengers within the last year (multiple responses)

	Hackney Trade		Private Hire Trade	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Physically attacked	4	17.4	3	15.8
Verbally attacked	17	73.9	12	63.2
Not attacked	6	26.1	6	31.6

Some 17.4% of the hackney carriage trade and 15.8% of the private hire trade have been physically attacked within the last twelve months, with 73.9% and 63.2% respectively being verbally attacked. Some 26.1% of the hackney carriage trade and 31.6% of the private hire trade have not been attacked in the last twelve months.

The trade were asked if they felt safe whilst working as a taxi driver in Chorley Borough, the results of which are shown below in Table 5.2.

Table 5.2 Do you feel safe whilst working as a taxi driver in Chorley Borough?

	Hackney Trade		Private Hire Trade	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Yes, all of the time	0	0.0	4	21.1
Some of the time	21	95.5	15	78.9
None of the time	1	4.5	0	0.0
Total	22	100.0	19	100.0

The majority of hackney carriage and private hire respondents felt safe most of the time, (95.5% and 78.9%). No hackney respondents felt safe all of the time and 1 hackney respondent did not feel safe any of the time.

Those respondents who felt unsafe working in Chorley Borough were then asked when they felt unsafe. The results are outlined below in Table 5.3. Of those that did feel unsafe working in Chorley, 18.2% of the hackney carriage respondents and 26.3% of private hire respondents stated that they felt unsafe whilst working at night in Chorley Borough. Some 27.3% of hackney carriage respondents and 26.3% of the private hire respondents felt unsafe working in certain areas of Chorley. The area suggested as being unsafe was the town centre.

Table 5.3 When do you feel unsafe working in Chorley Borough? (multiple responses)

	Hackney Trade		Private Hire Trade	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Daytime	0	0.0	0	0.0
Night time	4	18.2	5	26.3
In certain areas	6	27.3	5	26.3

6 Ranks

Members of both trades were asked whether they believe there is sufficient rank space in Chorley. As shown in Table 6.1, almost two thirds (63.6%) of the hackney carriage and private hire trade (63.2%) did not feel there was enough rank space in Chorley Borough.

Table 6.1 Sufficient rank space available for hackneys in Chorley Borough?

	Hackney Trade		Private Hire Trade	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	8	36.4	7	36.8
No	14	63.6	12	63.2
Total	22	100.0	19	100.0

Table 6.2 shows that 21.7% of the hackney carriage trade respondents and 38.9% of the private hire trade respondents stated that there are areas in the borough where there should be new hackney carriage ranks. The trade were asked whether there were any areas where a new rank should be located. The most frequent suggestion was Chorley railway station. Other suggestions included: Church Street, Market Street, Balshaw Lane, Chorley Hospital, St Georges Street and generally in the Town Centre.

Table 6.2 Are there any areas where there should be new hackney ranks?

	Hackney Trade		Private Hire Trade	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	5	21.7	7	38.9
No	18	78.3	11	61.1
Total	23	100.0	18	100.0

Respondents were also asked if any existing ranks should be extended. Some 68% of the hackney carriage trade felt this was necessary, compared to just under 40% of the private hire trade. The majority of respondents stated the High Street rank needed extending (18), 2 respondents stated the rail station rank and another the Market Street Rank.

Table 6.3 Are there any ranks which should be extended?

	Hackney Trade		Private Hire Trade	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	15	68.2	7	38.9
No	7	31.8	11	61.1
Total	22	100.0	18	100.0

Respondents were asked if there was a rank at a number of locations would they use it. The results for the hackney respondents are shown in Table 6.4. (Private hire responses are not included here as ranking is not relevant to private hire, though approximately 30% of private hire respondents stated they would use ranks in each of the locations.) If respondents stated they would not use ranks in the suggested locations they were asked to specify why not. Reasons cited included; lack of work, not needed and private hire work.

Table 6.4 Would you use ranks in these locations? (Hackneys)

	Yes	No	Don't Know	Not Applicable
Chorley Station	18	1	3	1
Adlington Station / Village	1	10	4	1
Buckshaw Station / Village	1	10	4	1
Euxton Station / Village	1	10	4	1
Croston Station / Village	0	11	3	1
Chorley Hospital	2	10	3	1
Eccleston Village	1	10	3	1

7 Fares

Members of both trades were asked for their opinions regarding the current level of hackney carriage fares. Table 7.1 indicates the responses. The majority of hackney carriage respondents (95.7%) considered hackney carriage fares to be 'about right'. Of the private hire respondents, some 42.1% believe they are too low with 26.3% believing they are 'about right'.

Respondents were then asked when they thought the fare tariff should be increased. The results are shown in Table 7.2. The results indicate the majority of the private hire trade believe fares should be increased in line with fuel prices. While the hackney carriage trade were split with 43.5% believing fares should be increased annually and 43.5% every two years.

Table 7.1 Opinions relating to hackney carriage fares

	Hackney Trade		Private Hire Trade	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Too high	0	0.0	2	10.5
Too low	0	0.0	8	42.1
About right	22	95.7	5	26.3
None/no opinion	1	4.3	4	21.1
Total	23	100.0	19	100.0

Table 7.2 Opinions relating to fare tariff increase

Years	Hackney Trade		Private Hire Trade	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Annually	10	43.5	4	22.2
Every 2 years	10	43.5	3	16.7
In line with fuel prices	3	13	11	61.1
Other	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	23	100.0	18	100.0

8 Vehicle Conditions

The trade were asked their opinion on the current hackney carriage and private hire vehicle testing conditions. The current hackney carriage and private hire conditions require licensed vehicles to pass a 6 monthly mechanical test set by the Council and there are no vehicle age limits. Respondents were asked if this was satisfactory or unsatisfactory for hackney carriages and private hire vehicles. The results are shown in Tables 8.1 and 8.2.

Table 8.1 Hackney carriage vehicle conditions

	Hackney Trade		Private Hire Trade	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Satisfactory	22	95.7	18	94.7
Unsatisfactory	1	4.3	1	5.3
Total	23	100.0	19	100.0

Just one hackney carriage and one private hire respondent felt the hackney carriage conditions were unsatisfactory. The comments provided stated that there should be an age limit for hackney carriage vehicles with one respondent suggesting ten years. When considering the private hire vehicle conditions, three respondents believed they were unsatisfactory. Comments again included the need for an age limit with ten years being suggested. A further comment was that if brand new cars are licensed the MOT style testing every six months for the first two years is not justified.

Table 8.2 Private hire vehicle conditions

	Hackney Trade		Private Hire Trade	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Satisfactory	17	94.4	17	89.5
Unsatisfactory	1	5.6	2	10.5
Total	18	100.0	19	100.0

9 Training

Before being granted a driving licence all new applicants are required to pass the Driving Standards Agency practical test. An enhanced test is required if the application is to drive a wheelchair accessible vehicle. Both trades were asked whether they felt sufficient driver training was in place before being granted a licence. The results are shown in Table 9.1 and show the majority of the hackney carriage and private hire trades believe the training required is satisfactory.

Table 9.1 Driver training

	Hackney Trade		Private Hire Trade	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Satisfactory	20	87.0	12	63.2
Unsatisfactory	3	13.0	7	36.8
Total	23	100.0	19	100.0

Those respondents who felt the training was not satisfactory made the following comments:

- Training not required.
- I have already passed a standard UK driving test and should not need to do another practical test.
- I have already done a practical test to get my UK driving licence.
- Training is good for wheelchair customers, but otherwise is the same as for a car.
- Better knowledge test required.

10 Taxi Market in Chorley

Members of both trades were asked whether they consider there are sufficient hackney carriages to meet the current level of demand in Chorley, both in the town centre and in the outer areas of the borough. Table 10.1 and 10.2 summarises the responses.

Table 10.1 Sufficient hackney carriages to meet the current level of demand in Chorley Town Centre?

	Hackney Trade		Private Hire Trade	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Yes, too many	12	52.2	6	31.6
Yes, sufficient	8	34.8	3	15.8
No, not during all periods of the day	3	13.0	9	47.4
Don't know	0	0.0	1	5.3
Total	23	100.0	19	100.0

Table 10.2 Sufficient hackney carriages to meet the current level of demand across the Borough (outer areas)?

	Hackney Trade		Private Hire Trade	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Yes, too many	7	36.8	2	11.8
Yes, sufficient	8	42.1	4	23.5
No, not during all periods of the day	1	5.3	9	52.9
Don't know	3	15.8	2	11.8
Total	19	100.0	17	100.0

Over half of hackney carriage respondents believe there are too many hackney carriages in Chorley Town Centre, whereas almost a half of private hire respondents believe there are not sufficient hackney carriages available at all times of day. When considering the outer areas of the borough, the results show

Project: Chorley Unmet Demand Study
Subject: Trade Survey

that the hackney trade believed there were sufficient or too many vehicles (78.9%), while over a half of private hire respondents believed there were not sufficient during all periods of the day.

Those respondents who did not consider there to be enough hackney carriages at certain times were then asked at which periods more hackney carriages were required. The responses are shown in Table 10.3 and show that the majority of respondents to this question believed that more hackney carriages were required during all day and night.

Table 10.3 When are more hackney carriages required in Chorley?

	Hackney Trade		Private Hire Trade	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
During the daytime	0	0.0	2	20.0
During the evening/night	0	0.0	2	20.0
All day and night	2	100.0	6	60.0
Total	2	100.0	10	100.0

All respondents were asked to state how many hackney carriages there should be in the fleet in the Chorley Borough. The results are detailed in Table 10.4. Of those who responded, 50% of the hackney carriage trade and 23% of the private hire trade felt that the hackney carriage fleet size should be less than 36. The average size of hackney carriage fleet considered for the Chorley was 36 for the hackney carriage trade compared with 41 (with a further 5 stating deregulate/unlimited) cited by the private hire trade.

Table 10.4 Opinion on ideal hackney carriage fleet size in Chorley

	Hackney Trade		Private Hire Trade	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Under 36	9	50.0	3	23.1
36	6	33.3	1	7.7
Over 36	3	16.7	9	69.2
Total	18	100.0	13	100.0

All respondents were asked to state whether they thought that Chorley Borough Council should remove the numerical limit on the number of hackney carriage vehicles. The responses are detailed in Table 10.5. The majority of respondents from the hackney carriage trade (91.3%) felt that the numerical limit should not be removed in Chorley. In contrast 63.2% of the private hire respondents were of the opinion the limit should be removed.

Table 10.5 Opinion on removing the limit on the number of hackney licences

	Hackney Trade		Private Hire Trade	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	2	8.7	12	63.2
No	21	91.3	4	21.1
No opinion	0	0.0	3	15.8
Total	23	100.0	19	100.0

Some of Chorley Borough Council's neighbouring authorities have removed the numerical limit on the number of hackney carriage vehicle licences. Respondents were asked to what extent they believe this had impacted on the hackney carriage market in Chorley. The results are shown in Table 10.6. The results show that 47.8% of the hackney carriage and 52.6% of the private hire respondents feel the policy of neighbouring authorities has had a negative or very negative impact on the hackney carriage market in Chorley. Respondents were asked to provide the reasons why they believed there had been a negative impact. The comments given by respondents included:

- Increased competition has caused price wars
- There is no longer enough work, a lack of rank space and working more hours
- Ranks full
- Same expense but earnings have been reduced
- More vehicles are coming into the Borough
- They are taking our work
- More Chorley plates are required / There should not be a limit in Chorley

Table 10.6 Impact of neighbouring authorities licensing policy

	Hackney Trade		Private Hire Trade	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Very Positive Impact	2	8.7	3	15.8
Positive Impact	0	0.0	2	10.5
Neither Positive nor Negative Impact	10	43.5	4	21.1
Negative Impact	7	30.4	7	36.8
Very Negative Impact	4	17.4	3	15.8
Total	23	100.0	19	100.0

Project: Chorley Unmet Demand Study
Subject: Trade Survey

Views were sought from respondents regarding the likely impact on a series of factors if Chorley Borough Council were to remove the limit on hackney carriage licences. The findings are summarised below and presented in Table 10.7.

Traffic Congestion

If the limit were to be removed some 81.8% of the hackney carriage trade believe congestion would increase, whereas 73.7% of the private hire trade felt that there would be no effect on congestion in Chorley.

Fares

Some 81.8% of the hackney carriage trade and 57.9% of the private hire trade felt that any removal of the numerical limit on hackney carriages would have no impact on fares.

Table 10.7 Opinions relating to the impact of de-restriction

	Hackney Trade			Private Hire Trade		
	Inc.	No Effect	Dec.	Inc.	No Effect	Dec.
Traffic congestion	81.8	18.2	0.0	21.1	73.7	5.3
Fares	0.0	81.8	18.2	10.5	57.9	31.6
Passenger waiting time at hackney ranks	4.8	76.2	19.0	10.5	5.3	84.2
Passenger waiting time when flagging hackneys	5.0	80.0	15.0	10.5	15.8	73.7
Passenger waiting time when pre-booked by phone	11.1	66.7	22.2	10.5	36.8	52.6
Hackney vehicle quality	0.0	26.3	73.7	26.3	63.2	10.5
Private hire vehicle quality	5.2	47.4	47.4	36.8	52.6	10.5
Effectiveness of enforcement	5.5	38.9	55.6	22.2	61.1	16.7
Illegal plying for hire – private hire	22.2	66.7	11.1	21.1	15.8	63.2
Illegal plying for hire – unlicensed vehicles	47.4	42.1	10.5	26.3	15.8	57.9
Over ranking	85.7	9.5	4.8	42.1	42.1	15.8
Customer satisfaction	9.5	42.9	47.6	63.2	10.5	26.3

Passenger Waiting Times

The majority of hackney carriage trade respondents felt that the removal of the limit on the number of licences in Chorley would have no effect on the passenger waiting times at ranks, by flag down or by telephone. In contrast the majority of private hire respondents felt passenger waiting times would reduce at ranks, by flag down and by telephone booking.

Vehicle Quality

When asked about vehicle quality, the hackney carriage trade felt that the removal of the limit would have a negative impact on quality of hackney carriage, but were divided on their opinion on the quality of private hire vehicles. However, the private hire trade felt that vehicle quality would be unaffected.

Effectiveness of Enforcement

Some 55.6% of the hackney carriage trade felt that the removal of the limit on the number of hackney licences would have a negative impact on the effectiveness of enforcement in Chorley. Just 16.7% of the private hire trade agreed that this would be the case, whilst the majority (61.1%) felt that there would be no impact.

Illegal Plying for Hire

The private hire trade respondents felt removing the numerical limit on the number of hackney licences would reduce the amount of illegal plying by private hire vehicles and unlicensed vehicles. In contrast the hackney carriage trade felt that there would be no effect on plying by private hire vehicles and were divided on plying by unlicensed vehicles with 47.4% believing this would increase and 42.1% believing there would be no effect.

Over Ranking

It was felt by the hackney carriage trade that over ranking would increase as a result of removing the limit on the number of hackney licences. The private hire respondents were divided with 42.1% believing this would increase and 42.1% believing there would be no effect.

Customer Satisfaction

The majority of the hackney carriage trade felt that customer satisfaction would decrease (47.6%) as a result of the limit being removed, whilst 63.2% of the private hire trade felt that it would increase.

All respondents were asked their response to 'There is not enough work to support the current number of hackney carriages'. The results in Table 10.8 show that 47.6% of hackney carriage respondents strongly agree or agree with the statement that there is not enough work to support the current number of hackney carriages. In contrast 55.5% of the private hire respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed.

Table 10.8 Opinion of 'There is not enough work to support the current number of hackney carriages'?

	Hackney Trade		Private Hire Trade	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly disagree	4	19.0	6	33.3
Disagree	3	14.3	4	22.2
Neither agree or disagree	4	19.0	4	22.2
Agree	2	9.5	2	11.1
Strongly agree	8	38.1	2	11.1
Total	21	100.0	18	100.0

Some of the most common responses agreeing with the statement included:

- Drivers wait hours to get a fare
- More vehicles will reduce driver earnings
- The recession has badly effected the trade in Chorley
- People can easily get a taxi at all times of day
- There is no space on the ranks

There were also comments disagreeing with the statement and these included:

- There is plenty of work out there if you want it
- Some passengers have to wait for hackneys
- Private hires often take bookings picking up near the hackney ranks at peak times showing there is demand
- If the hackney drivers were not making any money they would not be there

The survey then asked opinions of the following statement; 'I have been affected by vehicles from neighbouring authorities working within Chorley Borough'. The results in Table 10.9 show that 61.1% of private hire respondents strongly agreed or agreed that they have been affected by vehicles from neighbouring authorities working within Chorley Borough. Just over a third (36.4%) of hackney carriage respondents agreed this was the case.

Table 10.9 Opinion on 'I have been affected by vehicles from neighbouring authorities working within Chorley Borough'

	Hackney Trade		Private Hire Trade	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly disagree	4	18.2	5	27.8
Disagree	1	4.5	0	0.0
Neither agree or disagree	9	40.9	2	11.1
Agree	4	18.2	4	22.2
Strongly agree	4	18.2	7	38.9
Total	22	100.0	18	100.0

Some of the most common responses agreeing with the statement included:

- Drivers are coming in from other areas and taking our fares
- Hackneys from other boroughs are working in Chorley
- People come into Chorley for work and we can't stop it
- More seem to be picking up fares in the Chorley area.
- Since the hackney carriage rule changed we see Rossendale and Wigan plates in Chorley

There were also comments disagreeing with the statement and these included:

- Never been affected by this
- Never spotted other drivers coming into Chorley for work, there isn't enough work for Chorley drivers already.
- Vehicles in neighbouring authorities are too busy to affect our work.
- Never had any problems with Borough taxis
- Although vehicles licensed in other areas have been seen in Chorley they are always undertaking school contracts or a legal telephone booking, not plying.

The survey then asked opinions of the following statement; 'Removing the limit on the number of hackney carriages in Chorley would benefit the public by reducing waiting times at ranks'. The results in Table 10.10 show that 81.8% of hackney carriage drivers strongly disagreed or disagreed that removing the limit on the number of hackney carriages in Chorley would reduce the public waiting times at ranks, compared with just 16.7% of private hire respondents.

Some of the most common responses disagreeing with the statement included:

- Hackneys have the waiting time not customers
- There is never a queue of customers even at a weekend

Project: Chorley Unmet Demand Study
Subject: Trade Survey

- Passengers have had no waiting time in years
- Current number of taxis not fully utilised
- There are enough taxis
- Taxis wait for passengers

Table 10.10 Opinion of 'Removing the limit on the number of hackney carriages Chorley would benefit the public by reducing waiting times at ranks'?

	Hackney Trade		Private Hire Trade	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly disagree	13	59.1	2	11.1
Disagree	5	22.7	1	5.6
Neither agree or disagree	0	0.0	3	16.7
Agree	0	0.0	6	33.3
Strongly agree	4	18.2	6	33.3
Total	22	100.0	18	100.0

Comments agreeing with the statement included:

- 36 hackneys is not enough at peak times
- It would benefit customers as they want a taxi asap
- It would reduce waiting times on weekends
- The only people to lose out would be those who have paid large amounts of money to transfer licences, not customers.

The survey then asked opinions of the following statement; 'There are special circumstances in Chorley that make the retention of the numerical limit essential'. The results in Table 10.11 show that 54.5% of the hackney carriage trade agree or strongly agree that there are special circumstances in Chorley that make the retention of a numerical limit essential, compared with 6.3% of private hire respondents.

Table 10.11 Opinion of 'There are special circumstances in Chorley that make the retention of the numerical limit essential'?

	Hackney Trade		Private Hire Trade	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly disagree	3	13.6	7	43.8
Disagree	1	4.5	2	12.5
Neither agree or disagree	6	27.3	6	37.5
Agree	3	13.6	1	6.3
Strongly agree	9	40.9	0	0.0
Total	22	100.0	16	100.0

Project: Chorley Unmet Demand Study
Subject: Trade Survey

Some of the most common responses agreeing with the statement include:

- Because Chorley is small more taxis would be devastating
- Chorley is a ghost town since the recession with shops and pubs closing down
- More taxis would cause congestion and parking problems
- Needed to keep things in control like quality of service

Other comments disagreed with the statement including:

- There is no strong reason, there are many more reasons to remove the limit
- What special circumstances
- Small hackney fleet is only benefiting plate owners not the people of Chorley
- Pandering to owner drivers is not in the public interest

Finally the trade were asked what effect they thought it would have on them if the authority removed the numerical limit on hackney carriages. The results shown in Table 10.12 indicate that 47.8% of hackney carriage responses cited they would work longer hours and 60.9% claim they would leave the trade. Some 68.4% of private hire drivers said they would switch from private hire to hackney carriage. Other comments cited include "I would wait and decide according to the situation at the time" and "already struggling to pay bills so I would leave the trade".

Table 10.12 Effect on the trade if the numerical limit was removed (multiple responses)

Effect of removing the limit	Hackney Trade		Private Hire Trade	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No change	6	26.1	6	31.6
Work more hours	11	47.8	4	21.1
Work fewer hours	1	4.3	3	15.8
Acquire a hackney vehicle licence	1	4.3	10	52.6
Acquire more than one hackney vehicle licence	0	0.0	4	21.1
Switch from hackney to private	0	0.0	0	0.0
Switch from private to hackney	0	0.0	13	68.4
Leave the trade	14	60.9	1	5.3
Other	2	8.7	0	0.0

This page is intentionally left blank