

Taxi Licensing Consultation

Questionnaire Breakdown Aug 1-Oct 24

Questions over why this consultation came into existence?

Whose brainchild, will or judgement was it?

Who are the architect, engineer and author?

What is the motivation and dynamics behind this proposal?

And why was something of such enormous importance allowed to be introduced as a late item when constitutional principles, practices and values were at stake?

Having a report like this placed at every councillor's station pending their arrival to the chamber on the 18 May 2016 brings into question the very motive and intention of why it was submitted as a late item in the first place. Remembering too that each councillor must then read it, understand it, process it, digest it, and then vote on it, all in the length of time it takes to conduct a fully blown council general meeting where there are other matters to address that were timely placed on the agenda.

Why on earth hand over and give away power, command and control of a democratically functional, independent, self-governing, representative regulatory licensing body and constitutional system to corporate council officers? À la the United Kingdom's relationship with the European Union prior to the Brexit vote, in comparison to what it is today.

'A Constitutional Democracy is a system of governance in which the limits of political authority are clearly stated and the electorate has the power to remove poor performing governments.'

'A Constitution is a body of fundamental principles or established precedents according to which a state or other organisation is acknowledged to be governed.'

'A Democracy is a system of governance by the whole population or all the eligible members of a state, typically through elected representatives. It is also the control of an organisation or group by the majority of its members, as well as the practice or principles of social equality.'

Alleged transgressions of councillors used as a pretext to propose constitutional change as reported in the media and press. [Source: Derby Telegraph – Private Hire Taxi Monthly]. On top of the well-known catastrophic fiasco, pandemonium and bedlam over recent 'DBS' (Disclosure Barring Service) issues, and the well documented Public Interest Report (Grant Thornton) whose findings and

recommendations Derby City Council acknowledges in regard to the 'Political Points Scoring' saga.

Has the issue over councillor's behaviour, conduct, demeanour and bearing finally come to an end? Have any councillors actually been found guilty of anything, or are there corporate officers guilty of negligence, indiscretions or malfeasance, as the same principle and value applies?

Training, study and evolutionary development are extremely important aspects of any form of operational system. With that in mind, have councillors undergone formally recorded training before sitting on the taxi and private hire licensing committee or sub-committee? Have they received training in licensing practices and procedures, natural justice, understanding the risks of child sexual exploitation and disability awareness? Have they had training and tuition on how to make difficult and potentially controversial decisions? Have they been adequately taught how to use case study material, and have they been educated in understanding the importance of equality impact evaluation and assessment?

Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) – 'is a process designed to ensure that a policy, project or scheme does not discriminate against any disadvantaged or vulnerable people.' The keyword here is 'Discriminate' – recognise a distinction, or differentiate, to make an unjust or prejudicial distinction in the treatment of **different categories of people**, especially on the grounds of race, sex, or age.

The whole consultation is unsound, erroneous and flawed. It is neither exhaustive nor comprehensive, and imbued with ambiguity. For that reason it is none other than unfit for purpose, hence why it needs suspending and returning to the drawing board immediately. It must therefore be noted for and on the record, that there is an overwhelming sentiment and consensus of unified 'Primary Stakeholders' that are diametrically opposed to the overarching principle of **'CONSTITUTIONAL POWERSHIFT TRANSFER' (CPT)**

'IF either of the proposals were to come into effect, additional resources would be required, the COST of which is likely to form part of the LICENCE FEE.' INCREASED COST = FINANCIAL IMPACT = FINANCIAL BURDEN = MONEY

THERE MUST BE A POSSIBILITY TO PUT FORWARD A THIRD OPTION.

This would be to keep the existing constitutional sub-committee and parent committee system that is made up of non-executive/councillors in place, but to restructure, re-shape, strengthen, bolster and ameliorate what already exists in order to shore up and alleviate any concerns, failings or shortcomings. Recalling that apart from setting taxi fares and ranks, TAXI/PHV licensing is a **'COUNCIL'** and **NOT** an executive function!

21 base question categories including the **FUNDAMENTAL CORE QUESTION** relating to the proposal of **'CONSTITUTIONAL POWERSHIFT TRANSFER.'**

Question 2) Derby Points Based System

'We propose to introduce a system where points would be given for any driving and criminal convictions and/or conduct/behavioural transgressions.'

'We believe this would improve safety for our customers' – what customers are actually being referenced, because the customers of the taxi licensing department of corporate council are the applicants that lease licenses from them for financial reward, the customers/clients of booking agent operators are the licensed drivers, and the customers of licensed drivers are the taxi using consumer general public? Having the correct perception and perspective is everything.

Notwithstanding the belief, interpretation and claim, that without rationale and reason, customers, drivers and other road users would benefit from what is described as 'improved safety.'

The council's whole premise is highly and extremely questionable, seeing as the very people that would be disadvantaged and suffer would be the licence holders that were not able to be judged by a fair, impartial, independent, constitutionally democratic regulatory licensing scheme. Just because someone holds position and title, doesn't mean to say that personality is any good, the empirical evidence of which is all around us. This applies to both 'Corporate Officer's' as well as 'Elected Councillor's!' We have a constitutional system in place already, this system **MUST REMAIN**, and as previously stated, any deficiencies, weaknesses or flaws can then be eradicated, expunged and purged. Thus leaving the way open for a system to flourish that is fair, just, impartial, free from bias, pragmatic, workable, and above all else, protect the safety, interest and well-being of licence holders **AS WELL** as the wider public at large.

NO examples given in regard to 'due-process, practice, procedure or protocol.'

Who is independently responsible for determining whether a licence holder is actually guilty of anything or not? Does this just come down to one single enforcement officer's perception, interpretation, determination or resolve?

En passant, as an extremely critical paragon, one must also further consider the level of faith, trust, confidence, credence and belief that 'Primary Stakeholders' really actually have in corporate licensing officers.

Question 3) Minimum Application Criteria

Can we assess and analyse the data from other licensing authorities to determine whether this proposal is necessary, practical, and workable and to what extent there are any advantages or disadvantages to be seen?

NO '**KNOWLEDGE TEST**' listed within the proposed met criteria instantly means a reduction, decline, deterioration and drop in excellence, quality of standards and value of service. There is a reasonable and justifiable unwritten tacit understanding and expectation from taxi using consumers, that a licensed booking agent in the area where they are requesting the service will provide them a driver who firstly has the local 'knowledge,' and secondly has reached the minimum required standard set by the authority wherein they are licensed. This means that if a member of the public uses a Derby taxi company they automatically expect a 'Derby Driver,' the logic simply follows.

Why is there a requirement for a valid Disclosure and Barring Service Enhanced Criminal Record Certificate when a renewal applicant has an update service ID account registered in their name on the DBS's Database?

As a consequence and by product of abolishing the knowledge test there will be a significant, substantial, innumerable and preponderant:

**INCREASE IN SUPPLY AT A RATE DISPROPORTIONATE TO DEMAND =
REDUCTION IN BOOKING VOLUME = LOSS OF REVENUE = LOSS OF
EARNINGS = LOSS OF MONEY = FINANCIAL IMPACT = FINANCIAL
HARDSHIP**

Question 4) Group 2 Medical Standard

NOT explained. A consistent uniformed medical examination standard already exists. Drivers are on the road for long hours because the 'Tariffs' in relation to their 'Earning Ability' have long been repeatedly suppressed, this causes wage compression resulting in severe and extended onerous hardship, depravation, social imbalance, inequality and in many cases impoverishing them into **DEBT**.

NO uniformed, standardised or consistent medical **FEE**.

On the basis of such egregious and rapacious differences in **COST**, all licence applicants should be free to choose which doctor conducts their medical test, as long as that doctor has in front of them an individual's medical records, and they are themselves registered as a medical practitioner. Are not all NHS GP's professionally qualified to the same minimum required standard within their vocational field? It just does not make any sense at all to impose something of this manner upon licence applicants in such an unequal, adverse and undesirable way. Once again the **FINANCIAL IMPACT** has **NOT** even been contemplated let alone considered. It's downright unconscionable!

NO consideration to a) the 'Private Sector' as opposed to the 'Public Sector' (NHS), and b) NO consideration whatsoever given to overseas medical treatment, consultation or examination. Maybe everybody thinks an individual's medical history stops with the NHS. How extremely naïve and credulous people can be.

INCREASED COST = FINANCIAL IMPACT = FINANCIAL BURDEN = MONEY

Question 5) Age Limit

Removing the requirement for a DVLA driving licence to have been held for a continuous period of 1 year and abolishing the 21 year age limit will dramatically increase the numbers of licensed drivers operating in Derby City, thus even further dividing up and aggregating the market share of available consumers.

Furthermore, can an 18 year old that has just passed their driving test (DVLA) a year earlier realistically be expected to have the relevant life experience and skill set to be able to adequately apply themselves to the profession, when the taxi using consumer market is made up of a mélange of people from all walks of life?

There are **ULTRA VIRES LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**. Review of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 Section 51 (1) – ***Subject to the provisions to this Part of this Act, a district council shall, on receipt of an application from any person for the grant to that person of a licence to drive private hire vehicles, grant to that person a driver's licence:***

Provided that a district council shall not grant a licence –

(b) to any person who has not for at least TWELVE MONTHS been, and is not at the date of the application for a drivers licence, the holder of a licence granted under Part III of the Act of 1972 (not being a provisional licence) authorising him to drive a motor car.

Perhaps the final point on age limit should be made by asking one simple question, how much **MONEY** would an insurance premium **COST** an 18 year old wishing to take out 'hire & reward' slash 'social domestic & pleasure' vehicle insurance in fiscal year 2016/17, hence why the word 'realistic' springs to mind?

As a result and consequence of removing the age limit criteria there will be a significant and substantial:

INCREASE IN SUPPLY AT A RATE DISPROPORTIONATE TO DEMAND = REDUCTION IN BOOKING VOLUME = LOSS OF REVENUE = LOSS OF EARNINGS = LOSS OF MONEY = FINANCIAL IMPACT = FINANCIAL HARDSHIP

Question 6) Driver and Vehicle Standards Agency Test

NO description with paper questionnaire relating to what the tests consists of?

'It is proposed that existing licence holders may be required to achieve the higher driving standard as a sanction (a threatened penalty for disobeying a law (statute) or rule) following a complaint about their driving standard being upheld.' – why would there be a lesser requirement for 'Private Hire' than for 'Hackney Carriage' when essentially the drivers of both types of licensed vehicles are doing the same job and performing the same function, purpose and task? This is what is commonly referred to as double standards, to which this same paradigm exists within the proposal of dual licenses, thus resulting in grave equality implications. Not forgetting of course that the NVQ Level 2 Certificate in Road Passenger Vehicle Driving was a combined accreditation for both 'Taxi and Private Hire,' the Taxi Wheelchair Exercise of which was extensively covered. I wonder why that was! No isolated stand-alone distinction there milord.

One must also consider here the variances in prices concerning the different tests. An applicant that has already taken a basic assessment (hackney and private hire saloon vehicles) might at some point choose to either drive a purpose built hackney carriage, or lease a hackney driver's licence. Assuming that is the case, they would then have to take a taxi wheelchair exercise costing £26.56 weekdays only. Adding the **COST** of the original test to the £26.56 would equal £102.22, £13.28 dearer than if the applicant had taken the enhanced driving assessment test in the first place.

GRANDFATHER RIGHTS – knowledge is familiarity, awareness, understanding and discernment gained through experience or study. Tenure of driving (DVLA) and the amount of years in which a licence holder has held their badge should be equated for.

**INCREASED COST = FINANCIAL IMPACT = FINANCIAL BURDEN =
MONEY**

Question 7) Safeguarding Training

'The Jay and Casey reports into child sexual exploitation found a LINK between 'taxi licensing' and child sexual exploitation' – what is this **LINK** explained? Is it an established axiomatic fact, or is it someone's interpretation or conjecture?

Any approved safeguarding training course that would be compulsory and without exception indicates an outside training provider? Therefore who will be funding this? Or to put it another way, where is the **MONEY** coming from?

**INCREASED COST = FINANCIAL IMPACT = FINANCIAL BURDEN =
MONEY**

Question 8) Basic Skills Test

BSKB Level 1 Functional Skills Assessment – improve standards yes, but the claim to ensure public safety is narrow at best and questionable at worst. Are there **COSTS**, if so, who is funding those **COSTS**?

Once again, **GRANDFATHER RIGHTS** – knowledge is awareness, familiarity, understanding and discernment gained through experience or study. Tenure of driving (DVLA) and the amount of years in which a licence holder has held their badge for should be equated. Additionally, the length of time they have actively been engaged within the trade for a continuous uninterrupted period should also be paralleled.

**POTENTIAL FOR INCREASED COST = FINANCIAL IMPACT = FINANCIAL
BURDEN = MONEY**

Question 9) Review of Private Hire Operators Licence Condition No.11a

The councils premise is correct. There is a distinct safeguarding issue directly related to a licensed driver's safety. This has been widely identified as a potential risk and permanent hazard to a driver's overall security and welfare.

It is already illegal under existing operator's licence conditions, not to request the 'Full Complement of Details' when consumers make bookings. This is in fact already a requirement of licensing as laid out within condition No.11a. Moreover this condition is backed up by private hire legislation in the shape of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976, Section 55 (3) – ***A district council may attach to the grant of a licence under this section such conditions as they may consider reasonably necessary.*** The above section directly pertains to the licensing of operators of private hire vehicles.

It is also important to note that one must consider the wider implications and plausible repercussions. It is without question crucially imperative, and in fact necessary, to have as a requirement of any regulatory licensing scheme, the ability to be able to create an audit trail of bookings that directly relates to a specific person by full name as well as their intended destination as a feature of private hire licensing. This not only protects and safeguards the interests of the general public, but also the interests, safety and wellbeing of licensed drivers. Notwithstanding the importance that surrounds the legal term 'Premeditated Intent with Malice and Deliberation.'

Interactive Voice Response (IVR) bookings for example in their current form do **NOT** benefit the general public, and they certainly do **NOT** benefit licensed drivers; they **ONLY** benefit (cui bono) booking agent operators by having a digital program that answers telephone calls instead of a **PAID** human resource, hence why they are **NOT** fit for purpose. So in point of fact it once again mushes down to none other than **MONEY**. In conclusion then, risking human life by deliberately creating a paradigm of peril for the sake of fiat currency is nothing less than depraved immoral corruption.

Broadly speaking it would be highly recommended and advantageous to the trade as a whole, including significant, apparent and obvious benefits to the general public, if commercial booking agent staff employed by licensed operators were to have undergone respective NVQ Level 2 Training in Customer Service. Likewise an NVQ Level 3 Certification in Managing Road Passenger Transport might be seemly. But beyond that, any combination of NVQ course units could also be tailored and custom-made appropriate to an individual's role, remit or responsibility. Therefore any commercial booking agent wishing to either renew or apply for a licence, where that operator engages the services of one or more employees that are directly responsible for taking and/or despatching bookings from members of the public, **MUST** be subject to an NVQ requirement similar to that which already exists for a driver. This is about being competent, proficient and professional, bearing in mind that professionalism is an excrescence of discipline. Besides, there is a further 18 months of EU funding available for this purpose under the heading 'Employ Local' starting October 2016. [Source: Skills UK Ltd.]

Question 10) Online Renewals for Drivers Licences

Further distance and detachment between corporate council and the licence holders it administers and leases licences to.

What precise access details would be required?

How would this proposal be engineered and designed?

How would it work and function?

Ambiguous, vague, nondescript and unclear!

Question 11) MOT for Vehicles

NO issues surrounding insuring or taxing licensed vehicles whether online or otherwise.

Replacing the 'Certificate of Compliance' with a DVSA MOT Certificate is, in principle, a good idea. It would in theory eliminate any grey area surrounding the question of whether a vehicle is insured or not if the licence plate officially issued to that vehicle were to be removed by a licensing enforcement officer.

Unfortunately though, the downside to this proposal would be that this concept is wholly inappropriate if the councils 'Supplementary Testing Manual' is simply a condition of testing and not subject to a condition of vehicle licence, therefore leaving the way open for a legal challenge. An MOT Certificate for a private hire and hackney carriage vehicle issued on behalf of the Driver and Vehicle Standards Agency (DVSA) by a registered MOT testing station represents a vehicle that is compliant with the DVSA 'Class IV MOT' test in terms of classification, standard and criteria, and **NOT** an Enhanced Vehicle Test compliant with the councils very own specifications and supplementary criteria. One test is simply not the same as the other; moreover they are unique and distinguishable from one another. Therefore an MOT Certificate of one classification cannot be issued to a vehicle that has undergone a test of a different nature. It's like saying that a PSV Class VI test is the same as an MOT Class V Test, to which the logic simply does not follow.

The only way forward would be to develop another completely separate category classification and test, which would awkwardly have to be done on a governmental level; the drawback being the differing standards concomitant to the 365 local licensing authorities around the country. This on its own would be entirely unworkable unless a national uniformed customary standard were to have been created and introduced.

It further opens the door to connotations relating to whether a vehicle presented for testing for the purpose of obtaining a private hire or hackney carriage licence cannot simply be tested by any registered 'MOT Station' in order to be issued with a proposed MOT Certificate. It begs the question therefore as to whether or not there should even be any form of additional council vehicle licence measures in the first place.

Section 48 (1) of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 states: ***Subject to the provisions of this part of this Act, a district council may on the receipt of an application from the proprietor of any vehicle for the grant in respect of such vehicle of a licence to use the vehicle as a private hire vehicle, grant in respect thereof a vehicle licence:***

Provided that a district council shall not grant such a licence unless they are satisfied –

(a) that the vehicle is –

1) suitable in type, size and design for use as a private hire vehicle;

- 2) *not of such design and appearance as to lead any person to believe that the vehicle is a hackney carriage;*
- 3) *in a suitable mechanical condition;*
- 4) *safe and;*
- 5) *comfortable;*
- (b) *that there is in force in relation to the use of the vehicle a policy of insurance or such security as complies with the requirements of Part VI of the Act of 1972,*

and shall not refuse such a licence for the purpose of limiting the number of vehicles in respect of which such licences are granted by the council.

The above has been cleverly circumvented by applying the legislation governing private hire vehicles, i.e. Section 48 (2) – ***A district council may attach to the grant of a licence under this section such conditions as they may consider reasonably necessary.*** The emphasis though is on the word 'Reasonably,' meaning in a sensible way; to a moderate or acceptable degree, fairly.

Additionally, transferring to a Vehicle Compliance Sheet is largely academic and nothing more than a superficially attractive re-arranged word for a Certificate of Compliance. Supposedly though not bearing the same watermark and hologram logo, and on cheaper still pieces of paper, to which the chain of **MONEY** can once again be tracked, or for want of a better expression, ***'being more commercial'*** <><><>Derby City Council<><><>Grant Thornton.

**DISTINCT QUESTION OF COST AS TO WHAT IS ACTUALLY BEING PAID
FOR = FINANCIAL IMPACT = FINANCIAL BURDEN = MONEY**

Question 12) Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) to be administered by a third party

Vague, does not explain the proposal in its entirety.

What organisations are being referred to?

Further distance and detachment between corporate council and the licence holders it administers and leases licences to.

What if a licensing applicant, renewal or otherwise does not have access to a piece of hardware capable of accessing cyberspace?

What if a licensing applicant is not computer literate?

Do other organisations charge for this service, surely yes?

**INCREASED COST = FINANCIAL IMPACT = FINANCIAL BURDEN =
MONEY**

Question 13) Dual Licences

Hackney carriages can already undertake private hire work.

The councils account and depiction is **INCORRECT**, it should read, '**so they can drive private hire vehicles!**' **NOT** '**so they can undertake private hire work.**'

'There would be a SEPARATE FEE for this dual licence.' What is the **PRICE TAG** of this **FEE**? And how does it compare to leasing two separate licences?

**POTENTIAL FOR INCREASED COST = FINANCIAL IMPACT = FINANCIAL
BURDEN = MONEY**

Question 14) DVLA Driving Licence Mandate

Is not this criterion already in place as a requirement of licensing?

Has not the licensing team already adopted this policy?

Does the licensing team not already apply this procedure?

Question 15) Good Conduct Certificate

Checks on applicants that are overseas nationals **MUST** be conducted as a pre-requisite before licensing can take place.

Do nation state's embassies or high commissions even provide this service?

Can the UK's very own Government provide this service?

Why would three months or more outside the UK for existing licence holders render them not a 'fit and proper' person without a Certificate of Good Conduct?

NO elaboration – NO explanation – NO clarification!

Question 16) Dress Code

Evidence inspection, assessment and evaluation of other licensing authority's dress code requirement.

No example of dress code given, afforded or offered.

There are **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**. Review of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 and the Town Police Clauses Act 1847 in regard to a 'dress code' within the legislation.

INCREASED COST = FINANCIAL IMPACT = FINANCIAL BURDEN = MONEY

Question 17) Vehicle Ownership

Do not see or envisage a problem.

Is not this criterion already in place as a requirement of licensing?

Has not the licensing team already adopted this policy?

Does the licensing team not already apply this procedure?

Question 18) Minibuses

'It has been identified that a number of minibuses licensed as private hire vehicles in Derby do not meet the standards laid out in the Council's vehicle specifications.'

There **MUST** be some kind of benchmark; therefore by extension there **MUST** be some kind of minimum standard, the logic of which **MUST** follow. Any minimum standard though must relate to the different kinds of manufactured vehicles permitted in terms of type, size and design (Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976).

On the other hand modifications **SHOULD** be allowed **IF**, they do not prejudice or impair upon any minimum customary standard. Accordingly, if a modification is made that enhances a vehicle in terms of provision, safety or security, then alterations of this kind **SHOULD** be allowed so long as any and all changes meet with, and conform to an officially recognised safety standard.

Having a Voluntary Individual Vehicle Approval (VIVA) 'Confirmation of Compliance' notification is a way forward in terms of unifying a consistent and common standard within the trade, so long as the modifications and improvements that have been made warrant and justify a test of such nature. In other words, any test must be proportionate, balanced and equal to that of the enhancements or changes. Remembering too that one must also be conscious of what actually constitutes a modification in the first place. The council might very well be treading an extremely thin line here, simply because the so called 'vehicle specifications' only relate to a vehicle as it was when leaving the factory. This is because throughout its lifetime, there might well be many modifications or alterations that are made by different owners prior to that vehicle being

owned by someone wishing to licence it for hire & reward. Noting too that a motor vehicle's make and model does not change just because that vehicle has been fitted with something other than when it was sold to its first owner. Furthermore, there could well be situations for example where simple written approval from the licensing department might be satisfactory and permissible.

No detailed description pertaining to the procedures of VIVA testing given or specified. No explanation as to what level of Voluntary IVA (basic or normal) is required, as well as no defined indication to the **COSTS, CHARGES** or **FEES**.

INCREASED COST = FINANCIAL IMPACT = FINANCIAL BURDEN = MONEY

Question 19) Hybrid Vehicles

Luggage space is **NOT** required or needed for the vast majority of journeys. The numbers of journeys that do need the use of luggage space are mainly limited to those customers who are travelling to and from airports etc.

Any member of the public wishing to make a private hire booking that wants to transport luggage will specifically request a vehicle capable of doing so. Alternatively, if a taxi using consumer is looking to travel to a bus terminal or airport for example, they will routinely be asked by booking agent staff how many pieces of luggage do they have, and what is their size in terms of small, medium or large, so that a suitable and appropriate vehicle can be dispatched.

In today's world, there is **NO** need to have a definitive luggage space requirement whatsoever. Furthermore, there are ample vehicles of all shapes and sizes licensed by Derby City Council, clearly enough variety to be able to cater for and represent the needs of members of the public wanting to travel with luggage. Remembering too, that vehicle manufacturers construct vehicles with a designated area for stowing luggage, which in most cases is more than sufficient anyway.

Question 20) Air Quality

'Derby MAY have to Introduce a Clean Air Zone (CAZ) by 2020.'

In the main, the overall consultation questionnaire is based on ambiguity. Stake holders are expected to participate not from a position of strength, but from a position of nebulous and opaque weakness. How is it possible for them to make informed choices when they do not have a complete and comprehensive quantity of knowledge and information detailed to them to begin with? When a proposed constitutional change of such seismic and monumental magnitude is at stake, it is of the utmost responsibility of council to meticulously provide an extensive

all-inclusive graphic account of what they are specifically proposing, including any additional **COSTS** and foreseen ramifications, in order to provide awareness, familiarity and cognition to the very people it directly affects.

'The city has been identified as one of the areas that MIGHT NOT meet the EU Limits if action is not taken.'

As a reminder, the UK is no longer part of the European Political Union, and therefore not part of its dictatorial Orwellian regulations or directives. The United Kingdom's people are free to self-govern and make self-determination through a system of constitutional democracy; a Government of the people, by the people, for the people. Remembering too, that man and women do **NOT** serve Government, Government serves man/women.

For the first time in history, international taxes have been proposed under the pretence of addressing climate change. Like a trogon horse the suggested treaty unveiled at the 2009 UN Copenhagen climate conference appealed to our concern for the environment, while distracting us from the fact that this unprecedented **CARBON TAX** would be paid to the World Bank and enforced by global police. There are ways to address our obvious need to curtail pollution without creating a tax base for tyranny. This carbon controlled cockamamie nonsense coming out of Derby City Council via the UK Government [source: Improving Air Quality in Cities – News Stories.gov – 17 Dec 2015] by way of the EU (which parenthetically the UK are no longer part of anymore), and originating from within the UN, is nothing more than a financial gimmick, it has nothing to do with the environment, that's because **MONEY** trumps everything in that world.

"For the love of money is the root of all evil: which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith to humanity, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows." - Timothy 6:10 (King James Version)

Is Derby City Council prepared to take on governments from around the globe by petitioning and lobbying them for the release of 'Suppressed Sciences,' 'Technologies' and 'Energy Propulsion Systems' in order to bring about humanitarian benefits to society? Are they prepared to take on the task of creating and developing an initiative to take planet earth off hydro-carbon fossil fuel reliance by changing the face of the macroeconomic and geopolitical hegemony power structure, by implementing exopolitics as a consideration for attention? Financially impacting upon Taxi Drivers and Licensed Vehicle Proprietors of Derby by inferring they either purchase another vehicle or pay a **CARBON TAX** tariff, when 1,149 [source: Taxi Licensing Administration and Compliance Activities – Qtr. 3 2015/16] licensed vehicles make up less than 1% of the total number of vehicles registered to keepers residing in this city is totally and utterly ludicrous. This ridiculously paltry number is unequivocally and irrefutably insignificant in the grand scheme of things.

"No problem can be solved from the same level of consciousness that created it." – Albert Einstein (14 March 1879 – 18 April 1955)

Moreover it is plainly clear to see that the object and target of attention by council and Government is that of business, whether it is a simple self-employed sole-trading taxi driver or a larger commercial enterprise. The idea that a **CARBON TAX** can be arbitrarily imposed upon Derby City Taxi Drivers Instead of tackling the **ROOT CAUSE** of why the world still burns fossil fuel as a source of energy is downright unacceptable and quite frankly insane! Mankind's vigour, drive and commitment should be focused and directed towards the people, planet and all living things, instead of towards big business and finance!

Where do authorities and Government think that Derby's Taxi Drivers are going to get the **MONEY** from to pay for all this? Are they expected to pluck it out of thin air in the same way that the banks do? Or are they expected to become **DEBT SLAVES** and vehicles to simply just create more **MONEY** by paying compounded interest. Haven't people noticed that we are living in a time of Pernicious, Rampant and Austere Wage Compression, do they not realise that in addition to this, we taxi drivers are being forced to bear the brunt of **INFLATED OPERATING COSTS** and **SUPPRESSED ANTIQUATED TARIFFS** that have no resemblance to reality whatsoever! Not to put a too finer point on it, but there's also the added **COST OF LIVING, INFLATION (STEALTH TAX),** and **MONETARY DEPRECIATION (PURCHASING POWER)** to contend with. This whole notion is utterly disgraceful and completely absurd. Not only that, but it is beyond the realms of the ridiculous.

**INCREASED COST = FINANCIAL IMPACT = FINANCIAL BURDEN =
MONEY = CURRENCY = ENERGY = FINANCIAL HARDSHIP, PLIGHT &
SUFFERING!**

**THE CYCLE OF WHICH REPEATS ITSELF UNLIL THERE IS PROFOUND AND
FUNDAMENTAL CHANGE FOR ALL OF HUMANITY!**

THE WAY FORWARD, well, this is a simple one. Firstly there would have to be an official decision made, presumably at council level, to retain and preserve the current independent, objective and unbiased constitutional regulatory licensing system on which the trade depend, rely and trust, (regardless of past issues or performances). Then there would have to be a conscious collective move to transform what already exists by way of sea change. This suggestion is by far the most efficient and effectual, basically because this system is already extant.

In addition to the above, it would particularly be of enormous value, worth and assistance, if 'Driver Representatives' were to be allowed to form a permanent cross association action group, the purpose of which would be to create a co-operational edifice aimed at effectively working with taxi licensing officers, in

assisting them when it comes to making difficult proposals surrounding the development, progression and evolution of the trade. This collaboration would then form the basis for any future proposals put before the taxi and private hire licensing committee. Furthermore, holding regularly timetabled trade meeting forums is another way in which the trade would benefit by offering the distinctly different, and distinguishable interest groups (to which there are three), the opportunity to discuss any proposals being considered prior to them being put forward before the licensing committee.

***"In religion and politics people's beliefs and convictions are in almost every case gotten at second-hand, and without examination, from authorities who have not themselves examined the questions at issue but have taken them at second-hand from other non-examiners, whose opinions about them were not worth a brass farthing."* – Mark Twain (30 November 1835 – 21 April 1910)**

Perhaps one final thought should be given to the executive branch's **FINANCIAL** and Value for **MONEY** oblique Risk Management statements under the heading 'IMPLICATIONS.' This can be seen on pages 5 & 6 of the Report by the Cabinet Member for Regulatory Services entitled Review of Taxi Licensing. At the risk of sounding redundant, this 'Late Item' wasn't seen by councillors until they arrived in chamber at 6pm on the 18th May 2016. This report states at 1.1 the following: ***'Any proposals that may arise will need to be reviewed to ensure the robustness of the FUNDING proposals needed to support the initiative.'*** Additional it reads at 9.1: ***'There would be significant reputational risk to council in devising and/or approving an ineffectual scheme.'*** It further goes on to define corporate objectives and priorities for change, which in essence is another way of describing the rationale behind the proposals. These examples at 10.1 include:

- protecting vulnerable children, young people, adults and other people

Without doubt that principle is correct, as long as there is recognition and comprehension that 'Taxi Drivers' fall into the camp of 'Adults and Other People,' and by definition they too need protecting.

- promoting health and well-being

Once again the attitude is correct, just so long as those responsible understand that more than half the questions within the consultation directly relate to **MONEY, MONEY** that this city's Taxi Drivers simply have **NOT** got

- being more commercial

This is no other than a fancy pants way of saying money-making, gainful or remunerative, as well as showcasing a paradigm of expediency for those it

benefits. In other words this is a 'Service to Self' approach, methodology and doctrine, and **NOT** a 'Service to Others' practice or policy.

- delivering our services differently

Delivering services differently alright, but may those councillors that read this be sturdily reminded that as Independently Elected Members, it is **YOU, NOT** corporate council that are responsible for ensuring the public travel safely and receive a good level of service, and that **YOUR** systems **NOT** corporate officers that attract good, reputable drivers, and that **YOU** are the Sine Qua Non, Lynchpin and Keystone of the Taxi and Private Hire Regulatory Licensing Scheme

Stripping, divesting and depriving councillors of their 'Role & Function' will **NOT** produce, create or construct a consistently fairer, just, impartial, unbiased, independent, diaphanous and transparent system. But what it will do is consolidate power in the hands of officers, which for all intents and purposes is corporate council. Consequently, in the councils of local authority, we **MUST** guard against the acquisition of unwarranted Influence whether sought or unsought by the proposals of some. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist. We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our 'Constitutional Democratic Processes.'

"I cannot teach anybody anything. I can only make them think." ~ Socrates (470/469 BC – 399 BC)

But first, you have to want to...

