

Considerations of the qualitative consultation feedback – Taxi Licensing Consultation

Broad comments about the proposed strategy or Taxi Licensing.

Consultation feedback		Officer response	Actions proposed
Comment themes	Unique points and suggestions		
Taxi licencing generally (18 comments)	Private hire drivers cannot be held socially responsible for people who are intoxicated by alcohol or drugs which affect their decisions; In Barcelona, taxis there have a button they can press which immediately alerts police to the fact that they are in trouble; My recent experience is very bad with bookings not fulfilled, over 2 hours late and continual misinformation; taxi drivers should be considerate when parked up and not have all their lights on as it can be very blinding. Also, more considerate when parking anywhere to drop somebody off as it can cause an accident; Technology has made booking safer instead of these stickers; The system now works very well and does not need changing our customers are very happy that they know which company is picking them up.	Southampton licensed drivers are better protected than most with the inboard taxi cameras. Levels of service for private hire vehicles will normally be addressed by operators. Although technology does provide safety features not all of the taxi trades or public currently have those facilities.	Nil.
Find Taxi's too expensive (2 comments)	I don't use the taxis around the city, they are too expensive; Find taxi's too expensive.		
Regular user of other taxi services (17 comments)	Use other taxi services in Southampton; Mainly use a certain taxi company at nights; In London I use certain taxi companies; mainly use one taxi service.		
Do not use taxi services (8 comments)	Do not use the taxis around the city; do not use taxi's as disabled; Use taxis very rarely; Rely on buses more.		
Pressurised into completing consultation response (6 comments)	I had no choice but sign their petition, I do not support the petition; I feel pushed into signing petition to support current policy; I had to sign the petition otherwise I could get kicked out from my job.		
Employee of a taxi company (6 comments)	Work for a taxi company.	The conditions proposed are innovative and to our knowledge not in existence anywhere else, however evidence has previously been provided that shows a tendency for areas that do not require the display of operator details to have more cancelled jobs. The removal of the requirement to display operator names will assist start up businesses as they will be able to recruit existing drivers who can continue to work for an established operator. The word taxi does derive from hackney carriages but nowadays is commonly used as a term to cover both hackney carriage and private hire trades. The government uses this same language with the 'Statutory Taxi and private hire standards'.	Nil – full Equality Impact Assessment will be completed for any report to the committee.
Concern about response being identified / not able to provide a detailed response (7 comments)	I refuse to give too much information in case my identity comes out which would put my job at risk; I sign the petition which I don't agree with but I had no choice so I will not give too much on my information just in case this gets back to the company; As a driver I won't give too much information because I know I will be kicked out on the platform.		
N/A / No comment (2 comments)	None.		
Overall support for the draft policy (22 comments)	It's understandable; Support draft policy; Good change, moving with the time; Strongly agree; There is no safety issue with the draft policy.		
Concerns about the draft strategy (11 comments)	Parts of the draft policy is merely opinion and not based on facts; It will cause arguments and disagreements; This is what institution racism can look like. 2021 majority campaigners against the change where white, elected members voting on it white, a special guest also white. The Council applying control to majority of BAME drivers, why?; Policy prevents or makes it difficult for new businesses to enter the city and compete with existing businesses; Well Southampton is the only council where this is in place which is such a shame. I am not sure what it is but Havant, Chichester, new forest or even London have far better rules in place and make better sense; Ironically, I can't help but note that your "DRAFT TAXI LICENSING POLICY CONSULTATION" makes no distinction between "TAXIS" and "PRIVATE HIRE VEHICLES", which in Law are distinctly different, and are legislated for as such, and yet your Policy Statement does. One wonders if this is a slip of the pen, or an indication of attitude towards the Private Hire Trade, in that Southampton Council sees them as one and the same – which, of course, in Law they are not.		
Suggestions around the strategy (8 comments)	Private hire vehicles should have the same requirements as taxi's; Change sticker policy; Just leave it simple; Remove this stupid policy; Well, you should have a question do you agree with operator details should stay on private hire vehicle. Yes or no; we keep things simple to understand that we are in 2023 and with the advancement of Technology and minds we can easily implement Policies instead of making cars a cartoon character in all over the City; Private hire vehicles should have the same requirements as taxis; we recommend significant further consultation on a range of practical considerations, as detailed below. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The definition of what would constitute a 'proper justification' for cancelling a trip. • Data privacy concerns: If a local authority has a record of cancellation data this may become publicly accessible via a Freedom of Information request with unforeseen and potentially negative implications for drivers and Operators alike. • Associated administrative burden and business impact on Private Hire Operators and drivers associated with reporting and tracking cancellations, for limited apparent benefit. • Analysis of current trip cancellation data to better understand whether this is a Southampton-wide driver issue or concentrated to a smaller subset of drivers. 	The livery requirements of both hackney carriages and private hire vehicles clearly differentiates between a hackney carriage, a private hire vehicle and an ordinary private car. We understand there are times when an accepted job will be cancelled for a valid reason, including by error. It is not practicable to list all scenarios and each case will be dealt with on its own merits. The current policy explains how matters will be dealt with.	Nil

Consultation feedback		Officer response	Actions proposed
Comment themes	Unique points and suggestions		
Other comments about proposals/strategy (12 comments)	The proposals are poorly crafted. It's not a proposal but imposition by the council on drivers. What right was created for drivers? Nothing. Proposal of choice on one hand, take away with stupid condition to report. As long as I own and drive, I have human right to choose and freedom to choose just like riders; We have a resident at our block who is no longer working as a taxi driver yet has retained his identifying licence plate and the taxi sign for the top of his car and uses both to conduct illegal activities. Forcing drivers to return this stuff would prevent them from doing this. [redacted personal information] Though I very much doubt you will bother to do anything to stop this man illegally using things he is not registered to use any longer; 13.2 Southampton City Council maintains a list of wheelchair accessible vehicles which can be here. The link in this section does not work ;Why were you planning to implement the changes in the first place?. Can't u register more than one driver to the car? (2-3) 4/5 yes fine to an extent but these will increase costs and overheads to both the Council and taxi company; Second those who struggle with technology they won't book the taxi from apps anyway and as a PH driver we always call through secure line upon arrival to let them know your taxi is here to make it easy for them. So, I highly recommend and request the council to pay attention to this ever-suffering PH trade.	The Freedoms of Information Act provides safeguards so personal data is unlikely to be disclosed. There is a small additional administration burden but it assists in protecting the public. Drivers have more choice with the proposal. Jobs can be cancelled for valid reasons. The comments on a driver retaining his plate have been investigated and all licences are in place.	
Other general comments (9 comments)	The other policy could be as it's now; Please do something about that; A company that is likely to disappoint is also one that customers should know about; Safety is paramount, Relive; I work in General hospital; What a disgraceful country we have become might as well be mirrored with North Korea. Dictatorship without any say; I wonder if majority of private hire drivers was not brown or from BAME background. And that this was a white struggle. Would this policy stayed as it is for such a long time? and would it be that difficult to get this changed; We are keen to work with local councils across the UK to explore this issue and how we, together, can best support private hire applicants.	Any increased costs are likely to be minimal.	

Positive/Support/Agreement comments about proposals.

Consultation feedback		Officer response	Actions proposed
Comment themes	Unique points and suggestions		
<i>In favour of removing signs/stickers in general (18 comments)</i>	Fully support removing signs; display is not necessary; agreement to remove door stickers; stickers are a sign of the past; removing stickers will have a positive impact; removal of signs will improve the economic wheel; no need for door signs; there is no risk on removing signs.	Door signs assist in clearly identifying the vehicle as a private hire vehicle, we see vehicles from other areas with no livery and it makes them very difficult to distinguish from a normal private car. The proposal is to remove the requirement to display the operator detail	Nil
<i>In favour of removing company/operators name from signs/stickers (16 comments)</i>	Get rid of the operator's information from the private hire cars; no need for company name; agree to remove company name; removal of door sticker with company name will cause a positive impact for drivers.	Some members of public do still rely upon the door stickers to identify private hire vehicles. Not all companies or members of public use apps or text.	Nil
<i>Car registration is safer than door signs (28 comments)</i>	Female riders find using car registrations safer; vehicle registration is safer; car registration cannot be copied; vehicle registration sent through the app is safer.		
<i>Currently do not look at door stickers/signs anyway (25 comments)</i>	Never looked at door stickers – it's not safe; never look at door signs; riders do not use door signs.		
<i>In favour of the new door sign (5 comments)</i>	Support new sign; new sign is better and safer; new stickers we are supportive of, as this can be done most effectively at a local authority level.		
<i>Currently look at vehicle details/registration/other method to identify car (72 comments)</i>	Car registration through text & app is much safer; always go by vehicle registration and model; I look at app and confirm vehicle information; I check vehicle details and photo of the driver; customers in my view tend to use the car description.		
<i>Will increase driver's earnings (15 comments)</i>	Driver earnings will potentially increase; positive impact to earnings; removal of door sticker with company name will increase income; more work for drivers by multiple operators will open the door of economic stability; will encourage operators to pay better.	Nil	Nil
<i>Able to work across multiple companies/operators/more independently (50 comments)</i>	Able to work freely with multiple operators; if proposal 1 goes ahead it will have very positive impact; drivers will have more options; Being self-employed, it's completely up to drivers to choose who and when they work for and who they pick up.		
<i>Removing door sign will create a better service (5 comments)</i>	Will provide fair services to all customers; will give passengers better value for money; will lead to more affordable transportation options for passengers; help drivers deliver the maximum potential in a heavily invested working role.		
<i>More availability/quicker pickups for customers (10 comments)</i>	Potentially more availability of drivers for services; giving the public more availability/greater choice; will result in less waiting for cars to pick up.		
<i>Support for the cancellation policy (79 comments)</i>	More accountability for cancelled journeys; support for the cancel policy; it will stop drivers cancelling without good reason, this will improve service for riders.		
<i>Other companies/Vehicles licensed outside of Southampton do not have stickers and work fine (20 comments)</i>	In London there no stickers for taxis; hackney cars can work multiple firms and without displaying any door signs; In Brighton and Hove they have many signs including without company details; no problem without company information; Many non-Southampton cars operate in Southampton without issue with no stickers other than a rear plate; regularly use Bolt, Freenow and Uber - no door sign; Executive class company cars never had door signs and they running their businesses very well; many other authorities have this policy in place so there is no safety concerns.	Door signs were introduced in or around 2000 as a result of safety concerns at night with unlicensed vehicles picking up vulnerable people. Clearly identifying what type of vehicle it is improves the safety of the public. Executive companies are only excused livery etc when they evidence they only do contract work and are picking up known clients, not ad hoc bookings.	Nil
<i>Removing operators name/sign will give drivers more safety/peace of mind (5 comments)</i>	Drivers can sleep with a peace of mind that their car, parked outside cannot be identified as a private hire thus it might be safe; Agreeing to remove the operator stickers from the vehicles which will reduce the number vandalism in the city. Have witnessed windows been broken of taxis around Southampton; Many times, passengers knock on door thinking it's their taxi - signage attracts the public towards drivers, it's not safe; Removing operator name gives drivers more safety.		
<i>Policy will create healthy competition (3 comments)</i>	New policy will provide healthy competition for all; door sign change will help to bring about better and fair competition in Southampton; will increase competition in the trade.		
<i>Other positive comments (8 comments)</i>	It has some positive impact; draft policy is good; it respects workers' rights and safer for public; it will help the drivers and the customer and there will be no compromise of safety at all as we are electrically and digitally on up to date; we agree that adding this obligation to the Private Hire Operators' Licence Conditions would be a benefit to the trade; Livery -		

Consultation feedback		Officer response	Actions proposed
Comment themes	Unique points and suggestions		
	we support the recommendations in relation to livery, having long held the view that licensing authorities should not impose any livery requirements on operators; The environment will benefit due to shorter trips required by drivers to get to their pick up point; Amazing to see the council are doing everything to help those who drive PHV; Personally, I think the licencing team do a great job.		

Concerns and suggestions about proposals.

Consultation feedback		Officer response	Actions proposed
Comment themes	Unique points and suggestions		
Removing signs will make it harder to identify the vehicle (15 comments)	There should be some kind of signage so the customer is aware of the vehicle they are getting into; limited eye sight and rely on display of large numbers to recognise a pickup taxi; Important to be aware which company the taxi and driver work for before getting in the vehicle; Customers generally use the operator badge on the door to identify which taxi is theirs and removing this would cause confusion; Outside bars and nightclub when you have two or three cars coming from same company no badge will cause confusion; Essential that Taxis have signage to look out for to stop approaching unmarked cars.	It is only the removal of the operator details that is proposed. Operators/drivers may need to take further steps to protect vulnerable customers.	Nil
Removing signs will make it harder to report an incident/complaint (9 comments)	Will be unsure who to complain too; Passengers need to be able to know who the driver is in case, for example, they are sexually assaulted by the driver; More difficult to keep track of issues.	As these conditions relate to private hire the passenger will know the company to complain to regards quality of service issues. Anything else ought to be reported to the police or licensing authority with booking details. Simply knowing which company the vehicle is operated by is not sufficient detail to identify a driver or vehicle. Merely cancelling job is not going to result in loss of licence. There will need to be other factors to show the driver is not fit and proper. The proposed changes need to be read in conjunction with the rest of the policy. Legal requirement for drivers to wear their badge, this is not changing. The livery requirements still differentiate between different types of vehicle. Reporting of cancelled jobs reduces risks of passengers left at the roadside. Council legal opinion is current policy does not break the law, the council do not employ the drivers but licence them. This has not been tested through the courts. The removal of the operator details will negate this argument.	Nil
Reporting drivers will cause them to lose their license (2 comments)	Private hire drivers can lose very easily their badge; If operators are allowed to report drivers to the licencing on a regular basis, I doubt they will abuse the whole reporting system and may cause many drivers losing their licences.		
Drivers wrongly accused (2 comments)	Against reporting drivers as some may report drivers wrongly with no evidence and that is not fair; Maybe a good reason for cancel can be switched with something not good and can affect drivers.		
Policies favours operators (6 comments)	Some operators can abuse with this to revenge; Most of the points are in the favour of operators, the operators can dismiss any driver any time with false accusations, which is very normal; Southampton council is a disgrace for allowing this policy to give control over the drivers to companies .		
Signs should be retained (8 comments)	Removing identifying details is never a good idea; Prefer to know details of driver etc; Name and contact details of driver should be always on display; passengers should have a clear idea as to who the operator is for the journey.		
Signs should be retained for safety (29 comments)	No details of driver - not safe? Trust; The signage on private hire vehicles should be retained this is a safety aspect for the public; Wouldn't feel safe not knowing who was driving; Feel significantly less confident about the vehicle; Removing the requirement to display driver and operator details increases the chance of rogue drivers.		
Displaying company name does not ensure safety/benefit customers (9 comments)	Company name does not provide any safety; Council mistaken in believing that the company name provides protection; Requirement of using door sign to make it safer is just another one of those council policies.		
Policy changes may violate safety (9 comments)	Safety could be violated; This just makes it a free for all for rogue driver /operators and does nothing to help the public, either safety; It allows for more fraudulent vehicles and drivers to transport our public; Lone women travelling in a taxi will be more at risk with this policy; Appreciate drivers need to work - but customer safety isn't being considered here at all.		
Policy breaks laws (3 comments)	Current policy is outdated and breaking laws; Policy now break laws, controlling self-employed workers; Does Laws mean anything to council licensing department?		
Policy is stopping competition/not respecting competition law (15 comments)	Southampton Council is stopping competition; Competition law must be respected; Better competition is needed; Competition Current policy discourages competition; Current conditions create a competition restriction.		
Policy favours a certain taxi company (6 comments)	Current policy favours one Taxi company; Southampton Council giving so much power and influence to a certain taxi company.		
Will create a lack of options for the public (8 comments)	Reducing options; Not giving consumers options; Customers will suffer from a poorer service, more cancellations and potentially vulnerable passengers being left stranded if multiple drivers who are working multiple platforms each cancel the small jobs continually; Less likely to use a taxi late at night from taxi rank if they're not using branded taxi companies livery; Sadly with poor night bus service you're not giving non-drivers many alternative options.		

Consultation feedback		Officer response	Actions proposed
Comment themes	Unique points and suggestions		
Policy has negative impact on drivers (7 comments)	Will council give money for the extra cost on fuel? Will council give money for Uber or Bolt extra income; Drivers would earn less money; May erode drivers' flexibility and freedom to choose if, when, and for how long they work; Will have to work for multiple companies and increase earnings to support family.	Believe the removal of operator details will make whole system more efficient and allow individual drivers increased opportunities to earn, however the change will not increase the volume of work for the trade as a whole. The police report from recorded crime there is no evidence to suggest taxis are being targeted. However they do suggest drivers empty the vehicles of any cash and items of value. Copying a doorsign indicates premeditation and requires some effort. Not having a doorsign makes it even easier to impersonate a licensed vehicle. These changes apply to pre booked work only. Hackney carriages operate under the table of fares set by the licensing authority. Operators can still advertise but they are not required to do so, the drivers can choose which operators they will work for. This could cause confusion for the public if a vehicle arrives after booking with operator A but it is displaying adverts for operator B.	
Not supportive of cancellation policy (10 comments)	Currently cancel many jobs after accepting for many reasons; Will not complete hire if the client is rude or disrespectful; Drivers should have the same rights to cancel as riders do; Job gets accepted by accident; Reject this condition strongly.		
Displaying company name causes nuisance to drivers/ to be victims of crime (11 comments)	It makes drivers vehicles a target for thieves; Public approach drivers when they are not working; Private hire vehicles a target for criminals; Company name and stickers on cars cause break ins; Car's attract anti-social behaviour; Countless incidents of damage to licensed vehicles when parked.		
Door signs are not safe (13 comments)	Current stickers are dangerous; Door sign is not safe; Door sign is dangerous at night-time; Anyone can copy and pretend.		
Proposals will have no impact (3 comments)	Would be no impact on the community or business at all; Theoretically little to no impact at all, but it depends which way it goes; Proposals 2-5 will only have +- impact.		
Incorrect/increased fares (7 comments)	Additional costs added to the fare; Because they all have become "under the sleeve snakes" and charging the customers excessively; If drivers are allowed to work for more than one operator then different tariffs will apply depending on operator. How will passenger know correct tariff being charged, as some have night rates, weekend rates, out of city rates etc while others don't.		
You can still keep/advertise operators/companies name on vehicle regardless of policy (7 comments)	If the policy changes, the operators can still advertise their company brand on the rear doors; why is a council misleading the public thinking the operators name be removed? Disgusting behaviour from Southampton licencing department in my opinion; You can keep or have operators name on vehicles; Operators will still be able to advertise so it's not completely getting removed.		
Current policy is unfair/high-risk (4 comments)	Current policy is unfair; Council is helping these companies to harm the drivers; Current policy is dangerous.	Proposal is to change the policy	Nil
Ability to work for multiple operators will decrease earnings (more drivers) (2 comments)	This is where the concern is working for one operator and there's not enough jobs to go around then we're not making much money and there is other taxi coming from different city and working in Southampton with multiple apps and taking more busy than Southampton taxi driver; Will mean more cars joining the company and some drivers working for two or three different operators which should not be allowed also less earnings when everyone's expenses are going up.	The drivers/vehicles licensed else where are currently working here anyway so bringing them into the Southampton regime will not reduce the volume of work but will improve safety and air quality as they will need to have a taxi camera and driver a cleaner vehicle.	Nil
Working for multiple operators will have negative impacts (2 comments)	Working for multiple sources is a conflict of interest; A driver with a grudge can do a lot of damage to the good reputation, built up over years, of a company; Drivers will be able to exploit the customers with little come back. Smaller companies with less integrity will not report or investigate indiscretions as thorough as a bigger better disciplined company.	There is no evidence to support these comments.	Nil
Proposals will have negative impacts (2 comments)	A very dangerous move if this is implemented; I feel the proposals will have a negative impact - (as no expert) but it reads to me as a lot of extra work for all concerned and I somehow feel it can or will tend to be pushed aside - or will cause companies /people /to give up this work.	There is no evidence to support these comments.	Nil
Previous experience getting into the wrong taxi (3 comments)	White taxi comes with no signs, and recently they also send West quay cars. One time I got in the wrong car because of the name on the doors, due three cars came at the same time; One night out. I got in the wrong taxi, three vehicles outside Edge club and I jumped in going by door sign. So, it's not safe to have company; 2 women mistook it for their taxi, got into the back seat and the driver proceeded to ask their postcode. The street pastor team spotted from the back, the car had no taxi plate, the team quickly opened the back car doors and asked the women to come out. They had no awareness this was not a taxi, the Team Leader had to explain this, they then realised the danger they had been in.	There is always going to be a certain amount of reliance on passengers getting into the correct vehicle but drivers should be checking this as well. The Street Pastor example is evidence of livery supporting public safety as the Street Pastors knew what a licensed vehicle should look like.	Nil
Council prevents extra income for drivers (4 comments)	I am driver, I am losing money; So why is the council stopping this extra income for the drivers; 10 & 11 Feb, Uber gave promotion offer. Total of extra £80 earnings. Due to current policy, I missed out on this bonus, I hold Southampton council for this. SCC is affecting how much I can earn.	Removal of the operator details will resolve this	Nil
Operators do not pay drivers fairly (2 comments)	Currently work for uber and maybe we will get tested fairly by them. They pay less money than other companies for example, Paying the drivers miserly less for the trips. Modern slavery is practically practiced by all these operators in Southampton.	The proposal increases the options for drivers	Nil

Consultation feedback		Officer response	Actions proposed
Comment themes	Unique points and suggestions		
Police are breaking laws - Taxis will not follow their authority (3 comments)	It's funny how Southampton licensing wants us drivers to follow the rules and the laws yet police officers managing this department are breaking the laws; Are we surprised ex police officer breaking the employment law with the current signage because that's the opinion he has well based on met report recently. Is not a good reflection.		Nil
Other concerns (12 comments)	Lack of sight; Not happy with the information given about how big the new signage will be; Nepotism and friends good job allocation is on peak; Proposal 3 & 4 unnecessary; The only way to avoid being assigned a driver is to avoid the operator; People with time-limited permission to be in the country are allowed to drive a hackney cab; The cost involved in employing staff for the extra conditions will be expensive and will be recouped through drivers subscriptions or percentages; New Student accommodation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are several recently built student accommodations that seem to have drop-off points built, but at least 2 I know have a bizarrely raised curbs to access these. They seem to be higher than normal curbs. Some you'd need a 4x4 to access them. Planning really needs to improve the drop off areas for the safety of our passengers. I also think it very odd the Uber drivers cannot drop off at Taxi ranks especially when they are empty, and loads are located near crossing and zig-zag lines. The drop-off points at Southampton Central is so small it's frankly dangerous. The worst thing about driving for me is finding a space where customers want to be put down and safely for them without out being shouted at for not dropping off where they think they should be. 	Livery needs to clearly identify the vehicle as a licensed private hire vehicle to promote public safety. Proposal 3 and 4 require the operator to take action to reduce the incidents of cancelled jobs and support the licensing authority to uphold public safety. The data required is generally held on a computer system and a report can be run with minimal input from staff. Planning are aware of issues and a matter of law prevents a private hire or any other vehicle using a rank.	Nil
Concern/Suggestion - Proposals/laws should be enforced/policed (3 comments)	Little or no enforcement of present laws regarding PH; Proposals will only have a positive impact if properly 'policed'; Will not work without proper enforcement - i.e., mandatory fines.	No legal authority to issue fines other than for smoking in a vehicle. Enforcement officers are active. Numbers of suspensions and revocations are significantly higher now than 10 years ago.	Nil
Suggestion - More accountability from drivers/operators (5 comments)	More accountability for cancelled journeys; Focus accountability for operators; There must be accountability not just for driver but the company that they work for along with being self-employed; Regularly updating the drivers that an operator employs will improve traceability and accountability in the event of complaints.	Agree	Nil
Concern/Suggestion - Workers rights and laws must be respected (53 comments)	Respect employment/workers' rights law; Local authority must respect workers' rights; Stop trying to control self-employed workers; Council must stop breaking workers' law.	See above	Nil
Concern/Suggestion - Advertisement for companies should be paid for (9 comments)	Council must pay drivers for free advertisement for these companies if name stays; Support Free advertisement for companies; Pay for previous advertisement.	Council not involved in the arrangement between vehicle proprietors and operators.	Nil
Suggestion - ID/Information ready to show at all/any time (3 comments)	All drivers to carry ID's and be ready to show at any time; Drivers badges should always be visible to all passengers in the car wherever they choose to sit; Perhaps a clear wallet displayed clearly inside.	Legal requirement for drivers to wear badges	Nil
Suggestion - Implement signs/stickers/signs inside vehicle/magnetic signs (7 comments)	Signage should be small; Permanent stickers with the company details; Magnetic operator panels/magnetic door stickers that can be removed or swapped; Additional PHV signs inside the vehicle.	Magnetic signs are a risk, likely to be stolen and potential to then be used by bogus driver.	Nil
Other suggestions (14 comments)	Stop slavery like Uber, Maybe half yearly reviews; If working for multiple operators then their main/usual operator should still be displayed, and leave it to the secondary operators to notify their customers if a non-regular driver on their platform will be dispatched/completing the job; Change the door policy; Increase safety for women; Hackney carriage taxi any colour must have roof sign; The Council should be regulating the cars and the drivers, not the drivers decisions and affairs; Companies should have in place the other policies regardless of whether or not driver details are displayed. Council should be putting more safeguards in place not taking them away and making it far more difficult to trace who the driver was. Plus there should be a requirement for drivers to return licence plates and other taxi paraphernalia when they stop driving; Driver time should be monitored as with HGV drivers; The taxi industry needs more checks into who are working for the companies, are the companies doing the responsibility of checking staff and reporting/ responding to complaints , who are driving day and night and what licenses are the drivers.	Impact of any policy will be reviewed. Arriving displaying a different operator is likely to cause confusion and in some cases anxiety with vulnerable individuals. Abandoning the colour scheme weakens the policy, making differentiation of types of vehicle more difficult. Additional conditions mitigate the risks as we see them of removing the operator detail. No legal status to allow us to monitor driver hours with tachographs. Policy requires robust checks of all drivers and DBS checks of all proprietors and operators. Operators	Nil

Consultation feedback		Officer response	Actions proposed
Comment themes	Unique points and suggestions		
		are required to record driver details on jobs allocated.	

Understanding the policy.

Comment themes	Consultation feedback	Officer response	Actions proposed
Comment themes	Unique points and suggestions		
<i>Uses too much council jargon (2 comments)</i>	As a resident all the jargon used is something I did not fully understand; Poorly written document clearly designed to mislead the public and elected members because if the policy goes ahead and changes the companies can still put the Brand on private hire vehicles. Another trickery played by licencing department in order to keep this policy.	Policy and conditions need to be written in such a manner they are not challengeable at court, without specific examples it is difficult to know which parts the author is referring to. No intention to trick anyone. Author identifies a point that needs addressing in that if operators do advertise measures need to be in place to prevent confusion	Amended condition for vehicle and driver preventing a vehicle displaying operator details working for another operator.
<i>Needs to be easier to read / shorter (10 comments)</i>	The question is not clear and have more than one answer; Not all the drivers are fluent in English and draft is written in strong official language; I understand it as I was in the industry others /public may not; Very complex details. Do not understand what is meant; Yes, could be clearer; The removal in proposal 1 adds further confusion to the customer i.e., who they have booked, who will turn up and while there is legislation preventing unauthorised use/display of a private hire vehicles this confusion only gives further temptation; It's very long and is just all plain text. Whilst this conveys the necessary information the average resident isn't going to bother to read all of it. Having just completed the Net Zero survey that document was much easier to read; However, we find the reference to make these reports "to the satisfaction of the Council" when read alone in the draft, unclear; The alternatives were confusing; Poorly written document clearly designed to mislead the public.	Feedback noted for next revision	Consider language at next review
<i>Needs to hold more information (5 comments)</i>	There is no mention of possible consequence to drivers that cancel jobs ,all be it legitimately and by which measure the council would use to punish offenders; The draft policy has not included the evidence from other councils that actually proves the door stickers is no longer required in this changing modern industry; The council is not providing enough information to the public; Southampton Council is a joke, this policy is outdated and no evidence based; It doesn't explain why Private Hire vehicles have to have the drivers name and number, and why a certain taxi company vehicles only have the company name and number displayed on the outside of vehicles. Surely, they should both have the drivers' details displayed clearly - preferably inside the cab on the back of the driver's seat.	Proposal is to remove the need to display operator details. Drivers by law are required to wear badges.	Nil

<i>Easy to understand (3 comments)</i>	The draft policy was fine to read; The draft policy was easy enough to read and understand; I understand it as I was in the industry.		
<i>Poor wording (5 comments)</i>	This question is poor. The answer for "you" "your family" "business" and "wider community" all have very different answers; This is a bad question. As each answer for, me, my family and my business and the wider community can and will be different; Southampton Council is a joke, this policy is outdated and no evidence based; No surprise licensing misleading the public, the politicians and the trade; Poorly written document clearly designed to mislead the public and elected members because if the policy goes ahead and changes the companies can still put the Brand on private hire vehicles. Another trickery played by licencing department to keep this policy.	Currently the council mandate the display of operator details, the proposal removes that mandate. It is then a choice for the proprietor of the vehicle to decide if they are to advertise the operator. Operators may offer subsidies for proprietors who advertise the company.	Nil
<i>Proposals worded to get a certain response (2 comments)</i>	However, this consultation is written to get the results the council want. The questions are directed to responses the council wants; but this Consultation is filled with loaded questions aimed at getting one certain response.		Nil