# Rossendale

**ITEM NO.B1** 

Subject:	Proposed Review	of Hackney	Status:	For Publicat	ion
	Carriage Fares				
Report to:	Licensing Committ	ee	Date:		
Report of:	Director of Commu	unities	Portfolio Holder:	Public Prote	ction
Key Decision:	Forward	Plan 🗌	General Exception		cial Urgency
Community Imp	bact Assessment:	Required:	No	Attached:	n/a
<b>Biodiversity Im</b>	pact Assessment	Required:	No	Attached:	n/a
Contact Officer	: Phil Morton		Telephone:	01706 2524	42
Email:	philmorton@rossendalebc.gov.uk				

1.	RECOMMENDATION(S)
1.1	That Members consider the attached report and approve the proposed fares following the statutory advertising requirements and consideration of any subsequent objections.
1.2	

# 2. PURPOSE OF REPORT

2.1 To inform Members of the current Hackney Carriage Tariff as outlined in Appendix A To inform Members of a request to increase the current tariff as outlined in Appendix B.

# 3. CORPORATE PRIORITIES

- 3.1 The matters discussed in this report impact directly on the following corporate priorities:
  - A clean and green Rossendale creating a better environment for all.
  - A healthy and successful Rossendale supporting vibrant communities and a strong economy.
  - **Responsive and value for money local services** responding to and meeting the different needs of customers and improving the cost effectiveness of services.

# 4. RISK ASSESSMENT IMPLICATIONS

4.1 There are no specific risk issues for members to consider arising from this report.

# 5. BACKGROUND AND OPTIONS

5.1 At a meeting of the Licensing Committee on 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2008 it was agreed to commence a consultation exercise to review the existing Hackney Carriage Tariff.

As a result of that consultation the tariff was increased as outlined in Appendix A.

5.2 A request has been received from a member of the Taxi Trade to request that the tariff is reviewed and amended as outlined in Appendix B.

This would keep the 1<sup>st</sup> mile fare unchanged, but increase the 2 mile fare from £4.50 to £5. This would ensure that those passengers who travel only a short distance would be least affected.

5.3 A comparison with a selection of neighbouring authorities in Lancashire, Greater Manchester and Yorkshire has been carried out and the results are outlined at Appendix C.

	Version Number:	1	Page:	1 of 2
--	-----------------	---	-------	--------

# Rossendale

# COMMENTS FROM STATUTORY OFFICERS:

#### 6. SECTION 151 OFFICER

6.1 There are no specific financial implications

#### 7. MONITORING OFFICER

7.1 The Council must make a decision based on all relevant information and following consideration of all relevant Council policies.

# 8. HEAD OF PEOPLE AND POLICY (ON BEHALF OF THE HEAD OF PAID SERVICE)

8.1 There are no specific human resources implications.

#### 9. CONSULTATION CARRIED OUT

9.1 In line with required legislative requirements contained within Section 65 Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976.

#### 10. CONCLUSION

10.1 That members determine this report.

Backgr	ound Papers
Document	Place of Inspection
LGMPA 1976	Public Protection Unit

Appendices	
Document	Appendix Number
Existing Tariff	Appendix A
Proposed Tariff	Appendix B
Local Authority comparison	Appendix C

Version Number: 1 Page: 2 of 2
--------------------------------