Appendix 1 – summary of consultation responses as presented to General Licensing Committee in October 2017

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source:** | **Date:** | **Issue:** | **Council response** |
| Driver 1 | 17.8.17 | Not like the thought of just 1 testing station for this it creates an unfair competition which forces prices up. | Noted |
| Driver 2 | 24.8.17 | Would prefer testing at SRBC approved garage rather than by LCC – would keep cost down and employment local | Noted |
| LCC | 25.8.17 | Draft suggests that maximum height of step should be 420mm for first step and 300 mm for subsequent ones, whereas LCC criteria for school work are 250mm for first step and 300mm for subsequent ones | Noted |
| Manufacturer 1 | 30.8.17 | **Inspections to ensure converted vehicles have been correctly and safety modified:**  Feels that further consultation is required with all interested parties before a meaningful revision to a policy for wheelchair accessible vehicles can be adopted | All noted |
|  |  | Current testing regime by LCC ensures vehicles are inspected to VOSA standards and include ensuring tracking and seats are correctly fitted |  |
|  |  | Current testing undertaken by the appointed testing stations also ensure correct fitting and use of seats and seatbelt during a class 5 test |  |
|  |  | Seating compliance is impossible to demonstrate for older vehicles already licensed as many seat certificates are unavailable from manufacturers due to age |  |
|  |  | **Standards for modified minibuses/psv’s**  All drivers have been trained in wheelchair use by LCC compliance officer |  |
|  |  | Passenger seats have the same trim wherever possible but due to operational needs matching seats are not always possible. This is not a safety issue and these type of vehicles aren’t front line taxis that service the general public directly |  |
|  |  | Floor height at 420mm incorrect |  |
|  |  | Minimum rail length incorrect or wrongly worded |  |
|  |  | Turning circle of a wheelchair within the vehicle doesn’t seem to have any relevance. |  |
|  |  | **Testing going forward**  IVA’s booking are not easily available in the local area. I understand that FMU may have capacity issues if they were to undertake all of the ongoing road worthiness testing. |  |
|  |  | We propose FMU undertake a 1st use inspection instead of an IVA using the amended Appendix one details to tests to be undertaken on modified vehicles. The current appendix has some errors that would need to be amended before it is to be used |  |
|  |  | Opposed to testing solely by LCC - ongoing testing to be undertaken by authorised garages using established taxi test regime along with an amended appendix one. |  |
|  |  | This is only a brief response due to current time constraints and I feel a great deal more of further consultation is required before things can move forward.  I am happy to work with SRBC to this end. |  |