

**MANDATORY CCTV IN TAXIS:**  
**CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

12 responses were received to the consultation. Two were received from stakeholder organisations:

- North Derbyshire Deaf Forum
- Sight Support Derbyshire

The remaining 10 were received from the private hire trade, either from operators or drivers who own vehicles. Of these one was broadly supportive, with some concerns. Two were supportive but with scope for exemptions. Three were clearly opposed to the proposals and the remainder, while raising questions and comments, did not express a clear view.

The first table below summarises the issues raised by the trade, by category, with officer comments in the final column.

The second table sets out the various observations of the stakeholder organisations with officer responses.

Issue Raised:	No of Respondents who raised it:	Officer Comments
<b>COST:</b> General objection to the £500-800 cost per vehicle. Most indicated the cost is prohibitive, especially for small operators. Some asked if support will be available.	7	Lower cost systems will not meet the strict demands of a legally-compliant policy. It is for members to determine if the benefits of the policy justify the costs to vehicle proprietors. The option of financial support from the Council cannot be determined by Licensing Committee. However, members may wish to ask Cabinet to consider whether budgetary provision is available to do so.
<b>COVID 19:</b> Of those concerned with the cost several pointed out they are in financial difficulty as a result of the pandemic.	5	The policy is in line with statutory guidance that CCTV policies should be introduced unless good reason exists not to, and as the impact of Covid 19 is expected to be temporary it shouldn't affect the merits of the policy.

		Members may wish to take a view on whether the timing of implementation should be conditional on progress of the the post-Covid economic recovery.
<b>EXECUTIVE TRAVEL:</b> Objections to CCTV in taxis which are used almost exclusively for executive/business travel, where confidentiality will be undermined with potential loss of clients.	3	These concerns may carry significant weight. However the number of operators affected is small, so it would not constitute sufficient reason to drop the policy proposals.
<b>EXEMPTIONS:</b> Request that executive/business operators be allowed exemptions to the policy in order to protect client confidentiality.	2	All licence holders are legally entitled to apply for exemptions to policy requirements. Members need to decide whether such requests should all be referred to Sub-Committee for consideration or whether the policy should set criteria for exemptions (i.e. evidence of executive-only travel) to enable officers to grant an exemption under delegated powers. NB Refusal of exemptions will be subject to the right of appeal to the Magistrates Court. If refused without adequate reasons there is a risk of costs being awarded against the Council.
<b>NO BENEFITS:</b> Objections based on a lack of need/benefit in having the policy. E.g. one respondent indicated their 15-year clean record negates the need for CCTV, another points out that there have been no incidents locally to justify the policy. 2 respondents indicate small firms operating around rural villages will see no benefit/value, e.g. mainly transporting elderly passengers in the local area only.	3	Members have previously determined that there are no strong local reasons not to pursue mandatory CCTV in taxis. In considering the consultation response Members must assess whether these responses change that position. In doing so Members must take into account the number of representations and whether that renders the overall policy unnecessary.

<p><b>COMPLAINT RESPONSES:</b> One respondent queried whether complaints raised by drivers will be taken seriously and given more attention by the Council or Police if CCTV is present.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Matters of Police practice are of no relevance here. The scope for enforcement within the Council is not affected by the presence or otherwise of CCTV in taxis. It is a matter of prioritisation and resources, which have been addressed in a recent restructuring of the Licensing team.</p>
--	----------	--

ISSUE RAISED:	OFFICER COMMENTS:
<p><b><i>North Derbyshire Deaf Forum:</i></b></p>	
<p>Alternative language provision in policies doesn't include recourse for BSL users.</p>	<p>This is a corporate issue, not directly relevant to the policy under consideration. Comments have been passed to the relevant department for consideration.</p>
<p>CCTV recording must be done with consent. How will the presence and use of the system be communicated between driver/passenger if either of them are deaf?</p>	<p>Signage will help inform passengers of the presence of CCTV. Publicity may also be undertaken (see below). Licence conditions applicable to blind passengers could be extended to deaf persons too.</p>
<p>Concerns that drivers with low literacy may struggle to communicate to deaf passengers.</p>	<p>Solutions or means of support will be explored as part of the implementation of the policy. The Council's Equality Act obligations will be observed.</p>
<p>No contact details in policy for the officers responsible for implementation.</p>	<p>Contact details for the Licensing Section can be included. Suitable concerns can then be passed to the officers responsible for implementation.</p>
<p>Signage should use plain English and/or imagery.</p>	<p>Suitable signage will be developed during the implementation of the policy. These comments will be taken into consideration at that time.</p>
<p>Will there be visual indicators that the system is in use/emergency audio recording has been activated?</p>	<p>Suitable CCTV systems will be identified by officers as part of implementation. While we may be constrained by the technological limits of the available systems we can try as far as possible to identify ones which address this concern.</p>
<p>In order to protect privacy audio recording will be limited. Users of BSL will not benefit from this protection, their communication will be recorded.</p>	<p>Suitable CCTV systems will be identified by officers as part of implementation. While we may be constrained by the technological limits of the available systems we can try as</p>

	far as possible to identify ones which help to address this concern.
How will deaf passengers know if the status indicator is working/what it is showing?	In line with the specifications the status indicator is designed to be seen by the driver only. The system will be checked by Council mechanics at each 6 month test.
Provision needs to be made for passengers who are deaf-blind.	This is a complex area and communications may be difficult. Means of support can be examined as part of the implementation process.
How will the introduction of CCTV in taxis be publicised to the deaf community?	Publicity of the measure can be undertaken as part of the implementation process. Subject to available resources the suggestions of NDDF will be taken into account when determining which options to pursue.
<b><i>Sight Support Derbyshire:</i></b>	
The policy may help blind passengers with evidencing any complaints.	This positive feedback is welcomed.
CCTV recording must be done with consent. Because signage may be of little or no assistance, and drivers may fail to inform the passenger of CCTV, other means of communicating this may be of value e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RNIB connect radio</li> <li>• local Talking newspapers</li> <li>• local radio.</li> <li>• Sight Support Derbyshire could include a Council leaflet in their newsletter in relevant areas.</li> </ul>	Publicity of the measure can be undertaken as part of the implementation process. Subject to available resources the suggestions of SSD will be taken into account when determining which options to pursue.
It would help if, when ordering a taxi, passengers were advised on the phone by the taxi company that the journey would be recorded.	Such an obligation can be placed on Operators in their licence conditions as part of the policy.