

Q1a

- Most taxi companies use Sat Nav system so a local knowledge test is not so necessary. A basic knowledge test of major roads and locations could be given but not too detailed.
- All taxi drivers has satnavs these days. Perhaps we should have a condition that they should be equipped with a satnav though. Not practical to have a knowledge test except in the most general sense. How wide to you go? Drivers would need to know West Essex and London but in what detail?
- Test should include many questions identifying the shortest route from point A to B, to cover working area of EFDC. Pin pointing various places of interest on a map. i.e., polices stations, underground, retailers, pubs, clubs (Golf), community centres and schools.
- proof of area they will be working in
- Also the driver should have been driving at least five years and not have to many points for reckless driving.
- I would fully endorse this idea. The test should be set at a level that takes some effort to pass. At least a month of studying the local network and towns should be required to pass.
- A general knowledge of the area would show a commitment to providing a satisfactory service and provide a barrier to casual drivers. It would also provide more confidence to customers. However, navigation devices are in widespread use. It would be important to avoid increasing the cost of a license, which is already very high (given the level of remuneration), and time consuming to obtain. Would you also introduce maximum driver hours to minimise dangerous incidents of tired drivers?
- modern satellite navigation makes is far superior to any possible knowledge test.
- Clarity of speech
- Mainly places of local interest
- Yes, they should have good knowledge of issues before coming into practise
- A knowledge test is a good idea because many new drivers are unfamiliar with the local area because they live in other district
- A knowledge of the local area is imperative
- To prove their dedication
- As a taxi driver it is expected of the public to know where your going
- Because there are drivers where I work that have no knowledge at all
- It is common to hear complaints about drivers not knowing basic knowledge of area
- To improve quality of service by the licensed trade
- Questions regarding customer relations
- As a protection to the customer, all new drivers should do a knowledge test
- A knowledge of a taxis local area important to all
- Airport journeys
- I feel this would put people off and ultimately have a negative effect on the affordability that can be offered by minicabs.
- So they can operate efficiently from the outset
- There are quite a few drivers who have little or no knowledge of area, this reflects badly on other drivers who do.
- But not retrospectively, there are only a finite amount of fares to go round the Epping Forest District therefore anything that limits the amount of new drivers you register can only be a help to us established drivers
- All knowledge helps
- Just not necessary with the advent of Sat Nav.

- Some drivers only mildly aware of geography the District
- Basic knowledge of area essential
- In Line with other authorities
- Customer satisfaction equable fare charging
- To improve services and encourage good practice.
- Ensures good level of knowledge for beginners. Introduce max no. of licenses in district
- Main road name knowledge, town halls, police/train stations

Q2a

- Because Epping Forest District is a small area
- As above
- As above
- In my opinion, this all depends on how difficult the test is. If it is very difficult once on application would be sufficient, however, if test is easy then a yearly or every other year would be fine. But, i think the test should be difficult and taken once on application, this will ensure a good standard of knowledgeable taxi drivers.
- after driving for a year they should already gain knowledge
- possibly every five years to keep the standards high.
- Once passed that should be it, after all knowledge will only increase with experience.
- Likely to increase costs to drivers who would already have gained a knowledge of the area.
- see above
- Why fill in your CV every month
- Because they are already into practise it might discourage license holders to keep this profession. Its an extra burden i.e. expensive and stressful
- I don't think any other local authority including London's PCO renew the knowledge test once its been taken and passed.
- No need to be repeated on yearly basis
- Roads and buildings do not change very much annually. New locations of pubs, clubs, restaurants can be obtained from other drivers.
- As an existing driver you will automatically gain knowledge
- Because if you still cant know your way around by then the company should get rid of you anyway
- I know of no other district that does this, if the first test is stringent enough, further test would be unnecessary
- To allow for new road layout etc
- After a year of working the area it would not be necessary
- No need to re-test once experience is there
- By now the driver would have learnt by doing the job
- It would seem sensible to repeat the test every say 10 years, but not more frequently. The repeat would deal with changes in the road network and would act as a "refresher" on the existing network.
- As above.
- Perhaps every 3/4 years
- Drivers will have already obtained sufficient knowledge of the area
- If the test is stringent enough it will not be necessary
- Once you know the area you know it
- This would seem to be a money making exercise by yourselves we already have to pay out enough yearly without any added expenses we

get precious little back. Where are our taxi ranks in the District apart from Epping?

- Just not necessary.
- No need if passed 1st test
- Not necessary if no problems occur
- With every 12 months additional experience knowledge would automatically improve.
- The Committee feels that as the testing of Hackney Carriage drivers is already quite stringent it therefore suggests a repeat test would only be necessary if there has been a break of more than 3 years in their employment.
- Not time or cost effective
- After 1 year of driving, license holder should know his way around by then!

Q3a

- Not for existing drivers, but for new drivers
- This would restrict and delay people from becoming a taxi driver when they may need to quickly earn money due to redundancy, etc.
- Should be a condition that drivers should be members of the Institute of Advanced Motorists. Not practical for EFDC to set up its own test because of costs involved and extra administration required.
- I do not think this is a test that would benefit passengers. If the knowledge test is hard enough this will automatically separate competent drivers.
- having worked as an assessor in other industries i do not see any gain
- It would help the Council to attain a higher level of driver.
- Anything to improve the customers end product would be good, whether it needs to be a formal qualification I'm not sure.
- In an ideal world this may be beneficial. Taxi driving is often viewed as a short term/temporary occupation and examination/qualifications are unlikely to appeal to the majority of drivers. If such requirements were introduced remuneration would need to improve on a par with Black Cabs.
- How many complaints has the council received about the existing system?
- Driving ability is all that is necessary
- English test and advanced driving test
- They are already into practise, it should be for those who are getting complaints against them.
- I cant see any real benefit for this qualification. Most customer service is just common sense.
- Helps in customer relations
- A driver would naturally treat well behaved passengers with civility
- For new drivers yes. For existing drivers no commonsense should tell you when a passenger requires assistance.
- Because its irrelevant to the job in my opinion
- Maybe for first application
- To keep up the professional standards
- This would add to the ever increasing cost of licensing wither i lost earning whilst training or from being charged for it
- Not for experienced taxi drivers as they have built up their experience
- Experience by doing the job grows

- Passengers are putting their safety in the hands of the driver. It might be preferable to use an existing test (Advanced Motorists or similar) to avoid the costs of setting up and running a new test.
- As above
- Not sure. We want high standards but without cost increases for customers
- So only competent drivers are allowed to operate
- For cost trades and professions this is mandatory licensed drivers should be the same
- Common sense should prevail here and any bad or rude drivers are already dispensed of by firms via customer feedback
- Again this helps and its good to have a qualification
- No, just a way of getting more money off us.
- No need if 1st test is appropriate
- It would be helpful if language problems occur
- Principally passenger safety and satisfaction
- To raise standards.
- Already have high knowledge through experience of working own areas

Q4a

- Pre booked customers need to know that the driver knows where he is going
- As above
- As above
- I strongly believe that there should be no difference in the test for hackney carriage and private hire. The majority (if not all) of hackney carriage drivers in EFDC work through an office where the taxis are pre-booked.
- Not necessary - the 'area' can be anywhere, via airports, central London. In my case, the only work 'in the area' is pick-up and drop-off, via where the customer lives/works. All addresses/journeys are easily pre-planned using online street/route websites. A knowledge test is of no practical use.
- as above
- I see no reason why a test for a Private Hire driver should be different to one for a Hackney driver. 99.9% of my work is pre-booked, I've had just one street hire job in the last four weeks, so for the vast majority of the time the areas Taxi's are operating as private hire cars. This will always be the case until the council introduces more taxi ranks, sets the fares and introduces meters. If the council wants to encourage good practice, why is it virtually the only licensing authority in the country not to do this ?
- Many private hire drivers tout for work outside clubs etc
- see answer 1, plus covering such a vast area it would be impossible. Companies already ensure their drivers know the circuit they work, modern despatch systems supply the best route
- Sat Navs are not always working
- English test and advance driving test
- Yes They should have knowledge before they perform
- A good idea
- To prove their dedication
- As a taxi driver it is expected of the public to know where your going
- It is common to hear complaints about drivers not knowing basic knowledge of area
- To improve quality of service by the licensed trade
- As for Hackney carriage
- This is pre booked hire from numerous pick ups and drops

- Although satnavs are a great help, they cannot deal with the effects of roadwork's, accidents etc, and do not cover the sort of local places of interest
- This would be sensible to achieve high standards
- So they can operate efficiently from the outset
- There are quite a few drivers who have little or no knowledge of area this reflects badly on other drivers who do
- Shows the person wants to help the passenger
- Not necessary for Private Hire. The advent of Satellite Navigation has made this a thing of the past. The "Knowledge" test for Black Cabs is just a way of limiting numbers of drivers and safeguarding their jobs.
- Basic knowledge of area essential
- In line with other authorities
- Level of knowledge required is the same as for Hackney Carriage
- For reason of customer service and operator efficiency.
- Ensures good level of knowledge for beginners. Introduce max no. of licenses in district

Q5a

- Epping Forest is a small area
- as above
- As above
- My suggestion is the same as for hackney carriages drivers.
- See answer to Q.4
- See Q2
- Increases costs.
- as above
- Why keep proving oneself
- As year go pass quick, I think there is no need for that.
- no other authority/organisation does this
- Roads and buildings do not change very much annually. New locations of pubs, clubs, restaurants can be obtained from other drivers.
- As an existing driver you will automatically gain knowledge
- I know of no other district that does this, if the first test is stringent enough, further test would be unnecessary
- To allow for new road layout etc
- A drivers knowledge will only get better as time goes on, so further test will only be a waste of tax payers money
- As for Hackney carriage
- Virtually all drivers use sat navs
- It would seem sensible to repeat the test every say 10 years, but not more frequently. The repeat would deal with changes in the road network and would act as a "refresher" on the existing network. Airport journeys
- Perhaps every 3/4 years
- Drivers will have already obtained sufficient knowledge of the area
- Just not necessary for Private Hire. We know all our customers and routes are known in advance plus we have Sat Nav and Traffic info.
- No need if passed 1st text
- Knowledge would automatically improve over time
- To take account of any changing circumstances.
- Not time or cost effective

Q6a

- Taxi metres should be a must have, as it stops customers being ripped off! You should set the fares! Customers being picked up in the high street of a night and being charged silly prices
- as above
- As above
- Same as above.
- Not sure what this involves so difficult to comment
- See Q3
- Would be beneficial but needs to be cost effective since driver's remuneration is very low at present. See comments Q3
- Driving ability only
- English test and advanced driving test
- License holders who are performing their duties good enough, don't need any further tests Thanks
- No real benefit, just common sense
- A driver would naturally treat well behaved passengers with civility
- For new drivers yes. For existing drivers no common sense should tell you when a passenger requires assistance.
- Maybe for first application
- To allow for new road layout etc
- As I have been a chauffeur for some 20 years and as you may know I drive the Chairman of EFDC. I feel qualified in assisting with your consultation should you need my help
- As for Hackney carriage
- I can not see what help it would be to drivers or public, a mini cab is not a black cab, a private hire driver has ample time to sort out address' and routes prior to the job
- Passengers are putting their safety in the hands of the driver. It might be preferable to use an existing test (Advanced Motorists or similar) to avoid the costs of setting up and running a new test.
- Not sure. We want high standards but without cost increases for customers
- so only competent drivers are allowed to operate
- For most trades and professions this is mandatory licensed drivers should be the same
- No, just a way of getting more money off us. Do you realise how much it costs to license, tax, and insure a private hire vehicle 6 seater with Epping Forest Council? Plus the fact that i have to have a medical every year (cost £120.00) and 3 MOTs a year. Drivers from other areas laugh when i tell them I have to find nearly £3,000.00
- All this will be too costly and too time consuming as costs will be passed on the drivers in increased license fees. In this present climate its hard enough to make a living as it is.
- No need if 1st test appropriate
- Principally passenger safety and satisfaction
- This would increase customer confidence and respect for licensed drivers, as well as safety for passengers. IN ADDITION TO THE ABOVE: i) All operators should have a First Aid qualification and carry a First Aid kit in their vehicle. ii) The Committee has noticed that quite a lot of private hire drivers break the speed limit and should be reminded to observe speed restrictions.
- Already have high knowledge through experience of working own areas

Q7a

- As there is a need for them
- I think this would be a good idea, however it would depend on the costs to the local taxi companies. It should not be too expensive as companies are run on fairly tight margins already.
- A proportion of taxis in a company with 3 vehicles or more should have disabled access. Proportion to be decided by EFDC but it should be up to the company to decide which vehicles have the facility
- I am not sure if there is a need for more vehicles specially adapted for the disabled because i know that certain operators have many vehicles already in use.
- do not find many disabled people use taxis, cost will be very high for companies
- Maybe the Taxi Companies should have a certain amount of vehicles at each office.
- There is very little demand. I know one driver who has had a Peugeot Euro Taxi for the last 3 years, he has never had to use his wheelchair ramp !!!!
- Unless there is a move towards restricting taxis to custom built vehicles this is impractical.
- Every operator of more than 3 vehicles should have 1 fully accessible vehicle always available for hire
- This should be a community project with qualified carers
- Mainly places of local interest
- If possible yes otherwise its still manageable
- I have driven a wheel chair access taxi for five years and only been asked to carry disabled passengers on two occasions
- We find the vehicles we already have are sufficient
- There are enough wheel chair access in Epping already
- No discrimination
- The London taxis have disabled facilities so should local councils providing this
- At my company we have numerous disabled cars
- I drive a wheel chair accessible vehicle, and there is not the demand you would think this is owing to dial a ride council vehicles
- Disable must not be /feel excluded from any service offered
- I have been a hackney carriage driver in the Epping area for approx 14 years and not once needed wheelchair access
- Black cabs are equipped to deal with requirement
- It is difficult to give a firm answer without knowing the extent of provision at present.
- Yes but only in proportion to the demand otherwise costs will increase too much.
- Very few vehicles currently provide this access
- In my experience this is already well catered for
- I think the work is already being adequately covered
- I have been carrying disabled passengers for the last 2 years if the only people I carry and find their is not a lot of work about
- A suitable percentage of our vehicles can be accessed by disabled passengers
- All transport should be provided for all people
- but only for hackney carriage
- Seems sufficient at present community transport also underused

- Not all public transport has disabled access
- I already carry many disabled people with various disabilities as a normal service. Any more severe would require an ambulance
- To provide greater equality for disabled people.
- Disabled passengers are entitled to taxi travel
- Estate cars are often able to deal with wheelchair facilities

Q8a

- One per company is enough
- impractical
- No but there ought to be a minimum provision within a company above a certain size
- Because, in the five years as a taxi driver only once have i been unable to take a disabled person and this was due to a motorised wheelchair that was not foldable. Otherwise, i have always been able to take the disabled.
- I am a single-car operator, so this is impractical. I have had wheelchair customers in the past - wheelchair has gone in boot. An Audi A8 is an Audi A8, and that's it. If I am unable to transport anyone, for any reason, I would not take the booking.
- to costly and minimal used
- I feel that it would be allot of money paid out by each driver, that would not used.
- Absolutely not for the same reason as Q7. If you did go ahead with this for Taxi's, I and nearly every taxi driver I know would switch to a private hire plate. Also wheelchair accessible vehicles tend to be larger and higher off the ground. Many elderly but able bodied folks find these vehicles harder to get into and much prefers saloon cars. So in an attempt to be inclusive to one section of the community you would exclude another.
- Too expensive. There would need to be considerable investment in new vehicles and currently the returns would not justify this. The majority of drivers are self employed.
- The demand would not cover the extra costs, plus running larger vehicles would increase pollution multiply that over all the licensed vehicles and the increase would be considerable
- Provided by EFDC
- In a company only few vehicles are enough to have that facility
- Its not necessary as demand for such a vehicle would not be that high
- We personally feel that 10 in 10 vehicles is sufficient
- Some customers like comfort on long journeys which cannot be given in a adapted van
- Disabled people have the same rights as everyone else
- Not all drivers can afford to purchase such vehicles
- But a company should be given a minimum requirement
- The cost would be far to much
- No but there should be a good quantity in service perhaps 50% of every fleet operator
- Disabled passengers prefer to sit in the vehicle
- Drivers should have the option
- There are vehicle hire firms specific to this need if required
- This would put an excessive cost on operators
- Far too expensive and restrictive to insist on this.
- Only in proportion to the demand otherwise costs will increase too much

- Would be impractical
- Increased driver costs on an already marginal business
- Depends on the type of vehicle
- Carrying people in wheelchair is a lot more involved than what you think. I went on a training course through Essex County Council. Where we learnt to handle people in wheelchairs and how to get them out of the wheelchair in case of fire.
- This type of vehicle can already be requested
- All transport should be provided for all people
- a ridiculous suggestion.
- In all the times I have had a license. I have never not been able to accommodate a disabled customer and their wheelchair
- Impractical and expensive
- I have had no requests for a wheelchair accessible car. On the contrary all disabled passengers I have carried prefer a normal saloon
- The increased cost to operators won't be commercially viable.
- Unrealistic. Six seat vehicles and saloons can't be.
- Most cab firms have wheelchair adapted vehicles

Q9a

- One is enough
- too costly
- Not reasonable if operator has only 1 or 2 vehicles
- See answer to Q.8
- too costly
- Again for financial reasons.
- For a start I can't think of one local operator that has less than three vehicles. But if there were, imposing this regulation would put people out of business.
- I consider your questions do not reflect the nature of how taxi businesses are run - there are very few directly employed drivers. On this basis such vehicles would need to be charged out at a higher rate (to encourage the additional investment in them) which no doubt would infringe discrimination laws.
- see above
- Unless the extra cost is borne by EFDC
- Mainly experience
- Because they might find it very expensive
- I think just one wheelchair access vehicle is reasonable
- They still need to meet certain criteria
- Would not get enough use.
- One rule for everyone
- Again small firms may not be able to afford vehicles
- Would have to be across the board if brought in.
- Cost again
- Compromise dilutes the quality of service offered.
- I find that wheelchair access is really not needed
- I can see no point in this requirement for a very small % requiring it
- Yes - otherwise this would put an excessive cost on operators
- If it were to be brought in, then yes.
- Possibly. We want disabled passenger capability but only in proportion to demand. For example not all Private Hire vehicles have more than 4 seats but

if you have more passengers you will expect to pay more for the larger vehicle

- All operators should comply
- If decision is taken as yes Q8 this would put other drivers at a disadvantage
- Why
- As long as there is a reasonable number of wheelchair vehicles in the area
- N/A
- I have one car that is used in the chauffeur trade only
- N/A
- All or none
- I think all operators should be treated the same if there is sufficient need for an adapted vehicle then they can buy one
- Concerned that unless small operators are exempt they could be faced with a prohibitive financial burden.
- Too restricting for operator

Q10a

- Disabled people want a nice car
- too costly
- If self-employed and owning 2 vehicles or less yes, otherwise no.
- cost again
- The rules can be adapted so it also works for Chauffeurs, without it making it impossible for them to do their job.
- How do you make a top of the range Mercedes or BMW wheelchair accessible ?
- Chauffeur implies a personal service and hence the vehicle would be chosen by the owner/passenger
- lack of suitable vehicles
- I do not know
- Its always good to have more facilities for disabled people
- This is a contradiction in terms. All chauffeur driven vehicles are generally four door saloons which means by their very nature they cannot be wheelchair accessible.
- They still need to meet certain criteria
- Would not get enough use
- One rule for everyone
- Chauffeurs aim at a different market and not everyday transportation
- Would have to be across the board if brought in
- Cost
- None
- All drivers should operate within the same parameters
- From my experience the fold up wheelchair goes into the boot and the person managed with help to car, / the vehicle
- Yes - otherwise this would put an excessive cost on operators
- Probably as this is a slightly different service
- A different client base
- Unless the people can be seated in the car seats it is hard to accommodate a wheelchair in a limousine or saloon unfolded
- N/A
- This would be a need for the employer

- I never need a car with Wheelchair access. If I did I would pass it on to someone qualified to do it.
- N/A
- Hard to get suitable vehicles for this purpose
- Type of car
- All or none
- Again I think all operators drivers should be dealt with in the same way
- This is not practical in a non-adapted vehicle.
- Luxury vehicles cannot carry wheelchairs

Q11

- No the drivers own there own cars
- 10%
- 20%
- One vehicle would be sufficient.
- one percent
- Possibly a ratio of one in every five vehicles in their fleet.
- 10% maximum due to lack of demand.
- If there is a requirement then all licensed taxis should be wheelchair accessible. If not providing an "advertised" wheelchair accessible service would be impracticable i.e. if a company had 1 suitable taxi it may not be available 24hrs or if in use elsewhere a wheelchair user may have to wait hours for a service which may then lead to complaints etc. The questions raised in this paper may lead to a wholesale change in the local taxi business. In addition to the questionnaire I consider you should set up a forum and meet with interested parties.
- one vehicle per operator
- I have not considered this suggestion
- Thirty percent
- One wheel chair vehicle per shift would be reasonable e.g. one night shift and day shift
- 20 percent
- 1 in 10
- 1 per 12 cars
- 100%, but with financial help for the operator and tax relief.
- Age limit on vehicles, discount on licensing fees
- 20%
- I would say at least 5 vehicles
- 50% as stated in Q9
- None
- approx 10%
- Not required unless operator wanted acquire such a vehicle
- 20%
- To answer this question needs market research among the relevant disabled groups
- Only in proportion to the demand otherwise costs will increase too much
- 20%
- I have no opinion on this question
- 10%
- One or two cars per fleet max should cover all requirements
- All vehicles that are Hackney carriage

- At least one vehicle
- 10%
- 80%
- Doesn't apply to me
- 75%
- 5%
- 50%
- 10%
- 25%
- N/A
- The same percentage that represents wheelchair users in the Epping Forest District Council area.
- Up to the same percentage as wheelchair users versus non wheelchair users within population. Take in to consideration that not all wheelchair users will use taxis
- No I do not think there should be a condition - If an operator wishes to advertise that he has wheelchair access, then it is to his advantage, more so than a firm that does not!

Q12

- Limit the age of the vehicles
- Reduce license fees to greener vehicles (similar to road tax bands)
- Can we vary the licence fee according to published emissions used by the DVLA?
- A new taxi vehicle should not be older than five years on first registration and not more than ten years old. This would ensure newer models of cars thus greener and more economical, because cars are always getting greener.
- Grants to assist the drivers to change their vehicles. Also the Drivers, Fleet Operator's and Council all getting together, and working together. The aim being a higher level of service, so the customer wins.
- I don't believe that by saying you want to make vehicles greener you are providing enough information to get an informed answer. However anything that would increase costs to the drivers would, I'm sure, be vigorously opposed.
- Provide grants to encourage use of newer more fuel efficient vehicles. This would need to be introduced progressively since drivers may already have made investment decisions on vehicles that will last up to 5 years.
- all vehicles currently meet EEC emission standards. HYBRID vehicles are not all that green over whole of life, they have a terrible environmental impact when dismantling. The production & destruction of their batteries particularly. Non are wheelchair accessible
- I don't know
- More economic vehicles
- The authority can give them some discounts who are using these kind of vehicles.
- I think this would be a very unpopular move among the licensed taxi trade and would prove costly in updating to new vehicles.
- Costing towards running and purchasing greener vehicles
- None
- Not technically qualified to answer this question
- Age limit on vehicles, discount on licensing fees
- Get older cabs off the road, some are a disgrace that I've seen on other firms

- No
- The introduction of a discounted license for green vehicles
- None needed because as worn out vehicles are replaced by newer vehicles they will become greener, as newer vehicles are greener
- More direct advertising from licensing authority aimed at the user
- I don't know
- To reduce Licensing cost.
- a differential in the licensing fees. See Q13
- LPG powered vehicles.
- This is a good concept. Most hire vehicles are diesel which creates a lot of pollution with soot particles. Diesel emissions are particularly unpleasant for pedestrians and cyclists. Hire vehicles are used continuously so this increases their pollution effect.
- Ban petrol vehicles with large engines
- Not to license vehicles that have poor emissions
- Gas converted vehicles only or small engine diesels
- Vehicles should not be used if they are over a certain age
- More greener vehicles
- Cut back on licensing staff!!!
- No vehicle with emissions over 140 to be licensed at all. Reduction fees for my ones
- Free Licence
- Do not know
- Cheaper licence fees for greener vehicles
- Please see attached letter
- Encouragement to use hybrid and low-emission vehicles as they get cheaper road licences and insurance, as well as greater mileage.
- Introduce max age of vehicles. Introduce meters in all taxis
- Cheaper plates

Q13

- Cost is the only incentive, therefore discounts on green cars or reduced fees to the authority.
- Discount the licence fee as above, or alternatively penalise those with polluting vehicles - possibly not legal though.
- No.
- Again possible Grants or even the Council buying the vehicles and renting them to drivers at each office.
- Grants, subsidies and interest free loans.
- Financial incentives. The introduction of fare metering (depending on the levels set) may provide a better framework to justify investment. At present the sensible way is to run the cheapest vehicle. Current returns to owner drivers is marginal.
- Large Grants
- Yes money
- They should be given time frame and also some funds or loans should be provided to meet this requirement
- Maybe a reduction in annual licensing fees might be an incentive
- Government Grants
- Cheaper licensing for drivers and cabs
- Yes, financial help, discounts and tax relief.

- Discount on fees, green vehicles encourage customers to use companies I know, I drive a Toyota Prius
- Lower licensing fees
- Yes
- Again a discounted operator licence fees
- No
- Some sort of Government grant for conversion of old vehicles
- I suppose money incentives
- Does EFDC provide a list of licensed firms on its website? This would be a good idea in itself. If adopted it could be used to indicate which firms provided greener vehicles.
- Lower or zero duties and fees!
- Yes. The more unpleasant vehicle emissions are for pedestrians, cyclists and the environment the more they should be penalised. Diesel soot emissions is a particular problem. Smaller cubic capacity engines perfectly adequate for our congested roads should be rewarded. Large CC engines penalised.
- Not to license vehicles that have poor emissions
- Lower fees for licensing
- Why should there be any incentives
- Make them more cheaper
- Would help the area
- A hefty grant from the council.
- No vehicle with emissions over 140 to be licensed at all. Reduction fees for my ones
- Free licence
- If they pay less tax
- Cheaper licence fees for greener vehicles
- Matching Parish Council
- A reduction in the licensing fees for such vehicles
- Financial incentives.
- Higher tariff on meter for wheelchair vehicles to reflect extra time taken to load / offload wheelchair
- Discounts on plating large groups of 'green' vehicles