

Present: Councillor Pat Vaughan (*in the Chair*),
Councillor Alan Briggs, Councillor Adrianna McNulty and
Councillor David Clarkson

Apologies for Absence: Councillor Loraine Woolley

10. Confirmation of Minutes from the last meeting held on 2 September 2021

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 2 September 2021 be confirmed.

11. Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were received.

12. Exclusion of Press and Public

RESOLVED that the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following item(s) of business because it is likely that if members of the public were present there would be a disclosure to them of 'exempt information' as defined by Section 100I and Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

13. To Interview an Applicant for a re-Licence of a Private Hire Driver's Licence who has 11 Current Penalty Points - Item No 04/2021

The Licensing Officer:

- a) stated that following the Sub Committee hearing on 2 September 2021, further information was requested in relation to comments made by the applicant before the Sub Committee could determine whether the applicant was a fit a proper person to continue to hold a licence

The Sub-Committee questioned the applicant regarding further information received and received responses from the applicant.

The Decision was made as follows:

That the Licence holders Private Hire Drivers Licence be revoked due to new evidence put before the Sub-Committee.

The Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Sub-Committee thought the licence holder to be dishonest and not a fit and proper person to hold a Private Hire Driver Licence for the following reasons:

1. The licence holder seemed to change his mind when asked difficult questions or about inconsistencies with his version of events.
2. The Sub-Committee were confused as to how the guilty plea could have been entered to the court without the licence holder's knowledge.

3. The licence holder admitted to the Sub-Committee that his taxi was moving when the accident occurred but stated that he was stationary at the previous Sub-Committee and denied causing the accident. Whilst this may seem like a minor detail, the inconsistencies in the licence holder's version of events at both committees was troubling to the Sub-Committee particularly as both committees were heard within a short space of time. During the hearing the licence holder did admit causing the accident and apologised for this despite initially denying causing the accident.
4. At the previous Sub Committee, the licence holder denied that he left the car park by a route marked no exit however at this hearing he confirmed that he had done this but that he hadn't seen the no exit sign.
5. During the previous hearing the Sub-Committee expressed concern that the license holder had failed to report the incident to the licensing authority. During this hearing the licence holder stated that he had provided the Licensing Officer with some information, to which the Licensing Officer confirmed that this had not been the case.
6. At the last hearing the Sub Committee decided to allow him to keep his licence (with conditions) because they believed that he had "conducted himself correctly at the time of the accident in reporting it to his employer including providing his employer with the contact details of the two witnesses". An email from his employer now suggested that this was not the case.
7. At the last hearing the Sub Committee decided to allow him to keep his licence (with conditions) because they believed that "following the accident he had done everything correctly in relation to the accident", however, the email from his employer now contradicted this as they were now faced with contradicting statements given by the licence holder regarding how his employer was notified of the accident.
8. The sub-committee found that the licence holder was being dishonest to them as his accounts of the accident and his actions following the accident kept changing, there were discrepancies between what the licence holder was telling the committee and the oral evidence of the licensing officer and in the email from his current employer and they were struggling to establish which version of events put forward by the licence holder was the truth. The Sub-Committee found that on the balance of probabilities he was being dishonest.