

Appendix A

ID	Start time	Completion time	Email	Do you support an increase in automatic DVLA licence checks carried out by the Council from annually to six-monthly?	Please provide any feedback to your response
1	8/15/25 8:54:42	8/15/25 8:54:50	anonymous	Yes	
2	8/15/25 8:50:05	8/15/25 9:05:16	anonymous	No	I think if council make it compulsory for all drivers to share DVLA check code every 6 months (this way you will be able to see if there is any issue) which can be done by the individual online free. If a driver do not provide the information then Council can Suspend the driver
3	8/15/25 9:06:59	8/15/25 9:09:21	anonymous	No	This has been in place for a long time and has been working successfully, I believe that the cost is too much.
4	8/15/25 9:10:39	8/15/25 9:11:30	anonymous	No	This is unacceptable changes in price.
5	8/15/25 9:13:26	8/15/25 9:22:03	anonymous	Yes	If made public knowledge it would give passengers peace of mind knowing there driver is regulary checked.They will also know the company they use is up to licensing standards.
6	8/15/25 10:11:41	8/15/25 10:19:11	anonymous	No	Previously, the council's own employees did these checks on our driving licence and DBS checks whenever they wanted and that is perfectly fine and acceptable to protect the public and service users. Whilst I FULLY SUPPORT the need for more checks I do not think we should be the ones to have to pay for the councils decision to outsource to another company... Check on me as much as you please.. I have nothing to hide but do not expect me to pay for it financially. It is hard enough to earn a living wage as I am only school run driver I cannot afford to keep paying more and more to even be able to go to work.
7	8/15/25 10:02:51	8/15/25 10:19:24	anonymous	No	The constant increased fees by Uttlesford in relation to Taxi Licensing are already unaffordable and unnecessary (I recently had to take the Green Penny refresher course which was a complete waste of money and time, when I fed this back into the licensing team I was advised they didn't know what was on the course), I understand the need to protect the general public, but why should the cost be directed back to the driver? If you can't trust a driver to inform you of a change to their license I would question the number and quality of drivers that are being allowed to operate.Also as Uttlesford drivers are having their income decimated (my personal earnings are down by over 40% year on year) by the influx of Uber and other app drivers who are not held to the same standards why should we have to increase our checks? Also it is obvious that the people in Essex are happy to risk their safety to save a few pounds then why should I have to pay more. The writing is on the wall for private taxi companies as we can not compete, I know a good deal of good drivers who are not renewing the licences now as the industry is on its knees - maybe you could direct a consultation into how the industry can be saved
8	8/15/25 10:17:39	8/15/25 10:19:57	anonymous	No	Totally unnecessary. Increasing the checks is both a wasted resourcing effort and applying pressure on licensed drivers who follow the rules and regulations anyway. More effort should be paid on the unlicensed drivers who illegally work in the district as well as the Uber problem we have at Stansted Airport.
9	8/15/25 10:18:37	8/15/25 10:20:38	anonymous	No	I do agree that checks should be made more frequently but not at a charge to the drivers. Its costs us more than enough to go to work, to the point where we dont even make minimum wage. The costs are ruining the industry as people just can not afford to go to work so adding another cost per year seems unfair.
10	8/15/25 10:21:41	8/15/25 10:22:09	anonymous	No	
11	8/15/25 10:24:07	8/15/25 10:25:54	anonymous	No	It is hard enough to make money from working as a Private Hire Taxi driver as it is! How much more money are we expected to pay out!!!

12	8/15/25 10:27:53	8/15/25 10:28:24	anonymous	No	<p>I understand the Council’s concern about ensuring driver suitability and public safety, and agree that endorsements should be identified promptly.</p> <p>However, I believe the proposed move from annual to six-monthly DVLA licence checks — effectively doubling the cost to drivers — is not proportionate given that it is already a licence condition to report any endorsements within 7 days. This condition, if enforced, should address the Committee’s concern without imposing additional financial burdens.</p> <p>Many drivers are already facing significant cost pressures (fuel, insurance, vehicle maintenance, compliance fees). An extra £14.40 per year, though seemingly modest, adds to these cumulative costs, and the benefit may not be proportionate if drivers are already required to self-report promptly.</p> <p>If the Committee feels that earlier detection is essential, I would suggest considering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☒ targeted six-month check only for drivers with prior endorsements, complaints, or concerns, rather than applying it universally; or ☒ less costly in-house or alternative provider arrangement. <p>This would balance public safety with fairness to drivers, ensuring resources are directed where risk is highest without penalising the majority of compliant licence holders.</p>
13	8/15/25 10:27:47	8/15/25 10:29:57	anonymous	No	The current timeframe is sufficient and drivers should be responsible for informing the authority of any driving offences immediately
14	8/15/25 10:29:30	8/15/25 10:30:03	anonymous	Yes	
15	8/15/25 10:13:44	8/15/25 10:31:16	anonymous	No	<p>I personally see this as a money making exercise we as taxi drivers have to go through all sorts sorts of checks to be able to drive a taxi to take special needs children and adults to and from either school or daycare centres but councils don't do regular checks on PA's and this is something that I feel very strongly about.</p> <p>Drivers have to go and do the green penny course and PA's don't we as drivers are expected to train up and educate the PA's and this is on top of all the other training that we have to undertake to actually get our taxi driver's license and now the council wants to do 6 monthly DVLA checks and make us taxi driver's foot the BILL this is totally unacceptable and in my honesty opinion should not have even been considered we have to notify the council about any changes to our personal drivers licence and in my honest opinion if a taxi driver is found in breach of the councils taxi drivers licence rules at the 12 monthly checks then they should have their licence REVOKED immediately.</p> <p>Why should the majority be penalised for what the minority are not actually reporting to the council straight away.</p> <p>Many thanks Paul Beckwith</p> <p>P.S Thankyou for taking the time to read my response</p>
16	8/15/25 10:28:17	8/15/25 10:31:35	anonymous	No	<p>Clamp down on the uber drivers operating in areas where they have no operator’s license ie Chelmsford is full of illegal uber drivers everyday more and more running of Cambridge licences or Colchester there not just dropping off there going to Chelmsford to work which is really unfair as we earn less you want to charge us more how about enforcing illegal uber drivers they even have uber stickers so not like there hiding</p>
17	8/15/25 10:31:49	8/15/25 10:36:20	anonymous	No	<p>As a Private hire driver, I have not been making enough money as things are and any increase in expenses is not welcome.</p> <p>I have driving in Braintree and money is not enough. I have been offered some help by being on a retainer that will give me £700 a week (before tax) but I will have to do 6 shifts of 12 hours to qualify. So no, license checks are great but if no extra costs.</p>
18	8/15/25 10:36:06	8/15/25 10:38:59	anonymous	No	A 100% increase in cost seems to be excessive, even in todays current economy.
19	8/15/25 10:38:24	8/15/25 10:40:35	anonymous	Yes	I support the increased frequency, but would propose the fee is reduced by 50% to ensure this is not seen as a revenue grab opportunity by some

20	8/15/25 10:37:54	8/15/25 10:42:26	anonymous	No	This is 100% increase and is unfair considering most of the other essential I have to pay have gone up by between 10 and 20 % . Just another means of rasing money
21	8/15/25 10:28:40	8/15/25 10:44:42	anonymous	No	This is absolutely unnecessary , ones in a year is more from enough ! The only difference will be that you will collect more money from us, and in some cases you will even waste our time. Who suggested this !!! Regards !
22	8/15/25 10:52:01	8/15/25 10:57:04	anonymous	No	I would be in support of any amount of random checks by the council as in theory it should further safeguard the public. I do not however support these checks impacting on the driver's financial situation, especially as we already struggle some months to make money. We also already pay a premium several times throughout the licensing process. If the council want to increase checks, it should be done at their expense not the driver.
23	8/15/25 10:45:51	8/15/25 11:00:26	anonymous	No	By all means carryout additional checks as required but at no additional cost to the licensee. Surely the cost can be absorbed by "TaxiPlus" if not maybe an alternative provider could be sourced at a competitive rate. Failing this may be it could be brought in house and UDC could carryout the checks at a competitive rate. Thanks
24	8/15/25 10:58:08	8/15/25 11:02:10	anonymous	No	I think this is more a money making exercise, number of drivers that will actually be picked up with endorsements will be low v number with none undeclared. .It is a condition of your licence to declare any endorsements . The annual checks are sufficient
25	8/15/25 11:07:48	8/15/25 11:07:59	anonymous	No	
26	8/15/25 11:13:44	8/15/25 11:17:37	anonymous	No	In council lic terms & conditions to a drivers it has mention if any endorsement is given to him & report back within 7days so I think so it not worthy to increase any amount.
27	8/15/25 11:09:26	8/15/25 11:18:27	anonymous	No	Because the requirement is to report any endorsements within 7 days to the council. So six months does not help the 7 day requirement from the current 12 months. If this is accepted as a solution, the next step will be to run checks monthly, then to run checks to weekly, and then if it gets out of total control it will be hourly checks? This is only being looked at as a money making excersice. This is totally unnecessary as the current requirement is sufficient.
28	8/15/25 11:16:02	8/15/25 11:20:06	anonymous	No	Enforcement of the illegal drivers would be more appropriate - drivers doing transfers from the illegal car parking sites to and from the airport that have no licensing plates or licensed drivers!
29	8/15/25 11:20:09	8/15/25 11:20:25	anonymous	Yes	
30	8/15/25 11:22:06	8/15/25 11:22:37	anonymous	Yes	Checks I agree with but maybe at a reduced cost not double
31	8/15/25 11:21:14	8/15/25 11:23:24	anonymous	No	We don't earn enough that's a joken
32	8/15/25 11:21:24	8/15/25 11:27:13	anonymous	No	
33	8/15/25 11:23:06	8/15/25 11:29:34	anonymous	Yes	I say yes so long as this includes Uber drivers and I would have said that even before starting my job as a PCO driver. They are an utter menace on the roads, especially in London. They're on their phones half the time, driving in the middle lane of motorways for no reason and quite frankly, are generally rude individuals. In regards the actual fee, I'm sure most people will moan and whilst I also do not wish to pay more for what is basically an admin fee... I agree that professional drivers should be held to a higher standard and therefore the licensing authorities should know about endorsements sooner.
34	8/15/25 11:27:21	8/15/25 11:31:00	anonymous	No	Our costs are already too high. The fact it is a condition of drivers to report any endorsements within 7 days is a rule should suffice where the minority may not comply. The vast majority of drivers I believe will be operating honestly so shouldnt be penalised for the few that dont declare there endorsements.
35	8/15/25 11:24:31	8/15/25 11:34:32	anonymous	No	As licensed driver are aware of there responsibility to report of any driving endorsements within sevens days this additional cost would be unreasonable.
36	8/15/25 11:34:52	8/15/25 11:40:28	anonymous	Yes	This not only helps to protect the safety of the travelling public but gives them confidence that the taxi and private hire trade are providing a professional service. With the ongoing bad press and misinformation from some nationally who clearly don't understand licensing requirements, this move can only be a good thing for Uttlesford licenced drivers.

37	8/15/25 11:36:09	8/15/25 11:40:45	anonymous	No	<p>and effective when combined with the existing legal obligation for drivers to report endorsements within 7 days. Doubling the frequency doubles the cost to drivers without clear evidence that public safety would be significantly improved.</p> <p>The Council already holds a safeguard in place through the mandatory self-reporting condition, and failure to comply can be enforced with existing disciplinary measures. Increasing the cost during a time of rising living expenses places an unnecessary financial burden on drivers, many of whom are already operating on tight margins.</p> <p>Alternative approaches to manage licence points without charging drivers extra:</p> <p>1) Use DVLA “Licence Check Service” via e-consent – The DVLA offers free or low-cost access to driver records with the driver’s permission. This could allow the Council to perform checks as needed without relying solely on a paid third-party provider.</p> <p>2) Random spot checks – Continue with three scheduled checks per licence term, but add occasional random checks (at no cost to the driver) targeting higher-risk cases or where there are concerns.</p> <p>3) Driver-triggered checks – Maintain the current process but supplement it with immediate checks if a driver reports (or is suspected of having) new endorsements.</p> <p>4) Shared cost through the licensing budget – If the Council believes six-month checks are essential, the extra cost could be absorbed within existing licensing fees rather than as a separate additional payment per check.</p> <p>5) Data-sharing agreements – Establish direct agreements with DVLA for real-time notifications of new endorsements, removing the need for repeated blanket checks.</p> <p>The current system, combined with enforcement of the self-reporting requirement, already offers a proportionate balance between public safety and fairness to drivers. Rather than automatically doubling the cost, the Council should consider smarter, targeted approaches that keep the process fair, efficient, and affordable</p>
38	8/15/25 11:40:20	8/15/25 11:43:21	anonymous	No	As its my duty to report any endorsements on my licence I believe it to be unnecessary and failure to do so should result in the taxi licence being revoked
39	8/15/25 11:43:18	8/15/25 11:43:36	anonymous	No	
40	8/15/25 11:42:10	8/15/25 11:48:33	anonymous	No	The price is a 100% increase this is a recommendation from the Council/Goverment, I don’t have an issue with the 6 months check but if you need to increase due to extra admin/Staff then only increase it to £33.3%, we are paying enough over the top bills without the council adding to it, this is typical of a scheme being thought of but the licence holder has to front up the the whole fee and slight inconvenience to pay for this.
41	8/15/25 11:50:51	8/15/25 11:55:48	anonymous	No	This is extremely unfair to add extra charges on top of all expenses private hire drivers pay, so why not fine those who’s not following regulations!
42	8/15/25 12:02:24	8/15/25 12:04:28	anonymous	No	We are part time workers and every penny counts we don’t have extra money for that Highly not support
43	8/15/25 12:04:26	8/15/25 12:04:46	anonymous	No	
44	8/15/25 12:06:42	8/15/25 12:07:37	anonymous	No	Checks could be made every 6 months by remain at the annual payment cost.. do not raise
45	8/15/25 12:17:36	8/15/25 12:18:13	anonymous	No	Extra cost to the cost of living and high cost of running a taxi
46	8/15/25 12:17:38	8/15/25 12:19:53	anonymous	No	By all means carry out the additional checks and if discrepancies are found the charge or fine the driver for not following the rules they signed up for
47	8/15/25 12:19:39	8/15/25 12:19:55	anonymous	Yes	
48	8/15/25 12:17:26	8/15/25 12:20:58	anonymous	No	I do not support the increase in payment as we have to pay it ourselves just to stay employed as part time drivers some of which are trying to survive on state pensions as it is
49	8/15/25 12:22:23	8/15/25 12:22:58	anonymous	No	Is up to the driver to report any changes the individual should be financially punished not every driver
50	8/15/25 12:22:40	8/15/25 12:23:36	anonymous	Yes	

51	8/15/25 12:19:25	8/15/25 12:27:11	anonymous	No	<p>It is set out in the terms and conditions that we have to inform you immediately of any changes to our dvla licence.</p> <p>If you wish to increase the period of checks then it should be done at your expense not mine.</p> <p>I always have and always will comply with the terms and conditions of my licence, so I do not support the additional charge that you want to charge for something that I have to do anyway.</p> <p>Maybe a suggestion to this, if you find someone that has not complied with the terms and conditions, then increase their checks with them paying the additional fees.</p> <p>Those that do comply, like myself, then it is totally unfair to expect them to pay.</p>
52	8/15/25 12:26:54	8/15/25 12:27:12	anonymous	No	
53	8/15/25 12:27:22	8/15/25 12:30:19	anonymous	No	<p>With the cost of living going up and all bills going up.How are people suppose to afford increases i have a family of 5.I wouldnt be able to afford increase alongside other bills have risen 🙄🙄</p>
54	8/15/25 12:29:19	8/15/25 12:32:27	anonymous	No	<p>I do not support the proposed increase from £14.40 to £28.80 for DVLA licence checks.</p> <p>Drivers are already facing significant financial pressures from rising fuel, insurance, maintenance, and licensing costs. Doubling this fee would further reduce already tight incomes, particularly for part-time drivers. Public safety is already protected by the existing licence condition requiring drivers to report any endorsements within 7 days, meaning the additional checks would duplicate safeguards already in place.</p> <p>The proposal does not present evidence that the current annual system has led to serious incidents due to delayed awareness of endorsements. Without clear evidence of risk, imposing higher costs on all drivers is disproportionate. If the Committee believes more frequent monitoring is necessary, there are alternatives that avoid extra costs to drivers:</p> <p>1-Fund the additional checks from existing licensing income.</p> <p>2-Use continuous DVLA licence monitoring to receive real-time updates.</p> <p>3-Implement random spot checks between annual checks to deter non-reporting.</p> <p>Public safety must be balanced against fairness and affordability. These alternatives would improve oversight without creating extra financial burdens for licence holders. Thank you.</p>
55	8/15/25 12:36:53	8/15/25 12:37:07	anonymous	No	
56	8/15/25 12:36:18	8/15/25 12:39:27	anonymous	No	<p>Apart from the cost being higher: I believe it will affect the transport operations.</p>
57	8/15/25 12:41:28	8/15/25 12:41:51	anonymous	No	<p>I dont like to see these increases always coming up on a regular basis. As it is we spend a lot of money to get our driver licences and vehicle licences . Many councils across the country cover the additional costs which sometimes come up but it seems UDC licensing pass on all increases to us .</p> <p>With regard to the additional check being proposed , 2nd check not really needed. You've got to rely on drivers to 'come clean' about reporting endorsements etc in the timeframe permitted.</p> <p>If they haven't done that when an annual check is done they get a minimum 30 day suspension or longer if deemed appropriate.</p> <p>Regards Robert Rodriguez Abel Private Hire Show quoted text</p>
58	8/15/25 12:45:25	8/15/25 12:45:38	anonymous	No	
59	8/15/25 12:25:37	8/15/25 12:48:23	anonymous	Yes	<p>Always happy for checks but not at the expense of the drivers as it's only the minority that break the rules</p>
60	8/15/25 12:47:20	8/15/25 12:49:16	anonymous	No	<p>It should be the responsibility of the driver who committed the offence to be accountable for thier action solely. Financially this is another burden when you work part time hrs imo .</p>
61	8/15/25 12:44:51	8/15/25 12:49:26	anonymous	No	<p>I understand your point of 6 monthly checks, but not at my expense.</p>
62	8/15/25 12:58:01	8/15/25 13:00:31	anonymous	Yes	<p>Good idea.</p>
63	8/15/25 13:00:14	8/15/25 13:02:21	anonymous	No	<p>Cost should be paid by the company.</p>
64	8/15/25 13:03:21	8/15/25 13:04:52	anonymous	No	<p>This would mean it would be £50 per year everything is increasing so this would be a extra cost yet again</p>
65	8/15/25 13:03:11	8/15/25 13:10:17	anonymous	No	<p>The emphasis upon the taxi driver to inform the council of a driving conviction, alongside the driver knowing that the annual check, will highlight any conviction, by the council should suffice. If the taxi driver has not informed the council then that is evidence on the driver's behaviour going forward that council should take into account when considering the drivers license renewal.</p>

66	8/15/25 13:10:21	8/15/25 13:11:52	anonymous	Yes	I agree with the checks but disagree with the charges
67	8/15/25 13:13:37	8/15/25 13:13:42	anonymous	No	
68	8/15/25 13:15:27	8/15/25 13:18:35	anonymous	No	Cannot think of a good reason to why these changes are being made (unless its just money)
69	8/15/25 13:14:37	8/15/25 13:18:47	anonymous	No	It's already a requirement of drivers to report any motor offence/ban to UDC. The checks happen every 12 months. Increasing these to every 6 months seems like an overreaction, which will cost more for the drivers. As it is, all the drivers I know working for 24x7 are paid minimum wage. This additional charge, should be met by the employer and not simply deducted from drivers salary, as I suspect will happen if this new charge is levied.
70	8/15/25 13:21:46	8/15/25 13:22:30	anonymous	No	I don't feel this is necessary due to a cost increase
71	8/15/25 13:21:11	8/15/25 13:23:01	anonymous	Yes	Absolutely, passenger safety is the utmost priority.
72	8/15/25 13:23:59	8/15/25 13:25:45	anonymous	No	Taxi + have already increased fees. It's difficult enough to find good drivers and run a local taxi company at a profit. The dvla has an ongoing check in place in any case. The increase is simply profiteering.
73	8/15/25 13:24:33	8/15/25 13:26:10	anonymous	No	Not necessary, money making scheme to increase cost on the driver. Leave it at 12 months.
74	8/15/25 13:25:58	8/15/25 13:28:42	anonymous	Yes	
75	8/15/25 13:32:16	8/15/25 13:32:47	anonymous	Yes	We should not have to pay double.
76	8/15/25 13:27:28	8/15/25 13:34:01	anonymous	No	6 months / 12 months not much difference. If you wanted to be really safe you could check every week. Need to draw the line somewhere and annual checks are probably in line with other similar checks done for public safety. What statistics are available to demonstrate that 12 months is too long, or that a 6 month check would have prevented an incident/accident?
77	8/15/25 13:33:55	8/15/25 13:34:20	anonymous	No	
78	8/15/25 13:34:01	8/15/25 13:36:37	anonymous	No	Is there really a need when it is probably only a very small minority cause a problem?
79	8/15/25 13:33:48	8/15/25 13:37:21	anonymous	Yes	If the increase in checks highlight and discrepancy or fraud, this can only benefit the honesty and integrity of other drivers
80	8/15/25 13:36:10	8/15/25 13:40:12	anonymous	No	With the cost of living crisis, drivers are already struggling financially as many like myself did not receive a payrise due to companies forced to increase NI contributions, therefore unable to offer a pay rise. As a driver I now earn just 4p more than a PA, which without the driver a PA cannot do their job. I do not think it is fair for struggling drivers to be hit with this increase.
81	8/15/25 13:40:28	8/15/25 13:43:09	anonymous	No	Due to current inflation and most drivers only being on 12.5 hours a week then I find the doubling of the fee to be absolutely scandalous
82	8/15/25 13:43:17	8/15/25 13:44:10	anonymous	Yes	
83	8/15/25 13:34:08	8/15/25 13:44:30	anonymous	Yes	
84	8/15/25 13:44:59	8/15/25 13:45:20	anonymous	Yes	
85	8/15/25 13:42:14	8/15/25 13:45:32	anonymous	No	I have no issue with providing the information, provided the cost is covered by the employer /local authority, not by part time workers on minimum wage
86	8/15/25 13:42:09	8/15/25 13:47:31	anonymous	No	The system as it is work fine and increasing to 6 months would obviously create delays and effect ability for drivers to work as I have experienced significant delays before. Additionally the additional cost is unreasonable and would affect public service
87	8/15/25 13:46:48	8/15/25 13:47:42	anonymous	Yes	
88	8/15/25 13:46:22	8/15/25 13:47:58	anonymous	Yes	I have no objection.
89	8/15/25 13:55:12	8/15/25 13:55:33	anonymous	No	
90	8/15/25 14:02:10	8/15/25 14:04:19	anonymous	No	The cost alone is the issue as we are part time drivers and do not earn a great deal, for the cost to land on the driver seems very unfair. Surely the cost of this should be the hiring companies responsibility?
91	8/15/25 14:04:45	8/15/25 14:06:08	anonymous	No	Purely on cost to driver , don't have issue with 6 months checks
92	8/15/25 10:57:14	8/15/25 14:12:08	anonymous	No	Proposed increase in the cost to drivers is not reasonable nor fair. My query is what percentage of drivers do not report driving endorsements within 7 days of received. If this is high, then I can understand. I feel that you should target the drivers who do not abide by the rules rather than penalising the rest of the law abiding drivers. Public safety risks shouldn't always have to be involved clawing back money from the people just like it has the last few years.
93	8/15/25 14:24:53	8/15/25 14:26:30	anonymous	Yes	I believe that checks are carried out to make the level of compliance high and don't have a problem with this increase Ian Hayward PHD1146
94	8/15/25 14:26:25	8/15/25 14:26:50	anonymous	Yes	
95	8/15/25 14:28:26	8/15/25 14:28:40	anonymous	No	

96	8/15/25 14:25:28	8/15/25 14:28:59	anonymous	No	
97	8/15/25 14:25:03	8/15/25 14:29:48	anonymous	No	I do not agree with it simply because of the cost, I don't have a problem with more frequent checks but I don't want to pay double the price for it.
98	8/15/25 14:30:58	8/15/25 14:33:05	anonymous	Yes	A lot can happen in a year. Same as an MOT on a car is yearly, it still doesn't say the car is safe 6 months down the line.
99	8/15/25 14:32:38	8/15/25 14:34:24	anonymous	No	I Do not understand why this additional check would be necessary
100	8/15/25 14:36:26	8/15/25 14:36:47	anonymous	Yes	
101	8/15/25 14:35:54	8/15/25 14:37:44	anonymous	Yes	Anything that ensures the safety of people in our care is paramount.
102	8/15/25 14:37:23	8/15/25 14:38:46	anonymous	Yes	Cost should be added to cost of obtaining or renewal of licence,
103	8/15/25 14:37:24	8/15/25 14:44:13	anonymous	No	As it is the responsibility of the driver to inform the relevant council of any endorsements to their licence, and they are aware of this; I consider a DVLA licence check every 6 months to be an unnecessary additional cost, and bureaucratic overkill.
104	8/15/25 14:38:34	8/15/25 14:47:17	anonymous	Yes	It will the Council to keep a tighter hold on frequent offenders
105	8/15/25 14:47:53	8/15/25 14:50:18	anonymous	Yes	
106	8/15/25 14:49:10	8/15/25 14:59:41	anonymous	Yes	Axiomatic that doubling checks will cost more money. However, it does not follow that it will cost twice as much. Perhaps staff time will increase, but many of the associated overheads probably won't. Perhaps intelligent integration of AI and IT will also facilitate economies. If you're going to argue for doubling the cost, then it's only fair to itemise and justify how you come across the revised fee.
107	8/15/25 15:11:18	8/15/25 15:11:30	anonymous	Yes	
108	8/15/25 15:08:09	8/15/25 15:14:00	anonymous	No	Each driver is responsible for reporting offences...if it found they have not then implement a draconian fine. If an offence is committed in month 7 and not reported it still 5 months before it is found out...so twice yearly checks will only catch endorsements incurred months 1-6.
109	8/15/25 15:12:17	8/15/25 15:17:01	anonymous	Yes	No objections at all, will help and ensure all dubious drivers are removed from the road. There is quite a few who flout the rules of being a capable driver.
110	8/15/25 15:15:43	8/15/25 15:17:07	anonymous	Yes	I do support more frequent checks, however, feel it unfair to constantly ask for more fees, this should be standard.
111	8/15/25 15:16:59	8/15/25 15:17:43	anonymous	Yes	Think it's fair to keep track of drivers regularly
112	8/15/25 15:18:33	8/15/25 15:20:42	anonymous	No	I would agree if I had a regular work forecast... not having regular work £28 is a chunk from only receiving £10 for every availability shift
113	8/15/25 15:26:28	8/15/25 15:27:29	anonymous	No	Looks like just an excuse for additional charge !!
114	8/15/25 15:18:10	8/15/25 15:29:06	anonymous	Yes	Existing licences should be allowed run their course and the new system to apply to new applications.
115	8/15/25 15:22:22	8/15/25 15:29:31	anonymous	No	The idea itself is good, as a business we actually complete a check every three months, monthly for those with 6 points on the licence. These are at a cheaper rate than what is proposed with Taxiplus.
116	8/15/25 15:29:46	8/15/25 15:29:49	anonymous	No	
117	8/15/25 15:28:00	8/15/25 15:30:25	anonymous	No	Just a way for the council to make more money out of us
118	8/15/25 15:29:50	8/15/25 15:34:16	anonymous	No	It's just an excuse to "tax" drivers of more money. The council will literally double its revenue under the guise of legality and safety. Why the sudden change? Where's the statistical evidence supporting a need to change the current frequency of checks? I see it as a cash grab by a council struggling with funding. My opinion.
119	8/15/25 15:35:40	8/15/25 15:37:42	anonymous	No	We all work for basic rate pay.The proposed increase is not affordable.
120	8/15/25 15:37:42	8/15/25 15:41:27	anonymous	No	I think it should be the responsibility of the driver to notify if they receive any motoring convictions. By doubling the frequency of testing, and charging accordingly, is just another charge to a driver who's only on minimum wage as it is.
121	8/15/25 15:56:38	8/15/25 15:57:07	anonymous	No	
122	8/15/25 15:50:02	8/15/25 15:58:14	anonymous	No	just stealth tax, another way to take money from hard working drivers, what's the point of this form when you are going to do it anyway, deflated,
123	8/15/25 16:01:25	8/15/25 16:03:18	anonymous	Yes	Is it not possible to have a time graduated check depending on the number of points on a licence such as 0 points, every year. 1-6 points every 6 months, 7+ points every 3 months?
124	8/15/25 16:21:03	8/15/25 16:21:50	anonymous	No	Because it should be free if the DVLA that that interested checking for endorsement
125	8/15/25 16:22:56	8/15/25 16:24:18	anonymous	No	I don't this this is reasonable or fair

126	8/15/25 16:36:44	8/15/25 16:39:39	anonymous	No	
127	8/15/25 16:44:28	8/15/25 16:44:48	anonymous	No	
128	8/15/25 16:43:59	8/15/25 16:45:26	anonymous	No	Should a driver not declare any endorsements then possibly a suspension is more appropriate.
129	8/15/25 16:38:47	8/15/25 16:46:50	anonymous	No	Already too much bureaucracy, time and cost. Please leave as is.
130	8/15/25 17:09:02	8/15/25 17:09:43	anonymous	No	N/a
131	8/15/25 17:03:57	8/15/25 17:13:12	anonymous	No	This would still mean that any dishonest driver would still evade detection for up to 6 months, so the change accomplishes little. Surely, drivers should be reminded of their obligations and the fact that the council will take a harsh course of action with those who breach their conditions. If this cost were agreed, I would argue that the cost for increased checks for drivers in an existing period of licence be covered by the licensing authority. The increased cost should be borne by drivers only at renewal or at the point of application. You should perhaps be more concerned that non-conviction information records are updated on the DBS Update Service only every 9 months, which arguably presents a significantly greater risk to public safety.
132	8/15/25 17:11:43	8/15/25 17:13:52	anonymous	No	I agree with the reasoning, just not with the extra fee for us drivers who aren't abusing the system. maybe a spot check or random one off license checks too keep everyone honest would be better
133	8/15/25 17:13:40	8/15/25 17:14:37	anonymous	No	I think it is unreasonable to negatively impact the majority financially because of a few poor drivers
134	8/15/25 17:09:31	8/15/25 17:15:40	anonymous	No	As a term time driver only I find it a bit unfair that I would have to pay an extra cost so that the council can down on the amount of checks that may be needed. Or will this charge fall on the company supplier who will pass it on regardless.??
135	8/15/25 17:34:33	8/15/25 17:35:09	anonymous	Yes	
136	8/15/25 17:47:09	8/15/25 17:48:02	anonymous	Yes	
137	8/15/25 17:47:08	8/15/25 17:49:15	anonymous	No	I only do home to school contracts where I only work 20 hours a week and the school year is 9 months , so I feel that it is unfair that I would have to pay the increase for this hours and on a low income
138	8/15/25 17:51:12	8/15/25 17:52:06	anonymous	No	Totally object.
139	8/15/25 17:54:37	8/15/25 17:56:50	anonymous	Yes	No taxi driver should mind how many their licence is checked if they have done nothing wrong
140	8/15/25 17:56:34	8/15/25 17:57:09	anonymous	No	I work 10 hours a week. Can't afford it
141	8/15/25 18:26:24	8/15/25 18:26:59	anonymous	No	
142	8/15/25 18:46:49	8/15/25 18:51:40	anonymous	Yes	
143	8/15/25 18:45:41	8/15/25 18:51:56	anonymous	No	6 monthly is a bit overkill
144	8/15/25 19:19:09	8/15/25 19:20:05	anonymous	No	£14.40 should be sufficient
145	8/15/25 19:53:03	8/15/25 19:54:10	anonymous	No	I believe that is an unreasonable cost.
146	8/15/25 19:53:29	8/15/25 19:55:15	anonymous	Yes	Everything goes up never comes down
147	8/15/25 20:20:32	8/15/25 20:21:05	anonymous	No	
148	8/15/25 20:21:28	8/15/25 20:21:35	anonymous	Yes	
149	8/15/25 20:25:31	8/15/25 20:28:35	anonymous	Yes	It makes perfect sense in order to keep people safe
150	8/15/25 20:41:58	8/15/25 20:43:07	anonymous	Yes	
151	8/15/25 20:50:55	8/15/25 20:51:50	anonymous	No	
152	8/15/25 20:55:59	8/15/25 20:58:23	anonymous	No	I dont agree with incurring a cost which tje business will reimburse.If the powers to be wish to ascertain the info then they should incur the cost
153	8/15/25 21:07:59	8/15/25 21:08:37	anonymous	Yes	
154	8/15/25 22:19:39	8/15/25 22:38:53	anonymous	Yes	It is a good idea , but it's a shame people don't update if things happen
155	8/16/25 0:00:31	8/16/25 0:09:01	anonymous	No	Why not implement a fixed fine for not revealing an endorsement instead of making this an excuse for a money grab from those that abide by the rules.
156	8/16/25 1:12:33	8/16/25 1:13:26	anonymous	No	I thought once u had ur license that lasted until u badge run out
157	8/16/25 4:55:25	8/16/25 4:56:39	anonymous	Yes	To check drivers are legal to hold licences
158	8/16/25 6:50:18	8/16/25 6:52:21	anonymous	Yes	I think 6 Monthly checks are reasonable as in our Business Safety must come first.
159	8/16/25 7:35:16	8/16/25 7:37:36	anonymous	No	We pay out for medical, dbs service,licensing already I for one cannot afford increases
160	8/16/25 8:16:29	8/16/25 8:17:52	anonymous	Yes	In the interest of public safety this makes sense

161	8/16/25 8:54:53	8/16/25 9:00:10	anonymous	No	I believe that since being a private hire driver, the timings are adequate of once a year as we have it. I feel that as long as a compliance check is also carried out yearly then this is sufficient. In terms of drivers letting the council know of any endorsements within 7 x days, could you not increase costs for those for not sending this in. What i am struggling to get my head around is is this just another cost exercise as our cars are always looked after, serviced etc. So I do not agree that we should have more checks done.
162	8/16/25 8:59:17	8/16/25 9:03:26	anonymous	No	You are supposed to inform the council of any endorsements within 7 days so what is the point in an additional check being added. It adds cost and admin.....for very little benefit in my opinion
163	8/16/25 8:59:34	8/16/25 9:06:07	anonymous	No	Drivers needs to report any endorsements to the council within 7 days of receiving them anyway.
164	8/16/25 9:15:13	8/16/25 9:15:59	anonymous	Yes	
165	8/16/25 9:28:33	8/16/25 9:35:14	anonymous	Yes	i support the increase in checks but i do not support the new price being passed onto drivers, this should be taken on by the company to pay for the increases. I understand some drivers don't inform the authorities/company and yet we all are being punished not fair and unacceptable this is why i don't support the the increase
166	8/16/25 10:04:35	8/16/25 10:14:53	anonymous	Yes	I am not in full agreement with the proposed increase in fee but will accept whatever is finally agreed.
167	8/16/25 11:17:46	8/16/25 11:19:24	anonymous	Yes	Appears to be good business moving forward
168	8/16/25 13:19:04	8/16/25 13:31:01	anonymous	Yes	If you have nothing to hide then no problem but i do object to double the fee from 14-40 to 28-80
169	8/16/25 13:43:30	8/16/25 13:44:10	anonymous	No	
170	8/16/25 13:49:01	8/16/25 13:50:41	anonymous	No	Cannot sustain an increase in fees as I earn so little in the first place.
171	8/16/25 13:44:07	8/16/25 13:53:34	anonymous	No	It seems an unnecessary extra cost, with no obvious benefit to the driver.
172	8/16/25 13:57:21	8/16/25 13:59:24	anonymous	No	I prefer the annually checks than the six months.
173	8/16/25 14:20:19	8/16/25 14:20:34	anonymous	Yes	Nothing to add
174	8/16/25 16:06:00	8/16/25 16:07:24	anonymous	Yes	...but not at the expense to the licence holder/driver!
175	8/16/25 16:11:25	8/16/25 16:12:58	anonymous	Yes	I feel that the DVLA Checks should be carried out every 3 months.
176	8/16/25 17:02:51	8/16/25 17:05:41	anonymous	No	It seems to me that we are having to pay for more and more things and prices are always rising where will it end .
177	8/16/25 17:22:55	8/16/25 17:23:11	anonymous	Yes	
178	8/16/25 17:55:19	8/16/25 17:56:25	anonymous	No	The costs are going up as is everything else apart from our Hourly Pay!
179	8/16/25 18:05:12	8/16/25 18:05:26	anonymous	No	
180	8/16/25 20:49:30	8/16/25 20:50:57	anonymous	No	I do not agree with the price increase when our Council are letting an Uber work at Stansted Airport and we are making no money. I think that should be the first thing they should be sorting out instead of increasing the price of taxi plus
181	8/16/25 22:18:38	8/16/25 22:19:44	anonymous	No	Can't afford 6 monthly
182	8/17/25 0:22:11	8/17/25 0:25:05	anonymous	No	If the council want to increase the amount of checks they shouldn't force a higher price on the driver. Why does the driver need to pay more to satisfy a council static it's unfair.
183	8/17/25 8:45:36	8/17/25 8:46:34	anonymous	Yes	
184	8/17/25 9:44:09	8/17/25 9:44:25	anonymous	No	
185	8/17/25 10:51:04	8/17/25 10:51:26	anonymous	No	
186	8/17/25 12:25:48	8/17/25 12:30:38	anonymous	No	
187	8/17/25 15:18:33	8/17/25 15:18:59	anonymous	No	
188	8/17/25 15:34:53	8/17/25 15:35:12	anonymous	No	
189	8/17/25 16:03:54	8/17/25 16:07:00	anonymous	No	It seems unnecessarily bureaucratic. No checking system can be perfect and that includes the proposed one. Drivers not declaring an infringement within one month of it occurring should lose their licence
190	8/17/25 17:10:02	8/17/25 17:12:47	anonymous	No	I believe it has been worked good all this time, it should not be modified, it would be an additional cost and time.
191	8/17/25 17:29:54	8/17/25 17:32:13	anonymous	No	It seems unnecessarily heavy handed given the legal requirement on drivers to report endorsements anyway.
192	8/17/25 20:34:25	8/17/25 20:36:58	anonymous	Yes	The more checks the better passenger safety is paramount.
193	8/18/25 8:16:56	8/18/25 8:18:53	anonymous	No	Whilst I appreciate public safety is important, I believe this is unnecessary as if you want to be that stringent it should be carried out monthly. This is yet another cost which will discourage drivers to partake in this kind of work or for this council in my opinion.
194	8/18/25 9:02:06	8/18/25 9:03:50	anonymous	No	I think 12 months is sufficient and if there's a change to licences is should be the responsibility of the driver to update any changes.
195	8/18/25 9:33:33	8/18/25 9:37:17	anonymous	Yes	Although I support increased checks, I do not support doubling the cost to taxi plus. There must be a way for you to check without taxi drivers incurring an additional charge. As I have access to the online disclosure & barring service, could we not give you access so you can view our records & this would not incur any further charges.

196	8/18/25 9:46:12	8/18/25 9:47:49	anonymous	Yes	any increase is fair and the extra checks are a good idea this ensures the safety of our passengers
197	8/18/25 10:05:49	8/18/25 10:06:51	anonymous	No	Personally I think it is unnecessary as the current system seems to work adequately
198	8/18/25 12:33:23	8/18/25 12:34:24	anonymous	No	Just another channel to squeeze more money from poorly paid drivers
199	8/18/25 15:07:37	8/18/25 15:09:29	anonymous	No	
200	8/18/25 15:11:54	8/18/25 15:12:37	anonymous	Yes	
201	8/18/25 15:54:22	8/18/25 16:06:00	anonymous	No	I would have thought that the DBS update service would cover this sort of check. It is also the drivers responsibility to inform the licencing authority when they receive endorments, Is it right that the good drivers should be asked to pay to catch the drivers that do not take their responsibility seriously.
202	8/18/25 18:07:32	8/18/25 18:09:46	anonymous	Yes	Important to do regular checks on all drivers for the safety of clients using our services
203	8/18/25 18:36:02	8/18/25 18:36:42	anonymous	No	It's getting ridiculous now !!
204	8/18/25 19:22:29	8/18/25 19:24:27	anonymous	No	
205	8/18/25 21:23:18	8/18/25 21:23:54	anonymous	No	.
206	8/18/25 21:22:55	8/18/25 21:24:33	anonymous	No	At approximately £22 per day after tax this job is barely worth doing!
207	8/19/25 7:04:49	8/19/25 7:07:31	anonymous	No	Because we have to report any endorsements that we receive anyway so the council will be aware.
208	8/19/25 8:54:39	8/19/25 8:55:24	anonymous	No	I'm a pensioner, and do not think this increase/cost is needed.
209	8/19/25 11:00:25	8/19/25 11:02:23	anonymous	Yes	I personally believe that it is a great idea .
210	8/19/25 18:02:53	8/19/25 18:08:14	anonymous	Yes	I fully support the proposal as it will potentially increase the safety of the passengers. Thus is our highest priority.
211	8/19/25 18:22:35	8/19/25 18:38:49	anonymous	No	When I last checked with DVLA someone from Uttlesford had accessed my details on more than five occasions in January and February this year. If you are able to check on numerous occasions why am I being asked to pay for it, I get charged enough for my licence fee already with the suspect green penny courses. If you are serious about people's save keeping why are you allowing Uber free rain at Stansted Airport. You are allowing unlicensed vehicles and drivers to take advantage at the cost to us whom pay our fees to you. I and all Uttlesford licensed drivers would appreciate you using your powers to address this situation.
212	8/19/25 19:53:25	8/19/25 19:54:44	anonymous	Yes	i understand the safety aspect given that we work with children. the cost however should be modified so that the burden is shared
213	8/19/25 20:24:21	8/19/25 20:24:50	anonymous	No	
214	8/20/25 15:28:33	8/20/25 15:41:07	anonymous	No	The proposed increase in frequency of check would of course increase public safety but it would only mean that instead of driving for up to a year with a driving endorsement a driver could now only drive up to 6 months with one. Where do you draw the line for public safety, a monthly check or a weekly check to make it even safer? The type of driver who would abuse the system would probably still try to abuse the system. Could not something be put in place at a DVLA level that if a driver is listed as a private hire/taxi driver any endorsements placed on his license would automatically be communicated to the relevant licensing authority to ensure public safety? Surely in these days of invasive and all seeing technology this would be more than possible and a lot cheaper for everyone concerned to administer.
215	8/21/25 3:12:46	8/21/25 3:26:12	anonymous	No	i have no problem with the council checking DVLA licences as many times as you require, however i have an issue having to pay extra for these checks. In the current climate the rising costs in living and Uber now cutting the fares, most drivers are now seeing a down turn in their annual salary.
216	8/21/25 9:18:27	8/21/25 9:27:22	anonymous	Yes	Safety is a priority, if you have nothing to hide and stick to the rules and inform of any endorsements you will be fine.
217	8/21/25 13:19:53	8/21/25 13:53:11	anonymous	No	As a driver on minimum wage I am sensitive to any deductions from my earnings. I appreciate the need to fix the issue however I do not see that doubling the fees I pay fixes the most important issue:- Ensure drivers notify the council/employers etc. of a relevant offence etc. This will still only show when offenders are convicted. The objective would be better covered by fixing the reporting of serious offences ("Police common law duty") system and include when relevant "less serious offences" at various trigger points. The increase solution may give a false sense of security. What numbers/percentage of non-disclosures would have resulted in the suspension/removal of the "taxi" license? How many should /were caught by the "Police common law duty" and what the delay for the issue of an endorsement etc? What is the cost £ per otherwise not detected?
218	8/21/25 15:58:39	8/21/25 15:59:57	anonymous	No	With the cost of living increasing, I think that to double the cost is too much.

219	8/21/25 8:48:25	8/21/25 20:14:50	anonymous	Yes	As much as the price increase is an unwanted thing I do support heavier controls over cabs and there drivers. I see some diabolical things from day to day at work and this can be a bitter pill for myself and others who take pride in there work to swallow. So I support any measure that raises standards and pushes the industry towards being seen as a more skilled, professional trade. Kind regards Mr Gray
220	8/22/25 5:25:26	8/22/25 5:37:40	anonymous	No	As you state in your opening letter, it's the drivers responsibility to report any endorsements to their licence within 7 days to the licensing department, this is part of the rules and conditions set by the council. I don't see why drivers who follow the rules should be penalised especially at a time where there is a cost of living crisis. If a driver does not follow the rules and conditions they should be punished full stop.
221	8/22/25 12:06:40	8/22/25 12:06:56	anonymous	No	
222	8/24/25 13:23:05	8/24/25 13:32:41	anonymous	No	This is totally unfair, we are professional licensed drivers and should not be financially penalised because of a small minority who do not adhere to the rules. we already pay a subscription to the DBS which shows UDC & Taxi Plus make regular checks on me. The rule breakers should be financially penalised if they do not inform UDC or Taxi Plus of any endorsements received.
223	8/25/25 9:16:15	8/25/25 9:28:11	anonymous	Yes	Frequency check levels can be done as often as proposed therefore action could be exercised sooner should it be necessary
224	8/26/25 8:17:45	8/26/25 8:19:39	anonymous	No	This is another cost not only thrown at the driver but companies and users, with other increases which have been pushed through from current government, such as NI increases, national minimum wage increases to name a few.
225	8/26/25 15:07:40	8/26/25 15:11:37	anonymous	No	By increasing the frequency I feel this will put a financial burden upon drivers who are already on on a low salary and would prefer it to stay as it is currently
226	8/27/25 10:27:53	8/27/25 10:28:05	anonymous	Yes	
227	8/28/25 8:12:41	8/28/25 8:13:39	anonymous	Yes	Makes sense
228	8/29/25 9:12:20	8/29/25 9:20:48	anonymous	Yes	The bi-annual check is prudent and necessary but the cost appears to be excessive for effectively accessing a free HM Gov Service. Any out sourced service where a recharge at this level is the outcome should be subject to scrutiny and that scrutiny should include a simple cost/benefit analysis that should take account of quotes from alternate service providers.
229	8/30/25 8:57:17	8/30/25 8:58:58	anonymous	No	It's another increased cost on difficult times, if there is any endorsement in the 12 months the driver should report in writing or face a heavy sanction, surely that should be sufficient
230	8/31/25 16:27:18	8/31/25 16:29:48	anonymous	No	I dont think it is fair to charge more money to conduct more regular checks as I personally would inform the council in accordance with the licensing terms within the 7 days and not leave it undisclosed.
231	9/1/25 3:11:52	9/1/25 3:12:06	anonymous	No	
232	9/1/25 8:29:16	9/1/25 8:56:41	anonymous	No	Taxi/PHV drivers licenced by UDC are already under staggering financial pressures as they try to eke a living while confronted with the plague of Uber/Bolt, Wolverhampton licenced vehicles doing exactly as they please within UDC while the council sits back and does 5/8 of zero about protecting the livelihoods of those whose licence money they take. To demand even another £14.40 would be adding insult to injury. It also begs the question of how honest the council considers drivers to be in reporting licence infractions/endorsements etc. Rather insulting really. We pay a lot of money and get absolutely no support from UDC while outside drivers and operators ride roughshod over the 1976 Act and destroy the incomes of UDC drivers. Let's not also forget that the third party partner this additional money goes to, has been careless with drivers' data in the past and had the nerve to ask for it again. You trust them while not trusting drivers to report licence issues!!!!
233	9/1/25 11:44:34	9/1/25 11:48:04	anonymous	No	It's for the company to pay not us. We are on minimum wage seems another pointless or just money making again for the council. Unless I have it all wrong again.
234	9/2/25 10:58:10	9/2/25 10:58:47	anonymous	No	Much to expensive
235	9/2/25 19:40:06	9/2/25 19:44:09	anonymous	No	Checks are thorough enough already. If a driver fails to notify you then they should have their Licence revoked immediately. Finally the cost, most drivers earn the basic wage, myself included, this is just another cost that we can ill afford to bear. Please consider this review carefully.

236	9/3/25 13:32:07	9/3/25 13:32:49	anonymous	No	<p>I do not support the proposal to increase the DVLA licence check frequency from annual to six-monthly and to double the cost to drivers from £14.40 to £28.80.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial burden on drivers: Drivers are already facing rising costs (insurance, fuel, vehicle maintenance, licensing fees). Doubling this cost places an unfair financial strain, especially at a time when incomes are under pressure. Unnecessary duplication: Drivers are already legally required to notify the Council of any endorsements within 7 days. This condition of licence makes six-monthly checks unnecessary, as the Council will still be informed promptly if any endorsements occur. Disproportionate measure: The increase in frequency does not provide significant additional safety benefits compared to the existing system, since drivers must report endorsements immediately. Therefore, the proposal is not proportionate to the cost increase. Alternative solutions: Instead of doubling costs for drivers, the Council could explore other measures such as random spot checks or improved enforcement of the existing 7-day reporting rule. <p>For these reasons, I strongly object to the proposed changes and request that the current system of annual DVLA checks remains in place.</p>
237	9/4/25 9:50:40	9/4/25 9:53:38	anonymous	Yes	I support the increase to six-monthly checks as it will strengthen public safety. More frequent checks will allow the Council to identify endorsements earlier and take action if needed, ensuring only safe and responsible drivers are licensed. The additional cost is reasonable in light of the potential safety benefits to the travelling public.
238	9/4/25 12:45:53	9/4/25 12:49:52	anonymous	No	If you want to check them twice a year go ahead but don't expect me to pay you twice. I am an honest person and a safe driver. If I broke the law and received any penalty's it is my duty to inform you of this.
239	9/4/25 20:58:01	9/4/25 21:05:29	anonymous	No	I agree with increase to safety, however it is more of an outlay for drivers.
240	9/5/25 15:25:16	9/5/25 15:28:31	anonymous	No	Instead of increasing the frequency and therefore cost to drivers why can't contracts include that it's mandatory to let companies know of any new licences penalties following the current annual check date?
241	9/6/25 13:34:12	9/6/25 13:35:11	anonymous	No	Cost for a taxi to be on the road is increasing dramatically,