



cts

TRAFFIC + TRANSPORTATION

THE DATA COLLECTION SPECIALISTS



Contents

Executive summary	vi
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Background to taxi licensing in Luton	7
3. Results from rank surveys	15
4. Public Consultation results	38
5. Stakeholder Consultation.....	42
6. Licensed Vehicle Trade Consultation	48
7. Summary and conclusions	50
8. Recommendations	58

CTS Traffic & Transportation Ltd.
Unit 14 Aqueduct Mill, Aqueduct Street, Preston, PR1 7JN
Tel: (01772) 251 400 Fax: (01772) 252 900
E-mail: enquiries@ctstraffic.co.uk Web-site: www.ctstraffic.co.uk

Data Quality Assurance:

Report by: Ian Millership

Date: 27/07/16

Checked by: Joe Maclaren

Date: 29/07/16

Executive summary

CTS Traffic and Transportation were appointed by Luton Borough Council to undertake their "Independent hackney carriage research" on 5th February 2016. This report presents the results of all investigations undertaken to provide a database of robust information on which a decision can be taken by councillors in regard to the hackney carriage vehicle limitation policy. All research was undertaken in line with the current Department for Transport Best Practice Guidance (April 2010) and taking advantage of the extensive research undertaken by the Law Commission in their recent review of licensing.

(remains to be completed)

There is no evidence that any observed unmet demand, either patent or latent, is significant at this current time. The committee can retain the current policy and limit at the present level and defend this as necessary.

1. Introduction

Luton Council is responsible for the licensing of hackney carriage and private hire vehicles operating within the council area. The licensing authority retains a limit on the number of hackney carriage vehicles it licences. This limit began before statistics were formally published in 1994 although the policy was one of managed growth from 2004 onwards, albeit with changed levels of plate issue in the more recent years (and zero since the last survey). There have been regular reviews of policy supported by surveys in 2013, 2008 and 2006.

Study timetable

Luton appointed CTS Traffic and Transportation on 5th February 2016 to undertake this survey of taxi demand in line with our quotation dated January 2016 as revised at the Inception Meeting held on 10th February 2016.

The review was carried out between February and July 2016, with pedestrian survey work undertaken in March 2016. Licensed vehicle driver opinions were gathered by a letter and questionnaire issued by the Council and returned to us by post or electronically during February and March 2016. Other key stakeholder consultation was undertaken between February and July. Rank surveys were undertaken in early March 2016 at a similar time to the previous 2013 rank surveys. A Draft Final report was submitted and this was reviewed in July 2016 to identify any factual or missing issues. The Final Report will be reported to the hackney carriage trade in January 2017 and then to committee in Spring 2017.

National background and definitions

At the present time, hackney carriage and private hire licensing is carried out under the Town Police Clauses Act 1847 (as amended by various further legislation including the Transport Act 1985, especially Section 16) in regard to hackney carriages and the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 with reference to private hire vehicles. A number of modifications have been made within more recent legislation and through case law.

The issue of limits on hackney carriage vehicle licences (and other potentially restrictive practices) were considered by the Office of Fair Trading (OfT) (and latterly the House of Commons Select Committee on Transport). The Department for Transport most recently published Best Practice Guidance in April 2010 to cover a number of more recent issues and take on board both the recommendations of the OfT and House of Commons Select Committee (HoC SC).

More recently a further HoC SC has led to the Law Commission (LC) taking on a wide-ranging review of vehicle licensing law to be completed over the next few years. The consultation document from the LC was released in mid-May 2012. The final LC recommendations published on 23rd May 2014 including 84 recommendations (specific recommendation numbers in brackets below from Report) including:

- Retaining the two-tier system (1)
- A statutory definition of pre-booking (3) and a new offence of anyone other than a locally licensed taxi driver accepting a booking 'there and then' (10)
- That the term "hackney carriage" should be replaced in legislation with the word "taxi" (4)
- New duty on taxi drivers to stop in specified circumstances if so determined by the local licensing authority (12)
- Each licensing authority under a duty to consult on the need to alter rank provision, not exceeding every three years (13)
- Introduction of national standards for taxi and private hire services (30)
- Licensing authorities retain power to set local taxi standards over and above national standards (46)
- A more flexible power to introduce and remove taxi licensing zones (57)
- Licensing authorities continue to have power to limit the number of taxi vehicles licensed in their area (58)
- Subject to a statutory public interest test with how this statutory test should be applied determined by the Secretary of State (59)
- Reviewed every three years and subject to local consultation (60)
- Mandatory disability awareness training for all drivers (62)
- An accessibility review at three year intervals (65)

Other recommendations are included of less relevance to this current report. The status of this report and draft Bill remains unclear at the time of writing this report, with no specific Government response yet provided nor any date for when this might be provided.

The Deregulation Bill originally contained three clauses impacting on taxi licensing. These cover unlicensed relatives being able to drive private hire vehicles (dropped), operators being able to transfer work across borders and length of driver and operator licences. An opportunity was also given for trade representatives to identify conditions of licence that were felt to be unduly restrictive. None of these really impact on the issue of unmet demand directly but could have some impacts on operations which might move demand from hackney carriages towards private hire more than the current situation might. Both clauses taken forward came into effect in October 2015.

At the present time, passenger carrying vehicles in England are split by passenger capacity. All vehicles able to carry nine or more passengers are dealt with under national public service vehicle licensing and licensing authorities only have jurisdiction over those carrying eight or less passengers. These locally administered vehicles are subdivided into:

- Hackney carriage vehicles (sometimes referred to as 'taxis' in legislation), which alone are able to wait at ranks and pick up people in the street (ply for hire). To operate such a vehicle also requires a driver to be licensed to drive within the area the vehicle is licensed to operate
- Private hire vehicles, which can only be booked through an operating centre and who, otherwise, are not insured for their passengers (often also known as 'taxis' by the public, or mini-cabs in London and some other areas). To operate such a vehicle requires a vehicle and driver licence, and there must also be an affiliation to an operator. Such vehicles can only transport passengers who have made bookings via this operator.

For the sake of clarity, this report will refer to 'licensed vehicles' when meaning hackney carriage and private hire collectively, and to the specific type when referencing either specific type of vehicle. The term 'taxi' will be avoided as far as possible, although it has to be used in its colloquial form when dealing with the public, few of whom are aware of the detailed differences.

There is a further current issue that does impact on demand – the fact that many hackney carriages once properly licensed in an area with a driver then undertake private hire work in other licensing areas, often many miles from their home base. Such vehicles can have cost base advantages and can appear to be available for immediate hire when they are not in fact legally able to do so (e.g. with stickers saying 'this vehicle can be hired immediately', which only applies within their licensing area).

Review aims and objectives – national background

Luton Council is seeking a review of their current policy towards hackney carriage quantity control in line with current Department for Transport (DfT) Best Practice guidance as published in April 2010. Further background information about previous policy is contained in Chapter 2 to set the context of the current situation.

The "Best Practice Guidance" paragraph 47 states: "Most licensing authorities do not impose quantity restrictions the Department regards that as best practice. Where restrictions are imposed, the Department would urge that the matter should be regularly reconsidered....". Our database of taxi regulation, updated to December 2015, shows 91 authorities who openly declare a limit on hackney carriage vehicle numbers.

There are other licensing authorities who restrict new plates to various levels of wheelchair accessible vehicles and have various levels of grandfather rights for the remaining saloon vehicles which are effectively often limited in number albeit not in the terms of a formal limit under Section 16 (as this is counted as quality restriction rather than quantity).

Of the 91 authorities in England and Wales with a formal limit on vehicle numbers, four have never seemed to have any formal study of the limit. A further 26 have tested their policy, but on an irregular basis (and not within the last three years). Over two thirds (61 authorities) undertake a regular review, all but three of which tend to undertake this more or less every three years. Many of these authorities are very strict on their repeat cycle.

In recent years several authorities have determined to remove their limit policy – most recently Exeter and Hastings. Others – most recently Cambridge – have returned a limit. In some cases authorities returning a limit set either a ‘settling limit’ eg Watford, or a limit beneath the current level (Chesterfield), whilst others fixed at the level when the decision was made (allowing for vehicles in the pipeline at the time of decision). Some limited authorities (notably Knowsley) have set a new limit lower than the current to take account of dormant licences at time of survey. Some authorities still are found needing to issue plates (eg BANES). Other authorities are currently considering if a limit needs to be re-applied in their area given evidence that the market is not restricting numbers appropriately.

Current Luton requirements

Luton held the previous survey in 2013. The key objectives of the independent study of demand are to:

- Determine whether there is any evidence of significant unmet demand for hackney carriage services in Luton
- If significant unmet demand is found recommend how many licences would be required to eliminate this

The study includes the following:

- Inception meeting
- Benchmarking to other similar areas
- Rank review
- Rank observations based on direct observations
- Public attitude interviews comprising face to face interviews
- Written consultation
- Report (draft and final)
- A presentation to the hackney carriage trade
- A presentation to committee

Methodology

In order to meet Luton Council's objectives, the following methodology was adopted:

- Review of relevant policies, standards etc: to understand the authority's aspirations for meeting travel needs and social inclusion and provide context to determining overall demand for travel and how this should be met;
- Extensive rank observations and audits of all the ranks in the Authority, including monitoring passengers' waiting time, any illegal plying for hire, use of Hackney Carriages by wheelchair users and rank audits;
- On street interviews: a survey of representative people on street to obtain information about their understanding of the sector, their last taxi journey, their overall levels of taxi use, about quality and barriers to use;
- Consultation: including consultation with all relevant stakeholders – the local authorities, police, trade associations, all drivers, mobility impaired, specific user groups, businesses, and other major generators of taxi trips

In essence, the methodology used follows similar principles to all surveys undertaken by CTS together with all developments of methodology more recently applied to our surveys, particularly including guidance from both the 2004 DfT letter and their 2010 Best Practice Guidance (which includes the 2004 guidance as an appendix), and including the latest knowledge arising from the Law Commission Review and the current status of the Equality Act. This report also seeks to provide compatibility with previous reports provided by other consultants to the Council. As the 2013 survey was undertaken by CTS this latter compatibility is readily undertaken. Some items undertaken in 2013 have not been repeated in 2016 to ensure best value for money.

Report structure

This Report provides the following further chapters:

- Chapter 2 – current background to taxi licensing statistics and policy
- Chapter 3 – results from the rank surveys
- Chapter 4 – results from the surveys undertaken with the public
- Chapter 5 – up to date stakeholder consultation
- Chapter 6 – results from consultation with the taxi licensing trade
- Chapter 7 – summary and conclusions of this review
- Chapter 8 – recommendations for policy arising from this review.

2. Background to taxi licensing in Luton

The Luton Council area

Luton Borough Council (LBC) is one of three unitary councils within the former Bedfordshire county area. The Borough has a current population of 216,400 according to the 2016 estimates from the 2012 based subnational population projections. This is around 5% more than the level reported in the 2013 survey for 2013.

LBC covers the Luton urban area plus a significant rural area including Leagrave together with the expanse of Luton Airport. In transport terms it lies not far from the M1 motorway providing north – south access, as well as being directly on the East Midlands rail route which links London with Bedford, Luton and the East Midlands cities as well as Sheffield directly.

In terms of rank provision, all ranks on public highway land are provided by the Council itself which is the highway authority. However, the area has several private ranks, at the Airport, three railway stations and also some on private land (although the principal one of these is no longer used). Most of these private ranks require a supplementary fee and agreement which means that overall the local council is unable to ultimately influence the number of vehicles which can service that location – although very few if any of the public or passengers using these vehicles will be aware of that fact.

In terms of usage of the standard evaluation index of significance of unmet demand (ISUD), the private agreements have an implication for the calculations. If either unmet demand at this location, or the sum of unmet demand was found to be significant and requiring more licences, the authority would normally issue these and expect them to follow market forces and move to where the most significant unmet demand was. If any of this was at a private rank, this would most likely not be possible as the new plates would either not be able to, or would be less likely, to be able to obtain plates for those locations. The local authority would certainly have no control over this. Hence, our view is that such sites should not be included in the overall evaluation of significance of unmet demand, or at least that there should be a test with and without these ranks.

The question then arises if an unmet demand study should collect information at these ranks. The public can rarely differentiate between local authority and private ranks. Their views of service across the local authority area is coloured by all ranks they use within the area, private or not. It is therefore important from this point of view to have a reasonable understanding of the performance of these ranks. Further, the private ranks do utilise parts of the hackney carriage fleet so it is important to know how important they are in drawing from supply. Finally, it is important to balance service between the public and private ranks since the supplementary contracts can often imply that the trade have to focus on these locations to ensure they continue to retain these contracts. This can perversely mean that better service may be provided to private ranks

than to the council ranks which are provided alongside with the limited vehicle licences.

However, with a key part of the cost of surveys being rank surveys and their evaluation we believe it is most cost effective only to collect information at private ranks for one typical day, rather than include extended data collection there at further expense. For a rail location we tend to focus on Fridays which tend to be the busiest days at most rail locations, with a mix of business peaks and leisure travel. Airports, however, have a different profile, even within different airports, and if possible we seek their advice on their peak day. For Luton, this was agreed to be a Saturday.

In summary, our evaluation tests the performance and service levels to all ranks within an authority, serviced by the vehicles provided by that authority, but takes a very careful view in terms of defining significance of unmet demand, with the principal estimate of any significance of unmet demand excluding the private ranks at least in the first instance.

Background Council policy

LBC has highway and transport powers for the area. Transport Policy is summarised in the current Local Transport Plan (LTP3). This covers the period from 2011 to 2026 and being implemented by implementation plans. LTP3 covers Luton, Dunstable and Houghton Regis, and identified the key issue that 26% had no car access, but generally the area was found to see low levels of non-car use. Expected growth was focussed on the area north of Luton Town Centre, together with significant expected expansion at the Airport. The Thameslink development will see a wider range of services at all the LBC stations, as well as the recently announced fixed link between the Airport and Luton Airport Parkway station.

Like most LTP documents, there is only marginal reference to hackney carriage and private hire vehicles. It does encourage development of their use but not in any specific or costed manner.

Policy of restricting hackney carriage vehicle licences

LBC has a power to restrict the number of hackney carriage vehicle licences it grants when it is satisfied there is no unmet demand for the services of hackney carriages which is deemed to be significant. This power has been in this format since the introduction of the 1985 Transport Act, Section 16 (before which the power to limit was unfettered).

At the present time, overall government taxi policy is under review by the Law Commission (LC) (see Chapter 1, page 1 for more detail). The current status is that the LC recommended that councils are able to retain the option of limiting their number of hackney carriage vehicles, although any change will have to be agreed by Government and then taken through any appropriate legal process. Formal Government encouragement remains towards the minimisation of restrictions, including limit policies.

Luton held a fixed limit on hackney carriage plate numbers from before current statistics were collected in 1994 until 2004. At that time, there were 81 plates on issue. From then, managed growth was initiated at a rate of 20 plates per year. After four sets of 20 plates were introduced, the managed growth was reduced to two plates per year, and once the last survey was initiated this growth was frozen at no plates per year. After the last survey, the limit has remained at the same level.

A further part of the licensed vehicle scene is the fact that Luton has long held a 'mandatory policy' which means the fleet has been long 100% WAV. This means there has been for a long time a relatively high entry cost to the local hackney carriage trade even when extra plates were on offer.

Where an authority limits vehicle numbers, the plates issued are primarily to ensure sufficient service to ranks and hailing across the council provision in the area. The focus is on ensuring there are sufficient vehicles to meet public demand, principally at locations the council can influence. The use of such licences on private contracts or private land could provide difficult situations where public service to council ranks was compromised. In many areas this can arise from vehicles obtaining contracts for social services or school transport. It may be further complicated by such contracts needing wheel chair style vehicles. More complex issues can arise where an authority focusses provision of wheel chair accessible vehicles into the hackney carriage fleet by various methods.

Previous surveys

Surveys using a similar format were undertaken in 2006, 2008 and most recently (and most similarly) 2013. The 2008 survey identified trade concern about high levels of private hires serving areas near to ranks, with long waits for fares and correspondingly high competition for space at or near ranks. It was found the busiest ranks were at Park Street and the Airport, with much late night demand met by private hire vehicles. There appeared to be an increase in waiting times between 2006 and 2008. The conclusion was the continuation of the managed growth scenario.

The 2013 survey found three all day/night ranks active provided by the Council plus five night-only ranks. The high provision of active ranks was completed by one private central, two private rail station and the private Airport rank (serviced by one of the local hackney carriage radio circuits). The impacts of pedestrianisation were seen between the 2008 and 2013 surveys with Manchester Street becoming an all-day rank location, and levels of usage of Wellington Street falling. Park Street remained the busiest rank seeing about a third of estimated weekly rank patronage. The Airport rank was next busiest, followed by the two private rail station ranks, Manchester Street and then Wellington Street.

Saturday demand was about 60% busier than the Friday. Both peak hours were 02:00 the next morning with a focus on Manchester Street. Long waits by vehicles for passengers were still found. There was evidence that private ranks obtained better service than the public ranks. Falling demand between 2006 and 2008 had been replaced by growth to 2013. The identified unmet demand was not found to be significant using the industry standard ISUD calculation which found an index far below the cut-off which could otherwise suggest unmet demand to be significant.

Further comparisons between the surveys are provided in the conclusion and synthesis chapter below.

Background statistics

Information was obtained to demonstrate the current make-up of the licensed vehicle fleet in the Luton area, including current vehicle trends. The table below shows the historic level of vehicle numbers in this area.

	Hackney carriage vehicles	Private hire vehicles	Total licensed vehicle fleet	Driver numbers			Comment
				hcd	phd	Dual	
	DfT data has no information re start of limit						
1994	81	Unknown	n/k	250			
1997	81	500	581	300	1200	0	
1999	81	778	859	358	1400	0	28 ops
2001	81	760	841	320	1500	0	26 ops
2004	81	760	841	320	1500	0	26 ops
2005	101	760	861	320	1500	0	26 ops
2007	141	1040	1181	250	2900	150	28 ops
2009	161	937	1098	187	1069	129	33 ops
2010	163	1105	1268				
2011	167	1020	1187	210	1800	350	28 ops
2012	167	1110	1277				
2013	167	822	989	267	1116	171	37 ops
2014	167	835	1002				
2015	167	829	996	248	1029	172	39 ops
2016	167	859	1026				

*Note: DfT statistics suggested used from 1994 to 2007/2009/2011/2013 and 2015.
National Private Hire Association surveys for 2010/12/14.
Mandatory order 1993 according to DfT 2001 survey
Ops= private hire operators*

The Table above shows that since 1994 when DfT first published statistics, the hackney carriage fleet has just over doubled (+106%). The bulk of the growth was between 2004 and 2009 with the introduction of managed growth. Interestingly the main growth in private hire numbers also occurred in this period although there was a peak just before the last survey in 2012, though this may relate to data issues. The current private hire fleet level is 72% higher than in 1997, less than that on the hackney carriage side suggesting issue of plates has suppressed growth of the private hire side. In overall terms, the total fleet has now settled around 1000 vehicles after the peaks of 2010 and 2012, about 30% higher.

In terms of drivers, specific hackney carriage drivers are now very similar to the level they were in 1994, suggesting many of the new plates swapped drivers from sharing vehicles to having their own. Private hire driver numbers are now less than in 1997, although since around 2007 there have been a small number of dual drivers who can drive either hackney carriage or private hire, which if taken into account suggest overall driver numbers about the same as in 1997.

Operator numbers have grown markedly in the last few years, and certainly since the last survey.

Driver ratios

Having some dual drivers makes the direct comparison of the level of drivers to vehicles less exact. We have therefore assumed a range of values, calculating on the level excluding all dual drivers to the opposite extreme of assuming all dual drivers operate on one side of the fleet or other. On this basis, there are between 1.49 and 2.5 hackney carriage drivers per vehicle and 1.24 to 1.45 private hire drivers per vehicle.

Whilst this suggests there is some scope for double shifting, particularly with dual licence drivers using hackney carriages, the levels are not particularly high. They are reduced marginally on both sides from the levels identified in the last survey.

Benchmarking to other authorities

The table below compares, using national DfT statistics for 2015 (unless we have more recent information), and population information for 2016 to compare vehicle statistics for similar authorities to Luton. The table is sorted with the lowest proportion of hackney carriages to population levels at the top of the Table.

Area	Popn 2016, 000	No of HCV (% WAV)	HCV per 1000 popn	No of PHV (% WAV)	PHV per 1000 popn	Total veh	Total veh per 1000 popn
Bedford R	166	70 (100)	0.4	523 (10)	3.1	593	3.6
Slough R	149	107 (50)	0.7	587 (1)	3.9	694	4.6
Milton Keynes R	267	199 (68)	0.7	765 (0)	2.9	964	3.6
Luton R	216	167 (100)	0.8	859 (0)	4.0	1026	4.7
West Berkshire	158	178 (32)	1.1	143 (1)	0.9	321	2.0
North Hertfordshire	134	181 (9)	1.4	68 (0)	0.5	249	1.9
St Albans	148	284 (55)	1.9	170 (1)	1.2	454	3.1
Watford R	97	291 (19)	3.0	176 (0)	1.8	467	4.8
Average		185 (48)	1.1	411 (2)	2.5	596	3.6
England excl London		(41)	1.2	(3)	2.2		3.4

Hackney carriage provision in Luton is towards the middle of the table, but below both group and English average levels. On the contrary, private hire provision is the highest in the group, and well above both group and English average levels. In total vehicle numbers, only Watford has a higher provision of total vehicles, with Luton still far above the group and English average in overall vehicle terms.

All the top four of the table are authorities who retain limits on hackney carriage vehicle numbers. The difference with Watford is that it had a spell when there was no limit at all, and vehicles were allowed to grow according to demand. This puts the level of hackney carriages for Watford significantly above any other authority in the comparison, as well as far above both the group and national averages. However, in Watford the hackney carriage growth did restrain private hire levels but overall licensed vehicles in Watford are still the highest in the group.

In WAV terms, just two of the group are fully WAV, Bedford as well as Luton. This puts Luton well above both the group and national averages for the proportion of hackney carriages which are WAV. However, as is often common where the hackney carriage fleet is required to be fully WAV, the level of WAV in the private hire fleet is actually non-existent. This can have repercussions for those needing WAV style vehicle who wish to phone for them if the hackney carriage fleet is highly independent and with few phone links.

Fares

Private Hire and Taxi Monthly (PHTM) regularly present comparisons of fares to the national average, based on a standard formula from the varied fare tables used by authorities. A comparison was made for the group of authorities above using the latest data from PHTM May 2016. In the group, excluding the 'Luton Airport' fare, Watford is the highest value recorded, with Bedford the lowest. The average for this group is 6.35 whilst Luton is 6.00 using the standard formula, two miles and tariff 1.

Compared to the average for the group, Luton fares are 5% lower. Compared to the national average, however, Luton fares are 6% higher. Neither of these statistics suggest the fares are other than average.

3. Results from rank surveys

The Table below shows the result of our review of the ranks available in the Luton licensing area. This is based on a list provided by Luton Borough in their tender documents, as revised at the Inception meeting.

Rank / operating hours	Spaces (approx)	Comments
24-hour ranks		
Park Street	2 + approx. 15	2 space head of rank with longer length of feeder
Wellington Street	5	Rank in lay-by at end of street nearest to George Street
Manchester Street / New Bedford Road	2 + 5	All-day rank in Manchester Street supplemented by bus layby that provides additional night capacity.
Alma Street	2	Occasional feeder to Manchester Street
Night ranks		
Upper George Street	2 + 2 + 6	Three sections of rank, all operating 2100-0600 only. Only larger section on right hand side of road tends to be used, though lower sections often abused by private hire vehicles, though less so with current parking enforcement
Park Street West	2	2100 to 0600 only outside Casino
Midland Road	3	Revised rank still outside night club, now just one section but still 24-hour
Cheapside	3	2300 to 0400 only, serving one night club
Chapel Street	n/a	2100 to 0600 only, lost to road layout changes
Gordon Street	n/a	Now removed even though road no longer closed at night
Midland Road	n/a	Rank introduced after last survey near northern exit from Luton station, but not used and now removed.
Informal rank locations – NONE		
Out of town locations – NO COUNCIL PROVIDED FACILITIES		
Private rank locations		
Luton Airport	50	Formally NOT a rank but an area where hackney carriages currently wait – after survey no longer available to same fleet of hcv
Luton Station	5	Requires permit (shared with Luton Airport Parkway site).
Luton Airport Parkway Station	6 + 9	Under First Capital Connect rail operation, joint permit with Luton
Galaxy Centre	5	Separate section of car park, now no longer used but hackney carriages allowed to wait near exit from Centre under contract arrangement

There have been several changes since 2013 in rank provision. Most have seen ranks removed with a few minor amendments. The Midland Road night rank is now just one section and remains outside the night club there, although that club now tends to operate more as a longer operation with less peak events. The new rank introduced in Midland Road near the northern exit from Luton Station was put in place, but was not used and was removed before this survey took place. The Gordon Street night rank, which was formerly unusable when the road was closed, has been removed although the road is now not closed at night, but the direction of traffic has also been reversed. None of these changes are significant.

At the time of our survey the airport 'rank' was only allowed to be serviced by the 101 plates which had the supplementary permit, with enforcement undertaken using number plate recognition. During the course of our survey, the permit to use this location was under renegotiation, and more recently we were advised that the contract had been awarded to a non-hackney carriage based company. Further implications of this are discussed later in the Report.

Since the last survey, the rail company operating the local rail franchise has changed. Whilst in 2013 they provide us significant feedback and assistance in our research, the current company advised us that it was no longer possible or permissible to contact local stations or managers but that they would attempt to answer our questions from a higher level. As is usual in this situation, no response was received.

During our research we did not find evidence of any other ranks within the Luton area and understand our rank coverage is therefore comprehensive as required by the Department for Transport's Best Practice Guidance on taxi and private hire licensing (BPG). The number of private ranks remains one of the highest levels around English authorities.

The breakdown of rank hours covered by video is shown in **Appendix 1**. This is made up of twelve ranks. Four ranks were covered between early on Friday morning through to the early hours of Sunday morning. The sample was carefully structured to cover a robust sample of operating hours, trying to take account of when facilities feeding a rank were open as far as was possible. In total, 279 hours of rank operation were observed. The sample was as similar as possible to that used in 2013, when a marginally greater 288 hours were observed. The feeder part of the Manchester Street rank outside the Galaxy Gym was observed separately specifically to assist with determination if this was an important part of rank provision.

Ranks were observed, using video methods with the recordings observed by trained staff, and analysed to provide details of the usage and waiting times for both passengers and vehicles. Passenger waiting time was kept to that which was true unmet demand, ie when passengers were waiting but no hackney carriage vehicle was there.

Full details of the observed volumes of passenger and vehicle traffic are included in **Appendix 2**. Our observations took account of feeder ranks where necessary to ensure true estimation of the hackney carriage waiting times at ranks for passengers (as at Park Street).

Overall comments on ranks

A total of 16 different rank locations / days were observed (each termed a sample). In total, around 2,340 hackney carriage vehicle arrivals and departures were recorded, with all vehicle departures some 3,314.

Of the total vehicle arrivals and departures observed, 4% were private cars at or near the ranks. There were just six goods vehicles and three emergency vehicles using ranks during our observations. However, the level of private hire at or near ranks was very high, some 25%. The remaining 71% of observed vehicles were hackney carriages.

In terms of private hire at or near ranks, the worst location was Manchester Street where over the two days of observation some 532 private hire vehicles left the area with some 378 passengers. The observer noted most of these left from the bus stop area adjacent to the rank. The next highest level of passenger departures was from near the private facility at the Galaxy Centre – with 77 departures taking 78 passengers (almost all certainly bookings). Wellington Street saw 135 vehicles with 40 passengers (many of the rest were set-downs).

The area near the Midland Road rank saw 39 departures and 22 passengers, these tended to be on the opposite side of the road from the rank. Other private hires were observed at Park Street, Luton station, Upper George St, the Casino, the Manchester Road feeder rank outside Galaxy and Ice Diamond rank, although none of these saw more than nine vehicles or four passengers in total at any location. Further detail of potential sources of these vehicles in terms of if they are local or not is discussed in the plate section below.

There was just one person observed accessing a hackney carriage in a wheel chair – at the Luton Airport Parkway rank. Two other persons were observed who appeared to be disabled at Manchester Street and at its feeder rank opposite. 106 cases were noted of drivers providing assistance to passengers to enter vehicles.

Detailed rank performance

The Table below summarises the time periods observed at each location as well as providing overall operational statistics for each location during each period of observation. A detailed description of the observations follows below.

Rank	Period (2016)	Total passengers observed	Total loaded vehicle departures	Passengers per loaded vehicle	Empty vehicle departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	No. of passengers having to wait for vehicle to arrive
Park Street	Friday 4 th March 10:00 to Saturday 07:00	549	394	1.4	25	6	31
	Saturday 5 th March 07:00 to Sunday 07:00	719	459	1.6	43	9	3
Wellington Street	Friday 4 th March 09:00 to Saturday 07:00	146	104	1.4	13	11	16
	Saturday 5 th March 07:00 to Sunday 06:00	177	98	1.8	23	19	3
Manchester Street	Friday 4 th March 10:00 to Saturday 07:00	43	32	1.3	18	36	0
	Saturday 5 th March 07:00 to Sunday 06:00	35	24	1.5	29	55	0
New Bedford Road feeder to Manchester Street	Friday 4 th March 10:00 to midnight	4	2	2	4	67	2
Upper George Street	Friday 4 th March 22:00 to Saturday 05:00	0	0	0	3	100	0
Park Street West (Casino)	Saturday 5 th March 20:00 to Sunday 05:00	120	71	1.7	26	27	1
Cheapside Ice Diamond	Saturday 5 th March 22:00 to Sunday 05:00	0	0	0	2	100	0
Midland Road Bar 32	Saturday 5 th March 22:00 to 05:00	0	0	0	6	100	0
Luton Railway Station	Friday 4 th March 08:00 to Saturday 07:00	197	151	1.3	73	33	4
	Saturday 5 th March 07:00 to Sunday 05:00	99	74	1.3	145	66	0
Luton Airport Parkway	Friday 4 th March 09:00 to Saturday 07:00	283	216	1.3	23	10	18
Galaxy Centre	Friday 4 th March 20:00 to Saturday 06:00	17	10	1.7	18	64	1
Luton Airport	Saturday 5 th March 02:00 to Sunday 02:00	482	234	2.1	20	8	0

For each rank, we conclude with an overall qualitative appreciation of the performance of the rank over the days observed:

- Poor – major issues with service to rank resulting in long passenger queues;
- Fair – rank deals with high volumes but sees some passenger queueing at times;
- Good – no passenger queueing observed but nothing else of note in way rank operates;
- Excellent – very high turnover with no passenger queueing and clear examples of drivers helping passengers use rank;
- Developing – rank of recent origin but clearly growing in use

Overview

An initial over-view of the above table shows that Park Street is clearly the busiest of the ranks followed by the Airport private location and Luton Airport Parkway private rank. Three of the night ranks were only used by vehicles with no sign of any potential passengers at all. Further details of specific rank operation are discussed below, with detailed tables of hourly usage recorded in **Appendix 2**. In general the hours covered almost exactly mirror those collected in the 2013 survey to minimise differences between the data.

Park Street Rank

This rank has a two space head located very close to the main shopping area, fed by a large extent of additional space the other side of the roundabout (and sometimes supplemented by vehicles waiting on the opposite side of the road).

The rank was observed on Friday 4th and Saturday 5th March 2016, from 10:00 on the Friday through to 07:00 on the Sunday morning.

Friday operation

During the Friday, the rank saw around 549 passengers leaving in 394 vehicles with occupancy of loaded taxis being 1.4 persons - low. Just 6% of vehicles arriving at this location left without passengers.

31 passengers had to wait for hackney carriages to arrive at the rank, in the 12:00, 17:00 and 18:00 hours. However, the longest a person had to wait was four minutes. Even for the 22 waiting in the 18:00 hour their average wait was just under two minutes, and for all passengers in that hour this reduced to an expected wait time of just 40 seconds. When all waits were averaged over the full number of passengers during this day, expected typical average wait time per passenger was just six seconds.

In terms of passenger variation through the day, numbers ranged from one to the peak of 63 in the 17:00 hour. The next peak was 62 in the 18:00 hour. Flows were 35 or more in all hours from 10:00 to 18:00 after which flows fell to around 12-14 with the area becoming completely quiet after the 02:00 hour – though small flows did begin again from the 05:00 hour onwards (but only one or two persons per hour).

This is generally a shopping related rank but with some later activity.

During the day vehicles that waited for fares had average waits varying between four minutes and 23 minutes. After 19:00, vehicle maximum waits and average waits for fares increased, with average waits towards 40 minutes, longer than in 2013.

Saturday operation

The Saturday saw a higher 719 passengers leaving in 459 vehicles. Each taxi on average took 1.6 passengers (moderate and as in 2013 higher than Friday). A slightly higher proportion, some 9% of vehicles left the location without a passenger.

Three people were observed to arrive when no vehicles were available, but only had to wait at most three minutes for a hackney carriage to arrive, in the hours of 10:00 and 13:00. Averaged over the whole period of observation the expected wait time per passenger was less than one second. The night waits observed in 2013 were not observed in 2016.

Passenger levels were between 48 and 87 in every hour from the 10:00 hour to the 17:00 hour, with a peak of 87 in the 14:00 hour. However, on the Saturday, passengers continued to use the rank in every hour until and including the 03:00 one, though levels were between four and 34 and most typically around the 10 level.

Vehicle waits for passengers tended to be lower on the Saturday (4 to 9 minutes during the main day period). Longer waits for fares by vehicles occurred in the evening (nine to 25 minutes between 19:00 and 03:00).

Summary

In summary, the service provided at the Park Street rank is **good**.

Wellington Street rank

This rank is at the opposite end of the main town centre axis, and near the Town Hall. However, it is located on the left hand side of the road, facing down-hill and slightly obscured from the view of pedestrians leaving the main shopping centre (who might see hackney carriage at the slightly more distant Manchester Street rank from that view). The rank operates all days and hours and is well marked.

The rank is now the principal provision on this route through the town centre – the former George Street all day spaces having been removed with the pedestrianisation of this section of route. The three sections of Upper George Street night ranks remain.

The rank was observed between 09:00 on Friday 4th March 2016 right through to 06:00 on Sunday 6th March 2016.

Friday operation

During the Friday there were 146 passengers who used 104 vehicles to leave the rank, an average loading of 1.4 passengers per vehicle. Compared to 2013, a much lower level of 11% of vehicles left without taking any passengers.

There were two hours when passengers arrived and no vehicle was available, 16:00 (10 passengers, maximum wait 4 minutes), and 17:00 (6 passengers, maximum wait also 4 minutes). When averaged over the whole day and all passengers, the average wait was 17 seconds.

There were no passengers until the 10:00 hour after which there were between 13 and 30 in every hour between the 11:00 and the 17:00. The peak two hours were 16:00 and 17:00, with the 30 passengers seen at 16:00. These two hours corresponded with the time some passengers had to wait for a vehicle to arrive. Flows dropped to between two and five after this, with the rank completely unused effectively from the 20:00 hour onwards by passengers (though there were the odd few passengers in the 21:00 and the 03:00 hours, and vehicles generally waited here even when no passengers were observed).

Longest vehicle waits of vehicles for passengers varied from 18 minutes to 41 minutes. Average waits for those vehicles staying to collect a fare ranged from 8 minutes to 23 minutes, although with significantly lower demand late at night it appears most vehicles either responded to bookings or were taken as they passed through by those on their way to other ranks.

Saturday operation

Average passenger numbers increased to 177 on the Saturday. These left in some 98 vehicles meaning that occupancy increased to 1.8 passengers per vehicle (the same as in 2013). A higher 19% of vehicles left the rank without passengers.

Three people had to wait for vehicles to arrive. One had to wait ten minutes in the 13:00 hour whilst two others waited in the 14:00 hour, one for some seven minutes. However, when averaged over all passengers in this set of observations the typical wait time for someone using this rank was just six seconds.

The rank was really only used from the 10:00 hour to the 18:00 hour, with no passengers after this time at all. Flows ranged from 11 to 41 per hour with the peak at 14:00 (leading to the two people having to wait for a vehicle to arrive).

Typical vehicles waits for passengers were between 10 and 23 minutes, although vehicles did wait longer in the hour before the rank saw any passengers. In the hours used, the longest observed vehicle wait was around 34 minutes.

Summary

Overall, demand at the Wellington Street rank is relatively modest, but the service provided to passengers is **good**.

Manchester Street / New Bedford Road ranks

The rank in Manchester Street / New Bedford Road is a 24-hour location with a night feeder. Actual provision in this location was revised with the header rank on the left hand side of the road heading away from the town centre, and the feeder taking over bus stops on the right hand side. This rank was observed on Friday 4th March 2016 from 10:00 through to 06:00 on the morning of Sunday 6th March 2016.

At the request of the Council, the New Bedford Road feeder was observed separately on the Friday (see detail below).

Friday operation

During the hours the main rank was used, it saw a total of 43 passengers leaving in 32 vehicles, with occupancy of 1.3 passengers per vehicle, low. 36% of all hackney carriage vehicles visiting this location left without passengers. No passenger ever arrived when no vehicle was available for immediate hire.

The feeder area saw just four passengers leave in two vehicles, with just four other vehicles arriving there and feeding to the main rank, empty. However, two passengers did arrive and waited at that rank for a vehicle to arrive. They waited four minutes in the 12:00 hour, and were the only passengers using this location.

Passenger demand at this rank was very low, with between one and nine passengers per hour, although it did see passengers in all hours from the 09:00 through to the 18:00 hour and also in the 23:00 hour. Vehicle waits were between two and 25 minutes depending on the hour.

Saturday operation

On the Saturday the rank saw a lower 35 passenger leave in just 24 vehicles, a moderate vehicle occupancy of 1.5 per vehicle. Some 55% of vehicles arriving left this location empty.

Two passengers arrived in the 18:00 hour to find no vehicle available for immediate hire. They waited seven minutes (together). Over all passengers the typical expected wait was 24 seconds. On the vehicle side, waiting for passengers ranged from four to 27 minutes dependent on the time of day.

This location does appear to be much less used than in 2013 (see further detail below).

Summary

A **good** service is provided to customers using this location.

Night ranks

There are some specific night-only ranks provided near to clubs in Luton, although the Manchester Street rank also has a night extension to increase capacity. Since the previous survey, Gordon Street has been reopened, albeit in the opposite direction, but the rank there has been removed.

Upper George Street ranks

This rank is located beyond the Council offices, just round the corner from the two main night clubs. There are three parts. They were observed on the evening of Friday 4th March 2016 between 22:00 and 05:00.

During our observations the ranks were not used by passengers at all, and just three vehicles waited up to nine minutes before leaving empty.

It is not appropriate to provide any summary service level for this location.

Park Street West (Casino) rank

This rank is located directly outside the exit from the Casino, and very near to one of the main access routes through Luton. It is also on one of the routes through to the main Park Street rank, so a large number of hackney carriages do pass by this location. The rank was surveyed on Saturday 5th March 2016 from 20:00 to 05:00. It is understood there remains a private contract between the Casino and a hackney carriage network to service this location although it remains a council provided rank on which any vehicle could wait to serve customers.

This rank was the busiest night only rank in our survey period – and in fact this time the only one actually used by passengers. Over its hours of operation, it saw 120 passengers leaving in 71 vehicles, an average occupancy of some 1.7 per vehicle. A further 27% of vehicles arriving left without taking any passenger.

One person arrived in the 04:00 hour when no vehicle was immediately available for hire and waited five minutes. Their wait, shared over all passengers, was just two seconds.

The rank was used by passengers from 22:00 onwards, but increased in passenger numbers from midnight although its main period of usage was between 02:00 and 03:00 when it saw 33 passengers leave. There were no passengers in the 05:00 hour, with a range between nine and 24 other than the peak (and two passengers only in the first hour).

Average vehicle waits for passengers were 9 to 15 minutes in the busy periods, but longer earlier in the evening. The longest wait recorded was some 47 minutes by a vehicle arriving around 23:00.

Overall service to this rank was **good**.

Cheapside (Ice Diamond) rank

This rank was observed in 2013 in lieu of the Midland Road rank below. For 2016, both were covered on Saturday 5th March from 22:00 until 05:00 the next morning. The Ice Diamond rank did not see any passengers at all during our observations. Two vehicles paused here for up to four minutes but both left empty. There is no service level relevant to this location.

Midland Road (Bar 32) rank

The club at this location, and the layout of the rank, have both changed since 2013, with far fewer late night openings of significance. The observations identified no passengers at all and just six vehicles who waited for up to two minutes before leaving without passengers. Again no service level is relevant to this location.

Private Ranks

Luton has amongst the highest level of private ranks across any authority. Unlike many authorities who only have one private rank provider (usually the train operating company), Luton has "ranks" provided by the Airport, the train operating company (two locations) and a shopping / leisure centre. However, in the two non-rail locations, the site is subject to a private agreement and in effect the marked areas are not counted as ranks but more as 'pick up' areas as they are under the jurisdiction of their operator and both could, on contract renewal, find the service provided by private hire rather than hackney carriage, although to meet current legislation operation would have to be modified in that case (principally to ensure a booking with an operator was clearly in place). Unfortunately for the local hackney carriage trade, the Airport rank contract was lost to the main hackney carriage contractor shortly after completion of our rank work.

From a significant unmet demand perspective it should also be noted that any unmet demand identified on private land cannot be counted as significant unmet demand requiring further plates since there can

be other stipulations made by the operators over which the Council has no control, and which could be the reason for significant unmet demand there were it observed (eg a limited number of permits being granted, less than the council limit).

However, it is still important to have one typical day of operating data for such locations as the public view of service at ranks is based on all active ranks irrespective of ownership or operator. It is also important to set these ranks in the context of the whole operation in a council area since in some authorities the trade are very dependent on such ranks, sometimes to the exclusion of council locations, which is a very risky business model given the private companies are not under the same strictures as council ranks.

Railway station ranks

The two main rail station ranks are both under the same rail operating company and it is understood the permit issued covers both stations. There is a further rank provision at Leagrave Station but this is under the auspices of being a private hire office rather than a hackney carriage rank, which was omitted from any observations due to this.

Luton Station rank

Govia Thameslink operate Luton, Luton Airport Parkway and Leagrave stations. Hackney carriage ranks are provided at both Luton and Luton Airport Parkway, for which a joint permit is required at additional cost. We believe these are provided via the company administering parking for the operator (APCOA).

Since late 2012, the hackney carriage rank is now a loop just north of the main access, and although all passengers heading to the town centre now have to see the rank as they leave the station, the actual rank head is some distance from the main exit, and away from the natural walking route. The area is also shared by private hire vehicles setting down as well as general car set downs. The station building is proposed for redevelopment, which will then return the rank closer to the passenger flows, although the timetable for this is unclear at present.

The rank was observed on Friday 4th March 2016 from 08:00 through to 05:00 on Sunday 6th March 2016. Discussion of the observations has been split to cover Friday 08:00 to Saturday 07:00 and then from Saturday 07:00 to Sunday 05:00.

Friday operations

On the Friday, 197 passengers were observed using this rank. Leaving in 151 vehicles, average occupancy was 1.3 passengers per vehicle, low. Some 33% of vehicles servicing the location left empty without passengers.

Four passengers had to wait for a hackney carriage to arrive in the 19:00 hour, two of whom were waiting six minutes. When averaged over all passengers, the average wait was just 5 seconds.

Passenger flows were between five and 28 in various hours. There were few passengers after the 21:00 hour. The peak occurred in the 20:00 hour, with high flows in the 08:00 and 09:00 hours as well as flows over 22 per hour in each of the 17:00, 19:00 and 20:00 hours. Average vehicle waits for passengers were between 12 and 59 minutes, with several vehicles waiting up to 90 minutes for fares.

Saturday operations

Total Saturday passengers were 99, leaving in 74 vehicles providing an average occupancy of 1.3 similar to the Friday. Some 66% of all vehicles arriving left without passengers, but no passenger ever arrived when there was no vehicle available for immediate hire.

Passenger flows were much lower, with between five and 18 per hour only. The peak was at 16:00 with a marginally lower level in the following hour. There were just single passengers in the 20:00 and 01:00 hours, with no passengers otherwise after the 18:00 hour.

Vehicle waits for passengers were much higher, with one average of some 90 minutes and one vehicle recorded waiting nearly two hours before leaving.

Summary

Overall service at Luton Station private rank is **good**.

Luton Airport Parkway station rank

This rank is also subject to the same rail operator permit. There are six spaces within the car park, and further spaces within the distant part of the car park and along the access road. A bus service is provided linking the station with the Airport on a 10-minute frequency, reducing the potential demand for a rank. This may further reduce in future years when a fixed link is provided using a cable railway.

This private rank was observed on Friday 4th March 2016 from 09:00 until 07:00 on the Saturday.

During our observations the rank saw 283 passengers leaving in 216 vehicles, with a low occupancy of 1.3 passengers per vehicle. 10% of vehicles arriving left without passengers.

18 passengers arrived when there was no hackney carriage available (in the hours 09:00, 16:00, 17:00 and 18:00). When averaged over the full day and all passengers, these waits were 11 seconds. The longest passenger wait was five minutes. The highest level of waiting was in the 09:00 hour, but even then shared over all the passengers in the hour the typical wait time people might expect within that hour was 40 seconds.

On the Friday, the Airport Parkway station rank saw more passengers than the Luton station rank (283 compared to 197). The highest flow

was at 09:00 with some 54 passengers – similar to 2013. The rank was used at all hours, but saw highest flows in the 09:00 hour followed by the midnight hour (28) and the 07:00 hour (25). Other flows ranged from one to 21.

Average wait times of vehicles for fares at this location were very variable, with some quite high averages during the day and more so overnight.

Service to passengers at the Luton Airport Parkway station is **good**.

Galaxy Centre

The Galaxy Centre has a contract for providing licensed vehicle services to its private highway access. This is currently held by the hackney carriage trade and considered to provide good value for money and for their customers. There is a formal rank on the far side of the car park, but this is rarely used by hackney carriages and tends to be more a parking area for staff. Hackney carriages pick up from the front, nearer to the access from the centre.

The location was surveyed on Friday 4th March 2016 from 20:00 through to 06:00 on the Saturday morning. During this period, 17 passengers made use of this location. Leaving in 10 vehicles, average occupancy was 1.7, and just one passenger arrived when no vehicle was available -waiting for just one minute. 64% of all hackney carriages left without a passenger.

Passenger flows were low, just one to three passengers in the hours from 20:00 to midnight, with a peak of seven passengers leaving in the 01:00 hour, and then no other passengers. Vehicle waits were low, suggesting more use of bookings rather than many vehicles waiting here, although this was not borne out by anyone actually appearing to wait. Service at this location is **good**.

Luton Airport

Provision for hackney carriage and private hire car services at Luton Airport is controlled by the Airport owners. Provision of the 'on demand' service is subject to a contract which at the time of the survey lay with a group of hackney carriages. As part of the contract, a pick-up area is provided for the permitted vehicles and is not counted by the airport authority as a 'rank'. Access to the area is only allowed to authorised vehicles who have to register their vehicle registration with the Airport authority to be allowed access. However, the access barrier is not specific to hackney carriages and also allows other service vehicles access to the more secure areas of the Airport (but not airside).

At the time of the survey there were 101 hackney carriage vehicles allowed to use this pick up area. We also understand that many of these are the independent hackney carriage owner/drivers who are not necessarily part of the hackney carriage radio circuits in Luton. Many

tend to serve this location exclusively. We are also aware that this situation will be changing with the contract now being held by another company (further discussion below in the synthesis chapter as this change occurred after the survey was completed). The Airport thought that about 30 to 40 vehicles serviced this rank for a few peak hours per day whilst the remainder tended to service it full time.

This location was observed on Saturday 5th March 2016 from 02:00 until 02:00 the next morning. Permission for the surveys was obtained from the Airport authority and the hours were revised based on the results from the 2013 survey.

During our full 24-hours of observation, there were 482 passengers leaving in 234 vehicles, giving a relatively high occupancy of vehicles at 2.1 passengers per vehicle. No passengers ever arrived when a hackney carriage was not present at the rank. Despite the entry restriction, 8% of hackney carriages left without picking up passengers.

There were no passengers in the 02:00 to 05:00 hours. Flows were highest in the hours between 08:00 and 23:00 but otherwise there were nearly always flow levels of 13 or more per hour. The highest flow was 46 in the 13:00 hour. The 19:00 hour saw 42 passengers. Many hours saw levels over 30 per hour.

Vehicle waiting times for fares were very long however, with average waits up to two and a half hours in some periods, and generally never less than 90 minutes.

Overall, service to passengers at this location is **excellent** although those providing the service seem to be willing to pay a very high price in waiting time to provide this level of service, as in 2013.

Synthesis of night demand and supply

In 2013 we compared night demand and supply over the Luton area. On the Friday in total between 22:00 and 05:00 there were some 263 passengers observed using various ranks whilst the Saturday was much busier with some 421. Similar estimates for 2016 show a very sharp decline, with no use of several night ranks which were used in 2013, and a decline in use of other ranks as well. The counted Friday usage was about half that of 2013, whilst the Saturday usage was down by about 30%. Overall, this suggests a sharp drop in usage of hackney carriages by those coming out in the early hours at the weekend.

Comparison of overall supply and demand

The Table below provides a slightly different summary of supply and demand, comparing average vehicle arrivals per hour with average loaded departures per hour, ie seeing how supply and demand match on average.

Rank	Period	No of hours rank active	Average vehicle arrivals / hr	Average loaded departures / hr	Overall judgment of service provided
Park Street	Friday 4 th March 10:00 to Saturday 07:00	20	21	20	Good
	Saturday 5 th March 07:00 to Sunday 07:00	23	22	20	
Wellington Street	Friday 4 th March 09:00 to Saturday 07:00	11	11	9	Good
	Saturday 5 th March 07:00 to Sunday 06:00	10	12	10	
Manchester Street	Friday 4 th March 10:00 to Saturday 07:00	11	5	3	Good
	Saturday 5 th March 07:00 to Sunday 06:00	11	5	2	
New Bedford Road feed to Manchester Street	Friday 4 th March 10:00 to midnight	2	3	1	n/a
Upper George Street	Friday 4 th March 22:00 to Saturday 05:00	0	0	0	n/a
Park Street West (Casino)	Saturday 5 th March 20:00 to Sunday 05:00	7	14	10	Good
Cheapside Ice Diamond	Saturday 5 th March 22:00 to Sunday 05:00	0	0	0	n/a
Bar 32	Saturday 5 th March 02:00 to Sunday 02:00	0	0	0	n/a
Luton Railway Station	Friday 4 th March 08:00 to Saturday 07:00	15	15	10	Good
	Saturday 5 th March 07:00 to Sunday 05:00	13	17	6	
Luton Airport Parkway	Friday 4 th March 09:00 to Saturday 07:00	21	11	10	Good
Galaxy Centre	Friday 4 th March 20:00	6	5	2	Good

	to Saturday 06:00				
Luton Airport	Saturday 5 th March 02:00 to 02:00	20	13	12	Excellent

Of all the 16 rank / days observed, 10 were active in passenger terms for more than 9 hours per day. Just four were active for 20 hours or more with none really active 24/7 (Park Street was closest with both sets of observations 20 hours or more active). Three night ranks saw no usage at all. The New Bedford Road feeder to Manchester Street saw very little usage.

In terms of overall passenger demand at ranks per hour when operational, Park Street was busiest, with both sets of observations seeing an average of 20 passengers over the active hours observed. The next busiest location was the private Airport provision – with an average of just 12 passenger departures per hour when active. Both Wellington Street sets of observations saw 9-10 passengers per hour on average. The Casino and the two private station sites (both on Friday) all saw an average of 10 passengers per hour when active.

In terms of overall service, comparing the number of vehicles supplied and the total number of loaded vehicles leaving (ie taking out the loading factor), seven of the sites/days saw close levels of provision whilst six had high levels of excess vehicles available. The other three sites were unused. There is no evidence from this comparison of any significant under-provision of vehicles.

Detailed comparison by rank and days

The table below has been updated from the 2013 report to include the latest observations.

Rank	Day / hours	Date	Passengers	Loaded vehicles
Park Street and feeder	Friday 0700-0400	2008	572	448
	Friday 0700-0500	2013	774	535
	Friday 0900-0600	2016	549	394
	Saturday 0700-0400	2008	517	408
	Saturday 0500-0500	2013	786	472
	Saturday 0700-0700	2016	719	459
Wellington Street and George St	Friday (factored to 0700-0300)	2006	?	137
	Friday 0700-0300 (0400)	2008	184	130
	Friday 0800-0400	2013	246	154
	Friday 0900-0700	2016	146	104
	Saturday (factored 0700-0400)	2006	?	172
	Saturday 0700-0400	2008	202	121

	Saturday 0700-0400	2013	200	114
	Saturday 0700-0700	2016	177	98
Gordon Street / Manchester Street	Friday 2200-0400	2006	?	?
	Friday 2200-0400	2008	63	43
	Friday 2200-0400	2013	149	83
	Friday 2200-0400	2016	5	1
	Saturday 2200-0400	2008	141	81
	Saturday 2200-0400	2013	240	109
	Saturday 2200-0400	2016	3	2
Luton Airport (private pick up area)	Friday 0700-0200	2008	856	394
	Friday 0500-0200	2013	435	258
	Saturday 0700-0400	2008	688	386
	Saturday 0400-0200	2013	322	169
	Saturday 0200-0200	2016	482	234
Luton Station (private rank)	Friday 0700-0100	2006	?	231
	Friday 0700-0100	2008	236	211
	Friday 0700-0100	2013	263	202
	Friday 0700-0100	2016	197	151
	Saturday 0700-0400	2008	?	173
	Saturday 0700-0400	2013	352	194
	Saturday 0700-0600	2016	99	74
Luton Airport Parkway Station (private rank)	Friday 0700-0300	2008	241	208
	Friday 0600-0200	2013	321	231
	Friday 0800-0700	2016	283	216
	Saturday 0700-0100	2008	156	112
	Saturday 0600-0000	2013	178	110
Galaxy Private rank	Friday 2000-0400	2006	?	36
	Friday 2000-0400	2008	?	36
	Friday 2000-0600	2013	157	94
	Friday 2000-0600	2016	17	10

The table only seeks to confirm the picture from the earlier sections – every rank, particularly those at night times, has seen falls in usage by passengers, with only two exceptions. The night ranks are particularly hard hit, with many not really being used much if at all any more by passengers entering hackney carriages. Nor are hackney carriages waiting that much at these locations suggesting the demand has gone away or gone elsewhere at some point over the last three years such that vehicles have responded by not considering there is any need to wait.

Summary of Total demand

The table below calculates a typical week from the observations undertaken in 2016 and compares to information from the previous survey. Ranks or pick-up locations are listed in descending order of passenger usage in 2016.

Rank	Pass per week, 2013 survey	Pass per week 2016 survey
Park St	5049 (31)	3549 (32)
Luton Airport	2658 (16)	3133 (28)
Luton Airport Parkway Station	1872 (11)	1840 (16)
Luton Station	1945 (12)	1035 (9)
Wellington St	1240 (8)	923 (8)
Casino	676 (4)	480 (4)
Manchester St	2125 (13)	264 (2)
Galaxy Centre	550 (3)	101 (1)
Upper George St	348 (2)	0 (0)
Ice Diamond	56 (0.0)	0 (0)
Bar 32	n/a	0 (0)
Totals	16519	11325
% change		-31%

Note – Total includes all observations at relevant points as available, both sets factored to full week from detail available.

Since 2013, there has been a 31% drop in observed demand of hackney carriages in the Luton licensed area. Whilst Park St has retained its share of the rank market, the level of passengers is down 30%. Night demand has fallen significantly and only the Airport showed any real growth (18% increase, and a 12 percentage point increase on the share). All other ranks have seen real decline in patronage. The highest decline in significant real and share terms is at Manchester Street together with no real use of Upper George Street at all now, and a big drop for the Galaxy Centre.

Comparison of this trend to other areas is provided below in the synthesis section of the report.

Plate activity levels

A sample of plate numbers were collected during the rank surveys to identify the level of activity of the fleet during the survey. Observations covered each part of the area near to key ranks (but not at the ranks) – covering a total of 8.5 hours on the Saturday of the surveys. This was to identify the level of activity of the fleet and to test if there was any 'playing up' by the trade to the survey. Five key locations were included.

Our brief was to observe any vehicles which appeared to be 'taxis' and to record if they were WAV or saloon style, noting Luton plate numbers, and the registration plates of any vehicles we either could not see the Luton plate for or which were not Luton plates. We then ensured all registration numbers were translated to Luton plate numbers (both hackney carriage and private hire) as far as possible using the up to date plate list at the time of the survey. Any 'illegal' apparent Luton plate numbers were also recoded as 'out of town'.

200 different vehicle movements were recorded. Of these, 125 were Luton hackney carriages. These accounted for 67 different vehicles, 40% of the fleet (47% were seen in 2013). 77 different Luton private hire vehicles were recorded together with 9 vehicles which were not Luton private hire, one of which was seen three times and another twice. The level of Luton private hires was much higher than in 2013, but the out of town level was reduced. This tends to suggest that some of the drop in usage of hackney carriages from ranks might be a transfer of these passengers to private hire use.

Of the hackney carriages, one was seen seven times, two were seen five times, eight were seen four times, six three times, eight twice and 42 just once.

Application of the ISUD index

The industry standard index of significant unmet demand (ISUD) has been used and developed since the initial Government guidance that limits could only apply if there was no significant unmet demand for the service of hackney carriage vehicles. Initially developed by a university, it was then adopted by one of the consultant groups undertaking surveys, developed further by them in the light of various court challenges, and most recently adopted as an 'industry standard' test utilised by most current practitioners of unmet demand studies.

The index is principally used to identify a statistical guide if observed unmet demand is in fact significant. Early in the process of developing the index, a cut-off point of 80 was identified beneath which no conclusion of unmet demand being significant had been drawn, and over which all studies had concluded there was significant unmet demand. This level has become accepted as the guide. Once unmet demand has been identified as significant it is usual for a calculation to be undertaken to identify the exact number of new licences needed in order to reduce the significance of the unmet demand below the threshold – although this cannot be an exact science in terms of outcomes due to the high number of parameters involved in determining where new licences actually end up working – there is no way to guarantee that licences will focus on reducing the unmet demand at all.

The ISUD calculations draw from various elements of the work, reflecting statistics which seek to capture components of 'significant unmet demand' although principal inputs are from the rank surveys, factored to produce a typical week of observations based on the knowledge available to us.

For Luton, where there are several ranks which need an extra permit, we have calculated two estimates, one for just the council ranks, and another for all ranks including those requiring supplementary permits. The council rank for which there is an agreement with the nearby premises was counted as a council rank in this case.

The current index has two elements which can negate the need for use of the index by setting the value to zero. The first test relates to if there are any daytime hours (Monday to Friday 1000 to 1800) where people are observed to queue for hackney carriages. Using the direct outputs from the

survey a value of 15.6% is estimated, and 14.6% with the private ranks included.

The other index that could be zero – proportion of passengers in hours in which waits occurred which was over 1 minute – was 0.5% and 0.3% when the private ranks are included.

The seasonality index is 1.0 since the surveys were undertaken in March 2016.

The area does not exhibit peaked demand, so this factor is 1.0.

Average passenger delay in minutes across the whole survey is 0.08 minutes (or five seconds). This value is constant for both the council ranks and when the private ranks are added in.

From the public attitude work, the latent demand factor is 1.028, assuming all who did not give an answer had not ever given up waiting.

The ISUD index is the multiple of all the above. Using detailed numbers (but then rounding) the calculated value is 0.67 or 0.38 when the private ranks are included. This is well short of the cut-off value of 80 suggesting there is no unmet demand in the Luton area which is significant at this point in time. This result takes on board both patent (measurable) and latent demand. This needs to be considered with other evidence to understand the right course of action with plate numbers but it is unlikely that this guide value would be reversed by other evidence.

As in 2013, this again provides evidence that ranks where there are private agreements tend to get better service. This is also indicated by the only rank classified as getting 'excellent' service being the Airport rank.

Comparison to previous studies

The ISUD index was used in the 2013 study. The Table below shows the change in specific indices between the two surveys to give an indication of the movement of the market between these two studies (where information is available). The surveys were all undertaken at the same time of year, so the seasonality index was 1.0 in all cases and has not been reported. There will be some differences arising from the specific sample hours used but in general an outline comparison is informative on the state of the hackney carriage market in Luton over the last three years.

Element	2013	2016
Average wait (mins)	0.05	0.08
Peak factor	1.0	1.0
% Queues in weekday daytime hours	17 to 15	15.6 to 14.6
% pass in hours with waiting over 1 minute	16 to 12	0.5 to 0.3
Latent demand	1.02	1.028
Overall index	14 to 9	0.67 to 0.38

Overall, service in Luton to passengers has generally improved since 2013. This is likely given the reduction in demand and the retention of the same number of vehicles, though the slight increase in average waiting is counter to this (and may suggest that supply has reduced, as hinted at by the lower level of vehicles observed active).

Further discussion occurs below to make use of this information in the decision regarding the significance or otherwise of unmet demand.

4. Public Consultation results

A fourteen question survey was undertaken with 250 persons in the Luton Council area (421 were obtained in 2013 including two samples of 50, one at Leagrave and the other near the night life of the town). Surveys were undertaken on Thursday 3rd March 2016 in the shopping area and near Luton station. The night surveys were on Friday 8th March whilst the Leagrave surveys were on Tuesday 8th March 2016. Responses were mainly from those available during the day time, following standard practise for these interviews, apart from those specifically targeted in late night establishments. The Table in **Appendix 3** summarises the overall responses.

64% of those interviewed had used a licensed vehicle in the Luton Council area in the last three months, a very good level of recent usage. The level was the same in all but the Luton station sample, which showed the lowest recent usage (even this was 56%). This was marginally less than in 2013 (68%) but showed the same patterns across the area. Variation was less than in 2013.

Of the respondents who told us they had used a licensed vehicle recently, a high 87% said how often they used a licensed vehicle. We have assumed the remaining non-respondents do not use licensed vehicles and calculated the average level of licensed vehicle trips per month. On average, there are 3.5 person trips by licensed vehicle per month based on these assumptions, a good level. This is reduced from the level of 4.8 in 2013.

The most reduced value compared to 2013 is that for the central area and the station, with night values only slightly reduced whilst the Leagrave value has increased further to 5.2 trips. This is compared to hackney carriage specific values below.

A very high proportion of interviewees told us how they obtained licensed vehicles in the Council area. Some gave multiple answers. By far the highest percentage got taxis by booking them by telephone (53%), followed by mobile or smart phone (31%), with the total by phone methods being 85%. Just 9% said they got them from ranks but 6% said their normal method was hailing (very high, exclusively in Luton day and night samples). The only place with relatively high rank usage at 25% was Luton station.

Compared to 2013 telephone shows a significant increase whilst ranks have dropped significantly in usage. However, hailing had increased significantly and particularly so for the night group.

The use of phones was queried further, seeking to understand the companies that people used. Across the full survey 63% of people suggested 226 mentions of companies. Just 7% suggested three companies, 29% two and 64% one – suggesting relative loyalty to companies. The highest number of mentions were 27% of the total to one company. The second highest mentioned company obtained 18%, then 17%, 15% and 7.5%. The remaining 21 (some of which may be phone numbers for the main companies or other references to them) did not get more than 1% of the responses.

Interestingly, in between the top five companies and the lesser companies were just under 3% who said they user Uber. The hackney carriage circuits do not appear to gain any significant mention.

A set of questions were then asked relating specifically to use of hackney carriages. A very high 88% of those questioned provided hackney carriage usage frequencies. However, 63% said they could not remember when they had last used a hackney carriage. 3% said they could not remember seeing a hackney carriage in the area. Overall, the number of trips per person per month from the stated frequencies of use of hackney carriages was 0.4, or 11% of that quoted for total licensed vehicles. As in 2013 there was no real usage of hackney carriages in Leagrave despite the high usage of licensed vehicles overall there. Interestingly, the night value (which fell least for overall licensed vehicles) halved for hackney carriages to a level of just 0.3 trips per person per month. This tends to support the rank surveys which demonstrated a high reduction in usage of rank based vehicles at night. However, the largest reduction in hackney carriage usage overall is during the daytime where values estimated have fallen from two trips per person per month to just 0.6, although overall licensed vehicle usage is also down.

People were asked to name all the rank locations they were aware of in the Council area and if they used the locations they named or not. 76% of respondents gave at least one response. Only at Luton Station did anyone mention three ranks, and not that many mentioned two (28% of people). Of the 251 different mentions given, there were 14 different names (some of which may be the same location). 48% of mentions were of the station rank followed by the generic 'town centre' (18%), then 'University' (5% - not clear where), and Wellington Street (3%).

Of all the responses, just 34% said they used the ranks they named. Other than a few colloquial names, and the generic High Street, people really only knew of four ranks, and none mentioned Manchester Street by name. This does suggest need for better advertising / mapping of ranks and marketing of this information. The situation seems worse than in 2013.

When asked about new locations, the whole sample provided only six suggestions none of which were therefore significant, particularly as they were only mentioned by a total of 14 people, and even more so as most were already locations with ranks.

In terms of problems with the local hackney carriages service, 108 people responded, giving 137 responses. This is 43% of those interviewed, much higher than the 9% in 2013. Of these responses, 69% were price. The next largest response was driver issues, just 12%, then position of ranks 6%. The issue of price has grown in significance whilst rank position has dropped and driver issues stayed about the same. This suggests that better driver training and better marketing of ranks might reduce issues people have with hackney carriages in the area, although the normal issue of price swamps as in most locations.

The counter question was asked, what might increase peoples' usage of hackney carriages. As normal, there was more response, some 206 total responses from those responding. 71% said cheaper fares, 12% better drivers with no other response higher than 5% and the rank issue not really much mentioned.

People were asked if they or anyone they knew had a disability needing either a wheel chair accessible licensed vehicle, or a vehicle adapted in some other way. All responded, 96% saying they did not need, nor know anyone who needed a WAV. Of the small response, four referred to needing WAV and seven to needing some other kind of vehicle – suggesting there may be an issue with service to the disabled, though this level of response is very low. However, this is a different response to 2013 where most people said they needed WAV if needing an adapted vehicle. This may tie up with the need for more focus on service to customers noted in the earlier questions about issues and matters which would increase usage.

Of those answering if they had ever given up waiting for a hackney carriage, just eight people said they had. One said they had given up waiting at home, which was discounted as this was most likely waiting for a private hire vehicle. One said they had given up waiting at the station, another two said 'town', one said university and the others did not give a location.

None of those interviewed either near the station or at Leagrave said they had ever given up waiting for a hackney carriage – different to the 5% in 2013. However, the proportion giving up in the night sample (which was zero in 2013) was now the highest (8%).

We have assumed all remaining seven total responses are legitimate which provides a latent demand estimate of 2.8%, or 1.028 in terms of the ISUD index values. This is an increase from the level of 2% identified in 2013, though not significant. However, the night increase does seem to back the observations showing little usage of ranks at night in 2016.

36% of those responding was full time employed. 20% were part time. 12% were full time students. 9% were self-employed and a further 8% retired. The full time proportion is reduced from the 53% of 2013.

43% said they had regular access to a car (higher than in 2013). 60% lived in Luton, 29% in Leagrave and 6% elsewhere in the Borough. This is generally similar to 2013.

Our gender sample saw a much higher proportion of women interviewed than in the Census (59% compared to 49%). More in the younger age groups responded than in the census, with the highest over-response from the 18-24 age group. The over 65 group was particularly badly represented. This was however similar to the 2013 bias, however, this does not appear to have significantly affected the results.

In terms of ethnicity, the proportion of white british interviewed has dropped from 63% in 2013 to 39% now. Everyone gave information for this question in 2016. Several groups saw around 8% of the sample, East European, black / black British Caribbean, mixed white and black African and Asian / Asian British / Pakistani. Representatives were obtained of nearly every group requested.

In general, these results are consistent with the rank results in showing decline in demand for hackney carriages across the area.

5. Stakeholder Consultation

The following key stakeholders were contacted in line with the DfT Best Practice Guidance 2010:

- Supermarkets
- Hotels
- Hospital
- Pubwatch / night clubs
- Disability representatives
- Police
- Rail operators
- Other council contacts
- County council contacts

Specific comments have been aggregated below to provide an overall appreciation of the current situation, although in some cases comments are specific to the needs of a particular stakeholder. It should be noted that the comments contained in this Chapter are the views of those consulted, and not that of the authors of this Report. **Appendix 4** provides further details of those consulted. Information was obtained by telephone / email / letter as appropriate. Contacts were made with a selection chosen from an extensive list provided by the Council as well as by checking internet sources for other contact details or more detailed references.

The licensed vehicle trade consultation is the subject of the following chapter.

Supermarkets

Five supermarkets were contacted. During the time available and following several attempts, three responses were obtained. All said their customers used licensed vehicles. One said customers walked to the rank directly outside the store. The other two said there were ranks but that people tended to use the Freephone within the store. The only issue that occurred was where vehicles blocked parking spaces at one of the stores.

Hotels

Six hotels were contacted. Five responded, all saying customers did use local licensed vehicles. Three would call for a vehicle from reception whilst two had direct Freephones. Only one was aware of a nearby rank, and another seemed to consider a booking office to be a rank. One had issues of arrival times being wrongly quoted whilst one other had issues with companies quoting one fare but then charging the passenger more, particularly if they were going to the Airport.

Restaurants / Night venues

Four restaurants, three entertainment venues, eight pubs and four night venues were contacted.

Two restaurants responded. One said their customers used licensed vehicles whilst another said they did 'sometimes'. These were usually tourists who asked for a 'taxi'. The other restaurant said customers would phone themselves. One was aware of a rank and neither had received any complaints nor had any issues with the service provided.

Just one entertainment venue responded. They explained they did have a private hire desk but that it was only there a few months. Most customers would phone themselves though most used the rank. They felt that the main use of hackney carriages was on Friday and Saturday nights. Their only issue was abuse of other car park spaces, though the vehicles usually moved on if asked.

Four public houses replied. All had customers that used licensed vehicles. One said customers asked for a taxi to be booked at the bar, another said customers walked to the nearby rank whilst the third said customers either phoned for themselves, or would ask for a taxi to be booked at the bar. The final pub called a private hire company for customers. Two central Luton pubs were aware of the nearby ranks. None had received complaints. The Leagrave establishment was aware of the rank at the station, but used a Dunstable based company for bookings as this was the most reliable company they had found.

Only one of the night clubs responded. One did not have any easily found contact number whilst two took messages but did not respond. The club responding said customers would either phone themselves or ask them to make a booking. They had a rank directly outside and phone calls were to the hackney carriage radio circuit – the only customer issues were time it sometimes took for a vehicle to arrive at the rank.

Hospitals

The Luton and Dunstable hospital was contacted but provided no response despite several attempts to speak with them.

Police

The police representative told us there has been a dramatic reduction in the number of larger venues within the Luton night time economy. This has reduced the market available for hackney carriages. They felt that the current level of supply of both hackney carriage and private hire was far beyond the level of demand at the present time.

Disability representatives

No response was obtained from those representing people with disabilities.

Luton Passenger Transport Unit

The representative from the PTU told us that there had been no change in the situation since 2013 – contracts are mixed in terms of being provided by both private hire and hackney carriage vehicles. The providers are contracted to provide the right kind of vehicle and driver and always do so. The main issue was that it often appeared that vehicles from other authorities tended to have lower operating costs and therefore were better placed to win these contracts, which could not be restricted to local authority vehicles.

Rail Operators

National statistics are publicly available showing the total number of entries and exits at each rail station in the United Kingdom. These numbers are calculated using ticket barrier and ticket issue information from ticket sales. The Table below shows information from 1997/1998 to date (the last year of data ending in March for the last year quoted, with information published the December after this date). The figures after the station name show the position in rank in terms of usage of English, Welsh and Scottish railway stations, with the smallest usage being the 2,539th station and the highest being 1st in the list (Waterloo, London). Within the Luton area there are three stations – Luton, Luton Airport Parkway and Leagrave. The detailed information is shown below for each of the three station, in order of patronage level at the current year.

Luton (136th)		
Rail year (ends March of latest year)	Entries / exits	Growth / decline
1997 / 1998	2,354,387	n/a
1998 / 1999	3,009,858	+28%
1999 / 2000	3,253,976	+8%
2000 / 2001	2,998,940	-8%
2001 / 2002	2,960,761	-1%
2002 / 2003	2,979,994	+1%
2004 / 2005	3,064,000	+3%
2005 / 2006	3,143,672	+3%
2006 / 2007	3,354,253	+7%
2007 / 2008	3,548,183	+6%
2008 / 2009	3,436,718	-3%
2009 / 2010	3,187,434	-7%
2010 / 2011	3,261,278	+2%
2011 / 2012	3,440,310	+5%
2012 / 2013	3,443,910	+0.0%
2013 / 2014	3,443,450	+0.0%
2014 / 2015	3,548,262	+3%
Overall	97/98 to 14/15	+51%
Since last survey		+3%

Luton Airport Parkway (199th)		
Rail year (ends March latest year)	Entries / exits	Growth / decline
1997 / 1998	(6)	n/a
1998 / 1999	(3,717)	n/a
1999 / 2000	(325,801)	n/a
2000 / 2001	1,195,856	n/a
2001 / 2002	1,389,701	+16%
2002 / 2003	1,569,178	+13%
2004 / 2005	1,886,911	+20%
2005 / 2006	2,156,699	+14%
2006 / 2007	2,384,740	+11%
2007 /2008	2,628,187	+10%
2008 / 2009	2,589,262	-1%
2009 / 2010	2,338,658	-10%
2010 / 2011	2,312,120	-1%
2011 / 2012	2,429,582	+5%
2012 / 2013	2,504,794	+3%
2013 / 2014	2,567,224	+2%
2014 / 2015	2,754,700	+7%
Overall	00/01 to 14/15	+130%
Since last survey		+13%

Leagrave (300th)		
Rail year (ends March latest year)	Entries / exits	Growth / decline
1997 / 1998	745,047	n/a
1998 / 1999	988,487	+33%
1999 / 2000	1,115,346	+13%
2000 / 2001	1,168,833	+5%
2001 / 2002	1,226,852	+5%
2002 / 2003	1,253,018	+2%
2004 / 2005	1,341,713	+7%
2005 / 2006	1,413,294	+5%
2006 / 2007	1,524,828	+8%
2007 /2008	1,651,382	+8%
2008 / 2009	1,633,058	-1%
2009 / 2010	1,511,076	-7%
2010 / 2011	1,554,446	+3%
2011 / 2012	1,686,524	+8%
2012 / 2013	1,757,188	+4%
2013 / 2014	1,810,120	+3%
2014 / 2015	1,894,294	+5%
Overall	97/98 to 14/15	+154%
Since last survey		+12%

Since data began collection, rail patronage at Luton has increased 51%, compared to overall national growth in the same period of 126%. The last data available suggests over 3.5 million passengers enter or leave the station per year. Growth since the last survey has been in the order of just 3%.

Luton Airport Parkway grew 130% within the data available (it only opened after the statistics began being collected), and 13% in the last three years, with nearly 2.75m passengers in the last available year. Leagrave is the smallest station, but still lies 300th and nearly 1.9m passenger entries and exits. Since data began it has grown 154% and some 12% in the last three available years.

All these values suggest that demand for hackney carriages at stations should have increased between surveys, but it has not (see synthesis section).

The internet-based Train Taxi guide correctly states that Luton is a major station with taxis usually available on a rank. Advance booking 'is not normally necessary or even possible.'. There are three operators to phone, two of whom claim WAV vehicles. Luton Airport Parkway is listed with a rank or office (it has an active rank) and gives the same three operators as for Luton. Only the two hackney carriage radio companies advertise WAV.

Leagrave is listed with a rank or office – this is in fact a rank for one of the private hire companies listed (there is just one other company listed, which is the same one as that listed at the two above stations but without WAV). The top listed company claims WAV vehicles. There is also a suggestion people use Luton station instead of Leagrave.

No comment was obtained from the rail operator.

Luton Airport

London Luton Airport in 2015 saw some 12.2m passenger journeys making it the fifth busiest Airport in the UK at that time. In August 1997 the local Council gave the 30-year operating concession to a public private partnership which last changed its ownership in 2004. The current waiting area for taxis was set apart by the private airport operator and agreements set in place, at the time covering all 101 current plates. When further plates were issued these were not included in this agreement. We understand that the concession also provides that most highway within the airport boundary is no longer council highway but under the auspices of the Airport operator.

As in 2013, we obtained comment from the operator of Luton Airport, who are responsible for administering the private rank at the terminal. We had been advised at inception of this 2016 survey that the contract for this private area was being retendered during the course of our work. At the time of undertaking our survey, operation was exactly the same as in 2013, with one of the key hackney carriage radio operators with the contract, operated fully by Luton based WAV style hackney carriages, but only those with the first 101 plates, the remainder not being able to access this rank nor ply for hire within the airport boundary.

The Airport retendered operation of this location and the new contract was awarded to a national private hire company. The airport told us that the new contract sought to provide specific service levels for passengers. A key improvement sought within the contract was provision of younger and lower mileage vehicles, with the previous fleet tending to have no maximum age limit and consequently quite a few vehicles which seemed of lower standards than was preferred.

The Airport told us that they believe their tender process was fair and open and did not exclude the potential for the same group to have continued operating. They told us that the contract remains based on a fleet of entirely Luton based vehicles and drivers. Whilst there was no opportunity for a 'TUPE' style transfer several key details were put in place to encourage retention of current staff although this was on the basis of working through a company rather than as the previous group of individuals.

We were advised that the new company would offer jobs to any of the previous drivers and also consider any previous hackney carriage vehicle as long as that vehicle meets the new Airport standard, particularly in regard to age and mileage. The new contract will now encourage return trips particularly those which tend to end up within London, and used to have long empty return journeys. Any hackney carriage driver not wishing to replace their vehicle would be offered the opportunity to transfer to a new leased vehicle on the private hire side. The Airport strongly believe that their new contract will allow a continued increase in the level of trips made from the airport by 'taxi'.

Whilst the Airport accepts that there could be several vehicles which will now end up working in the remainder of Luton having been displaced, they also felt that even whilst our survey was under way, and while the old contract remained in place, 30-40% of the 101 vehicles tended to work in Luton and only came to the airport to meet known peak arrival times – which is easier with an airport with very clear flight arrivals being well known.

We were advised by the licensing section that the new contract began at midnight on 25/26 June 2016. This closely tied in with the start of Ramadan and we were advised many former hackney carriage drivers had taken time off and were only considering their reactions once the holiday had ended (around 8th July). At the time of reviewing and finalising this Report it did not appear that many if any former hackney carriages would transfer. Further discussion occurs in the synthesis chapter below.

6. Licensed Vehicle Trade Consultation

Trade consultation

As in 2013 trade consultation was undertaken by an 'all driver' consultation undertaken by council distribution of a letter and questionnaire prepared by ourselves and agreed with the Council. This was returned either by freepost or by entry using an online portal system. The draft report was then discussed face to face with a meeting with the trade in advance of the summary, synthesis and conclusions being written, with their formal comments added at the end of this Chapter.

The council issued the letter and questionnaire to some 458 drivers by SMS, of which 322 arrived successfully. This was felt to be the most secure and comprehensive way to effectively reach the maximum number. We received a total of 47 responses, around 15% of those successfully received, a very good level of response. This was, however, less than the 90 responses received in 2013. Of the 2016 responses, 96% were drivers of hackney carriages and the remaining 4% were private hire drivers – interestingly the same number as in 2013.

Taking all of the responses, the average length they claimed to have been part of the Luton taxi trade was just over 16 years, about two years more than in 2013. The range was between four and 34 years (35 in 2013).

People said they worked between three and seven days, with the most common and average response being six days. 47% said they worked six days. Just 4% worked three, and a further 4% worked four days, with 15% saying they worked seven days.

This equated to an average working week being just over 45 hours, with a range from five to 70 hours quoted. This is the same average as in 2013 although the longest period quoted is down from 84 hours, consistent with the rank results.

Drivers were asked the issues that affect their choice of shift. There were 24 responses to this question. The highest response was that family commitments affected their choice – 38% said this. The next largest determinant was 33% who said they worked when it was busiest. 17% said hours were determined by them sharing a vehicle. No other response was given by more than 4% of respondents (one person).

74% owned their own vehicle – very similar to 2013. 40% said someone else also drove their vehicle. In 2016, 46% said they operated on a hackney carriage circuit – a lower response than in 2013 when the level was very high at 81%. Three radio circuits were named, the largest taking 56% of responses, the next 38% and the final one just 6%. Both private hire drivers worked on private hire circuits and both worked for the same company.

134 responses were given regarding ranks worked. 29% of these were Park Street, 25% the airport, 16% Wellington Street, 10% Luton Station and 7% Luton Parkway Station. 6% said Manchester Street. Some said 'all' (4%) whilst one mentioned the Casino rank. No other rank was specifically mentioned.

In terms of issues with ranks, no-one provided any responses in 2016. In terms of the responses regarding how drivers obtained fares, 44% said ranks, 19% hailing, 15% school contracts, 12% private contracts and 10% phone bookings. These were based on multiple responses from drivers.

The attitude towards the limit on hackney carriage vehicle numbers was that 88% felt it should be retained. This is up from 83% in 2013. Were the limit removed, 66% of those responding said they would leave the trade, four said they would protest, two said they would seek a further job and two said they would be disappointed.

Of the responses about how the limit being retained worked to benefit the public, 45% said it helped cars always being available at ranks. 29% said it reduced pollution levels. 6% said it stopped over-ranking and congestion, 6% said it helped address public safety issues with 6% also saying it delivered a better service. A further 4% said it provided better drivers.

Many comments were given including:

- Too many vehicles already with queues at most ranks of vehicles waiting for passengers
- Too much demand being taken by private hire particularly out of town vehicles
- Some felt more plates were needed to allow competition with private hire
- One commented they would prefer to switch to a hackney carriage to enable them to take the many requests they had from people to use their vehicle which they had to turn down because they were private hire

7. Summary and conclusions

Policy Background

The policy background is set in the context that Luton remains a unitary authority with highway and transport powers for its own area. The local transport plan, LTP3 extends to cover Dunstable and Houghton Regis, with continued focus on development north of Luton Town centre and at the Airport. A key transport development added recently is the fixed link to be introduced between the Airport Parkway station and the Airport itself, which in due course may therefore reduce demand for buses and taxis on this specific route. As with many LTP documents, there is general support for hackney carriage and private hire vehicles but nothing specific or costed to support their operation.

Luton continues to exercise its power to restrict hackney carriage vehicle numbers in its area, at the same level as in 2013. It also continues its full 100% WAV vehicle policy for all hackney carriages in the licensing area.

Statistical Background

Whilst there has been some growth in private hire vehicle numbers since the last survey, in general this has only been marginal, whilst hackney carriage numbers remain the same. The level of drivers has generally dropped since the last survey, further reducing the level comparing driver and vehicle numbers and suggesting further reductions in any sharing of either kinds of vehicle. The main statistical change since 2013 has been a rise in the number of private hire operators, although these must have developed with gain of drivers from the current fleet given the only moderate change in vehicle numbers.

The authority remains the one with the highest level of hackney carriages compared to population within the vehicle limited authorities in the comparison undertaken. The level of private hires in the area is second highest and very close to the highest level of provision (Watford), with both private hire and total licensed vehicles being well beyond what the English average demonstrates.

Luton, with a 100% WAV hackney carriage fleet, is therefore well ahead of the other authorities in the area without such a policy, although this does lead to there being no private hire providing such a facility.

Comparisons suggest Luton fares are around average for the group compared.

Rank Survey results

A very similar level of rank surveys were undertaken compared to 2013, with 279 hours observed. The main change in the sample was separate observation of the Manchester Street feeder rank near the Galaxy Gym with the specific aim of checking how essential this area was to rank demand in the area.

The rank observations also covered abuse of ranks by other vehicle types, including private cars, emergency vehicles, delivery vehicles and private hire vehicles. Whilst abuse by private cars was low at 4%, the level of private hire operating at or near ranks at 25% was very high. The worst location for private hire potential abuse was Manchester Street where over the two days of observation, 532 vehicles left with some 378 passengers. Most left from the bus stop area adjacent to the rank.

One person was observed using a wheel chair to access a hackney carriage at the Luton Airport Parkway station rank whilst a further 106 cases were noted of drivers helping passengers into hackney carriages.

When factored to an average week, total estimated demand from hackney carriage ranks in the Luton area was some 11,325, a reduction overall of nearly a third in observable demand over the three years. Ironically, the only place with increased usage and market share was the Airport rank. Most other ranks saw around a 30% decline in usage, although many retained market share. Park Street was the busiest rank overall, and the closest to being a 24/7 rank, followed by the Airport rank.

The worst case was the significant drop in hackney carriage usage from Manchester Street rank, which in this survey saw just 2% of overall demand and almost a drop to a tenth of the level of demand observed in 2013. Comparing the private hire observations suggests there to be an overall drop in the use of licensed vehicles overall, but that private hire has increased its share of the market. This appears to be the continued impact of the recession and people choosing to reduce discretionary spending and perhaps focus its use towards more affordable similar means of travel.

We have undertaken other recent demand studies whose findings are now publicly available. These provide benchmarks for what is happening nationally. They demonstrate a range of change for hackney carriages. The picture for Oxford is similar to Luton with hackney carriage decline (there of 24% over the last three years), whilst in Reading the picture has seen 11% increase over the last three years. Comparing the last six years, Oxford has seen 14% decline whilst Reading has seen a massive 68% increase. We also saw a very positive response by the Reading hackney carriage trade to the research detail in the survey, with them considering how to react to the gaps in service to customers identified in the rank survey work.

The lesser use of hackney carriages appears to be matched by the fleet appearing to be less active than in 2013, with the proportion of the fleet observed in our plate tests dropping from 47% to 40%. Again, there was evidence of transfer of business to private hire who appeared to be more active than in 2013. This appears to be their determination to get the most out of what appears to be reducing overall demand for 'taxis' in the area.

Detailed comparisons enabled from our having undertaken the previous survey in 2013 demonstrate the highest reduced usage being for night ranks with many no longer really used now. The feeder rank at Manchester Street, given the high reduction in overall demand here, sees no real usage at all and is under strong pressure from highways for removal due to other significant pressures on highway kerb space in this important part of the central area.

Further clear evidence of the reduction in demand is the improvement seen in the ISUD elements, although average passenger wait had increased marginally as had latent demand. All other performance parameters had improved over the three years, giving a vastly reduced level of unmet demand across the area in 2016. However, there remains evidence that the private ranks see better service than the council ranks.

It must be remembered that all the above were statistics related to the period when the Airport rank remained fully serviced under the same conditions as in 2013, giving a like for like comparison as far as this is possible in terms of operating statistics. The impact of the loss of the airport contract to the hackney carriage fleet is discussed further in the synthesis section.

Public Consultation

A more cost effective level of 250 public interviews were held with people in the streets of Luton, including a late night sample and a sample in Leagrave as in 2013. There was marginally less recent usage of licensed vehicles, but still overall a very good level (64%). However, the overall level of usage of licensed vehicles taking into account frequency of usage has reduced from 4.8 to 3.5, with the hackney carriage level being 0.4 trips per person per month, with a lower level for the specific night sample at 0.3.

Compared to 2013, there has been a large reduction in rank usage and an increase in telephone methods of obtaining licensed vehicles. The Luton Station sample appeared to show highest use of ranks. The only positive for the hackney carriage trade was that hailing had increased and more so for those interviewed in the night sample.

Further evaluation of the companies people phoned showed relative loyalty to specific companies in the area. In this survey, the hackney carriage circuits do not get any significant mention. Further, 63% this time overall said they could not remember when they last used a hackney carriage in the Luton area.

Knowledge of ranks in the area seems worse than the situation in 2013. Few know specific names for ranks and a high number of colloquial names are used. There was no strong suggestion of need for any new ranks, many of the locations mentioned already having ranks there.

In this survey, a much higher proportion had issues with the hackney carriage service, but mostly its cost. The second largest issue, and similarly for matters that would increase usage, was 'driver issues'. This suggests better driver skills, and better marketing of rank locations, could increase hackney carriage usage.

In terms of disability usage, compared to 2013 when most preferred WAV style there was now more people saying their disabilities required some other kind of vehicle, not WAV. This could best be improved by better training.

The sample was representative, and results consistent with declining demand for hackney carriages across this area.

Stakeholder Consultation

Stakeholder results identified some of their customers aware of and using ranks, and some clearly mainly using private hire or phone facilities, some of which may have been to the hackney carriage radio companies. Whilst it is clear that private hire companies tend to dominate, there is clearly still a good market for hackney carriages from ranks, which is not always the case in these studies. The police told us of excess supply of both hackney carriage and private hire in the area.

Whilst there was now no possible response from rail operators, nationally available patronage data for stations in the area suggests there should have been increases – albeit small – of usage of ranks at stations. Luton Airport Parkway had in fact retained about the same level of usage and increased market share, whilst Luton station itself had lost demand and market share, the latter might be related to the current more distant location of this rank from the normal passenger routes, and the option of using a closer private hire booking office along the other exit from the station.

Just one wheel chair customer was observed accessing hackney carriages at ranks during the survey. 106 further cases of drivers assisting passengers were observed. No other persons were found to discuss any issues related to those with disabilities.

The Airport operator provided detailed response, but more related to the future change rather than the operation at the time of the survey, with which our understanding is they remained pleased with to the end, as did customers using the service.

Trade Consultation

The trade consultation saw less response than in 2013, but the same split between hackney carriage and private hire. The level of response remained high in comparison to other similar surveys. Current levels of experience were greater than those quoted in 2013 at over 16 years. The average working week of 45 hours was similar to 2013, though the maximum time worked quoted had reduced to 70 hours.

The level of those saying they worked on a hackney carriage radio circuit was significantly reduced to 46% compared to 81% in 2013. There were three hackney carriage radio circuits named with the largest gaining 56% of responses and the smallest 6%. The other circuit obtained 38% of responses. In this survey there was a much stronger response that the limit should be retained with some 88% saying this now compared to 83% in 2013.

Synthesis and Conclusions

It is even clearer in 2016 compared to 2013 that there is no unmet demand in the Luton area, either at private or council ranks, which can be seen to be significant at this point in time. Once again, there is no need to add any further plates from the point of view of any lack of service either to council ranks, to hailing, or to the general public in the area use of hackney carriages.

It must also be remembered that this conclusion was made before the change to the Airport rank contract. Holding the survey at this point was very timely as it captured the final picture of operations similar to those in 2013 and has been very useful to identify the situation at a very key point before significant change occurred.

There has been a general decline in usage of licensed vehicles in the area over the last three years. However, the private hire trade seems to have fared better and competed more for trade than the hackney carriage side, which appears to have lost more trade than on the private hire side. Whilst some of this can be attributed to 'inappropriately met demand' where private hires make themselves available very near to hackney carriage ranks, particularly in Manchester Street, and might be returned to hackney carriages with increased enforcement, it is also possible that people are trying to make the most of their money by choosing the cheaper alternative of a private hire booking. This would be heightened by active promotion by private hire companies of their lower prices, as noted before seeking to get the most of what appears to be a reducing market.

There is a better service at ranks now due to the reduced level of demand than three years ago. However, there does seem to be much less supply at Manchester Street, and many of the smaller night ranks are now not used at all by hackney carriages expecting trade. This may be part of the reason for the marginal increase in the latent demand element.

There remains need to improve signing and visibility of the key central area ranks at Manchester Street, Wellington Street and Park Street. These should be seen as the focus of active ranks in the area, both for day and night demand. There also appears to be a need for the hackney carriage trade to have a strong focus on customer service, which could also see further increases in usage. The sign of hope is the apparent increase in levels of hailing observed.

Consideration could be given to removing some of the now redundant night ranks. This could allow those areas to be encouraged as focus points for private hire to pick up legitimate passengers. Were the authority solicitors happy to do so, the option of applying a no go area around ranks for private hires could have been applied (as occurs in Mid Sussex Council to good effect).

All the above conclusions remain valid despite the significant change taking place with the airport provision.

It now remains necessary to consider the impact of the loss of the Airport contract on service to other ranks in the main central area. Impact on the two private station ranks is likely to be lower as these are also partly restricted by need for a supplementary permit, so the main consideration is the impact increasing supply at the central ranks at a time of reducing demand. This section of the report was completed in July 2016 in conjunction with Council licensing officers, but has not been updated to take account of any emerging details since that time.

Some assumptions have been made to clarify the potential impact of this change:

- The change cannot be influenced by the council, the contract was always with the Airport and led by the Airport authority as their right on their own (albeit concessioned) private land
- Estimates from the Airport suggest up to 40% of the 101 plates also serviced town ranks and perhaps gave up to four hours per day at the Airport helping meet peaks
- Only the former 101 plates able to service the airport can transfer to the new arrangements at the present time
- The Airport advised us the new contract will only operate with drivers and vehicles registered in Luton under Luton Council licensing conditions.
- There are certain conditions for vehicles, particularly in terms of age applied in the new contract
- The new Airport fleet will contain saloon and WAV style vehicles the proportion of which is not determined
- At the present time there are only limited opportunities to grow hackney carriage demand in the town itself

Who will end up working on this contract remains fluid as the relationship between the Airport and drivers is now with the company holding the contract, who then have contracts with the individual drivers. At the time of writing this Report we understand most former airport focused Hackney carriages took a break when the contract ended on 25 June. This was partly related to many drivers celebrating Ramadan which is now over. It had not become clear if any would transfer.

Our data from the driver survey found 25% said they served the Airport – some 43 plates. Our survey day found a maximum vehicle queue during the Saturday of 45 vehicles. Peak vehicle demand in any hour was 21. Average occupancy was over 2 passengers per vehicle. Vehicle waiting time for a fare was about two hours. If there was an average return to rank time of two hours this would also tend towards an estimate of 42 vehicles needed to meet this peak.

From our assumptions above, the Airport thought there were about sixty full time vehicles servicing with 30 to 40 others only covering peaks. Some informal information from licensing suggested the initial operation was working fairly well with 60 full time vehicles but did have some issues with some peaks, consistent with our assumptions above.

The worst case scenario would be that all current 101 hackney carriages now become fully available to service the central area ranks. This would have serious repercussions for all hackney carriages and more so for those currently focussing on servicing the central area. However, passengers would benefit from more vehicles being available, and it may lead to more vehicles waiting in Manchester Street and some supplanting of private hires from there. This is entirely in the hands of the individuals now finding themselves not working as they were up to June 26th.

Using our assumed figures however, some 40 vehicles were already servicing the Airport at specific times, so would be only adding some extra hours in the town, although some 60 vehicles would be added to the 47 who already focussed on the central ranks (allowing for 20 vehicles to have their focus on the two rail station ranks). This implies up to a doubling of vehicles seeking demand from three ranks. This would potentially halve the remuneration for each vehicle as the worst case. There is a linked issue that those who have focussed on the airport service over many years may find the town rank customers and destinations / remuneration much different to what they are used to.

Speculation about what might happen at the Airport is just that at present. However, we were requested to add these thoughts to this report to set any conclusions about unmet demand in the new context. Whilst some might suggest this invalidates the current survey, the present unknowns would also confirm that even if a new survey was now felt necessary, it would need to be at least six months after the new modus operandi were clearly bedded in. Adding such consideration will also allow the Committee to think through potential reactions so that any response needed can be taken promptly and in a prepared manner than if such thinking was not put out at this time.

It is very unlikely that all 101 hackney carriages will be willing to upgrade where necessary and meet the new vehicle criteria. Were that to happen, some of the aims of the new contract, of adding saloon vehicles, might not be obviated. A potential scenario could be that the new contract needs 100 vehicles and drivers. If it is assumed 50 are saloons and 50 are hackney carriages transferring to an appropriate WAV style vehicle, the balance of 50 hackney carriage vehicles thus displaced might transfer fully to the town, a much less serious impact but still a significant one. It could be that 40 of these are actually those that already only gave a few hours to the Airport in any event, which would be much less serious an issue.

It is also possible that some of the hackney carriage owners might hand back their plates and take up the offer of a company saloon style vehicle. The best option in this case would therefore be that the council sets a moratorium on new plates, as done in Birmingham, which would imply that such plates were extinguished as handed back. This would help match supply with demand. Or the Council could take the view that offering such plates for issue might allow fresh blood to be added to the hackney carriage trade, which may lead to new and innovative service to potentially new rank locations and customers.

A key matter to be resolved in any event is if the present hackney carriage trade consider it possible to provide more service and obtain more passengers again at Manchester Street. We believe from our observations that some extra passengers could be gained from a more comprehensive service of this location. It would be prudent for the trade to agree together to document attempts to gain trade here, and then summarise their failure or success over perhaps a six-month period.

We are aware there are several requests for additional ranks to be provided in the developing town centre. However, we do believe that the time needed to develop these should not be invested before insight is gained into the potential for improving service and usage of Manchester Street. In 2013 this rank appeared to be developing well and it is not totally clear why this has not continued.

Further, there are current options available for developing hackney carriage trade, such as apps, which could help the hackney carriage trade to regain some of the market share lost to private hire companies, unless again clear evidence can be provided that this option was not viable for Luton.

All these 'trade' options need concerted business effort from the current trade to develop. We have seen this in other areas and believe it is possible for Luton. If there is no available ability to undertake such development, the Council may wish to see vehicle owners with new ideas, abilities, and energies allowed place in the hackney carriage trade to develop the business further, to the benefit of people in Luton. If the Council does not see this within a maximum of a year, and if plates are not released from the Airport change to allow this, it may be the option of removing the limit,

or switching the managed growth back on, might be necessary for the sake of both the economy of Luton and for the health of the overall 'taxi' trade.

8. Recommendations

Limits on the number of hackney carriage vehicles

There is **no evidence** of any unmet demand for hackney carriages either patent or latent which is significant at this point in time in the Luton area. The committee is therefore able to retain the current policy and limit at the present level and defend this if necessary.

Rank provision

Rank provision is currently suitable although there is significant need for better signage particularly for the three key ranks which are used well.

At the present time it would be unwise to allow highways to take back any ranks identified as unused, with it being prudent for the council to arrange regular walk-round surveys to see if any of the unused ranks are sparked back into life by any additional vehicles migrating from the airport. The key area where there is an opportunity to grow hackney carriage demand is at Manchester Street, where this could see some supplanting of private hire demand, although this is by no means certain as the public are choosing on the basis of cost as well as availability.

We believe that the trade needs to demonstrate the lack of viability and good reasons for this at Manchester Street before any other entirely new rank options could be considered by the Council.

Future review of hackney carriage demand

The Council should ensure that record is kept that, unless legislation or guidance changes, the next review of unmet demand ensures that fresh rank surveys are undertaken no later than March or April 2019 with relevant accompanying research by an independent review body.

It would be prudent that the licensing section produce a summary of the known impacts from the Airport change once a full six months has transpired. This would need summary information considering increased usage of central ranks and any impacts from over-ranking. It could also take on board any summary produced by the trade from their point of view. This could then be considered by councillors to see if any change was needed to vehicle limit policy, as discussed in various options above.

Trade development opportunities

The trade needs to seek to promote itself as far as possible particularly by a concerted effort to continue to improve their customer service, and in particular to pay attention to ensuring that vehicles give a modern and efficient appearance at all times.

It would be prudent for record to be kept of trade attempts to win back passengers and develop the offer from hackney carriages at Manchester Street. This would be critical in identifying what options there are for developing other ranks, and in demonstrating current trade commitment to development of their business, and how they were reacting positively to the various current challenges.

The Wellington Street and Park Street ranks have much less opportunity to see extra vehicles waiting, and any over-ranking here should be strongly discouraged with the focus being to get extra vehicles to service Manchester Street. There may be an option to dissuade private hire from this area were the legal background felt to apply similar rules to those in Mid Sussex.

Impact of airport contract

The council should keep itself informed of how the airport contract delivery pans out. This should be possible by monitoring plate handbacks and issue of private hire licences, as well as by noting any upgrading of older hackney carriages between plates 1 and 101. Changes to plates beyond 101, ie those not theoretically affected by the airport change directly, should be recorded separately. It will be valuable to compare the impact on the two parts of the fleet separately to see if there is any significant change due to the airport change or not.

We would recommend that a policy of a moratorium on licences be introduced with any plate handbacks from plates 1 to 101 being extinguished up to a level of no more than 60 plates (allowing for the 40 approximate vehicles that were servicing the central area as well as the airport in any event). Plates handed back from the generally available fleet should be kept for reissue so that those wishing to introduce fresh blood to the industry, or develop innovative service ideas would not be unduly restrained.

Appendix 1 – Planned Video Observation Hours

		Park Street and feeder	Luton Railway Station	Luton Airport Parkway Station	Luton Airport	Manchester Street	Wellington Street	Bridge Street / Galaxy (exit from centre not taxi lane)	Upper George Street	Park Street West (Casino)	New Bedford Road o/s Galaxy Gym	Midland Road (Bar 32)	Cheapside Ice Diamond	Hours
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	
Friday	04:00													0
Friday	05:00													0
Friday	06:00													0
Friday	07:00		Lost	Lost										0
Friday	08:00	Lost	1			Lost	Lost				Lost			1
Friday	09:00		2	1			1							3
Friday	10:00	1	3	2		1	2				1			6
Friday	11:00	2	4	3		2	3				2			6
Friday	12:00	3	5	4		3	4				3			6
Friday	13:00	4	6	5		4	5				4			6
Friday	14:00	5	7	6		5	6				5			6
Friday	15:00	6	8	7		6	7				6			6
Friday	16:00	7	9	8		7	8				7			6
Friday	17:00	8	10	9		8	9				8			6
Friday	18:00	9	11	10		9	10				9			6
Friday	19:00	10	12	11		10	11				10			6
Friday	20:00	11	13	12		11	12	1			11			7
Friday	21:00	12	14	13		12	13	2			12			7
Friday	22:00	13	15	14		13	14	3	1		13			8
Friday	23:00	14	16	15		14	15	4	2		14			8
Friday	00:00	15	17	16		15	16	5	3					7
Saturday	01:00	16	18	17		16	17	6	4					7
Saturday	02:00	17	19	18	1	17	18	7	5					8
Saturday	03:00	18	20	19	2	18	19	8	6					8
Saturday	04:00	19	21	20	3	19	20	9	7					8
Saturday	05:00	20	22	21	4	20	21	10						7
Saturday	06:00	21	23		5	21	22							5
Saturday	07:00	22	24		6	22	23							5
Saturday	08:00	23	25		7	23	24							5

Saturday	09:00	24	26		8	24	25							5
Saturday	10:00	25	27		9	25	26							5
Saturday	11:00	26	28		10	26	27							5
Saturday	12:00	27	29		11	27	28							5
Saturday	13:00	28	30		12	28	29							5
Saturday	14:00	29	31		13	29	30							5
Saturday	15:00	30	32		14	30	31							5
Saturday	16:00	31	33		15	31	32							5
Saturday	17:00	32	34		16	32	33							5
Saturday	18:00	33	35		17	33	34							5
Saturday	19:00	34	36		18	34	35							5
Saturday	20:00	35	37		19	35	36			1				6
Saturday	21:00	36	38		20	36	37			2				6
Saturday	22:00	37	39		21	37	38			3		1	1	8
Saturday	23:00	38	40		22	38	39			4		2	2	8
Saturday	00:00	39	41		23	39	40			5		3	3	8
Sunday	01:00	40	42		24	40	41			6		4	4	8
Sunday	02:00	41	43			41	42			7		5	5	7
Sunday	03:00	42	44			42	43			8		6	6	7
Sunday	04:00	43	45			43	44			9		7	7	7
Sunday	05:00	44				44	45							3
Sunday	06:00	45					46							2
Total hours at site		45	45	21	24	44	46	10	7	9	14	7	7	279
														279
														280

Appendix 2 – Detailed rank observation results

Location	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time in Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Park Street	F	04/03/16	9	2	2	1	1	33%	3	00:16:13	00:17:15	00:29:00						
Park Street	F	04/03/16	10	35	30	1.2	0	0%	30	00:09:00	00:09:00	00:20:00						
Park Street	F	04/03/16	11	54	43	1.3	0	0%	43	00:07:34	00:07:34	00:17:00						
Park Street	F	04/03/16	12	47	35	1.3	1	3%	36	00:05:28	00:05:23	00:15:00	00:00:16	00:01:51	7			00:04:00
Park Street	F	04/03/16	13	44	34	1.3	1	3%	35	00:06:54	00:07:00	00:17:00						
Park Street	F	04/03/16	14	52	38	1.4	0	0%	38	00:07:04	00:07:04	00:14:00						
Park Street	F	04/03/16	15	54	41	1.3	1	2%	42	00:10:18	00:10:14	00:21:00						
Park Street	F	04/03/16	16	61	46	1.3	0	0%	46	00:05:33	00:05:33	00:14:00						
Park Street	F	04/03/16	17	63	41	1.5	0	0%	41	00:04:47	00:04:47	00:09:00	00:00:01	00:01:00	2			00:01:00
Park Street	F	04/03/16	18	62	38	1.6	0	0%	38	00:04:38	00:04:38	00:31:00	00:00:40	00:01:54	22			00:04:00
Park Street	F	04/03/16	19	13	9	1.4	0	0%	9	00:21:25	00:23:10	00:28:00						
Park Street	F	04/03/16	20	14	10	1.4	2	17%	12	00:16:00	00:15:35	00:34:00						
Park Street	F	04/03/16	21	13	8	1.6	1	11%	9	00:15:10	00:16:24	00:31:00						
Park Street	F	04/03/16	22	2	2	1	0	0%	2	01:02:30	00:55:00	01:10:00						
Park Street	F	04/03/16	23	4	2	2	2	50%	4	00:38:45	00:36:40	00:43:00						
Park Street	F	05/03/16	0	13	7	1.9	1	12%	8	00:20:46	00:20:25	00:32:00						
Park Street	F	05/03/16	1	12	5	2.4	2	29%	7	00:33:51	00:41:00	00:45:00						
Park Street	F	05/03/16	2	1	1	1	6	86%	7	00:09:15	00:01:00	00:01:00						
Park Street	F	05/03/16	3	0	0	0	5	100%	5	00:07:30	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Park Street	F	05/03/16	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	00:03:00	00:03:00	00:03:00						
Park Street	F	05/03/16	5	2	1	2	0	0%	1	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Park Street	F	05/03/16	6	1	1	1	2	67%	3	00:10:48	00:12:00	00:14:00						
Park Street	F	04/03/16		421	549	394	1.4	25	6%	419			00:00:06		31	0	0	00:04:00

Location	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time in Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Park Street	Sa	05/03/16	7	10	7	1.3	2	22%	9	00:16:12	00:08:20	00:14:00						
Park Street	Sa	05/03/16	8	8	1	1	4	80%	5	00:35:37	00:39:20	00:51:00						
Park Street	Sa	05/03/16	9	16	17	1.2	1	7%	15	00:19:48	00:19:48	00:34:00						
Park Street	Sa	05/03/16	10	32	48	33	1.5	1	3%	34	00:07:20	00:07:25	00:16:00	00:00:03	00:03:00	1		00:03:00
Park Street	Sa	05/03/16	11	37	49	34	1.4	0	0%	34	00:10:45	00:10:46	00:19:00					
Park Street	Sa	05/03/16	12	32	52	34	1.5	2	6%	36	00:08:35	00:08:15	00:16:00					
Park Street	Sa	05/03/16	13	55	85	51	1.7	0	0%	51	00:04:05	00:04:05	00:10:00	00:00:01	00:01:00	2		00:01:00
Park Street	Sa	05/03/16	14	54	87	55	1.6	0	0%	55	00:05:08	00:05:07	00:13:00					
Park Street	Sa	05/03/16	15	49	85	51	1.7	1	2%	52	00:05:07	00:05:07	00:16:00					
Park Street	Sa	05/03/16	16	45	76	44	1.7	1	2%	45	00:06:38	00:06:38	00:17:00					
Park Street	Sa	05/03/16	17	44	61	44	1.4	0	0%	44	00:06:06	00:06:06	00:16:00					
Park Street	Sa	05/03/16	18	25	34	24	1.4	2	8%	26	00:08:45	00:08:54	00:22:00					
Park Street	Sa	05/03/16	19	11	15	10	1.5	1	9%	11	00:20:00	00:20:36	00:30:00					
Park Street	Sa	05/03/16	20	9	11	8	1.4	2	20%	10	00:16:13	00:16:51	00:34:00					
Park Street	Sa	05/03/16	21	5	5	3	1.7	1	25%	4	00:25:24	00:25:24	00:33:00					
Park Street	Sa	05/03/16	22	8	11	8	1.4	1	11%	9	00:19:45	00:20:00	00:35:00					
Park Street	Sa	05/03/16	23	9	21	8	2.6	0	0%	8	00:16:26	00:17:22	00:24:00					
Park Street	Sa	06/03/16	0	11	13	6	2.2	3	33%	9	00:16:21	00:18:30	00:29:00					
Park Street	Sa	06/03/16	1	13	18	12	1.5	3	20%	15	00:12:18	00:11:36	00:25:00					
Park Street	Sa	06/03/16	2	9	4	4	1	6	60%	10	00:11:40	00:13:15	00:28:00					
Park Street	Sa	06/03/16	3	10	10	5	2	6	55%	11	00:09:30	00:09:40	00:24:00					
Park Street	Sa	06/03/16	4	2	0	0	0	2	100%	2	00:03:30	00:00:00	00:00:00					
Park Street	Sa	06/03/16	5	5	4	2	4	67%	6	00:05:12	00:07:00	00:13:00						
Park Street	Sa	06/03/16	6	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00					
Park Street	Sa	06/03/16	7	1	3	1	3	0	0%	1	00:09:00	00:09:00	00:09:00					
Park Street	Sa	05/03/16		500	719	459	1.6	43	9%	502			00:00:00		3	0	0	00:03:00

Location	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Wellington St	F	04/03/16	9	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Wellington St	F	04/03/16	10	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Wellington St	F	04/03/16	11	18	19	14	1.4	2	12%	16	00:10:10	00:11:00	00:23:00					
Wellington St	F	04/03/16	12	14	20	13	1.5	1	7%	14	00:07:34	00:07:50	00:18:00					
Wellington St	F	04/03/16	13	14	16	13	1.2	3	19%	16	00:08:42	00:10:32	00:26:00					
Wellington St	F	04/03/16	14	14	13	12	1.1	0	0%	12	00:17:12	00:17:12	00:29:00					
Wellington St	F	04/03/16	15	15	14	10	1.4	1	9%	11	00:23:36	00:23:47	00:41:00					
Wellington St	F	04/03/16	16	18	30	21	1.4	0	0%	21	00:08:26	00:08:26	00:22:00	00:00:46	00:02:18	10		00:04:00
Wellington St	F	04/03/16	17	10	21	12	1.8	0	0%	12	00:11:30	00:11:30	00:24:00	00:00:51	00:03:00	6		00:04:00
Wellington St	F	04/03/16	18	5	5	4	1.2	0	0%	4	00:22:24	00:20:45	00:35:00					
Wellington St	F	04/03/16	19	3	5	3	1.7	1	25%	4	00:36:00	00:18:30	00:19:00					
Wellington St	F	04/03/16	20	2	0	0	0	1	100%	1	02:09:30	00:18:00	00:18:00					
Wellington St	F	04/03/16	21	0	2	1	2	0	0%	1	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00					
Wellington St	F	04/03/16	22	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00					
Wellington St	F	04/03/16	23	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00					
Wellington St	F	05/03/16	0	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1	02:45:00	02:45:00	02:45:00					
Wellington St	F	05/03/16	1	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00					
Wellington St	F	05/03/16	2	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00					
Wellington St	F	05/03/16	3	2	1	1	1	50%	2	00:17:30	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Wellington St	F	05/03/16	4	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1	01:51:00	00:00:00	00:00:00					
Wellington St	F	05/03/16	5	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00					
Wellington St	F	05/03/16	6	0	0	0	0	1	100%	1	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00					
Wellington St	F	04/03/16		117	146	104	1.403846154	13	11%	117			00:00:17		16	0	0	00:04:00

Location	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Wellington St	Sa	05/03/16	7	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Wellington St	Sa	05/03/16	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	00:30:00	00:40:30	01:06:00						
Wellington St	Sa	05/03/16	9	2	1	1	1	50%	2	00:35:00	00:35:00	00:50:00						
Wellington St	Sa	05/03/16	10	10	12	7	1.7	30%	10	00:10:54	00:11:08	00:17:00						
Wellington St	Sa	05/03/16	11	11	14	8	1.8	27%	11	00:16:16	00:16:00	00:20:00						
Wellington St	Sa	05/03/16	12	9	15	8	1.9	0%	8	00:19:40	00:19:40	00:32:00						
Wellington St	Sa	05/03/16	13	12	20	10	2	29%	14	00:09:45	00:10:37	00:24:00	00:00:28	00:10:00		1		00:10:00
Wellington St	Sa	05/03/16	14	23	41	18	2.3	5%	19	00:12:07	00:12:38	00:33:00	00:00:11	00:04:00	1	1		00:07:00
Wellington St	Sa	05/03/16	15	15	21	15	1.4	6%	16	00:21:44	00:21:09	00:34:00						
Wellington St	Sa	05/03/16	16	15	17	12	1.4	14%	14	00:24:08	00:22:46	00:37:00						
Wellington St	Sa	05/03/16	17	10	25	13	1.9	7%	14	00:17:48	00:17:48	00:27:00						
Wellington St	Sa	05/03/16	18	8	11	6	1.8	14%	7	00:38:45	00:20:45	00:29:00						
Wellington St	Sa	05/03/16	19	1	0	0	0	100%	2	07:45:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Wellington St	Sa	05/03/16	20	1	0	0	0	100%	1	07:13:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Wellington St	Sa	05/03/16	21	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Wellington St	Sa	05/03/16	22	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Wellington St	Sa	05/03/16	23	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Wellington St	Sa	06/03/16	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Wellington St	Sa	06/03/16	1	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Wellington St	Sa	06/03/16	2	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Wellington St	Sa	06/03/16	3	1	0	0	0	100%	2	01:45:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Wellington St	Sa	06/03/16	5	0	0	0	0	100%	1	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Wellington St	Sa	06/03/16	6	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Wellington St	Sa	05/03/16		121	177	98	1.8	19%	121				00:00:06		1	2	0	00:10:00

Location	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time in Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Manchester St	F	04/03/16	9	1	1	1	0	0%	1	00:13:00	00:13:00	00:13:00						
Manchester St	F	04/03/16	10	4	1	1	0	0%	1	00:25:45	00:24:30	00:25:00						
Manchester St	F	04/03/16	11	3	2	2	3	75%	4	00:13:00	00:19:00	00:21:00						
Manchester St	F	04/03/16	12	1	3	3	0	0%	3	00:02:00	00:02:00	00:02:00						
Manchester St	F	04/03/16	13	4	2	2	1	33%	3	00:04:30	00:04:40	00:08:00						
Manchester St	F	04/03/16	14	4	5	4	1.2	20%	5	00:20:00	00:21:00	00:32:00						
Manchester St	F	04/03/16	15	11	9	8	1.1	20%	10	00:06:38	00:07:46	00:20:00						
Manchester St	F	04/03/16	16	4	5	5	1	0%	5	00:14:45	00:14:45	00:26:00						
Manchester St	F	04/03/16	17	6	5	4	1.2	33%	6	00:06:00	00:06:30	00:10:00						
Manchester St	F	04/03/16	18	3	5	2	0	33%	3	00:04:20	00:02:30	00:04:00						
Manchester St	F	04/03/16	19	1	0	0	0	100%	1	00:25:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Manchester St	F	04/03/16	20	1	0	0	0	100%	1	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Manchester St	F	04/03/16	21	3	0	0	3	100%	3	00:04:20	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Manchester St	F	04/03/16	22	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Manchester St	F	04/03/16	23	1	5	1	5	0%	1	00:04:00	00:04:00	00:04:00						
Manchester St	F	05/03/16	0	1	0	0	0	100%	1	00:01:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Manchester St	F	05/03/16	3	2	0	0	0	100%	1	00:08:30	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Manchester St	F	05/03/16	4	0	0	0	0	100%	1	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Manchester St	F	05/03/16	5	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Manchester St	F	05/03/16	6	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Manchester St	F	04/03/16		50	43	32	1.3	36%	50									

Location	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Manchester St	Sa	05/03/16	7	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Manchester St	Sa	05/03/16	8	1	0					00:14:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Manchester St	Sa	05/03/16	9	1	0		2	100%	2	00:03:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Manchester St	Sa	05/03/16	10	3	0		2	100%	2	00:25:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Manchester St	Sa	05/03/16	11	4	1	1	4	80%	5	00:03:30	00:06:00	00:06:00						
Manchester St	Sa	05/03/16	12	3	1	1	1	50%	2	00:07:00	00:09:30	00:19:00						
Manchester St	Sa	05/03/16	13	3	6	3	2	0%	3	00:13:20	00:16:00	00:31:00						
Manchester St	Sa	05/03/16	14	7	3	2	1.5	75%	8	00:05:42	00:02:00	00:03:00						
Manchester St	Sa	05/03/16	15	6	2	2	1	33%	3	00:28:10	00:27:00	00:36:00						
Manchester St	Sa	05/03/16	16	3	4	3	1.3	40%	5	00:14:00	00:16:00	00:17:00						
Manchester St	Sa	05/03/16	17	6	7	4	1.8	33%	6	00:07:30	00:07:00	00:13:00						
Manchester St	Sa	05/03/16	18	6	7	5	1.4	29%	7	00:04:30	00:05:00	00:14:00	00:02:00	00:07:00	0	2	0	00:07:00
Manchester St	Sa	05/03/16	19	1	0	0	0	0%	0	00:23:00	00:23:00	00:23:00						
Manchester St	Sa	05/03/16	20	1	1	1	1	50%	2	00:10:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Manchester St	Sa	05/03/16	21	2	0	0	2	100%	2	00:01:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Manchester St	Sa	05/03/16	22	2	1	1	1	0%	1	00:02:30	00:04:00	00:04:00						
Manchester St	Sa	05/03/16	23	2	2	1	2	67%	3	00:02:30	00:04:00	00:04:00						
Manchester St	Sa	06/03/16	0	1	0	0	0	100%	1	00:02:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Manchester St	Sa	06/03/16	1	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Manchester St	Sa	06/03/16	2	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Manchester St	Sa	06/03/16	3	1	0	0	0	100%	1	00:21:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Manchester St	Sa	06/03/16	4	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Manchester St	Sa	06/03/16	5	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Manchester St	Sa	05/03/16		53	35	24	1.5	55%	53				00:00:24		0	2	0	00:07:00

Location	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
New Bedford Rd	F	04/03/16	10	1	0	0	1	100%	1	00:01:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
New Bedford Rd	F	04/03/16	11	1	0	0	1	100%	1	00:01:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
New Bedford Rd	F	04/03/16	12	2	2	1	2	50%	2	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:04:00	00:04:00	2			00:04:00
New Bedford Rd	F	04/03/16	13	1	0	0	0	0%	0	00:47:00	00:47:00	00:47:00						
New Bedford Rd	F	04/03/16	14	0	2	1	2	0%	1	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
New Bedford Rd	F	04/03/16	15	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
New Bedford Rd	F	04/03/16	16	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
New Bedford Rd	F	04/03/16	17	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
New Bedford Rd	F	04/03/16	18	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
New Bedford Rd	F	04/03/16	19	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
New Bedford Rd	F	04/03/16	20	1	0	0	1	100%	1	00:02:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
New Bedford Rd	F	04/03/16		6	4	2	4	67%	6				00:02:00		2	0	0	00:04:00

Location	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Upr George St	F	04/03/16	22	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Upr George St	F	04/03/16	23	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Upr George St	F	05/03/16	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Upr George St	F	05/03/16	1	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Upr George St	F	05/03/16	2	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Upr George St	F	05/03/16	3	2	0	0	2	100%	2	00:02:30	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Upr George St	F	05/03/16	4	1	0	0	0	0%	0	00:09:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Upr George St	F	05/03/16	5	0	0	0	1	100%	1	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Upr George St	F	04/03/16	3	0	0	0	3	100%	3									

Location	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time in Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Casino	Sa	05/03/16	20	6	0	0	6	100%	6	00:01:50	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Casino	Sa	05/03/16	21	5	0	0	3	100%	3	00:15:48	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Casino	Sa	05/03/16	22	7	2	1	7	88%	8	00:12:00	00:09:00	00:09:00						
Casino	Sa	05/03/16	23	12	9	5	4	44%	9	00:24:20	00:27:46	00:47:00						
Casino	Sa	06/03/16	0	11	24	13	0	0%	13	00:13:00	00:13:00	00:27:00						
Casino	Sa	06/03/16	1	15	23	12	1	8%	13	00:15:08	00:15:08	00:26:00						
Casino	Sa	06/03/16	2	18	33	20	0	0%	20	00:09:30	00:09:30	00:17:00						
Casino	Sa	06/03/16	3	13	18	13	1	7%	14	00:14:50	00:13:55	00:23:00						
Casino	Sa	06/03/16	4	10	11	7	1	12%	8	00:16:00	00:14:30	00:28:00	00:00:27	00:05:00	1			00:05:00
Casino	Sa	06/03/16	5	0	0	0	3	100%	3	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Casino	Sa	05/03/16		97	120	71	1.7	27%	97				00:00:02		1	0	0	00:05:00

Location	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Ice Diamond	Sa	05/03/16	22	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Ice Diamond	Sa	05/03/16	23	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Ice Diamond	Sa	06/03/16	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Ice Diamond	Sa	06/03/16	1	1	0	0	1	100%	1	00:01:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Ice Diamond	Sa	06/03/16	2	1	0	0	1	100%	1	00:04:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Ice Diamond	Sa	06/03/16	3	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Ice Diamond	Sa	06/03/16	4	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Ice Diamond	Sa	05/03/16	2	0	0	0	2	100%	2									

Location	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of Vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time in Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Mid Rd Bar 32	Sa	05/03/16	22	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Mid Rd Bar 32	Sa	05/03/16	23	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Mid Rd Bar 32	Sa	06/03/16	0	1	0	0	1	100%	1	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Mid Rd Bar 32	Sa	06/03/16	1	2	0	0	2	100%	2	00:01:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Mid Rd Bar 32	Sa	06/03/16	2	1	0	0	1	100%	1	00:01:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Mid Rd Bar 32	Sa	06/03/16	3	1	0	0	1	100%	1	00:02:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Mid Rd Bar 32	Sa	06/03/16	4	1	0	0	1	100%	1	00:02:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Mid Rd Bar 32	Sa	05/03/16	6	0	0	0	6	100%	6									

Location	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time in Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Luton Station	F	04/03/16	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	00:12:20	00:12:20	00:15:00						
Luton Station	F	04/03/16	8	21	16	1	1	6%	17	00:18:28	00:18:30	00:43:00						
Luton Station	F	04/03/16	9	11	18	11	0	0%	11	00:59:21	00:58:54	01:30:00						
Luton Station	F	04/03/16	10	5	5	4	1	20%	5	00:58:48	00:58:48	01:23:00						
Luton Station	F	04/03/16	11	5	14	10	0	0%	10	00:19:48	00:19:48	00:32:00						
Luton Station	F	04/03/16	12	3	6	4	0	0%	4	00:31:40	00:31:40	00:44:00						
Luton Station	F	04/03/16	13	9	14	8	0	0%	8	00:14:46	00:14:46	00:20:00						
Luton Station	F	04/03/16	14	14	13	10	0	0%	10	00:23:34	00:23:34	00:34:00						
Luton Station	F	04/03/16	15	7	10	9	1	10%	10	00:28:00	00:28:30	00:36:00						
Luton Station	F	04/03/16	16	13	14	9	0	0%	9	00:24:32	00:24:32	00:33:00						
Luton Station	F	04/03/16	17	8	22	15	0	0%	15	00:09:07	00:09:07	00:23:00						
Luton Station	F	04/03/16	18	17	11	11	0	0%	11	00:26:38	00:25:18	00:55:00						
Luton Station	F	04/03/16	19	24	24	21	4	16%	25	00:08:50	00:09:37	00:25:00	00:00:40	00:04:00	2	2	0	00:06:00
Luton Station	F	04/03/16	20	24	28	21	0	0%	21	00:18:42	00:13:56	00:27:00						
Luton Station	F	04/03/16	21	15	1	1	16	94%	17	00:20:08								
Luton Station	F	04/03/16	22	9	0	0	13	100%	13	00:05:06								
Luton Station	F	04/03/16	23	20	0	0	15	100%	15	00:14:09	00:18:00	00:18:00						
Luton Station	F	05/03/16	0	9	1	1	9	90%	10	00:32:20								
Luton Station	F	05/03/16	1	5	0	0	9	100%	9	00:21:36								
Luton Station	F	05/03/16	2	2	0	0	3	100%	3	01:35:30								
Luton Station	F	05/03/16	3	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00								
Luton Station	F	05/03/16	4	1	0	0	0	0%	0	02:03:00								
Luton Station	F	05/03/16	5	0	0	0	1	100%	1	00:00:00								
Luton Station	F	05/03/16	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	00:33:00	00:33:00	00:37:00						
Luton Station	F	04/03/16		227	197	151	73	33%	224				00:00:05		2	2	0	00:06:00

Location	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time in Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Luton Station	Sa	05/03/16	7	7	4	3	1.3	4	57%	7	00:28:17	00:13:00	00:13:00					
Luton Station	Sa	05/03/16	8	5	0		5	100%	5	00:46:24	00:45:20	00:56:00						
Luton Station	Sa	05/03/16	9	6	5	4	1.2	0	0%	4	00:40:50	00:40:12	00:53:00					
Luton Station	Sa	05/03/16	10	7	6	5	1.2	2	29%	7	00:34:00	00:32:00	00:37:00					
Luton Station	Sa	05/03/16	11	6	10	7	1.4	2	22%	9	00:26:40	00:25:12	00:39:00					
Luton Station	Sa	05/03/16	12	6	9	7	1.3	0	0%	7	00:18:20	00:18:20	00:21:00					
Luton Station	Sa	05/03/16	13	7	5	4	1.2	1	20%	5	00:42:17	00:44:00	01:56:00					
Luton Station	Sa	05/03/16	14	3	5	2	2.5	0	0%	2	01:31:20	01:31:20	01:43:00					
Luton Station	Sa	05/03/16	15	7	8	6	1.3	1	14%	7	00:23:08	00:21:40	00:39:00					
Luton Station	Sa	05/03/16	16	16	18	16	1.1	0	0%	16	00:20:11	00:20:11	00:30:00					
Luton Station	Sa	05/03/16	17	13	17	12	1.4	1	8%	13	00:24:32	00:24:25	00:37:00					
Luton Station	Sa	05/03/16	18	19	10	6	1.7	13	68%	19	00:15:56	00:07:00	00:08:00					
Luton Station	Sa	05/03/16	19	22	0	0	0	18	100%	18	00:18:30	00:24:00	00:24:00					
Luton Station	Sa	05/03/16	20	10	1	1	1	11	92%	12	00:34:06	00:00:00	00:00:00					
Luton Station	Sa	05/03/16	21	16	0	0	0	20	100%	20	00:13:22	00:00:00	00:00:00					
Luton Station	Sa	05/03/16	22	19	0	0	0	18	100%	18	00:11:50	00:00:00	00:00:00					
Luton Station	Sa	05/03/16	23	16	0	0	0	13	100%	13	00:16:15	00:00:00	00:00:00					
Luton Station	Sa	06/03/16	0	15	0	0	0	15	100%	15	00:22:56	00:30:00	00:30:00					
Luton Station	Sa	06/03/16	1	8	1	1	1	5	83%	6	00:33:30	00:00:00	00:00:00					
Luton Station	Sa	06/03/16	2	7	0	0	0	13	100%	13	00:34:34	00:00:00	00:00:00					
Luton Station	Sa	06/03/16	3	1	0	0	0	2	100%	2	01:27:00	00:00:00	00:00:00					
Luton Station	Sa	06/03/16	4	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00					
Luton Station	Sa	06/03/16	5	0	0	0	0	1	100%	1	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00					
Luton Station	Sa	05/03/16		216	99	74	1.3	145	66%	219								

Location	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time in Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time	
Luton Apt Pkwy	F	04/03/16	8	20	25	18	1.4	1	5%	19	00:05:51	00:06:00	00:13:00						
Luton Apt Pkwy	F	04/03/16	9	39	54	35	1.5	0	0%	35	00:07:07	00:07:07	00:20:00	00:00:40	00:03:00	12	0	0	00:05:00
Luton Apt Pkwy	F	04/03/16	10	7	6	6	1	0	0%	6	00:52:08	00:52:40	01:06:00						
Luton Apt Pkwy	F	04/03/16	11	2	7	7	1	1	12%	8	00:30:00	00:30:00	00:35:00						
Luton Apt Pkwy	F	04/03/16	12	4	2	2	1	0	0%	2	00:19:00	00:19:00	00:31:00						
Luton Apt Pkwy	F	04/03/16	13	10	8	7	1.1	2	22%	9	00:14:18	00:14:51	00:39:00						
Luton Apt Pkwy	F	04/03/16	14	8	5	5	1	3	38%	8	00:32:37	00:32:36	00:42:00						
Luton Apt Pkwy	F	04/03/16	15	7	4	4	1	2	33%	6	00:23:08	00:22:10	00:27:00						
Luton Apt Pkwy	F	04/03/16	16	11	18	13	1.4	2	13%	15	00:06:43	00:06:20	00:16:00	00:00:06	00:01:00	2	0	0	00:01:00
Luton Apt Pkwy	F	04/03/16	17	19	17	15	1.1	1	6%	16	00:04:03	00:04:00	00:14:00	00:00:10	00:03:00	1	0	0	00:03:00
Luton Apt Pkwy	F	04/03/16	18	17	20	15	1.3	0	0%	15	00:14:42	00:14:42	00:39:00	00:00:33	00:03:40	3	0	0	00:05:00
Luton Apt Pkwy	F	04/03/16	19	17	21	18	1.2	0	0%	18	00:19:17	00:19:17	00:38:00						
Luton Apt Pkwy	F	04/03/16	20	11	15	11	1.4	0	0%	11	00:31:05	00:31:05	00:46:00						
Luton Apt Pkwy	F	04/03/16	21	8	13	11	1.2	0	0%	11	00:22:00	00:23:42	00:51:00						
Luton Apt Pkwy	F	04/03/16	22	8	1	1	1	2	67%	3	01:02:22	01:08:00	01:25:00						

Luton Apt Pkwy	F	04/03/16	23	9	9	8	1.1	1	11%	9	00:22:53	00:22:52	00:35:00					
Luton Apt Pkwy	F	05/03/16	0	19	28	19	1.5	0	0%	19	00:15:31	00:15:31	00:32:00					
Luton Apt Pkwy	F	05/03/16	1	10	15	10	1.5	0	0%	10	00:28:12	00:28:12	00:49:00					
Luton Apt Pkwy	F	05/03/16	2	8	10	8	1.2	2	20%	10	00:29:45	00:33:30	00:46:00					
Luton Apt Pkwy	F	05/03/16	3	3	4	2	2	3	60%	5	00:58:00	01:15:00	01:15:00					
Luton Apt Pkwy	F	05/03/16	4	1	1	1	1	1	50%	2	01:43:00	00:00:00	00:00:00					
Luton Apt Pkwy	F	05/03/16	5	1	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:05:00	00:00:00	00:00:00					
Luton Apt Pkwy	F	05/03/16	6	0	0	0	0	2	100%	2	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00					
Luton Apt Pkwy	F	04/03/16		239	283	216	1.3	23	10%	239				00:00:11	18	0	0	00:05:00

Location	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time In Hour	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Bridge St Galaxy	F	04/03/16	19	2	0	0	0	0	0	00:01:30	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Bridge St Galaxy	F	04/03/16	20	1	1	1	2	67%	3	00:30:00	00:30:00	00:30:00						
Bridge St Galaxy	F	04/03/16	21	5	2	2	4	80%	5	00:01:00	00:02:00	00:02:00						
Bridge St Galaxy	F	04/03/16	22	5	3	2	1.5	3	60%	5	00:03:36	00:01:00	00:02:00	00:00:20	00:01:00	1		00:01:00
Bridge St Galaxy	F	04/03/16	23	5	2	2	1	3	60%	5	00:06:00	00:10:00	00:14:00					
Bridge St Galaxy	F	05/03/16	0	4	2	1	2	3	75%	4	00:06:45	00:04:00	00:04:00					
Bridge St Galaxy	F	05/03/16	1	4	7	3	2.3	1	25%	4	00:02:15	00:02:40	00:08:00					
Bridge St Galaxy	F	05/03/16	2	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00					
Bridge St Galaxy	F	05/03/16	3	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00					
Bridge St Galaxy	F	05/03/16	4	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1	00:02:00	00:00:00	00:00:00					
Bridge St Galaxy	F	05/03/16	5	1	0	0	0	1	100%	1	00:04:00	00:00:00	00:00:00					
Bridge St Galaxy	F	04/03/16		28	17	10	1.7	18	64%	28			00:00:04		1			00:01:00

Location	Date	Hour	No of Vehicle Arrivals	Total Passenger Departures	Loaded Vehicle Departures	Average vehicle occupancy	Empty Vehicle Departures	% of vehicles leaving empty	Total Vehicle Departures	Average Vehicle Waiting Time	Average Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Maximum Vehicle Waiting Time (for a fare)	Average Passenger Waiting Time, those waiting only	Average Passenger Waiting Time in Hour	Number of people waiting 1-5 mins	Number of people waiting 6-10 mins	Number waiting 11 mins or more	Maximum passenger wait time
Luton Airport	Sa	05/03/16	2	2	0	0	2	100%	2	00:05:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Luton Airport	Sa	05/03/16	3	3	0	0	2	100%	2	00:06:20	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Luton Airport	Sa	05/03/16	4	3	0	0	3	100%	3	00:26:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Luton Airport	Sa	05/03/16	5	12	0	0	4	100%	4	01:18:40	01:52:51	02:20:00						
Luton Airport	Sa	05/03/16	6	11	1	1	2	67%	3	02:05:49	02:05:49	02:15:00						
Luton Airport	Sa	05/03/16	7	10	6	4	1.5	0%	4	02:14:36	02:14:36	02:37:00						
Luton Airport	Sa	05/03/16	8	7	24	12	2	0%	12	02:30:08	02:30:08	02:44:00						
Luton Airport	Sa	05/03/16	9	8	13	7	1.9	0%	7	02:02:00	02:02:00	02:07:00						
Luton Airport	Sa	05/03/16	10	9	22	10	2.2	0%	10	01:44:53	01:44:53	01:56:00						
Luton Airport	Sa	05/03/16	11	16	17	9	1.9	0%	9	01:48:15	01:48:15	02:00:00						
Luton Airport	Sa	05/03/16	12	15	35	10	3.5	0%	10	01:29:12	01:29:12	01:47:00						
Luton Airport	Sa	05/03/16	13	15	46	21	2.2	0%	21	01:34:52	01:34:52	01:44:00						
Luton Airport	Sa	05/03/16	14	23	32	15	2.1	0%	15	02:00:13	02:00:13	02:54:00						
Luton Airport	Sa	05/03/16	15	14	37	21	1.8	0%	21	02:32:47	02:34:55	02:51:00						
Luton Airport	Sa	05/03/16	16	18	16	5	3.2	0%	5	02:48:00	02:48:00	03:02:00						
Luton Airport	Sa	05/03/16	17	14	24	12	2	8%	13	02:55:34	02:55:34	03:08:00						
Luton Airport	Sa	05/03/16	18	10	15	9	1.7	10%	10	02:42:36	02:42:36	02:52:00						
Luton Airport	Sa	05/03/16	19	15	42	18	2.3	0%	18	02:25:52	02:25:52	02:39:00						
Luton Airport	Sa	05/03/16	20	15	28	13	2.2	0%	13	02:14:56	02:14:56	02:28:00						
Luton Airport	Sa	05/03/16	21	14	31	18	1.7	0%	18	02:23:42	02:23:42	02:43:00						
Luton Airport	Sa	05/03/16	22	9	37	18	2.1	0%	18	02:30:46	02:30:46	02:41:00						
Luton Airport	Sa	05/03/16	23	11	18	10	1.8	0%	10	02:16:16	02:22:10	02:37:00						
Luton Airport	Sa	06/03/16	0	0	19	12	1.6	0%	12	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Luton Airport	Sa	06/03/16	1	0	19	9	2.1	18%	11	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Luton Airport	Sa	06/03/16	2	0	0	0	3	100%	3	00:00:00	00:00:00	00:00:00						
Luton Airport	Sa	05/03/16		254	482	234	2.1	8%	254									

Totals	284	2340	2871	1869	471	2340	150	12	0
--------	-----	------	------	------	-----	------	-----	----	---

Appendix 3 Public on street survey results

Q1: Have you used a taxi in this area?	Town		Night		Station		Leagrave		TOTAL	
Yes	66	66.00%	33	66.00%	28	56.00%	33	66.00%	160	64.00%
No	34	34.00%	17	34.00%	22	44.00%	17	34.00%	90	36.00%
Total	100	100.00%	50	100.00%	50	100.00%	50	100.00%	250	100.00%

Q2: How often do you use a taxi within this area?	Town		Night		Station		Leagrave		TOTAL	
Almost daily	6	8.00%	8	16.00%	2	4.65%	1	2.00%	17	7.80%
Once a week	5	6.67%	6	12.00%	5	11.63%	9	18.00%	25	11.47%
A few times a month	26	34.67%	10	20.00%	8	18.60%	11	22.00%	55	25.23%
Once a month	12	16.00%	6	12.00%	7	16.28%	6	12.00%	31	14.22%
Less than once a month	26	34.67%	20	40.00%	21	48.84%	23	46.00%	90	41.28%
Total	75	100.00%	50	100.00%	43	100.00%	50	100.00%	218	100.00%

Almost daily	20
Once a week	4
A few times a month	2
Once a month	1
Less than once a month	0.5

Resulting estimate of trips per person per month	2.5	3.8	3.3	5.2	3.5
---	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------

Q3: How do you normally book a taxi within this area?	Town		Night		Station		Leagrave		TOTAL	
At a Taxi rank	7	7.87%	7	7.87%	10	25.00%	2	3.08%	26	9.19%
Hail in the street	8	8.99%	8	8.99%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	16	5.65%
Telephone a company	43	48.31%	43	48.31%	19	47.50%	45	69.23%	150	53.00%
Use a Freephone	1	1.12%	1	1.12%	0	0.00%	1	1.54%	3	1.06%
Use my mobile or smart phone	30	33.71%	30	33.71%	11	27.50%	17	26.15%	88	31.10%
Other - ONLINE	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	89	100.0%	89	100.0%	40	100.0%	65	100.0%	283	100.0%

Q4: If you book a taxi by phone, which 3 companies do you call most often?	Town		Night		Station		Leagrave		TOTAL	
Go	21	29.17%	9	21.43%	9	23.68%	22	29.73%	61	26.99%
Tiger	12	16.67%	5	11.90%	11	28.95%	13	17.57%	41	18.14%
Circle	17	23.61%	13	30.95%	3	7.89%	5	6.76%	38	16.81%
Spearhead	6	8.33%	3	7.14%	3	7.89%	23	31.08%	35	15.49%
Silverline	4	5.56%	8	19.05%	4	10.53%	1	1.35%	17	7.52%
Uber	5	6.94%	1	2.38%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	6	2.65%
59ers	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	2.70%	2	0.88%
72's	2	2.78%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	0.88%
A1	1	1.39%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	1.35%	2	0.88%
All the 3's	1	1.39%	0	0.00%	1	2.63%	0	0.00%	2	0.88%
Britannia Cars	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	2.70%	2	0.88%
Circuit Cars	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	5.26%	0	0.00%	2	0.88%
Five Two's	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	5.26%	0	0.00%	2	0.88%
56 56 56	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	1.35%	1	0.44%
69 69 69	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	1.35%	1	0.44%
30 50 50	1	1.39%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.44%
40's	1	1.39%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.44%
50's	0	0.00%	1	2.38%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.44%
49ers	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	1.35%	1	0.44%
All the 5's	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	1.35%	1	0.44%
Ace	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	2.63%	0	0.00%	1	0.44%
Cheetah	0	0.00%	1	2.38%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.44%
Diamond	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	1.35%	1	0.44%
Luton Taxis	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	2.63%	0	0.00%	1	0.44%
Skyway Cars	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	2.63%	0	0.00%	1	0.44%
Would not disclose	1	1.39%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.44%
Viber	0	0.00%	1	2.38%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.44%
Total	72	100.00%	42	100.00%	38	100.00%	74	100.00%	226	4.87%

Q5: How often do you use a hackney carriage within the Luton area?		Town		Night		Station		Leagrave		TOTAL	
Almost daily		1	1.39%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.45%
Once a week		3	4.17%	1	2.04%	2	4.08%	0	0.00%	6	2.73%
A few times a month		6	8.33%	3	6.12%	4	8.16%	0	0.00%	13	5.91%
Once a month		9	12.50%	2	4.08%	4	8.16%	1	2.00%	16	7.27%
Less than once a month		23	31.94%	4	8.16%	3	6.12%	8	16.00%	38	17.27%
I can't remember when I last used a hackney carriage		27	37.50%	37	75.51%	36	73.47%	39	78.00%	139	63.18%
I can't remember seeing a hackney carriage in the area		3	4.17%	2	4.08%	0	0.00%	2	4.00%	7	3.18%
Total		72	100.00%	49	100.00%	49	100.00%	50	100.00%	220	100.00%
Almost daily	20										
Once a week	4										
A few times a month	2										
Once a month	1										
Less than once a month	0.5										

Resulting estimate of trips per person per month	0.6	0.3	0.4	0.1	0.4
---	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------

Q6: Which ranks are you aware of in the Luton area?		Town		Night		Station		Leagrave		TOTAL	
Station		19	31.15%	18	36.73%	42	51.22%	42	71.19%	121	48.21%
Town Centre		28	45.90%	18	36.73%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	46	18.33%
Park Street		1	1.64%	1	2.04%	28	34.15%	13	22.03%	43	17.13%
University		3	4.92%	9	18.37%	0	0.00%	1	1.69%	13	5.18%
Wellington Street		0	0.00%	1	2.04%	7	8.54%	0	0.00%	8	3.19%
Airport		5	8.20%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	5	1.99%
Galaxy		0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	2.44%	0	0.00%	2	0.80%
Gordon Street		0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	1.22%	0	0.00%	1	0.40%
High Street		1	1.64%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.40%
Leagrave		2	3.28%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	0.80%
Luton Roundabout		1	1.64%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.40%
Near Farmfoods		0	0.00%	2	4.08%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	0.80%
Park Square		0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	2.44%	3	5.08%	5	1.99%
Shopping Area		1	1.64%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.40%
Total		61	100.00%	49	100.00%	82	100.00%	59	100.00%	251	100.00%

Q7: Is there anywhere in the Luton area you would like to see a rank?	Town		Night		Station		Leagrave		TOTAL	
Airport	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	7.14%
Asda	0	0.00%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	7.14%
Galaxy	4	40.00%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	5	35.71%
Night Clubs	0	0.00%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	7.14%
Shopping Centre	0	0.00%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	7.14%
Station	5	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	5	35.71%
Total	10	100.00%	4	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	14	100.00%

Q8: Have you had any problems with the local Hackney carriage service?	Town		Night		Station		Leagrave		TOTAL	
Design or type of vehicle	1	2.27%	0	0.00%	3	9.09%	0	0.00%	4	2.92%
Driver Issues	3	6.82%	1	3.70%	10	30.30%	3	10.71%	17	12.41%
Position of ranks	5	11.36%	3	11.11%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	8	5.84%
Delay in getting a Taxi	1	2.27%	1	3.70%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	1.46%
Cleanliness	4	9.09%	0	0.00%	1	3.03%	1	3.57%	6	4.38%
Price	30	68.18%	22	81.48%	19	57.58%	24	85.71%	95	69.34%
Other problems (specify)	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	5	3.65%
Total	44	100.00%	27	100.00%	33	100.00%	28	100.00%	137	100.00%

Q9: What would encourage you to use taxis or use them more often?	Town		Night		Station		Leagrave		TOTAL	
Better standard of vehicles	8	10.39%	0	0.00%	2	4.00%	0	0.00%	10	4.85%
More hackney carriages I could phone for	5	6.49%	5	12.82%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	10	4.85%
Better Drivers	8	10.39%	1	2.56%	11	22.00%	4	10.00%	24	11.65%
More hackney carriages I could hail or get at a rank	0	0.00%	1	2.56%	0	0.00%	1	2.50%	2	0.97%
Cheaper Fares	51	66.23%	25	64.10%	37	74.00%	33	82.50%	146	70.87%
Better located ranks	0	0.00%	3	7.69%	0	0.00%	1	2.50%	4	1.94%
Rank In ...	1	1.30%	1	2.56%	0	0.00%	1	2.50%	3	1.46%
Other	4	5.19%	3	7.69%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	7	3.40%
Total	77	100.00%	39	100.00%	50	100.00%	40	100.00%	206	100.00%

Q10. Do you consider you or anyone you know to have a disability that means you need an adapted vehicle?	Town		Night		Station		Leagrave		TOTAL	
No	97	97.00%	48	96.00%	45	90.00%	49	98.00%	239	95.60%
Yes - WAV	1	1.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.40%
someone I know WAV	1	1.00%	1	2.00%	1	2.00%	0	0.00%	3	1.20%
Yes, but not WAV	0	0.00%	1	2.00%	1	2.00%	0	0.00%	2	0.80%
Someone I know, but not WAV	1	1.00%	0	0.00%	3	6.00%	1	2.00%	5	2.00%
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	100	100.00%	50	100.00%	50	100.00%	50	100.00%	250	100.00%

Q11. Have you ever given up waiting for a taxi?	Town		Night		Station		Leagrave		TOTAL	
No	97	97.00%	46	92.00%	50	100.00%	50	100.00%	243	97.20%
Yes	3	3.00%	4	8.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	7	2.80%
Total	100	100.00%	50	100.00%	50	100.00%	50	100.00%	250	100.00%

Q12. Do you have regular access to a car?	Town		Night		Station		Leagrave		TOTAL	
Yes	49	49.00%	18	36.00%	24	48.00%	17	34.00%	108	43.20%
No	51	51.00%	32	64.00%	26	52.00%	33	66.00%	142	56.80%
Total	100	100.00%	50	100.00%	50	100.00%	50	100.00%	250	100.00%

Q13. Do you live in the Luton Borough Council area?	Town		Night		Station		Leagrave		TOTAL	
Yes - Luton itself	75	75.00%	39	78.00%	32	64.00%	4	8.00%	150	60.00%
Yes - Leagrave	12	12.00%	5	10.00%	11	22.00%	44	88.00%	72	28.80%
Yes - Another part of the Borough	6	6.00%	4	8.00%	4	8.00%	1	2.00%	15	6.00%
No	7	7.00%	2	4.00%	3	6.00%	1	2.00%	13	5.20%
Total	100	100.00%	50	100.00%	50	100.00%	50	100.00%	250	100.00%

Q14. Are you..?	Town		Night		Station		Leagrave		TOTAL	
Full Time Employed	45	45.00%	10	20.00%	17	34.00%	19	38.00%	91	36.40%
Part Time Employed	9	9.00%	9	18.00%	14	28.00%	18	36.00%	50	20.00%
Self Employed	9	9.00%	12	24.00%	1	2.00%	0	0.00%	22	8.80%
Unemployed	8	8.00%	3	6.00%	1	2.00%	1	2.00%	13	5.20%
Full Time Student	15	15.00%	8	16.00%	6	12.00%	1	2.00%	30	12.00%
Part Time Student	2	2.00%	1	2.00%	4	8.00%	5	10.00%	12	4.80%
Looking after home / family	4	4.00%	3	6.00%	1	2.00%	2	4.00%	10	4.00%
Long term sick / disabled	0	0.00%	2	4.00%	1	2.00%	0	0.00%	3	1.20%
Retired	8	8.00%	2	4.00%	5	10.00%	4	8.00%	19	7.60%
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	100	100.00%	50	100.00%	50	100.00%	50	100.00%	250	100.00%

Q15. Gender	Town		Night		Station		Leagrave		TOTAL	
1. Male	55	55.00%	15	30.00%	15	30.00%	18	36.00%	103	41.20%
2. Female	45	45.00%	35	70.00%	35	70.00%	32	64.00%	147	58.80%
Total	100	100.00%	50	100.00%	50	100.00%	50	100.00%	250	100.00%

Q16: Age	Town		Night		Station		Leagrave		TOTAL	
Under 18	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
18 - 24	29	29.00%	8	16.00%	16	32.00%	14	28.00%	67	26.80%
25 - 34	27	27.00%	17	34.00%	14	28.00%	20	40.00%	78	31.20%
35 - 44	22	22.00%	13	26.00%	5	10.00%	2	4.00%	42	16.80%
45 – 54	15	15.00%	7	14.00%	3	6.00%	4	8.00%	29	11.60%
55 – 64	6	6.00%	3	6.00%	7	14.00%	6	12.00%	22	8.80%
Over 64	1	1.00%	2	4.00%	5	10.00%	4	8.00%	12	4.80%
Total	100	100.00%	50	100.00%	50	100.00%	50	100.00%	250	100.00%

Q17: Ethnicity?	Town		Night		Station		Legrave		TOTAL	
White – British	28	28.00%	18	36.00%	29	58.00%	22	44.00%	97	38.80%
Mixed - White and Black African	10	10.00%	3	6.00%	2	4.00%	4	8.00%	19	7.60%
Asian / Asian British – Kashmiri	3	3.00%	1	2.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	4	1.60%
Black / Black British Carribean	6	6.00%	6	12.00%	4	8.00%	4	8.00%	20	8.00%
East European	17	17.00%	1	2.00%	0	0.00%	3	6.00%	21	8.40%
White – Irish	1	1.00%	0	0.00%	3	6.00%	1	2.00%	5	2.00%
Mixed - White ans Asian	2	2.00%	0	0.00%	1	2.00%	0	0.00%	3	1.20%
Asian / Asian British Bangladeshi	3	3.00%	2	4.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	5	2.00%
Black / Black British – African	11	11.00%	7	14.00%	5	10.00%	1	2.00%	24	9.60%
Other Asian	1	1.00%	2	4.00%	0	0.00%	1	2.00%	4	1.60%
Other White	9	9.00%	3	6.00%	1	2.00%	2	4.00%	15	6.00%
Other Mixed	1	1.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	2.00%	2	0.80%
Black Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Mixed - White and Black Carribean	0	0.00%	1	2.00%	1	2.00%	0	0.00%	2	0.80%
Asian / Asian British – Indian	2	2.00%	4	8.00%	4	8.00%	9	18.00%	19	7.60%
Chinese	1	1.00%	1	2.00%	0	0.00%	1	2.00%	3	1.20%
Asian / Asian British – Pakistani	5	5.00%	1	2.00%	0	0.00%	1	2.00%	7	2.80%
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	100	100.00%	50	100.00%	50	100.00%	50	100.00%	250	100.00%

Appendix 4 Stakeholder Feedback Diary

Chapter	Stakeholder Group / Person	Views returned?
5	Supermarkets	
	Tesco, Arndale Centre	Y
	Sainsbury's Dunstable Road	Y
	Lidl, Francis Street	N
	Asda, Wigmore Lane	Y
	Sainsbury's Bramingham Park	N
5	Hotels	
	Icon Hotel	Y
	Easy Hotel, Guildford Street	Y
	Leaside Hotel	N
	Stuart Hotel	Y
	The Chiltern Hotel	Y
	Luton Hotel Residence	Y
5	Hospital	
	Luton and Dunstable Hospital	N
5	Restaurants / cafes	
	Jimmy's	Y
	La Trattoria	Y
	Papa J's	N
	Rogon Leagrave	R
5	Entertainment	
	Galaxy Centre	Y
	Luton Library Theatre	N
	The Hat Factory	N
5	Pubwatch / night clubs	
	Diamond	N
	The White House	Y
	Bricklayers Arms	Y
	English Rose	N
	Wheelwright Arms	N
	O shea's	N
	Old Moat House, Leagrave	Y
	Biscot Mill, Leagrave	N
	Bramingham, Leagrave	Y
	Grosvenor G Casino	Y
	Bar 32	N
	Flame Bar	N

5	Disability representatives	
	Bramingham Centre (Janine Macey)	Y
	Chaul End Centre (Blossom Wilson)	e-mail
5	Other Council contacts	
	Mark Mullane, Passenger Transport Unit	e-mail
	Police	
	Craig Gurr, Bedfordshire Police	Y
	Luton Airport	
	First Capital Connect	
	Karl McCormack	Email
	Darran Marchant (APCOA)	Email
6	Hackney carriage and private hire trade	
	Javed Hussain	Meeting
	Mr Raja	Meeting
	Andy Geddes, Private Hire operator	e-mail