

Transport Committee

Raising the standard: licensing of taxis and private hire vehicles

First Report of Session 2026–27

HC 80

Transport Committee

The Transport Committee is appointed by the House of Commons to examine the expenditure, administration, and policy of the Department for Transport and its associated public bodies.

Current membership

[Ruth Cadbury](#) (Labour; Brentford and Isleworth) (Chair)

[Steff Aquarone](#) (Liberal Democrat; North Norfolk)

[Dr Scott Arthur](#) (Labour; Edinburgh South West)

[Mrs Elsie Blundell](#) (Labour; Heywood and Middleton North)

[Jacob Collier](#) (Labour; Burton and Uttoxeter)

[Olly Glover](#) (Liberal Democrat; Didcot and Wantage)

[Katie Lam](#) (Conservative; Weald of Kent)

[Alex Mayer](#) (Labour; Dunstable and Leighton Buzzard)

[Baggy Shanker](#) (Labour; Derby South)

[Rebecca Smith](#) (Conservative; South West Devon)

[Laurence Turner](#) (Labour; Birmingham Northfield)

Powers

The Committee is one of the departmental select committees, the powers of which are set out in House of Commons Standing Orders, principally in SO No. 152. These are available on the internet via www.parliament.uk.

Publication

This Report, together with formal minutes relating to the Report, was Ordered by the House of Commons, on 2 June 2026, to be printed. It was published on 10 June 2026 by authority of the House of Commons.
© Parliamentary Copyright House of Commons 2026.

This publication may be reproduced under the terms of the Open Parliament Licence, which is published at www.parliament.uk/copyright.

Committee Reports are published on the Committee's website at www.parliament.uk/transcom and in print by Order of the House.

Contacts

All correspondence should be addressed to the Clerk of the Transport Committee, House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA. The Committee's email address is transcom@parliament.uk.

Follow the work of committees on Bluesky [@HOCcommittees](#), [parliament.uk](#), Facebook [UK House of Commons Committees](#), Instagram [@UKCommonsCommittees](#), LinkedIn [House of Commons Committees](#), Reddit [u/UKCommonsCommittees](#), X [@HOCcommitteesUK](#) and YouTube [Commons Committees playlist](#).

Contents

	Summary	1
1	Introduction	3
	Defining taxis and private hire vehicles	3
	The workforce	3
	The value of the sector and the problems facing it	4
	The draft Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Bill	5
	Our inquiry	5
2	The legislative framework and stalled reform	6
	An outdated legislative framework	6
	App-based operators: a gap in the legislative framework	7
	Stalled reforms since 2010	8
3	Out-of-area working	11
4	Responsibility for licensing	15
5	Setting high national standards	18
	The government's proposal for national minimum standards	19
6	What should national standards include?	23
	Passenger safety	23
	“Fit and proper”	25
	Information sharing between licensing authorities and the police	26
	The NR3S and potential for a new national database	28
	CCTV	30
	Licensing efficiency	32
	English language and local knowledge tests	33
	Accessibility	35
	Complaints	39

7	Enforcement that stops at the border	42
	Conclusions and recommendations	46
	Appendix 1: Summary of the Committee’s private roundtable with taxi and private hire vehicle drivers (December 2025)	52
	Appendix 2: Summary of confidential written evidence	54
	Formal minutes	56
	Witnesses	57
	Published written evidence	58
	List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament	63

Summary

Taxis and private hire vehicles are a vital part of England's transport network. Yet for too long, the sector has operated within a legislative framework that has failed to keep pace with a rapidly modernising industry. Successive governments have sat on worthwhile reforms without acting. In the King's Speech in May 2026, the Government announced its intention to bring forward legislation to modernise taxi and private hire vehicle licensing: we welcome this. We urge the Government to ensure that app-based operators are fully reflected in the new legislative framework.

We heard compelling evidence that the scale of out-of-area working has undermined public confidence in the sector and made enforcement harder. At the same time, we recognise that modern travel does not conform neatly to administrative boundaries. The government should develop a plan, in consultation with the trade and local authorities, which incentivises drivers to operate and remain licensed in their local areas.

England currently has more than 260 licensing authorities, each applying its own standards, creating a huge level of fragmentation. We welcome that the government is legislating for national minimum standards, but it is crucial that minimum does not mean low by default. The standards should be set at a high enough level to avoid a lowest common denominator effect, and carefully specified to remove incentives for licence shopping.

Consistent safety standards would benefit both drivers and passengers by providing clarity and confidence. Crucially, they would ensure that passenger safety is universally high and not subject to variation above a basic minimum floor. The government should also establish a national database covering licensed drivers and operators, place information sharing between licensing authorities and the police on a statutory footing and consult on the mandatory use of in-vehicle CCTV.

Standards should also include clear national benchmarks for licensing processing times, a new national complaints portal, and mandatory disability awareness and equality training for drivers and operators. This training should be delivered to a high minimum standard, with requirements for regular refresher courses. In addition, the government should publish a national plan to increase the availability of wheelchair-accessible vehicles, including in rural areas.

The government has begun to take steps to improve standards within the taxi and private hire sector and modernise the licensing framework, and we welcome that work. The standards must be high, comprehensive and promote consistency and safety for passengers and drivers as far as possible.

1 Introduction

Defining taxis and private hire vehicles

1. The term “taxi” is one that is used widely and often imprecisely. In London, it commonly refers to the city’s black cabs which are licensed as hackney carriages, while “minicab” is the usual term for private hire vehicles (PHVs). Outside London however, the term “taxi” is commonly used to describe both hackney carriages and PHVs, even though the two are distinct. The main difference between hackney carriages and private hire vehicles is that taxis can ‘ply for hire’ and be hailed by passengers on the street or at a taxi rank, but private hire vehicles cannot. Hackney carriages and PHVs are subject to different licensing regimes and are not interchangeable.¹ In this report we use the term “taxi” when describing hackney carriages, and PHV when describing private hire vehicles. Over the last decade digital ride-hailing platforms have transformed the taxi and PHV market, introducing new ways to book and pay for journeys.²
2. Responsibility for licensing taxis and PHVs in England sits with local licensing authorities which mainly consist of district and borough councils. Transport for London (TfL) acts as the licensing authority for the capital. The licensing framework operates across three distinct elements: the driver, the vehicle, and, in the case of private hire, the operator. Licensing authorities are responsible for setting and enforcing the conditions under which licences are granted or revoked, including fitness and propriety requirements for drivers and mechanical standards for vehicles.

The workforce

3. There has been a long-term upward trend in the total number of licensed taxi and PHV vehicles and driver licences in England, reaching 313,000 and 381,100 respectively by April 2024. Compared to 2023, there was a 10.5 per cent increase in the number of PHVs. The number of licensed vehicles has been steadily increasing since 2005, apart from over the covid-19 pandemic

1 The House of Commons Library, [Buses and Taxis FAQs](#), January 2026
2 The Urban Transport Group ([TPV0162](#))

where numbers temporarily fell to a low of 251,000 in 2021 before resuming an upward trajectory. The proportion of drivers who are self-employed increased from 76 per cent in 2010 to 89 per cent in 2024.³

4. The 2024/25 National Taxi & Private Hire Driver Survey indicated that the average driver works around 45 hours per week, sources their work through a mix of ride-hailing apps and traditional booking methods and covers more than 35,000 miles annually. Drivers taking part in the survey rated their physical health at an average of 6.5 out of 10 and their mental health at 6.9, and nearly two in five (37.5%) reported that the job had a negative impact on their physical wellbeing. 28.6% said the job had a positive effect on their mental health. Nevertheless, more than half of drivers (54.2%) believed the industry as a whole was experiencing a mental health crisis, and a quarter reported that their own mental health was negatively affected by the job.⁴
5. We also heard directly from taxi drivers about concerns around working hours and pay. Many reported low and unpredictable earnings, with some saying their take home pay fell below the minimum wage. Drivers told us they often faced high commission rates when working with app-based operators, while fluctuating demand made it difficult to maintain a stable income. Working hours were also described as inconsistent, with some drivers stating they needed to work up to 60 hours a week just to make ends meet.⁵

The value of the sector and the problems facing it

6. The taxi and PHV sector is a vital component of the transport network. It has a particular role in serving people who cannot drive or access public transport, getting people safely home late at night, and supporting the mobility of some of the most vulnerable members of society. It was described to us as a “lifeline”.⁶
7. The sector is facing a multitude of problems, however. These include a legislative framework that has not kept pace with changes in technology.⁷ While a shift towards app-based platforms has created opportunities for greater convenience and lower upfront costs for passengers, it has also raised challenges for enforcement and regulatory oversight.⁸ Licensing

3 The Department for Transport, [Taxi and private hire vehicle statistics, England, 2024 \(revised\)](#), gov.uk, January 2025

4 Taxi Plus and Taxi Point [The National Taxi & Private Hire Driver Survey 2024/25](#)

5 See Appendix 1

6 Urban Transport Group ([TPV0162](#)); Bury Council ([TPV0145](#))

7 Local Government Association ([TPV0035](#))

8 London Cab Drivers Club ([TPV0027](#)); Sheffield City Council ([TPV0103](#))

authorities apply different standards to drivers, vehicles and operators, with no statutory power to prevent a driver refused a licence in one area from obtaining one in another.⁹ Licensing officers are unable to enforce against drivers working outside the area that licensed them, which undermines public confidence.¹⁰ We also heard about safeguarding failures, disabled passengers unable to access suitable vehicles, and a complaints system that passengers and drivers alike struggle to navigate.¹¹

The draft Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Bill

8. In May 2026, as we were concluding our inquiry, the government announced in the King's Speech its intention to publish a draft Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Bill for pre-legislative scrutiny.¹² The government stated that the bill would seek to "modernise" taxi and PHV laws, replacing what it described as "a patchwork" of outdated legislation. It also indicated that the draft bill would include measures to improve licensing efficiency, strengthen enforcement with "funding to match where services are delivered", introduce a national database, and enhance the accessibility of services. These proposed reforms closely reflect the evidence we have received and the recommendations we have made throughout this report. We look forward to seeing the draft bill and expect that our evidence and recommendations will be taken into account when it is drawn up.

Our inquiry

9. We launched our inquiry into the licensing of taxis and PHVs in July 2025, in response to concerns about inconsistent local licensing standards, the growth and impact of out-of-area working and the implications for passenger safety, accessibility and public confidence. We received 141 written submissions and oral evidence from a range of contributors including taxi and private hire drivers, licensing authorities, operators, the third sector and the Minister for Local Transport, Lilian Greenwood MP. We would like to thank everyone who contributed to our inquiry, particularly the drivers who took time out of their working days to participate in a roundtable discussion with us. This was a valuable opportunity to hear directly from those working in the trade about the issues that matter most to them. A summary of that session is set out in an appendix to this report as well as a summary of unpublished confidential written evidence.

9 LEVC ([TPV0077](#)); Mr James Button ([TPV0090](#))

10 [Q2](#) [Andy Mahoney MBE]; London Cab Drivers Club ([TPV0027](#))

11 London Cab Drivers Club ([TPV0027](#)); Transport for All ([TPV0107](#)); [Q3](#) [David Lawrie]

12 Prime Minister's Office, [10 Downing Street, King's Speech 2026: background briefing notes](#), May 2026

2 The legislative framework and stalled reform

An outdated legislative framework

10. The licensing function performed by local authorities entails issuing licences to drivers, vehicles and operators permitting them to provide a taxi or private hire service, setting and enforcing local conditions on those licences and taking action, including suspension or revocation, where standards are not met. The legislative framework for taxi and private hire licensing in England is long established and sits across different pieces of legislation. The Town Police Clauses Act 1847, which remains partially in force, gives local authorities powers to regulate taxis.¹³ The main framework for licensing PHVs, drivers and operators is provided for by Part II of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976.¹⁴
11. We have heard from many contributors to our inquiry that the legislative framework is out of date and not fit for purpose.¹⁵ Cheshire East Council argued that “piecemeal changes” to legislation had not kept pace with rapid advances in technology.¹⁶ The Local Government Association suggested that there needed to be fundamental reform of legislation, describing the current framework as outdated and unable to keep up with developments in technology or the need to protect passengers. They urged government to bring forward “comprehensive legislation as soon as possible” to address the full range of issues.¹⁷
12. The minister acknowledged the problem, telling us that the sector now functions “despite the legislation rather than because of it” and that “there is a need for fundamental change to the regulations to put them all in a

13 [The Town Police Clauses Act 1847](#), The licensing framework established by Part II of the 1976 Act operates across three elements: vehicle licences (s. 48), driver licences (s. 51), and operator licences (s. 55), with accompanying powers to suspend, revoke or refuse licences (s. 60) and to inspect licensed vehicles for fitness (s. 68).

14 [Part II of the Local Government \(Miscellaneous Provisions\) Act 1976](#)

15 The Department for Transport ([TPV0189](#)); Gloucestershire Licensing Authorities ([TPV0108](#)); [Q34](#) [David Pattison]

16 Cheshire East Council ([TPV0139](#))

17 Local Government Association ([TPV0035](#))

sensible place.”¹⁸ Subsequently, in May 2026, the government announced its intention to publish a draft Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Bill which will be aimed at modernising taxi and PHV laws. When making the announcement, the government recognised the need to replace “a patchwork of outdated, Victorian-era rules with a single, consistent framework”.¹⁹

App-based operators: a gap in the legislative framework

13. We heard that the rise of app-based platforms has exposed significant gaps and challenges in a regulatory framework designed for an earlier era.²⁰ Drivers are no longer constrained by the range of their taxi radios to stay primarily in one district.²¹ The United Cabbies Group told us that the “near instantaneous” nature of hailing app-based operators had blurred the line between the two types of licensing: taxi and PHV.²² Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council told us that there was uncertainty in applying the requirements of current legislation because app-based operators are not referenced within it.²³ Lee Petrak, Public Protection Commercial Enforcement Manager at Blackpool Council noted that under the current framework a large platform could conduct national operations on a single operator licence, a situation he described as “absurd.”²⁴ Helen Chapman, Director of Licensing and Regulation at Transport for London (TfL) stated that despite London’s local taxi legislation being Victorian in origin, it had in some respects proved more enabling for technology than the 1998 Act governing PHVs, under which she argued it had been difficult to discern what the appropriate regulations for app-based operators were.²⁵ Southampton Hackney Private Hire Association recommended that new legislation be introduced to cover app-based ride-hailing services.²⁶

18 [Qq174–175](#) [Lilian Greenwood]

19 Prime Minister’s Office, [10 Downing Street, King’s Speech 2026: background briefing notes](#), May 2026

20 Unite the Union Taxi Education and Liverpool Hackney Branch ([TPV0109](#)); Gloucestershire Licensing Authorities ([TPV0108](#)); Southampton Hackney Private Hire Association ([TPV0042](#))

21 [Q2](#) [David Lawrie]

22 United Cabbies Group ([TPV0121](#))

23 Rotherham MBC ([TPV0171](#))

24 [Q31](#) [Lee Petrak]

25 [Private Hire Vehicles \(London\) Act 1998](#) [provides the legal power for licensing and regulation of private hire operators, drivers and vehicles in London]; [Q63](#) [Helen Chapman]

26 Southampton Hackney Private Hire Association ([TPV0042](#))

14. From the app-based operator's perspective, Uber told us that it believed the sector in the UK was well regulated and that authorities upheld high standards in licensing.²⁷ However, Bolt also told us that much of the framework dates back over 40 years and does not reflect today's technology or operating models.²⁸
15. We also asked Bolt and Uber about whether there is a safety concern about drivers having to refer to their apps to secure their next fare while driving. Both companies told us that drivers are not required to interact with their apps while on a journey and that trip requests can be ignored. Uber stated that its app is designed to minimise distraction, requiring minimal interaction, while Bolt referred to features such as auto matching and driver-set preferences to reduce the need for drivers to engage with the app.²⁹

Stalled reforms since 2010

16. In 2011, the Law Commission was asked by the Department for Transport to review the legal framework covering taxis and PHVs. The commission's report, published in May 2014, contained eighty-four recommendations and a draft Bill.³⁰ In its report, the Commission stated:

The piecemeal evolution of the regulation of taxi and private hire services has [...] resulted in a complex and fragmented licensing system. The relationship between taxi and private hire services is not clearly defined. The balance struck between national and local rules lacks an overarching rationale.³¹

The report's recommendations included retaining the two-tier system that distinguishes between taxis and PHVs, but with changes to the legal distinction between taxis and PHVs on the grounds that the current system relied heavily on the concept of 'plying for hire' which was not defined in statute. The Commission recommended a single consolidated legislative framework throughout England and Wales, including London, and applying to any vehicle carrying one or more passengers. Its report also proposed replacing the term "hackney carriage" with "taxi" in legislation and bringing in national minimum standards.³² The draft bill was not taken forward by government.

27 Uber ([TPV0177](#))

28 Bolt ([TPV0151](#))

29 Bolt ([TPV0151](#)); Uber ([TPV0177](#))

30 Law Commission, [Taxi and Private Hire Services](#), May 2014

31 Law Commission, [Taxi and Private Hire Services](#), May 2014 [p. 2]

32 Law Commission, [Taxi and Private Hire Services](#), May 2014 [P.24]

17. We heard that not taking forward the recommendations of the Law Commission represented a significant missed opportunity for progress.³³ The Local Government Association told us that potential solutions to many of the current challenges being faced by licensing authorities had already been addressed by the Law Commission’s work, and urged the government to revisit its findings and identify which elements remained relevant to today’s landscape.³⁴ Paul James of Unite the Union Taxi Education said that the trade had felt “let down” by successive governments failing to implement the Law Commission’s recommendations.³⁵
18. In 2017, the government established a Task and Finish Group to examine the regulatory challenges facing the sector. The group’s work was predominantly focused on what its report described as a regulatory regime that was “no longer fit for purpose”.³⁶ Its report argued that there was an urgent need to update the law, noting that it was not written with modern technology in mind and could be difficult to apply to current practice.³⁷ It found that the distinction between the taxi and private hire trades had been blurred by technological change, and that proving “plying for hire” under the current law was difficult and required “significant enforcement resources”.³⁸ The report also made a case for consolidating licensing authorities, suggesting that large urban areas, particularly those with Metro Mayors, should each be covered by a single taxi and private hire vehicle licensing authority.³⁹
19. In its 2019 response to the Task and Finish group’s work, the government stopped short of comprehensive reform. While accepting a case for change, it said that any broader legislative measures would be taken forward only when parliamentary time allowed. The main immediate step it took was instead to develop statutory guidance for licensing authorities, which became the Statutory Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Standards, issued in 2020.⁴⁰ Those standards—which licensing authorities must have regard to but are not mandatory—strengthened expectations, particularly on safeguarding, but they did not amount to the wider legislative overhaul

33 Warrington Borough Council ([TPV0104](#))

34 Local Government Association ([TPV0035](#))

35 [Q2](#) [Paul James]

36 Task and Finish Group, [Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Licensing Steps towards a safer and more robust system](#), September 2018,

37 Task and Finish Group, [Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Licensing Steps towards a safer and more robust system](#), September 2018 [p.15]

38 Task and Finish Group, [Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Licensing Steps towards a safer and more robust system](#), September 2018 [p. 8]

39 Task and Finish Group, [Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Licensing Steps towards a safer and more robust system](#), September 2018 [p. 7]

40 The Department for Transport, [Statutory taxi and private hire vehicle standards 2020](#), gov.uk, July 2020, The Department for Transport, [Taxi and private hire vehicle licensing: government response to independent report](#), February 2019

envisaged by either the Law Commission or the Task and Finish Group. The Institute of Licensing was stark in its view that both the Law Commission and the Task and Finish Group have “failed to impact” the sector.⁴¹

20. We asked the minister whether the department was inclined to revisit these previous pieces of work in order to improve the legal framework governing taxi and private hire vehicle licensing. She responded that the department “absolutely” wanted to draw on that work when developing future proposals. When specifically pressed on the need for a “fundamental” revisiting of the law, she concurred that “it would be far better to do a comprehensive reform”. At our oral evidence session in January 2026, the minister stopped short of saying the government would be undertaking a review of the legal framework.⁴² In May 2026, however, the government announced that a draft Taxi and Private Hire Bill would be brought forward to do so.⁴³

21. **CONCLUSION**

Evidence to our inquiry and the previous work undertaken by the Law Commission and the Task and Finish Group have all described a legislative framework that is unfit for purpose in the modern era, in which use of ride-hailing apps has grown rapidly. It is fragmented and does not provide a consistent basis for effective regulation and enforcement across England. Gaps in the framework cannot always be addressed through guidance alone.

22. **RECOMMENDATION**

We are pleased that the government has set out plans for legislation to modernise and consolidate the licensing framework for taxis and private hire vehicles. We urge the government to use the Law Commission’s 2014 draft bill and the report of the Task and Finish group as its starting points, updating them where necessary to reflect and incorporate app-based operators. A new framework should maintain clear distinctions between taxis and private hire vehicles, while placing both within a single consolidated statutory framework.

41 Institute of Licensing Limited ([TPV0130](#))

42 [Q175](#) [Lilian Greenwood]

43 Prime Minister’s Office, [10 Downing Street, King’s Speech 2026: background briefing notes](#), May 2026

3 Out-of-area working

23. ‘Out-of-area working’ refers to the practice whereby taxis or private hire vehicles licensed by one licensing authority operate wholly or predominantly in a different licensing authority area. This is permitted under current legislation, provided that the operator, driver and vehicle are all licensed by the same licensing authority: the so-called triple lock licensing requirement. The Deregulation Act 2015 allowed private hire operators to subcontract bookings to operators licensed in a different district, removing the previous restriction that had limited subcontracting to within the same licensing area.⁴⁴
24. In June 2025, the National Audit on Group-Based Child Sexual Exploitation, work led by Baroness Louise Casey, was published. That report highlighted persistent concerns about taxi licensing as a safeguarding issue. While recognising that the majority of drivers are law-abiding, the report warned that the current licensing system allows drivers to obtain licences from authorities with less stringent safety standards and to operate across borders, undermining safeguarding efforts. It stated:
- several areas we visited which were imposing rigorous standards were left frustrated by seeing taxi drivers freely operating in their areas having been licensed by other authorities who were perceived to operate less rigorous processes.⁴⁵
25. In some parts of the sector there is deep-seated opposition to routine out-of-area working. Blackpool Taxi Association referred to it as “the root cause to all that’s wrong”.⁴⁶ We also heard the view that the practice reduces standards by enabling ‘licence shopping’: this term refers to some drivers and operators deliberately obtaining licences from an authority with less stringent requirements than the one in whose area they primarily operate.⁴⁷ At present, licensing authorities cannot reject applications from drivers based on where they live, only on the basis of whether they are “fit and proper” to hold a licence. Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council told us that the current arrangements allow drivers to seek out licensing authorities with lower standards, easier application processes, lower costs and weaker

44 [Deregulation Act 2015](#); LEVC ([TPV0077](#))

45 Home Office, [National Audit on Group-based Child Sexual Exploitation and Abuse](#), gov.uk, June 2025

46 Blackpool Taxi Association ([TPV0023](#)); Cleveleys Taxis Limited ([TPV0033](#))

47 Addison Lee ([TPV0112](#))

local enforcement.⁴⁸ The council described the practice of out-of-area working as “the single biggest threat to the safety of the travelling public in Rotherham”.⁴⁹ Helen Chapman, Director of Licensing and Regulation at Transport for London said that the practice was a “significant problem”; she said that “it cannot be right, from a passenger perspective, that you stand in central London, open an app, and a driver licensed by a completely different authority comes along”.⁵⁰

26. We heard that drivers operating far from the authority that licensed them could be subject to little or no enforcement oversight.⁵¹ Taxi driver Harlan Kocabey told us the result is that drivers working in his patch, but not licensed there “[know] local licensing officers have no power over them, so they do what they like.”⁵² Mark Robinson, Owner and Director at Vokes Taxis Ltd, which operates in Medway, told us that vehicles not licensed in that area can come in and operate “without any oversight whatsoever”.⁵³ Rotherham MBC stated that out-of-area drivers knew that its own enforcement officers were “essentially powerless” to enforce standards against them.⁵⁴
27. Nonetheless, there are benefits for both drivers and passengers of out-of-area working, and there would be practical difficulties in restricting it or outlawing it altogether. Kimberly Hurd, Senior General Manager for the UK and Ireland at Bolt told us plainly that “cross-border is essentially the way people live and work”.⁵⁵ Emma O’Dwyer, Director of Public Policy at Uber argued that the travelling public would not expect to be prevented from travelling across licensing authority boundaries, and that imposing such controls would mean many trips that currently take place simply would not happen.⁵⁶ Andy Mahoney MBE, representing the Licensed Private Hire Car Association told us that a requirement for vehicles to return to their licensed area between jobs would be “totally unrealistic”, producing thousands of tonnes of unnecessary carbon emissions from empty running.⁵⁷
28. Some authorities license very significant numbers of drivers who do not operate in their area. Stockport Council told us that in Greater Manchester, nearly half (49%) of private hire vehicles are now licensed by authorities outside of its ten councils. The city-region’s ‘out-of-area’ figure of more than

48 Rotherham MBC ([TPV0171](#))

49 Rotherham MBC ([TPV0171](#))

50 [Q38](#) [Helen Chapman]

51 Bury Council ([TPV0145](#))

52 Mr Ibrar Hussain ([TPV0002](#)); Mr Harlan Kocabey ([TPV0005](#)); London Cab Drivers Club (LCDC) ([TPV0027](#))

53 [Q89](#) [Mark Robinson]

54 Rotherham MBC ([TPV0171](#))

55 [Q87](#) [Kimberly Hurd]

56 [Q87](#) [Emma O’Dwyer]

57 [Q14](#) [Andy Mahoney MBE]

12,000 has risen sharply from just under 7,000 in 2023.⁵⁸ The most prominent example is the City of Wolverhampton Council. In 2023, Wolverhampton had the highest number of licensed vehicles per 1,000 population, with 85.3, while several rural areas had less than one licensed taxi per 1,000 people.⁵⁹ As of November 2025, the City of Wolverhampton Council had licensed 33,893 private hire vehicles in that calendar year, compared to just 10,768 in 2020.⁶⁰

- 29.** The factors that have led Wolverhampton to become the largest licensing authority remain contested. Andrew Wescott, Corporate and Government Affairs Director at Veezu told us that a three-year driver licence costs £138 at Wolverhampton compared with £336 in Portsmouth, stating that it was understandable that drivers would seek the cheaper option.⁶¹ The United Cabbies Group argued that Wolverhampton had become popular due to more “flexible” standards, but David Pattison, Chief Operating Officer at the City of Wolverhampton Council rejected the implication that lower standards were in place at Wolverhampton, referring to a 55% failure rate at the council’s day-long licensing assessment as evidence that its threshold is not easily cleared.⁶² Wolverhampton stated that the “streamlining” and efficiency of its application process had led to an increase in drivers from across the country applying, dating from the point at which its process went online in 2016. When asked whether Wolverhampton Council could do more to deter out-of-area applications, such as implementing local knowledge tests as has been done in some other areas, Mr Pattison noted that the council follows the Department for Transport’s best practice guidance, which advises against such tests for PHV drivers.⁶³
- 30.** The minister concurred that Wolverhampton’s standards “are not significantly lower than elsewhere” and, when questioned whether Wolverhampton could do more to discourage out-of-area applicants, responded that the problem would likely just move somewhere else.⁶⁴ The department told us that out-of-area working is not inherently unsafe, as all licensing authorities are responsible for ensuring drivers meet “fit and proper” standards. The department acknowledged, however, that the practice can make enforcement difficult and allow drivers and vehicles to operate outside local licensing requirements, potentially undermining those safeguards.⁶⁵

58 Stockport Council ([TPV0169](#))

59 The Department for Transport, [Taxi and private hire vehicle statistics, England: 2023](#), gov.uk, July 2023

60 Eleanor Lawson, [Taxis licensed by council triple in five years](#), BBC News, November 2025

61 [Q85](#) [Andrew Wescott]

62 United Cabbies Group ([TPV0121](#)); [Q55](#) [David Pattison]

63 [Qq41–43](#) [David Pattison]

64 [Q195](#) [Lilian Greenwood]

65 Department for Transport ([TPV0189](#))

31.

CONCLUSION

Out-of-area working is now a widespread feature of the taxi and private hire vehicle market. We recognise the strength of concern about its impact on standards, local accountability and public confidence. We also acknowledge that outright prohibition would be impractical.

32.

RECOMMENDATION

We urge the department to bring forward a clear plan to curtail the extensive practice of out-of-area working and create greater incentives for drivers to license in the locality in which they operate. This will enable local licensing authorities to take enforcement action more readily, keep both drivers and passengers safe, and restore trust that has been lost across the sector.

4 Responsibility for licensing

33. At present, there are 263 licensing authorities in England consisting of 164 district councils, 62 unitary authorities, 36 metropolitan district councils and Transport for London.⁶⁶ Each can set its own licensing conditions, which leads to many variations in the requirements operators and drivers have to meet in different parts of the country. The kinds of requirements that may vary include vehicle standards, such as age limits and emissions specifications, driver knowledge and English language testing, medical standards, use of in-vehicle CCTV, and the proportion of wheelchair accessible vehicles operators are required to maintain in their fleets.
34. Local licensing authorities at present are typically lower-tier or unitary authorities. In November 2025, the Department for Transport announced plans to consult on consolidating this function, reducing the number of taxi licensing authorities from 263 to 70 by transferring responsibility to local transport authorities; the consultation closed in April 2026. The department has argued that the transfer of responsibilities could increase consistency of standards, enable more effective use of enforcement powers “across a whole functional economic area” and achieve efficiencies through economies of scale. The department has said that “together, these benefits should reduce the factors that induce people to license out of their usual working area”.⁶⁷
35. We heard evidence in support of the more regional approach that this reform would introduce. David Pattison, Chief Operating Officer at the City of Wolverhampton Council told us that working on a regional scale could enable greater investment in technology and enforcement, and that it could improve consistency.⁶⁸ Eamon O’Hearn, National Officer at the GMB Union argued that a body at the scale of Greater Manchester or Transport for London should in theory be the right size to run an effective and efficient

66 Department for Transport ([TPV0189](#))

67 The Department for Transport, [Open consultation: Local transport authorities and the licensing of taxis and private hire vehicles](#), January 2026

68 [Q71](#) [David Pattison]

system.⁶⁹ Helen Chapman, Director of Licensing and Regulation at Transport for London noted that TfL was, in her view, already operating this model effectively.⁷⁰

36. We also heard arguments against the proposal. James Button, President of the Institute of Licensing told us that the institute saw no advantage in such a move, warning that it would lead to larger variations in standards, particularly at a time when local authorities already face upheaval through local government reorganisation.⁷¹ Mark Robinson, Owner and Director at Vokes Taxis Ltd told us simply that “local licensing with local enforcement just makes sense to us”.⁷² David Lawrie cautioned that any regional approach must reflect the significant differences between areas.⁷³
37. We were also told that the proposal would not be sufficient to tackle out-of-area working.⁷⁴ Leeds City Council told us that moving the responsibility for licensing from local to regional authorities would mean that “border hopping” would just become “region hopping”. They argued that if standards varied significantly between regions, drivers may choose to obtain licences in areas with lower fees or weaker requirements, while continuing to operate elsewhere, meaning the underlying problem would persist at a larger regional scale rather than being resolved.⁷⁵ James Button, President of the Institute of Licensing added that out-of-area activity would continue simply with each area being larger.⁷⁶

38. **CONCLUSION**

The government’s proposal to move responsibility for licensing to local transport authorities may have advantages in terms of improving operational capacity, and the ability of transport authorities to better integrate taxis into their transport plans and brand accordingly. However, we are not persuaded that a transfer of licensing responsibilities will, on its own, remove incentives to out-of-area working. Licensing areas will become larger, but drivers will still be able to operate across boundaries.

69 [Q10](#) [Eamon O’ Hearn]

70 [Q72](#) [Helen Chapman]

71 [Q149](#) [James Button]

72 [Q84](#) [Mark Robinson]

73 [Q18](#) [David Lawrie]

74 Leeds City Council ([TPV0089](#)); Bristol City Council ([TPV0111](#)); Liverpool City Region Combined Authority, Liverpool City Region Local Authority Licensing Authorities; The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Merseyside ([TPV0136](#)); Rotherham MBC ([TPV0171](#))

75 Leeds City Council ([TPV0089](#))

76 Mr James Button ([TPV0090](#))

39.

RECOMMENDATION

Following the conclusion of its consultation on transferring taxi and PHV licensing to local transport authorities, the department should publish a comparative appraisal of licensing models, including the local transport authority approach and a potential national licensing model. This appraisal should assess which model would best reduce incentives for extensive out-of-area working.

5 Setting high national standards

40. With so many licensing authorities setting different licensing conditions, the national picture is fragmented. Andy Mahoney MBE, representing the Licensed Private Hire Car Association spoke to the scale of the problem, telling us that around 2,700 council officers across local authorities each make their own rules. He stated that this level of fragmentation was “why we are in such a mess.”⁷⁷ Lee Petrak, Public Protection Commercial Enforcement Manager at Blackpool Council described the number of variations in conditions across authorities as “an absurdity”.⁷⁸ The National Private Hire and Taxi Association told us that the variation in policies and conditions across licensing authorities is confusing for the travelling public, many of whom do not even understand the difference between a taxi and a private hire vehicle.⁷⁹ Kimberly Hurd, Senior General Manager for the UK and Ireland at Bolt told us that across the 50 local authority areas where the company currently operates, it faces 3,900 individual licensing requirements. She noted that Bolt operates in 50 countries and 600 cities worldwide yet described the UK market as “the most complex of them all”.⁸⁰

41. **CONCLUSION**

The sheer scale of variation in standards across different licensing authorities has created an inconsistent and confusing landscape for trade and passengers alike.

77 [Q2](#) [Andy Mahoney MBE]

78 [Q24](#) [Lee Petrak]

79 National Private Hire and Taxi Association (NPHTA) ([TPV0051](#))

80 [Q79](#) [Kimberly Hurd]

The government's proposal for national minimum standards

42. In its 2018 report, the Task and Finish Group recommended that the government legislate for national minimum standards, which would set a common floor for the conditions imposed by licensing authorities across the country.⁸¹ The group's report stated that:

the current level of discretion given to local licensing authorities has resulted in very significant and unacceptable variations in standards. Failures by some authorities to uphold high standards for the assessment of drivers, for example, have contributed to the involvement of the taxi and PHV trade in well-documented sexual abuse and exploitation of hundreds of children. Significant variation in standards and the application of these in the licensing of drivers provides an opportunity for individuals to 'forum shop' for licences.⁸²

43. In November 2025, the government announced that it would legislate to introduce national minimum standards for taxis and private hire vehicles through an amendment to the English Devolution and Community Empowerment Bill (now Act).⁸³ The government's proposal to introduce national minimum standards for taxi and private hire vehicle licensing follows, and is in part informed by, concerns identified in the Casey audit regarding inconsistent standards and risks to passenger safety.⁸⁴ The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government, Miatta Fahnbulleh MP, stated at Third Reading of the Bill:

National minimum standards will set a high but proportionate standard for licensing that is focused on safeguarding passengers and improving the accessibility of services for everyone. That means that people—particularly those who rely on these services the most, such as women, girls and people with disabilities—can be reassured that the drivers of such services have undergone rigorous vetting wherever they are in the country.⁸⁵

81 Task and Finish Group, [Taxi and private hire vehicle licensing: recommendations for a safer and more robust system](#), gov.uk, September 2018

82 Task and Finish Group, [Taxi and private hire vehicle licensing: recommendations for a safer and more robust system](#), gov.uk, September 2018

83 [English Devolution and Community Empowerment Bill 2025](#)

84 The Department for Transport, [New national standards on taxi licensing proposed to protect passengers](#), November 2025

85 HC Deb, 25 November 2025, [col 286](#)

44. We heard a great deal of evidence in favour of minimum standards.⁸⁶ Emma O'Dwyer, Director of Public Policy at Uber told us that there should be clearer national mandatory standards setting a baseline in licensing.⁸⁷ The Local Government Association told us that they would support the development of more robust national minimum standards on key issues such as safeguarding.⁸⁸ The Licensed Taxi Drivers' Association told us national minimum standards would simplify the conditions to be met across the country, making it easier for drivers and operators to understand what is required from them.⁸⁹ Leeds City Council told us that it could remove the incentive to 'licence-shop' by creating a "baseline" of standards everywhere.⁹⁰
45. Minimum standards would establish a floor for the conditions set by every licensing authority, while preserving the ability of individual authorities to vary conditions by setting higher requirements where local circumstances warranted it. The Urban Transport Group told us that licensing authorities should have the ability to go above minimum standards, in line with their priorities.⁹¹ The Local Government Association stated that there may be less need for national consistency in some areas, such as environmental standards.⁹²
46. Absolute national standards, by contrast, would impose a single set of conditions to be applied consistently by every authority, with no scope to add to or depart from them. We heard arguments in favour of absolute standards on the grounds of consistency for consumers, and because imposing the same standard everywhere would further reduce incentives on drivers to 'licence-shop' and consequently routinely operate out of area.⁹³ Andy Mahoney MBE, representing the Licensed Private Hire Car Association said that if drivers were indeed seeking out areas with lower requirements, absolute national standards would "stop that dead".⁹⁴ Andrew Wescott, Corporate and Government Affairs Director at Veezu argued that the term "minimum" risked giving the impression of a lower base for public safety, and that minimum standards would not necessarily resolve existing inconsistencies, since authorities already operating above that floor would continue to vary; for these reasons he favoured absolute standards.⁹⁵ David

86 Transport for London ([TPV0106](#)); Addison Lee Limited ([TPV0112](#)); Suzy Lamplugh Trust ([TPV0127](#))

87 [Q77](#) [Emma O'Dwyer]

88 Local Government Association ([TPV0035](#))

89 Licensed Taxi Drivers Association LTDA ([TPV0068](#))

90 Leeds City Council ([TPV0089](#))

91 Urban Transport Group ([TPV0162](#))

92 Local Government Association ([TPV0035](#))

93 Mr James Button ([TPV0090](#)); [Q139](#) [James Button]

94 [Q4](#) [Andy Mahoney]

95 [Q84](#) [Andrew Wescott]

Pattison, Chief Operating Officer at the City of Wolverhampton Council stated that the public expect consistency: “They want to know that if they get into a private hire in Berwick-upon-Tweed or in Penzance, they will have the same level of standard”.⁹⁶

47. The department’s written evidence to our inquiry acknowledged the distinction between absolute standards with no local discretion to go further, and minimum standards which would permit “local additions”. The department conceded that minimum standards would not entirely remove incentives to licence-shop, telling us:

Our sense is that many licensing authorities favour national minimum standards, but that approach does mean that if an authority chooses to go above them, and the requirement is more costly for applicants, then out-of-area licensing might still be induced.⁹⁷

48. When we asked the minister why the government had chosen to legislate for minimum standards rather than absolute standards, she said that not allowing licensing authorities to vary conditions to take local circumstances into account “does not feel like the spirit of devolution”.⁹⁸ She said that, while the goal was to use national minimum standards to “raise the bar and to have a much more consistent set of standards across the entire country”, she did not want to rule out licensing authorities having “discretion to have additional things that meet their particular issues”.⁹⁹ The minister explained, however, that the minimum standard may in fact include some areas in which variation would not be permitted: “When it comes to safeguarding, safety and accessibility, we want to set standards that it would be hard to improve on.”¹⁰⁰
49. The government’s plans for a draft Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Bill, announced in May 2026, refer to “setting clear requirements for obtaining and holding licences” and introducing “a single, consistent framework across England that passengers and drivers can trust”.¹⁰¹

96 [Q24](#) [David Pattison]

97 The Department for Transport ([TPV0189](#))

98 [Q177](#) [Lilian Greenwood]

99 [Q177](#) [Lilian Greenwood]

100 [Q177](#) [Lilian Greenwood]

101 Prime Minister’s Office, [10 Downing Street, King’s Speech 2026: background briefing notes](#), May 2026

50.

CONCLUSION

We welcome the department's acknowledgement that greater national consistency in licensing standards is required. However, we are not persuaded that the current plan to pursue national minimum standards will be sufficient, unless those standards are strong enough to avoid a lowest common denominator effect, and carefully specified to remove incentives for licence shopping. The department already accepts that in practice there should be an absolute standard in areas like safety.

51.

RECOMMENDATION

The government's plan for national minimum standards must not mean low by default. The areas in which variation in standards is permitted should be minimised in order to disincentivise licence shopping, and set at a high level wherever possible to ensure consistently high-quality passenger experiences.

52.

In the following chapter we go on to consider the content of national standards in more detail.

6 What should national standards include?

Passenger safety

- 53.** The evidence we received was clear that the vast majority of drivers in the sector operate safely. James Button, President of the Institute of Licensing stated:

I think it is very important to recognise that the vast majority of people in the hackney carriage and private hire industries—drivers, operators and vehicle proprietors—are hard-working, decent, law-abiding people who generally provide very good services to their users. That needs to be put on the record because it is very easy to think that they are all poor and they are not. It is a small minority. Some of those are very poor but it is still a very small minority.¹⁰²

- 54.** The guidance set out in the Statutory Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Standards contains a range of actions that licensing authorities “should consider” in respect of passenger safety. These include the level and frequency of DBS checks for drivers, vehicle owners, operators and their booking and dispatch staff; obtaining certificates of good character for extended periods of time spent out of the UK; safeguarding awareness skills for drivers; reviewing whether to mandate CCTV in all taxis and PHVs; and having a clear policy for the consideration of previous convictions.¹⁰³
- 55.** All applicants for taxi and private hire vehicle driver licences are required to undergo an enhanced Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. The department told us that “all licensing authorities report that they carry out the highest level of background checks on drivers—this is an Enhanced DBS check and checks of the adults’ and children’s barred lists”.¹⁰⁴ Despite this, we heard that serious safety concerns exist around the disclosure and barring process. The Local Government Association (LGA) told us that changes made in 2020 to the Police Act 1997 disclosure framework meant that the Disclosure and Barring Service now filtered more conviction

102 [Q152](#) [James Button]; [Q152](#) [Saskia Garner]

103 The Department for Transport, [Statutory taxi and private hire vehicle standards](#), gov.uk, July 2020

104 Department for Transport ([TPV0189](#))

information than previously, with the result that less information may be disclosed to licensing authorities on an Enhanced Disclosure Certificate.¹⁰⁵ The LGA said these changes could mean that authorities did not have all the information relevant to determining whether a driver is fit and proper to hold a licence.¹⁰⁶ Saskia Garner, Head of Policy and Campaigns at the Suzy Lamplugh Trust (a personal safety charity) told us that at least 90 active licences were held by drivers with convictions for violent offences including assault, battery, abuse and sexual offences. She stated that “we fear this is the tip of an iceberg”.¹⁰⁷

56. The minister told us:

When it comes to safeguarding, we want every local authority to require PHV and taxi drivers to have an enhanced DBS check and to be checked against the adults and children’s barring lists. For me, that is a minimum; it is also a maximum. There is no stronger regulation that you could have on that.¹⁰⁸

57. CONCLUSION

The overwhelming majority of drivers uphold high standards and play an essential role in keeping communities moving safely. However, the system needs to provide a robust safety net for the protection of passengers and drivers. Safety standards must be absolute and not subject to local variations.

58. CONCLUSION

An enhanced DBS check is the highest level of criminal record check available, yet it seemingly does not guarantee that licensing authorities receive all the information they need to make sound judgements about licence applications. We are concerned that the current framework creates a false sense of security: licensing authorities believe they are seeing a complete picture when they are not.

105 [Deregulation Act 2015](#); [Police Act 1997](#); [Police Act 1997 \(Criminal Record Certificates: Relevant Matters\) \(Amendment\) \(England and Wales\) Order 2020](#)

106 [Local Government Association \(TPV0035\)](#)

107 [Q139](#) [Saskia Garner]

108 [Q177](#) [Lilian Greenwood]

59.

RECOMMENDATION

We agree with the minister that every local authority must require drivers to have an enhanced DBS check and to be checked against the adults' and children's barring lists. We also recommend that requirements for safeguarding training and clear requirements for frequency of re-checking DBS certificates be included in national standards so that they are applied uniformly across every licensing authority. The department should also review the impact that legislative changes have had on DBS filtering and work with relevant partners to ensure these do not create unintended gaps in the information available to licensing authorities.

“Fit and proper”

60. Licensing authorities must apply a “fit and proper person” test when deciding whether to grant, renew, suspend, or revoke a driver’s licence to provide a taxi or private hire vehicle service. There is no statutory definition of the term “fit and proper”. The department’s guidance states:

It may be helpful when considering whether an applicant or licensee is fit and proper to pose oneself the following question: Without any prejudice, and based on the information before you, would you allow a person for whom you care, regardless of their condition, to travel alone in a vehicle driven by this person at any time of day or night?¹⁰⁹

61. The Suzy Lamplugh Trust told us that the lack of a statutory definition of what constitutes a fit and proper person results in significant variation in licensing standards which puts the public at risk.¹¹⁰ Emma Vogelmann, Co-CEO and Head of Policy, Public Affairs, and Campaigns at Transport for All told us that her organisation would support a clear definition and a standardised way of assessing fitness, arguing that the current reliance on discretion creates uncertainty, and that disabled passengers in particular would benefit from “a very strict, transparent and fair process.”¹¹¹
62. James Button, President of the Institute of Licensing warned that a very strict statutory test would risk removing the discretion that licensing authorities need; he argued that an element of flexibility should be preserved, for example to account for exceptional or historic cases where rigid rules could exclude individuals who do not pose a current risk. He

109 The Department for Transport, [Statutory taxi and private hire vehicle standards](#), gov.uk, November 2022

110 Suzy Lamplugh Trust ([TPV0127](#))

111 [Q154](#) [Emma Vogelmann]

also explained that “fit and proper” is a long-established legislative term; the Institute of Licensing uses the phrase “safe and suitable” to convey its meaning.¹¹²

63. The minister described the test suggested in guidance for determining whether a person is fit and proper as “easily understandable”. She acknowledged that it would be possible to draw up a more detailed list of what fit and proper means, but that it would be “quite a difficult list to construct because there would always be things that you would miss out”.¹¹³ Liz Wilson, Deputy Director for Accessibility, Coaches, Taxis and Community Transport at the Department for Transport added that the aim of the department was to provide much greater structure around decision-making, explaining that “if you do not meet the national minimum standards, you are not a fit and proper person to be able to operate”.¹¹⁴

64. **CONCLUSION**

Defining “fit and proper” in statute would not be straightforward, and any definition would need to preserve a degree of flexibility for licensing authorities to exercise judgement in individual cases. The consequences of getting decisions wrong are serious, however, and more specification could be useful for decision-makers.

65. **RECOMMENDATION**

The government should ensure that guidance clearly links the criteria for making a fit and proper person judgement to national licensing standards.

Information sharing between licensing authorities and the police

66. In October 2025, the department published guidance on information sharing between police and taxi and PHV licensing authorities. The guidance states that licensing authorities can suspend or revoke licences where concerns about fit and proper status arise, acting on the balance of probability rather than beyond reasonable doubt, and independently of any police action. In addition to providing information through DBS checks and barred list

112 [Q154](#) [James Button]

113 [Q225](#) [Lilian Greenwood]

114 [Q225](#) [Liz Wilson]

checks, the police can share relevant information with licensing authorities through common law police disclosure powers where there is a pressing safeguarding need, or via multi-agency safeguarding hubs.¹¹⁵

67. We heard about problems in information sharing, however.¹¹⁶ James Button, President of the Institute of Licensing told us that while a small number of constabularies shared information about potential safeguarding risks effectively with licensing authorities, in the vast majority of cases they did not. He explained that common law police disclosure is undermined by the judicial interpretation of “pressing social need”, making it extremely difficult for the police to decide what to share. He called for statutory rules to overcome these barriers, including statutory consultation with the police when a new driver application is made and automatic notification to the relevant licensing authority when a licensee is arrested. He estimated that this currently happens in only around four to five per cent of cases, with information often emerging months later or only at appeal while the individual continues to hold a licence.¹¹⁷ Warrington Borough Council spoke of significant delays and argued there should be a requirement for the police to notify licensing authorities of all investigations involving a taxi driver.¹¹⁸ If a taxi driver has their licence suspended as a precaution, it can have a huge impact on their livelihood while a matter is being investigated.
68. The minister acknowledged that putting information sharing between licensing authorities and the police on a statutory footing would require discussion with the Home Office, but stated, “if there is more that we can do, I am very open to looking at that”.¹¹⁹ In May 2026, the government announced that its planned draft Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Bill would seek to “improve transparency and information-sharing nationwide”, but did not specify putting information-sharing between police and licensing authorities on a statutory footing.¹²⁰

69. **CONCLUSION**

We recognise that there are established routes for sharing safeguarding and risk information between the police and licensing authorities. However, in practice, information sharing remains inconsistent and results in uneven access to information that is crucial for public protection.

115 The Department for Transport, [Information sharing between police and taxi and PHV licensing authorities](#), October 2025

116 Local Government Association ([TPV0035](#)); Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council ([TPV0105](#))

117 [Q155](#) [James Button]

118 Warrington Borough Council ([TPV0104](#))

119 [Q255](#) [Lilian Greenwood]

120 Prime Minister’s Office, [10 Downing Street, King’s Speech 2026: background briefing notes](#), May 2026

70.

RECOMMENDATION

We welcome the commitment from government that it intends, through legislation, to improve transparency and information sharing. The department should work with the Home Office to place information sharing between policing bodies and licensing authorities on a statutory footing so that there are common expectations everywhere. This should include a duty to share relevant safeguarding and risk information for licensing purposes, supported by a standard expectation on timeliness.

The NR3S and potential for a new national database

71. The National Register of Taxi and Private Hire Licence Refusals and Revocations (NR3S) was set up and funded by the Local Government Association in July 2018. The register allows licensing authorities to record details of refusals or revocations of taxi or PHV licences, and to check new applicants against the register.¹²¹
72. Councillor Arooj Shah, Leader of Oldham Council told us that the NR3S database is a crucial tool but that inconsistencies in its use undermine its utility.¹²² Uber told us that the database currently holds only basic information about licensees and a record that a decision was made to refuse, revoke or suspend a licence, but not the reasons for that decision. Obtaining further details requires a request to the authority that made the decision, which can be a protracted process.¹²³ The Suzy Lamplugh Trust noted that the system relies on authorities proactively seeking further information that is not logged on the database.¹²⁴ The London Cab Drivers Club told us that the “NR3S is only as strong as its weakest link” and raised concerns that the system is catching problems after a licensing decision has already gone wrong, rather than preventing unsuitable individuals from entering the system in the first place.¹²⁵ The City of Wolverhampton Council told us that the reduction in the retention period for NR3S records from 25 years under the previous voluntary NR3 scheme to 11 years under the statutory regime introduced by the Taxis and Private Hire Vehicles (Safeguarding and Road Safety) Act 2022 should be reversed, warning that

121 Local Government Association ([TPV0035](#))

122 [Q140](#) [Councillor Shah]

123 Uber ([TPV0177](#))

124 Suzy Lamplugh Trust ([TPV0127](#))

125 London Cab Drivers Club (LCDC) ([TPV0027](#))

this change means drivers revoked following serious complaints which did not result in conviction may now be able to apply to another authority with no record of the earlier decision.¹²⁶

- 73.** The NR3S only records individuals whose licences have been refused, revoked or suspended, the aim being to prevent them from obtaining a licence elsewhere. A number of witnesses called for something broader, such as a national database or live register of all currently licensed drivers, vehicles and operators, which licensing officers and police could check in real time.¹²⁷ The Local Government Association told us that it can currently be “extremely challenging” to identify who has licensed a driver, meaning that complaints and safeguarding concerns may not reach the right licensing authority. A national database of this kind would allow any officer encountering a vehicle in their area to establish immediately where it is licensed and by whom, and to route any concerns accordingly.¹²⁸ Lee Petrak, Public Protection Commercial Enforcement Manager at Blackpool Council described a recent case in which his authority received an allegation of illegal ranking by a driver not known to them but had no way of knowing whether the same driver had committed similar offences elsewhere. He told us that the kind of information held in a national database would help in making decisions about whether to prosecute in such a case.¹²⁹ Councillor Arooj Shah added unequivocally, “there should be a national database”.¹³⁰
- 74.** The minister told us that the department was already exploring the development of a national database and confirmed that work on this was underway.¹³¹ In March 2026, after the minister gave evidence to us, the government confirmed its intention to introduce “a national licensing database with the details of every driver, vehicle and private hire vehicle operator licence”.¹³² Provisions to mandate use of a national database were announced in May 2026 as forming part of the government’s draft Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle bill.¹³³

126 City of Wolverhampton Council ([TPV0160](#))

127 Local Government Association ([TPV0035](#)); Gloucestershire Licensing Authorities ([TPV0108](#)); Exeter City Council ([TPV0082](#))

128 Local Government Association ([TPV0035](#))

129 [Q69](#) [Lee Petrak]

130 [Q165](#) [Cllr Arooj Shah]

131 [Q233](#) [Lilian Greenwood]

132 [Taxis: Licensing](#); PQ 118051, 12 March 2026

133 Prime Minister’s Office, [10 Downing Street, King’s Speech 2026: background briefing notes](#), May 2026

75.

CONCLUSION

The absence of a comprehensive national database makes it harder for licensing authorities to make safe and consistent decisions, particularly where drivers, vehicles and operators work across authority boundaries. We welcome the fact that the department has started work to address this.

76.

RECOMMENDATION

We welcome the department's work towards establishment of a mandatory national licensing database covering all taxi and private hire drivers, vehicles and operators. The database should enable licensing authorities to confirm licence status, licensing history and the responsible authority quickly and ensure that refusals, revocations and other relevant decisions are recorded consistently and visible to all authorities. The department should set out a clear timescale on which this work will be completed.

CCTV

77.

Licensing authorities have discretion to mandate in-vehicle CCTV for taxis and PHVs. The department's Statutory Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Standards 2020 place responsibility for handling of the data generated by CCTV on the licensing authority which has mandated installation. Authorities are expected to think carefully about how systems are configured, particularly given that many vehicles double as personal cars, which is why the standards specify that drivers should be able to switch both audio and visual recording off when not working.¹³⁴

78.

We heard evidence in support of more widespread use of in-vehicle CCTV. Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council told us that it has dealt with "numerous" cases where having camera footage has protected passengers or led to the apprehension and prosecution of offenders.¹³⁵ Transport for London told us that in-vehicle CCTV contributes to supporting effective policing where evidence is needed to support enforcement or protect vulnerable individuals.¹³⁶ Unite called for national licensing standards to include mandatory CCTV and audio recording.¹³⁷ Saskia Garner, Head of Policy and Campaigns at the Suzy Lamplugh Trust argued that continuous video and audio recording would not only help assure drivers of their

134 The Department for Transport, [The Statutory Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Standards 2020](#), gov.uk, July 2020

135 Rotherham MBC ([TPV0171](#))

136 Transport for London ([TPV0106](#))

137 Unite the Union ([TPV0182](#))

own safety but also help prevent disputes about whether offences had taken place.¹³⁸ Others agreed that it would be valuable in providing an ‘objective record’ of incidents, ensuring accountability for both drivers and passengers.¹³⁹ The Institute of Licensing also supported the concept, stating that in-vehicle CCTV acts as a deterrent to inappropriate or criminal behaviour.¹⁴⁰ Transport for London told us that evidence from the use of body-worn cameras by transport staff in London shows that such technology can reduce the risk of physical violence, and similar benefits apply to the use of in-vehicle CCTV.¹⁴¹ Private hire firm Addison Lee told us:

Trust in reported complaints is reducing as customers have developed a growing trend of making fallacious complaints about drivers in order to either receive a refund for their journey or a promo code for future journeys. This trend has been uncovered through the installation of CCTV. Even quite serious complaints have been found to be completely untrue through accessing CCTV.¹⁴²

79. We did hear concerns about making CCTV compulsory, however. Andy Mahoney MBE, representing the Licensed Private Hire Car Association (LPHCA) told us that private hire is by its nature a private service, used by a wide range of passengers including people conducting sensitive business, and suggested that mandatory CCTV could deter some passengers from using private hire vehicles altogether.¹⁴³ The LPHCA therefore did not support mandating CCTV in PHVs, describing the Department’s best practice guidance as adequate and arguing that “the industry should not have the burden of installing CCTV at great cost when there is little evidence that it provides a benefit for either drivers or passengers.”¹⁴⁴
80. The minister told us that operators had raised concerns about the likely additional cost of mandatory CCTV and the impact this could have on the price and availability of services, alongside concerns about passenger privacy and data storage. She added that the Information Commissioner’s Office had also expressed concerns in this regard.¹⁴⁵

138 [Q140](#) [Saskia Garner]

139 Unite the Union ([TPV0182](#)); Institute of Licensing Limited ([TPV0130](#)); London Cab Drivers Club (LCDC) ([TPV0027](#))

140 Institute of Licensing ([TPV0130](#))

141 Transport for London ([TPV0106](#))

142 Addison Lee Limited ([TPV0112](#))

143 [Q9](#) [Andy Mahoney MBE]

144 Licensed Private Hire Car Association (The LPHCA) ([TPV0131](#))

145 [Q229](#) [Lilian Greenwood]

81.

CONCLUSION

We recognise that mandating in-vehicle CCTV across the sector would be a significant, and in some quarters, controversial step. However, we heard substantial evidence about its potential to strengthen safety for both passengers and drivers, and we consider that evidence to be compelling.

82.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that the government consult within the next 12 months on introducing mandatory in-vehicle CCTV, with a view to including this requirement within national standards if it is sufficiently supported by evidence. The consultation should also seek views on how data protection, privacy and storage concerns could be suitably addressed.

Licensing efficiency

83.

We were also told about long and inefficient licensing processes. Andy Mahoney MBE, representing the Licensed Private Hire Car Association told us that some licensing departments could take up to 15 weeks to process a licence, which is far too long for someone dependent on driving for their income, and that this time lag is a significant driver of licence shopping.¹⁴⁶ A constituency survey conducted by Committee member Baggy Shanker MP highlighted the fact that even fully compliant drivers can lose their income when licence renewals are delayed.¹⁴⁷ Helen Chapman, Director of Licensing and Regulation at Transport for London told us about the challenges TfL's licensing function had faced in timely processing of applications as a result of a cybersecurity incident and the introduction of a new licensing software system. She told us that significant time, effort and resources had been invested in addressing these challenges, but that there remained occasions where the process of writing to drivers to request additional information caused further delay.¹⁴⁸ Professional Driver Magazine told us that if other authorities followed Wolverhampton's example and invested heavily in digital systems and staffing to speed up the licensing process, the practice of licence shopping "could stop immediately".¹⁴⁹

84.

The minister acknowledged that poor efficiency could drive licence shopping, with drivers seeking out faster turnaround times out of their area of work.¹⁵⁰ She noted that there is a significant incentive for local authorities

146 [Q3](#) [Andy Mahoney MBE]

147 [Baggy Shanker MP \(TPV0201\)](#)

148 [Q73](#) [Helen Chapman]

149 [Professional Driver Magazine \(TPV0114\)](#)

150 [Q191](#) [Lilian Greenwood]

to process applications in a timely fashion if they want drivers to license with their authority. She referenced the government's proposed restructuring of the responsibility for licensing, away from a great many licensing authorities to fewer, larger strategic authorities as a potential solution for efficiency.¹⁵¹ In May 2026 the government stated that improving the efficiency of licensing would be one of the aims of its draft Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Bill.¹⁵²

85. CONCLUSION

Prolonged application and renewal delays create strong incentives for licence shopping. More acutely, they have a huge impact on the livelihoods of drivers. We welcome the government's intention to improve the efficiency of licensing through forthcoming legislation.

86. RECOMMENDATION

National standards should set a clear benchmark for licensing processing times, covering applications, renewals and variations, and require all licensing authorities to publish performance against that benchmark in a consistent format.

87. RECOMMENDATION

The government's proposal to move responsibility for licensing to local transport authorities will not apply in London, where Transport for London already acts as the licensing authority. London's recent experience of licensing backlogs demonstrates that this reform will not, at a stroke, solve resourcing and efficiency issues. The department must consider what can be learned from this experience about the operational and resourcing conditions that need to be in place if licensing responsibilities are to be exercised efficiently and reliably at a larger strategic authority level.

English language and local knowledge tests

88. The department's Statutory Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Standards state:

A lack of language proficiency could impact on a driver's ability to understand written documents, such as policies and guidance, relating to the protection of children and vulnerable adults and applying this

¹⁵¹ [Q191](#) [Lilian Greenwood]

¹⁵² Prime Minister's Office, [10 Downing Street, King's Speech 2026: background briefing notes](#), May 2026

to identify and act on signs of exploitation. Oral proficiency will be of relevance in the identification of potential exploitation through communicating with passengers and their interaction with others. A licensing authority's test of a driver's proficiency should cover both oral and written English language skills [...].¹⁵³

89. Leeds City Council told us that drivers must be able to speak, read and understand English at a functional level to communicate with passengers, understand road signs and navigate safely, but noted that many licensing authorities do not currently have this requirement.¹⁵⁴ Buckinghamshire Council told us that passengers and, in particular, vulnerable passengers can be put at risk if drivers cannot communicate in English.¹⁵⁵ James Button, President of the Institute of Licensing, told us that spoken and written English was one of a number of areas in which consistency was needed.¹⁵⁶ Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council agreed that proficiency in written and spoken English was critical to passenger safety, but cautioned that "careful consideration" would be needed to ensure that any new language requirements were "achieved in a suitable and consistent way without disadvantaging or creating an inequality with the trade".¹⁵⁷
90. Achieving a proportionate and consistent approach to English language requirements could present significant challenges. The Liverpool City Region Local Authority Licensing Authorities told us that there is no recommended course or nationally available standard for English language testing, leaving individual licensing authorities to devise their own training, which is time-consuming and defeats the purpose of what national guidance is trying to achieve.¹⁵⁸
91. The minister told us that the department's existing guidance already sets out that drivers should have a certain level of English. She said she wanted to look at the best way to standardise this, but stated, "I am pretty clear that English should be a requirement."¹⁵⁹
92. Some, but not all, licensing authorities require drivers to pass a local knowledge test to demonstrate a minimum level of expertise in navigating the area where it is presumed they will work. Fylde Coast Replacement Taxis Ltd told us that the rise of out-of-area working had effectively made local

153 The Department for Transport, [Statutory taxi and private hire vehicle standards](#), gov.uk, November 2022

154 Leeds City Council ([TPV0089](#))

155 Buckinghamshire Council ([TPV0170](#))

156 [Q140](#) [James Button]

157 Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council ([TPV0105](#))

158 Liverpool City Region Local Authority Licensing Authorities; Liverpool City Region Combined Authority and the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (Merseyside) ([TPV0136](#))

159 [Q183](#) [Lilian Greenwood]

knowledge among drivers “non-existent”.¹⁶⁰ Blackpool Taxi Association told us that replacing the traditional taxi driver knowledge test with a simplified questionnaire had led to poorer local knowledge and driving standards, contributing to road safety risks and increased concern about passenger safety.¹⁶¹ We heard an argument that satellite navigation and tools like Google Maps were rendering local knowledge a “non-issue”.¹⁶² Others argued, however, that the benefits of local knowledge could not be fully replaced by sat-nav systems, which may be outdated or incomplete and could leave drivers reliant on passenger directions.¹⁶³

93. CONCLUSION

The current inconsistent expectations for English language proficiency and local knowledge across different licensing authorities can have negative effects on the safety and confidence of passengers and drivers alike.

94. RECOMMENDATION

National standards should set proportionate and fair requirements for key elements of driver competence, including spoken English language proficiency and appropriate knowledge of the areas in which drivers operate.

Accessibility

- 95.** In 2024, 11.5% of all licensed vehicles were wheelchair accessible (WAVs). The wheelchair accessible fleet is largely composed of taxis, 54% of which are WAVs compared to just over 2% of PHVs.¹⁶⁴ The proportion of wheelchair accessible taxis has edged slowly downwards over the past decade, from 61% in 2011, while the number of accessible PHVs has remained consistently low.¹⁶⁵
- 96.** In London, all taxis are wheelchair accessible under Transport for London licensing requirements.¹⁶⁶ Elsewhere in England, 37.5% of taxis are accessible, with some major cities including Birmingham, Liverpool and

¹⁶⁰ Fylde Coast Replacement Taxis Ltd ([TPV0036](#))

¹⁶¹ Blackpool Taxi Association ([TPV0023](#))

¹⁶² Mr Matthew Francis ([TPV0076](#))

¹⁶³ Sunderland Hackney Carriage Operators Association ([TPV0081](#)); Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council ([TPV0105](#))

¹⁶⁴ The Department for Transport, [Taxi and private hire vehicle statistics, England, 2024 \(revised\)](#), gov.uk, January 2025

¹⁶⁵ The Department for Transport, [Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Statistics: 2011](#), gov.uk, December 2011

¹⁶⁶ Transport for London, [Passengers and accessibility](#), gov.uk

Manchester achieving full accessibility within their taxi fleets. By contrast, wheelchair accessible provision among private hire vehicles (PHVs) is much lower, at 0.4% in London and 3.2% across the rest of England.¹⁶⁷ Availability is further complicated by significant gaps throughout the day, particularly during school drop-off and pick-up times outside of holidays, when all WAVs in some areas may be in use simultaneously.¹⁶⁸ Emma Vogelmann of Transport for All told us that, particularly outside urban areas, “there are next to no wheelchair-accessible vehicles”.¹⁶⁹ Kimberly Hurd, Senior General Manager for the UK and Ireland at Bolt told us that, despite the company taking no commission and offering incentives through its Bolt Assist and WAV categories, it remains very difficult to find additional drivers to meet demand on the platform.¹⁷⁰ We pressed Uber’s Emma O’Dwyer on whether she knew the proportion of wheelchair accessible vehicles in Uber’s fleet; she did not have an answer.¹⁷¹

97. The cost of wheelchair accessible vehicles can be prohibitive for many drivers. Andrew Wescott, Corporate and Government Affairs Director at Veezu told us that such vehicles are significantly more expensive, with fewer models available, and warned that the removal of the VAT exemption on PHVs, with effect from January 2026, would “further exacerbate” the problem of affordability.¹⁷² Mark Robinson, Owner and Director at Vokes Taxis Ltd told us that requiring all vehicles to be wheelchair accessible, as some local authorities have attempted to do, is very difficult to enforce when there is no funding available to offset the expense of procuring the vehicle and that the return from fares did not cover the expense.¹⁷³ The department told us that there were some areas where it would be “inappropriate” to require every taxi licensed to be a WAV as they believe provision of a mixed fleet to be the more effective way of ensuring that a range of access needs are catered for. In these specific areas the department said authorities can encourage uptake through financial incentives, less stringent licensing requirements, and prioritised rank access.¹⁷⁴
98. The minister affirmed that the government wants there to be sufficient vehicles to meet the needs of disabled people but noted that wheelchair accessible vehicles are not necessarily the best option for all disabled people and that they are expensive to provide. Commenting on the idea of

167 The Department for Transport, [Taxi and private hire vehicle statistics, England, 2024 \(revised\)](#), gov.uk, January 2025

168 Department for Transport ([TPV0189](#))

169 [Q159](#) [Emma Vogelmann]

170 [Q107](#) [Kimberly Hurd]

171 [Q111](#) [Emma O’Dwyer]

172 [Q107](#) [Andrew Wescott]; HM Revenue and Customs, [Private Hire Vehicle Operators and the change in legislation for the Tour Operators’ Margin Scheme](#), gov.uk, November 2025

173 [Q107](#) [Mark Robinson]

174 Department for Transport ([TPV0189](#))

requiring an area's whole fleet to be wheelchair accessible, she concluded, "I am not sure that there is a really easy way to do it".¹⁷⁵ In May 2026 the government said that its proposed draft Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Bill would deliver "more accessible services for disabled passengers, by strengthening existing protections and removing barriers to travel".¹⁷⁶

99. Driver behaviour is the other key component of accessibility. Whilst the proportion of licensing authorities requiring disability awareness training has climbed steadily in recent years, as of April 2024, it remained a requirement for taxi and PHV drivers in only 67% and 65% of authorities respectively. This is despite the best practice guidance for licensing authorities setting out that all drivers should complete such training.¹⁷⁷ The department told us:

it is unacceptable that in a third of licensing authorities drivers are still not supported to understand their legal duties, potentially leaving disabled passengers vulnerable to unlawful discriminatory conduct.¹⁷⁸

100. Even when such training is mandated, it is not always effective. Emma Vogelmann of Transport for All told us that there is no standard for disability equality training or assistance provision across any mode of transport.¹⁷⁹ She reported that drivers are frequently unaware of their legal obligations, including when to start and stop the meter for disabled passengers, and argued that licensing authorities need to do more to communicate these standards rather than relying on whether individual drivers happen to keep up with regulations affecting their industry.¹⁸⁰
101. Emma Vogelmann told us that disabled people face extremely high rates of drivers refusing to provide service to them, with 26% having experienced some form of refusal relating to a disability, rising to 63% for assistance dog handlers.¹⁸¹ In our report, "Access denied: rights versus reality in disabled people's access to transport", we noted evidence about taxi and PHV refusals on an even broader scale.¹⁸² Leonard Cheshire, a UK-based charity supporting disabled people, told us that 14% of disabled people had been refused travel because of their disability, while accessibility campaigner

175 [Q250](#) [Lilian Greenwood]

176 Prime Minister's Office, [10 Downing Street, King's Speech 2026: background briefing notes](#), May 2026

177 The Department for Transport, [Taxi and private hire vehicle licensing best practice guidance for licensing authorities in England](#), gov.uk, November 2023

178 Department for Transport ([TPV0189](#))

179 [Q143](#) [Emma Vogelmann]

180 [Q163](#) [Emma Vogelmann]

181 [Q163](#) [Emma Vogelmann]

182 Transport Committee, First Report of Session 2024–26, [Access denied: rights versus reality in disabled people's access to transport](#), HC 770, para 145

Stephen Anderson told us that there were 43 different occasions when a taxi or PHV driver had failed or refused to transport him because of the presence of his guide dog.¹⁸³

- 102.** The Taxis and Private Hire Vehicles (Disabled Persons) Act 2022 amended the Equality Act 2010 to extend protections previously afforded only to wheelchair and assistance dog users to all disabled passengers, placing duties on all taxi and PHV drivers to not refuse carriage to a disabled person, to provide appropriate assistance, and to do so without additional charge.¹⁸⁴ The minister told us that the statistics and anecdotal evidence on service refusals were “appalling”, and that it could be assumed that enforcement was not working as well as it should.¹⁸⁵

103. CONCLUSION

Refusals of service, low availability of wheelchair accessible vehicles and inconsistent disability equality training remain significant barriers to inclusive travel by taxi and private hire vehicle. The cost of and practical challenges for drivers in purchasing and maintaining wheelchair accessible vehicles exacerbate the problem.

104. RECOMMENDATION

National standards should include mandatory disability awareness and equality training for drivers and operators, to be provided to a high minimum standard of quality, with clear refresher requirements and effective enforcement against non-compliance.

105. RECOMMENDATION

The department should publish a national plan to increase wheelchair accessible vehicle (WAV) provision. The plan should be underpinned by a single national WAV fleet requirement, specifying the minimum proportion of each licensing authority’s total licensed fleet that must be wheelchair accessible vehicles. The plan should require every licensing authority to demonstrate and report progress against that requirement. While local delivery models may differ, including in rural and low-density areas, the required minimum proportion of WAVs and the standard of passenger access those vehicles must meet should be consistent nationally. The plan should also include:

- a new requirement to improve transparency, requiring all operators to publish their fleet’s provision of WAVs; and

183 Leonard Cheshire ([ATL0045](#)); [Qq4, 55](#) (14 June 2023)

184 [Equality Act 2010](#), UK Parliament, [Taxis and Private Hire Vehicles \(Disabled Persons\) Bill Explanatory Notes](#), parliament.uk, March 2022

185 [Q248](#) [Lilian Greenwood]

- specific measures to improve WAV provision and provide greater incentives for drivers to use them across the country, including rural and low-density areas.

106. RECOMMENDATION

The plan should also be accompanied by additional funding, delivered through licensing authorities, to help drivers meet the costs of acquiring, adapting and maintaining WAVs.

107. RECOMMENDATION

Accessibility in the broadest sense also means giving users the widest variety of options for finding out about and booking services—both digital and non-digital. The department should consider including provision of a range of booking options by operators in the national standards.

Complaints

- 108.** When a passenger has a complaint about a taxi or PHV journey, their first point of contact is typically the operator, with unresolved complaints escalating to the relevant local licensing authority. Authorities can take action ranging from training to licence review, but they have no jurisdiction over licences issued by other authorities.¹⁸⁶
- 109.** We heard that the current system for complaints is confusing for passengers. Helen Chapman at Transport for London told us that many passengers do not know who their licensing authority is, particularly in the private hire sector.¹⁸⁷ Mark Robinson, Owner and Director at Vokes Taxis Ltd made a similar point, telling us that when passengers travel in a vehicle that is not licensed locally, “they haven’t got a clue who to make that complaint to”.¹⁸⁸ Emma Vogelmann of Transport for All told us that many disabled people do not make complaints, not only because of the distress involved but also because of a fear that when they do, they are left without a resolution or even any indication that action has been taken: “the feedback loop does not get closed”.¹⁸⁹ She called for complaints processes to be included in any national standard, ensuring that clear timeframes are set for what individuals can expect from operators and licensing authorities.¹⁹⁰

¹⁸⁶ The Department for Transport ([TPV0189](#)); Gloucestershire Licensing Authorities ([TPV0108](#))

¹⁸⁷ [Q60](#) [Helen Chapman]

¹⁸⁸ [Q102](#) [Mark Robinson]

¹⁸⁹ [Q164](#) [Emma Vogelmann]

¹⁹⁰ [Q142](#) [Emma Vogelmann]

110. The Gloucestershire Licensing Authorities proposed a single phone line or website through which all complaints related to taxi and private hire drivers, vehicles and operators could be lodged, processed and directed to the correct local authority for action. They acknowledged that establishing such a body would be challenging and would likely depend on a live national register of all licensed drivers, vehicles and operators, but noted that the foundations were already in place through the NR3S and that large app-based operators already forward complaints to the appropriate licensing authority despite operating fleets of tens of thousands of vehicles.¹⁹¹ The taxi operator Thomas Whiteside and Sons told us that current complaints systems are “fragmented and underused” and also called for a national complaints portal, accessible via app and hotline, that feeds into licensing decisions and is transparent to both passengers and drivers.¹⁹²
111. When asked whether a national complaints portal could be a potential solution, the minister told us she had not previously considered it, but that it was something that “absolutely we will look at”.¹⁹³ In our 2025 report on transport accessibility, we recommended that the government work with disabled people’s organisations to design a unified service to receive and triage complaints about transport accessibility across modes; the department’s response to that recommendation put the onus back on transport operators but said it would undertake “further work” to “explore” simplification of complaints processes.¹⁹⁴ That response also stated there would be a link to the Integrated National Transport Strategy, although that strategy, published in 2026, does not contain details about complaint handling.¹⁹⁵

112. **CONCLUSION**

Complaints and incident reporting arrangements are fragmented. In some areas they are difficult for passengers and drivers to navigate, reducing transparency and weakening accountability.

191 Gloucestershire Licensing Authorities ([TPV0108](#))

192 Thomas Whiteside & Sons Limited trading as Whiteside Taxis ([TPV0032](#))

193 [Q258](#) [Lilian Greenwood]

194 Transport Committee, First Report of Session 2024–25, [Access denied: rights versus reality in disabled people’s access to transport](#), HC 770, para 105, Transport Committee, First Special Report of Session 2024–25, [Access denied: rights versus reality in disabled people’s access to transport: Government Response](#), HC 931, para 44

195 The Department for Transport, [Better Connected A Strategy for Integrated Transport](#), gov.uk, April 2026

113.

RECOMMENDATION

The introduction of national standards should be accompanied by a single national complaints and incident reporting portal for taxi and private hire services. It should be digitally inclusive, route reports to the responsible authority, and include clear service standards for acknowledgement, updates, and resolution.

7 Enforcement that stops at the border

- 114.** Licensing authorities hold legal responsibility for inspection and enforcement of standards in the taxi and PHV sector, including assessing driver fitness, vehicle safety, and handling complaints. We heard that enforcement is patchy and ineffective, in part because licensing authorities can only act in respect of drivers or vehicles they have directly licensed: they cannot take action against drivers in their area who have been licensed by another authority, and have limited resources to travel to other areas where ‘their’ drivers may be operating.¹⁹⁶ The Local Government Association explains:

[A] key issue for councils is the limited enforcement powers they have to take action against PHVs that are licensed by another authority. First and foremost, councils have no ability to stop vehicles, which leaves them only able to intervene when a vehicle is stationary, and unable to prevent it being driven off—only the police may stop a vehicle. Secondly, a council may only take action against a vehicle or driver that it has licensed, meaning that there is absolutely nothing that a council can do if a vehicle or driver licensed elsewhere is operating in their area, other than complain to the ‘home’ authority.¹⁹⁷

- 115.** Lee Petrak, Public Protection Commercial Enforcement Manager at Blackpool Council told us that “chasing vehicles all over the country” is simply beyond the capacity of his authority’s enforcement function.¹⁹⁸ Helen Chapman of Transport for London concurred, describing enforcement against out-of-area vehicles as “really difficult” as licensing authorities do not have the same powers to act as they would against vehicles and drivers they themselves have licensed.¹⁹⁹

196 Local Government Association ([TPV0035](#)); Bristol City Council ([TPV0111](#)); Addison Lee ([TPV0112](#))

197 Local Government Association, [Councillor Handbook: Taxi and PHV Licensing](#), local.gov.uk, July 2021

198 [Q31](#) [Lee Petrak]

199 [Q38](#) [Helen Chapman]

- 116.** Resourcing and capacity are among the most significant barriers to effective enforcement.²⁰⁰ David Lawrie, Director of the National Private Hire and Taxi Association acknowledged that while some councils are very effective at enforcement, others increasingly cite limited resources as a reason for inaction.²⁰¹ Enforcement is funded through locally-raised licensing fees, which are dependent on the number of licences issued by each authority. As a result, there are significant disparities between the number of enforcement staff authorities have: Kimberly Hurd, Senior General Manager for the UK and Ireland at Bolt noted that Wolverhampton has 100 staff dedicated to licensing, while “many have one or a fractional person who is dedicated”.²⁰² The United Cabbies Group stated that Transport for London has only six dedicated enforcement officers covering nearly 17,000 taxis and more than 100,000 private hire vehicles. While these staff sit within a larger team of Compliance Officers, they still have a remit for all of London and Heathrow Airport.²⁰³ Disparity of resources, such as enough staff to carry out enforcement, is a particular problem for more rural licensing authorities.²⁰⁴ We also heard that licensing authorities should be given the ability to recover enforcement costs from the authority that issued the licence, to address the misalignment between responsibility and resourcing.²⁰⁵
- 117.** Some licensing authorities have co-operation agreements with others to ensure that their standards are being adhered to. One of the recommendations of the 2018 Task and Finish Group report was that all licensing authorities should use their existing powers to make it a condition of licensing that drivers cooperate with requests from authorised compliance officers in other areas.²⁰⁶ The effectiveness of cross-authority enforcement, where present, is also subject to the capacity councils have to monitor and take action against out-of-area drivers.²⁰⁷

200 Bristol City Council ([TPV0111](#)); Sheffield City Council ([TPV0103](#)); Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Cleveland ([TPV0128](#)); Gloucestershire Licensing Authorities ([TPV0108](#))

201 [Q18](#) [David Lawrie]

202 [Q104](#) [Kimberly Hurd]

203 United Cabbies Group ([TPV0121](#))

204 Gloucestershire Licensing Authorities ([TPV0108](#))

205 Brighton and Hove Private Hire Association ([TPV0122](#)); 24x7 Group Ltd ([TPV0135](#))

206 The Department for Transport, [Taxi and private hire vehicle licensing: recommendations for a safer and more robust system](#), gov.uk, September 2018 [p.8]

207 Rotherham MBC ([TPV0171](#)); Institute of Licensing Limited ([TPV0130](#)); Stockport Council ([TPV0169](#))

- 118.** We heard strong support for the idea of allowing licensing authorities to act against any vehicle or driver operating in their area, referred to by some as “national enforcement powers” for authorities.²⁰⁸ The Local Government Association told us that licensing officers only being able to enforce against drivers and vehicles they have licensed is a constraint and argued that national enforcement powers, supported by additional resources, would help address this.²⁰⁹ Saskia Garner of the Suzy Lamplugh Trust told us that such a move would be “critical” for the enforcement of any proposed national standards.²¹⁰ Paul James, Taxi Driver and Project Manager at Unite the Union Taxi Education told us that he was “supportive of national enforcement powers for all licensing authorities”.²¹¹
- 119.** The minister told us that enforcement was something the department was aware needed improvement, but that it would not be possible to address this through the measures at that time being taken forward in the English Devolution and Community Empowerment Bill. She noted that, under current arrangements, where vehicles are licensed in one area but operate in another, “the money provided in order to undertake enforcement activities is in the wrong place”, as responsibility for enforcement and the funding to support it can sit with different authorities. The minister stated that “[in] the longer term [...] we want licensing authorities to be able to enforce on all the taxis and PHVs operating in their area.”²¹² In May 2026, the government stated that its forthcoming draft Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Bill would “give regulators stronger enforcement powers” and would introduce “funding for enforcement matched to where services are delivered”.²¹³
- 120. CONCLUSION**
- Many licensing authorities lack the resources and capacity to carry out effective enforcement. Enforcement officers are not able to take action against all taxi and private hire activity in their area. Cooperation between licensing authorities can be a positive step in the right direction, but ad-hoc local agreements do not provide effective enforcement on a national scale.

208 Transport for London (TfL) ([TPV0200](#)); Brighton and Hove Private Hire Association ([TPV0122](#)); Local Government Association ([TPV0035](#)); Unite the Union Taxi Education and Liverpool Hackney Branch ([TPV0109](#)); Institute of Licensing Limited ([TPV0130](#))

209 Local Government Association ([TPV0035](#))

210 [Q142](#) [Saskia Garner]

211 [Q19](#) [Paul James]

212 [Q234](#) [Lilian Greenwood]

213 Prime Minister’s Office, [10 Downing Street, King’s Speech 2026: background briefing notes](#), May 2026

121.

RECOMMENDATION

We welcome the minister's statement that the government wants licensing authorities to be able to take enforcement action against all the taxis and PHVs operating in their area. We look forward to the government's forthcoming legislation setting out a clear pathway to achieving this.

122.

RECOMMENDATION

Enabling full cross-border enforcement will only be effective if licensing authorities have the capacity and incentives to undertake it. The government should address the current mismatch between enforcement responsibilities and funding by enabling licensing authorities to recover the costs of enforcement action taken against out-of-area drivers from the authority that issued the licence. Transitional support may be required to build enforcement capacity in authorities with more limited resources.

Conclusions and recommendations

The legislative framework and stalled reform

1. Evidence to our inquiry and the previous work undertaken by the Law Commission and the Task and Finish Group have all described a legislative framework that is unfit for purpose in the modern era, in which use of ride-hailing apps has grown rapidly. It is fragmented and does not provide a consistent basis for effective regulation and enforcement across England. Gaps in the framework cannot always be addressed through guidance alone. (Conclusion, Paragraph 21)
2. We are pleased that the government has set out plans for legislation to modernise and consolidate the licensing framework for taxis and private hire vehicles. We urge the government to use the Law Commission's 2014 draft bill and the report of the Task and Finish group as its starting points, updating them where necessary to reflect and incorporate app-based operators. A new framework should maintain clear distinctions between taxis and private hire vehicles, while placing both within a single consolidated statutory framework. (Recommendation, Paragraph 22)

Out-of-area working

3. Out-of-area working is now a widespread feature of the taxi and private hire vehicle market. We recognise the strength of concern about its impact on standards, local accountability and public confidence. We also acknowledge that outright prohibition would be impractical. (Conclusion, Paragraph 31)
4. We urge the department to bring forward a clear plan to curtail the extensive practice of out-of-area working and create greater incentives for drivers to license in the locality in which they operate. This will enable local licensing authorities to take enforcement action more readily, keep both drivers and passengers safe, and restore trust that has been lost across the sector. (Recommendation, Paragraph 32)

Responsibility for licensing

5. The government's proposal to move responsibility for licensing to local transport authorities may have advantages in terms of improving operational capacity, and the ability of transport authorities to better integrate taxis into their transport plans and brand accordingly. However, we are not persuaded that a transfer of licensing responsibilities will, on its own, remove incentives to out-of-area working. Licensing areas will become larger, but drivers will still be able to operate across boundaries. (Conclusion, Paragraph 38)
6. Following the conclusion of its consultation on transferring taxi and PHV licensing to local transport authorities, the department should publish a comparative appraisal of licensing models, including the local transport authority approach and a potential national licensing model. This appraisal should assess which model would best reduce incentives for extensive out-of-area working. (Recommendation, Paragraph 39)

Setting high national standards

7. The sheer scale of variation in standards across different licensing authorities has created an inconsistent and confusing landscape for trade and passengers alike. (Conclusion, Paragraph 41)
8. We welcome the department's acknowledgement that greater national consistency in licensing standards is required. However, we are not persuaded that the current plan to pursue national minimum standards will be sufficient, unless those standards are strong enough to avoid a lowest common denominator effect, and carefully specified to remove incentives for licence shopping. The department already accepts that in practice there should be an absolute standard in areas like safety. (Conclusion, Paragraph 50)
9. The government's plan for national minimum standards must not mean low by default. The areas in which variation in standards is permitted should be minimised in order to disincentivise licence shopping, and set at a high level wherever possible to ensure consistently high-quality passenger experiences. (Recommendation, Paragraph 51)

What should national standards include?

10. The overwhelming majority of drivers uphold high standards and play an essential role in keeping communities moving safely. However, the system needs to provide a robust safety net for the protection of passengers and drivers. Safety standards must be absolute and not subject to local variations. (Conclusion, Paragraph 57)
11. An enhanced DBS check is the highest level of criminal record check available, yet it seemingly does not guarantee that licensing authorities receive all the information they need to make sound judgements about licence applications. We are concerned that the current framework creates a false sense of security: licensing authorities believe they are seeing a complete picture when they are not. (Conclusion, Paragraph 58)
12. We agree with the minister that every local authority must require drivers to have an enhanced DBS check and to be checked against the adults' and children's barring lists. We also recommend that requirements for safeguarding training and clear requirements for frequency of re-checking DBS certificates be included in national standards so that they are applied uniformly across every licensing authority. The department should also review the impact that legislative changes have had on DBS filtering and work with relevant partners to ensure these do not create unintended gaps in the information available to licensing authorities. (Recommendation, Paragraph 59)
13. Defining "fit and proper" in statute would not be straightforward, and any definition would need to preserve a degree of flexibility for licensing authorities to exercise judgement in individual cases. The consequences of getting decisions wrong are serious, however, and more specification could be useful for decision-makers. (Conclusion, Paragraph 64)
14. The government should ensure that guidance clearly links the criteria for making a fit and proper person judgement to national licensing standards. (Recommendation, Paragraph 65)
15. We recognise that there are established routes for sharing safeguarding and risk information between the police and licensing authorities. However, in practice, information sharing remains inconsistent and results in uneven access to information that is crucial for public protection. (Conclusion, Paragraph 69)
16. We welcome the commitment from government that it intends, through legislation, to improve transparency and information sharing. The department should work with the Home Office to place information sharing between policing bodies and licensing authorities on a statutory footing so that there are common expectations everywhere. This should

include a duty to share relevant safeguarding and risk information for licensing purposes, supported by a standard expectation on timeliness. (Recommendation, Paragraph 70)

17. The absence of a comprehensive national database makes it harder for licensing authorities to make safe and consistent decisions, particularly where drivers, vehicles and operators work across authority boundaries. We welcome the fact that the department has started work to address this. (Conclusion, Paragraph 75)
18. We welcome the department's work towards establishment of a mandatory national licensing database covering all taxi and private hire drivers, vehicles and operators. The database should enable licensing authorities to confirm licence status, licensing history and the responsible authority quickly and ensure that refusals, revocations and other relevant decisions are recorded consistently and visible to all authorities. The department should set out a clear timescale on which this work will be completed. (Recommendation, Paragraph 76)
19. We recognise that mandating in-vehicle CCTV across the sector would be a significant, and in some quarters, controversial step. However, we heard substantial evidence about its potential to strengthen safety for both passengers and drivers, and we consider that evidence to be compelling. (Conclusion, Paragraph 81)
20. We recommend that the government consult within the next 12 months on introducing mandatory in-vehicle CCTV, with a view to including this requirement within national standards if it is sufficiently supported by evidence. The consultation should also seek views on how data protection, privacy and storage concerns could be suitably addressed. (Recommendation, Paragraph 82)
21. Prolonged application and renewal delays create strong incentives for licence shopping. More acutely, they have a huge impact on the livelihoods of drivers. We welcome the government's intention to improve the efficiency of licensing through forthcoming legislation. (Conclusion, Paragraph 85)
22. National standards should set a clear benchmark for licensing processing times, covering applications, renewals and variations, and require all licensing authorities to publish performance against that benchmark in a consistent format. (Recommendation, Paragraph 86)
23. The government's proposal to move responsibility for licensing to local transport authorities will not apply in London, where Transport for London already acts as the licensing authority. London's recent experience of licensing backlogs demonstrates that this reform will not, at a stroke, solve resourcing and efficiency issues. The department must consider what

can be learned from this experience about the operational and resourcing conditions that need to be in place if licensing responsibilities are to be exercised efficiently and reliably at a larger strategic authority level. (Recommendation, Paragraph 87)

24. The current inconsistent expectations for English language proficiency and local knowledge across different licensing authorities can have negative effects on the safety and confidence of passengers and drivers alike. (Conclusion, Paragraph 93)
25. National standards should set proportionate and fair requirements for key elements of driver competence, including spoken English language proficiency and appropriate knowledge of the areas in which drivers operate. (Recommendation, Paragraph 94)
26. Refusals of service, low availability of wheelchair accessible vehicles and inconsistent disability equality training remain significant barriers to inclusive travel by taxi and private hire vehicle. The cost of and practical challenges for drivers in purchasing and maintaining wheelchair accessible vehicles exacerbate the problem. (Conclusion, Paragraph 103)
27. National standards should include mandatory disability awareness and equality training for drivers and operators, to be provided to a high minimum standard of quality, with clear refresher requirements and effective enforcement against non-compliance. (Recommendation, Paragraph 104)
28. The department should publish a national plan to increase wheelchair accessible vehicle (WAV) provision. The plan should be underpinned by a single national WAV fleet requirement, specifying the minimum proportion of each licensing authority's total licensed fleet that must be wheelchair accessible vehicles. The plan should require every licensing authority to demonstrate and report progress against that requirement. While local delivery models may differ, including in rural and low-density areas, the required minimum proportion of WAVs and the standard of passenger access those vehicles must meet should be consistent nationally. The plan should also include:
 - a new requirement to improve transparency, requiring all operators to publish their fleet's provision of WAVs; and
 - specific measures to improve WAV provision and provide greater incentives for drivers to use them across the country, including rural and low-density areas. (Recommendation, Paragraph 105)

- 29.** The plan should also be accompanied by additional funding, delivered through licensing authorities, to help drivers meet the costs of acquiring, adapting and maintaining WAVs. (Recommendation, Paragraph 106)
- 30.** Accessibility in the broadest sense also means giving users the widest variety of options for finding out about and booking services—both digital and non-digital. The department should consider including provision of a range of booking options by operators in the national standards. (Recommendation, Paragraph 107)
- 31.** Complaints and incident reporting arrangements are fragmented. In some areas they are difficult for passengers and drivers to navigate, reducing transparency and weakening accountability. (Conclusion, Paragraph 112)
- 32.** The introduction of national standards should be accompanied by a single national complaints and incident reporting portal for taxi and private hire services. It should be digitally inclusive, route reports to the responsible authority, and include clear service standards for acknowledgement, updates, and resolution. (Recommendation, Paragraph 113)

Enforcement that stops at the border

- 33.** Many licensing authorities lack the resources and capacity to carry out effective enforcement. Enforcement officers are not able to take action against all taxi and private hire activity in their area. Cooperation between licensing authorities can be a positive step in the right direction, but ad-hoc local agreements do not provide effective enforcement on a national scale. (Conclusion, Paragraph 120)
- 34.** We welcome the minister's statement that the government wants licensing authorities to be able to take enforcement action against all the taxis and PHVs operating in their area. We look forward to the government's forthcoming legislation setting out a clear pathway to achieving this. (Recommendation, Paragraph 121)
- 35.** Enabling full cross-border enforcement will only be effective if licensing authorities have the capacity and incentives to undertake it. The government should address the current mismatch between enforcement responsibilities and funding by enabling licensing authorities to recover the costs of enforcement action taken against out-of-area drivers from the authority that issued the licence. Transitional support may be required to build enforcement capacity in authorities with more limited resources. (Recommendation, Paragraph 122)

Appendix 1: Summary of the Committee's private roundtable with taxi and private hire vehicle drivers (December 2025)

We held a virtual roundtable on 3 December 2025 with taxi and private hire vehicle (PHV) drivers from across England. This appendix summarises the principal themes. To protect participants' anonymity, contributions are attributed only by reference to drivers' occupation.

Out-of-area working was the dominant concern among the drivers we met. Participants from all kinds of areas described significant activity in their area by drivers holding licences from other authorities. Some participants attributed falls in their own earnings of between 30 and 40% to an increased presence of drivers not licensed by the local authority. Drivers in seasonal markets were particularly affected, with summer income essential to sustaining viable annual earnings. Complaints to licensing authorities had in most cases received no substantive response, and participants pointed out that local authorities are funded by their own licensed drivers and have little incentive or capacity to police drivers licensed elsewhere. One driver told us that "nobody seems to have power over cross-border drivers".

One driver offered a dissenting view supporting cross-border working, and suggesting that inadequate enforcement is down to a lack of will from individual authorities. However, aside from local joint enforcement arrangements, licensing authorities cannot take enforcement action against drivers licensed elsewhere.

There was broad support in principle for national minimum standards, but significant anxiety about its practical effect. The predominant concern was that a minimum would become the operative standard, driving compliance

downward rather than upward. One driver told us that minimum standards “strike fear into me”, concerned that they would occasion “a race to the bottom”.

Participants drew a distinction between driver standards, language requirements, local knowledge tests and driving assessments, which were considered attainable everywhere. Local knowledge testing was considered essential but difficult to incorporate into a national framework. Several participants also identified substantial variation in licensing fees as a primary driver of licence shopping, arguing that standardisation of standards alone would have limited effect while large fee differentials persisted.

The economics of wheelchair accessible vehicle (WAV) operation were widely described as unfavourable: higher capital costs and longer passenger loading times. One driver who had operated a WAV for a decade reported that the time cost of journeys where passengers had accessibility requirements became harder to absorb as income came under pressure from app-based operators. A disabled driver described existing vehicle cost requirements as effectively forcing drivers with protected characteristics out of the trade.

Working hours varied considerably among those we spoke to, with some drivers working around sixty hours a week to achieve incomes others reached in thirty. Hackney carriage drivers noted the asymmetry of regulated tariffs: unable to reduce fares in quiet periods or raise them during surges, they felt they were placed at a consistent disadvantage against app-based operators. Despite these pressures, a number of participants described genuine attachment to the trade; one said, “I love the trade. You meet every part of society in the cab. But these days it feels like a race to the bottom.”

Participants called for clearer enforcement mechanisms and, in several cases, an independent adjudicatory body to resolve disputes between drivers and licensing authorities. The concern was that drivers who raised complaints were vulnerable to retaliatory action by their own licensing authority, with no accessible route to independent challenge.

Appendix 2: Summary of confidential written evidence

We received a substantial volume of confidential written evidence, submitted largely by individual drivers and small operators from across England, including from the East Midlands, the South West, the South East coast, and London. The submissions covered broadly similar ground to the published evidence, with several consistent themes emerging.

Out-of-area working was the dominant concern, cited in the overwhelming majority of submissions. Submitters described how the ability of drivers licensed in one authority to operate in another had created significant tensions, with many arguing it undermined local enforcement, depressed earnings and eroded standards. Several submissions pointed to specific licensing authorities whose lower fees and more permissive conditions were seen as facilitating ‘licence shopping’. One submission offered a contrasting perspective, arguing that cross-border drivers meet the same national standards as locally licensed counterparts, and that the negative framing of the practice was not always supported by evidence.

Enforcement was a recurring concern. A number of submitters, including one from a law enforcement background, described significant gaps in practical enforcement capacity: licensing authorities unable or unwilling to act against out-of-area vehicles, limited use of existing statutory powers, and inadequate information-sharing between councils and police. The same evidence highlighted the NR3S database as a valuable but under-utilised tool, pointing to cases where revoked drivers had obtained licences from other authorities and returned to operating in the same city. Submitters broadly supported a mandatory national licensing database as a means of addressing this.

Several submissions addressed the impact of app-based platforms, expressing concern about the erosion of driver earnings, algorithmic dispatch practices that were said to disadvantage locally licensed drivers, and the absence of effective accountability mechanisms for platforms. A minority of submissions focused on safeguarding, highlighting risks posed by anonymised vehicles and the difficulty of tracing drivers licensed in distant jurisdictions when complaints arose.

Another issue raised was the working conditions experienced by drivers. We heard consistent evidence that many drivers face low and unpredictable earnings, with some reporting that, once costs are taken into account, income can fall below the minimum wage. Drivers working through app-based platforms in particular described high commission rates, opaque job allocation systems and fluctuating demand, making it difficult to plan working hours or maintain stable incomes. A further issue highlighted to us were declining trip volumes, irregular allocation of work, and increased competition from out-of-area drivers, all of which were felt to reduce earnings and force drivers to work longer hours to sustain their livelihoods. We also heard that the cumulative effect of these pressures could contribute to fatigue and stress, with implications for both driver welfare and passenger safety. We also heard from some drivers that they often felt unable to influence decisions affecting their work, while more acute impacts were also described, including reports of drivers living in their vehicles due to financial pressures.

Formal minutes

Tuesday 2 June 2026

Members present:

Ruth Cadbury, in the Chair

Steff Aquarone

Jacob Collier

Olly Glover

Alex Mayer

Laurence Turner

Raising the standard: licensing of taxis and private hire vehicles

Draft Report (*Raising the standard: licensing of taxis and private hire vehicles*), proposed by the Chair, brought up and read.

Ordered, That the draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 122 read and agreed to.

Summary agreed to.

Two papers were appended to the Report as Appendix 1 and Appendix 2.

Resolved, That the Report be the First Report to the House.

Ordered, That embargoed copies of the Report be made available, in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 134.

Adjournment

Adjourned till tomorrow at 9.15 am

Witnesses

The following witnesses gave evidence. Transcripts can be viewed on the [inquiry publications page](#) of the Committee's website.

Wednesday 15 October 2025

Mr David Lawrie, Director, National Private Hire and Taxi Association (NPHTA); **Eamon O'Hearn**, National Officer, GMB Union; **Andy Mahoney MBE**, LPHCA Official, Licensed Private Hire Car Association (The LPHCA); **Mr Paul James**, Project Manager, Unite Taxi Education Liverpool [Q1-22](#)

Helen Chapman, Director of Licensing and Regulation, Transport for London (TfL); **David Pattison**, Chief Operating Officer, City of Wolverhampton Council; **Mr Lee Petrak**, Public Protection Commercial Enforcement Manager, Blackpool Council [Q23-75](#)

Wednesday 19 November 2025

Emma O'Dwyer, Director of Public Policy, Uber; **Andrew Wescott**, Corporate and Government Affairs Director, Veezu Ltd; **Kimberly Hurd**, Senior General Manager for the UK and Ireland, Bolt; **Mark Robinson**, Owner and Director, Vokes Taxis Limited [Q76-137](#)

Emma Vogelmann, Co-CEO and Head of Policy, Public Affairs and Campaigns, Transport for All; **Saskia Garner**, Head of Policy and Campaigns, Suzy Lamplugh Trust; **Councillor Arooj Shah**, Chair of the Neighbourhoods Policy Committee, Local Government Association; **James Button**, President, Institute of Licensing [Q138-171](#)

Wednesday 14 January 2026

Lilian Greenwood MP, Minister for Roads, Department for Transport; **Liz Wilson**, Deputy Director, Accessibility, Coaches, Taxis and Community Transport Division, Department for Transport [Q172-265](#)

Published written evidence

The following written evidence was received and can be viewed on the [inquiry publications page](#) of the Committee's website.

TPV numbers are generated by the evidence processing system and so may not be complete.

1	247 Transport Solutions Ltd	TPV0137
2	24x7 Group Ltd	TPV0135
3	A1 Taxis Hinckley	TPV0045
4	AJD, Ali	TPV0185
5	Addison Lee Limited	TPV0112
6	App Drivers and Couriers Union	TPV0188
7	Avon and Somerset Constabulary	TPV0195
8	Bastin, Mr Roger	TPV0059
9	Blackpool Council	TPV0156
10	Blackpool Taxi Association	TPV0023
11	Bolt	TPV0202
12	Bolt	TPV0151
13	Boyle, Mrs Sandra	TPV0096
14	Brighton & Hove Cab Trade Association	TPV0080
15	Brighton and Hove Private Hire Association	TPV0122
16	Bristol City Council	TPV0111
17	Bristol Women's Voice	TPV0144
18	Buckinghamshire Council	TPV0170
19	Burnley Borough Council	TPV0098
20	Bury Council	TPV0145
21	Button, Mr James	TPV0090
22	Cabbidder Ltd	TPV0125
23	Cabsmart	TPV0093
24	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority	TPV0183

25	Sarah Champion MP	<u>TPV0055</u>
26	Chapple, Mr Neil	<u>TPV0154</u>
27	Cheshire East Council	<u>TPV0139</u>
28	Cheshire West and Chester Borough Council	<u>TPV0163</u>
29	City of Wolverhampton Council	<u>TPV0160</u>
30	Cleveleys Taxis Limited	<u>TPV0033</u>
31	Community Transport Association	<u>TPV0075</u>
32	Cooper	<u>TPV0102</u>
33	D.E.L.T.A Merseyside Limited	<u>TPV0176</u>
34	Durham Taxi & Private Hire Association	<u>TPV0140</u>
35	Department for Transport	<u>TPV0189</u>
36	Durham County Council	<u>TPV0079</u>
37	England's Economic Heartland	<u>TPV0168</u>
38	Exeter City Council	<u>TPV0082</u>
39	Francis, Mr Matthew	<u>TPV0076</u>
40	Freenow	<u>TPV0175</u>
41	Fylde Coast Replacement Taxis Ltd	<u>TPV0036</u>
42	GMB Union	<u>TPV0132</u>
43	Germain, Mr Stuart	<u>TPV0044</u>
44	Gerrard, John	<u>TPV0152</u>
45	Gloucestershire Licensing Authorities	<u>TPV0108</u>
46	Guildford Borough Council	<u>TPV0054</u>
47	Hill, Mr Jordan	<u>TPV0008</u>
48	Hull City Council	<u>TPV0092</u>
49	Humphreys, Mrs Nickii; and Mr Ben Attrill	<u>TPV0150</u>
50	Hussain, Mr Ibrar	<u>TPV0002</u>
51	Hussain, Mr Ibrar	<u>TPV0031</u>
52	IAM RoadSmart	<u>TPV0061</u>
53	Ibbetson, Mrs Sarah; and Mr Mark Ibbetson	<u>TPV0083</u>
54	Institute of Licensing Limited	<u>TPV0130</u>
55	Jason Kauder Starline	<u>TPV0071</u>
56	Joint Trade Council; and Leeds Taxi Owners Ltd	<u>TPV0142</u>

57	Khastgir, Professor Siddartha (WMG, University of Warwick, UK)	TPV0181
58	Kocabey, Mr Harlan	TPV0005
59	Lake District Taxi Drivers Hub	TPV0087
60	LEVC	TPV0077
61	Unite the Union Leeds Cab Branch	TPV0120
62	Leeds City Council	TPV0089
63	Licensed Private Hire Car Association (The LPHCA)	TPV0203
64	Licensed Private Hire Car Association (The LPHCA)	TPV0197
65	Licensed Private Hire Car Association (The LPHCA)	TPV0131
66	Licensed Taxi Drivers Association LTDA	TPV0068
67	Liverpool City Region Combined Authority; Liverpool City Region Local Authority Licensing Authorities; and The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Merseyside	TPV0136
68	Local Government Association	TPV0035
69	London & Eastern Unite the Union Cab Trade Advisory Committee	TPV0129
70	London Assembly Transport Committee	TPV0187
71	London Cab Drivers Club (LCDC)	TPV0027
72	Martin, Antony	TPV0041
73	Massey, Mr Mark	TPV0086
74	Medway Licensed Taxi Drivers Association	TPV0049
75	Metz, Dr David	TPV0067
76	Mohammed, Mr	TPV0146
77	Moore, Mr Stephen	TPV0069
78	Morgan, Mr Lee	TPV0159
79	Margaret Mullane MP	TPV0048
80	National Private Hire and Taxi Association	TPV0058
81	National Private Hire and Taxi Association (NPHTA)	TPV0204
82	National Private Hire and Taxi Association (NPHTA)	TPV0193
83	National Private Hire and Taxi Association (NPHTA)	TPV0051
84	National Taxi Association	TPV0172
85	Nazir, Mr Tariq Mahmood	TPV0074
86	Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council	TPV0105

87	North Yorkshire Disability Forum Accessible Transport Group	<u>TPV0072</u>
88	Northamptonshire Police, Fire and Crime Commissioner's office	<u>TPV0021</u>
89	Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Cleveland	<u>TPV0128</u>
90	Open Road Access (ORA)	<u>TPV0155</u>
91	Paragus Limited T/A CheckedSafe	<u>TPV0100</u>
92	Pidgley, Mr Darren	<u>TPV0025</u>
93	Podlecki, Mr Miroslav	<u>TPV0198</u>
94	Podlecki, Mr Miroslav	<u>TPV0034</u>
95	Private Hire Reform Campaign (PHRC)	<u>TPV0147</u>
96	Professional Driver Magazine	<u>TPV0114</u>
97	RMT Union	<u>TPV0186</u>
98	RMT Union TfL No.1 Branch	<u>TPV0088</u>
99	Red Cab Taxis Ltd T/A C Cabs	<u>TPV0110</u>
100	Richardson, Mr Perry	<u>TPV0179</u>
101	Rotherham MBC	<u>TPV0171</u>
102	Ryminster Medical Service T/A D4Drivers	<u>TPV0133</u>
103	Salford City Council	<u>TPV0199</u>
104	Scarborough, Mr Daniel	<u>TPV0134</u>
105	Shahzad, Mr Mohammed	<u>TPV0073</u>
106	Shanker, Baggy	<u>TPV0201</u>
107	Shanks, Dr Thomas	<u>TPV0190</u>
108	Sheffield City Council	<u>TPV0103</u>
109	Soiman, Mr Constantin	<u>TPV0123</u>
110	Southampton Hackney Private Hire Association	<u>TPV0042</u>
111	Stockport Council	<u>TPV0169</u>
112	Stockton on Tees Borough Council	<u>TPV0173</u>
113	Sunderland Hackney Carriage Operators Association	<u>TPV0081</u>
114	Suzy Lamplugh Trust	<u>TPV0127</u>
115	Syed, Mr Ahmed	<u>TPV0094</u>
116	Take Me	<u>TPV0001</u>
117	Tamworth Borough Council	<u>TPV0194</u>
118	The Survivors Trust	<u>TPV0161</u>

119	Thomas Pocklington Trust	<u>TPV0097</u>
120	Thomas Whiteside & Sons Limited trading as Whiteside Taxis	<u>TPV0032</u>
121	Transport & Environment UK	<u>TPV0166</u>
122	Transport for All	<u>TPV0107</u>
123	Transport for Greater Manchester	<u>TPV0157</u>
124	Transport for London	<u>TPV0200</u>
125	Transport for London	<u>TPV0106</u>
126	Uber	<u>TPV0177</u>
127	Unite the Union	<u>TPV0191</u>
128	Unite the Union	<u>TPV0126</u>
129	Unite the Union	<u>TPV0182</u>
130	Unite the Union Taxi Education and Liverpool Hackney Branch	<u>TPV0109</u>
131	United Cabbies Group	<u>TPV0121</u>
132	Urban Transport Group	<u>TPV0162</u>
133	Veezu Ltd	<u>TPV0164</u>
134	Vokes Taxis Limited	<u>TPV0040</u>
135	Wainwright, Mr Aaron	<u>TPV0029</u>
136	Ward, Mr Lee	<u>TPV0141</u>
137	Warrington Borough Council	<u>TPV0104</u>
138	Wilkes, MR Raymond	<u>TPV0047</u>
139	Wilson, Mr David	<u>TPV0143</u>
140	Worker Info Exchange	<u>TPV0178</u>
141	York and North Yorkshire Combined Authority	<u>TPV0153</u>

List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament

All publications from the Committee are available on the [publications page](#) of the Committee's website.

Session 2024–26

Number	Title	Reference
8th	Railways Bill	HC 1472
7th	Rail investment pipelines: ending boom and bust	HC 575
6th	Sifting of proposed negative Statutory instruments	HC 1679
5th	Engine for growth: securing skills for transport manufacturing	HC 1223
4th	National Policy Statement for Ports	HC 1028
3rd	Buses connecting communities	HC 494
2nd	Managing the impact of street works	HC 522
1st	Access denied: rights versus reality in disabled people's access to transport	HC 770
	BSL report summary – 1st Report – Access denied: rights versus reality in disabled people's access to transport	HC 770
	Audio summary – 1st Report – Access denied: rights versus reality in disabled people's access to transport	HC 770
6th Special	Engine for growth: securing skills for transport manufacturing: Government Response	HC 1860
5th Special	Rail investment pipelines: ending boom and bust: Government Response	HC 1852
4th Special	Railways Bill: Government Response	HC 1836
3rd Special	Buses connecting communities: Government Response	HC 1419

Number	Title	Reference
2nd Special	Managing the impact of street works: Government Response	HC 1318
1st Special	Access denied: rights versus reality in disabled people's access to transport: Government Response	HC 931