

## **LICENSING AND REGULATORY SUB-COMMITTEE**

**THURSDAY, 7 AUGUST 2025**

Present:

Councillors Gearon, Rollason (Vice-Chair) and Atkins

Officers in Attendance:

Licensing Manager

Legal Advisor

**206. APOLOGIES**

None.

**207. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (IF ANY)**

None.

**208. LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985 -  
EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

It was proposed by Cllr Rollason and seconded by Cllr Gearon that the meeting move into Part II to consider the following agenda item.

It was unanimously

**RESOLVED:** that the meeting move into Part II to consider the following agenda item.

**209. APPLICATION FOR HACKNEY CARRIAGE DRIVERS LICENCE**

The Applicant attended the meeting in person, and he answered questions put to him by the Sub-Committee. The Applicant's wife also attended the meeting and was given an opportunity to address the Sub-Committee in support of the application.

Arising from consideration of the report, evidence presented and in accordance with the Council's procedure for hearings, it was moved by Councillor Rollason and seconded by Councillor Gearon, and

**RESOLVED** that the application for a new Hackney Carriage Drivers Licence be granted under Sections 59(1)(a) of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976. The Sub-Committee felt that the conduct of the Applicant, supported its view that they are a fit and proper person to hold such a Licence.

**Reasons for the decision:**

Members noted the information set out in the Report relating to the Applicant's caution and the reasons why the application for a licence was refused at officer level.

In answer to the Sub-Committee's questions the Applicant explained the reasons for receiving a police caution in December 2023 and demonstrated to the Sub-Committee how the incident had occurred. This was an accident, but his wife had felt it was on purpose and the police were called. The police took the Applicant away at his wife's request to allow them some time apart to cool down. The Applicant is not proud of this and deeply regrets what happened. He is not a violent man or someone who breaks laws and wishes the incident had never happened. The Applicant understands that he has a duty of care to the general public and will not disappoint if given the licence.

The Applicant further explained that he is trying to obtain his licence to give him the opportunity of earning more money for his family. He currently works as a security guard which required him to go through a similar screening process in order to hold the SIA licence and he had explained the reasons for the police caution to them as well.

The Applicant's wife was then permitted to speak to the Sub-Committee and explained that they had been married for 10 years and explained that she is a nurse along with holding other positions of responsibility such as being a director. She and her husband are both involved in the community. The Applicant's wife further explained that she had suffered from domestic abuse in a previous relationship and feels this had affected her view of what happened on the day. She made a pledge to herself to never experience abuse again.

The Applicant's wife did not want to press charges and in fact they are currently fighting to get the caution overturned as they feel the Applicant did not understand what he was signing and the implications for this. She regrets calling the police that day knowing the impact it has had. There have been no other incidents, and they have worked through their issues. The Applicant has no other convictions and through his work as a security officer is used to dealing with stressful situations, difficult people and diffusing situations.

The Committee thanked the Applicant and his wife for appearing before them and noted that he appeared remorseful and regretted what had happened. The Sub-Committee felt that the Applicant's attitude to the caution and the fact that he wanted to improve his life, and that his wife was a credible witness and supported this application indicated that he was a fit and proper person to hold a licence.

When considering the Council's Taxi and Private Hire Policy the Sub-Committee were mindful that each case must be decided on its own merits. The Sub-Committee considered that this appeared to have been an isolated incident, and no other concerns had been raised about the Applicant. The Sub-Committee noted its overriding duty to the public, and of the importance of public safety but considered that, on balance, there was no cause to show that the Applicant was a risk to the public and was not a fit and proper person to hold a Licence.

Applying the test of whether Members of the Sub-Committee would be happy for a person they cared about or a vulnerable person to travel alone in a vehicle with the Applicant, it was concluded after significant deliberation that they would.

Taking the Council's Licensing Policy into consideration, along with the Applicant's submissions, the Applicant's wife's submissions and the supplied character references, the Sub-Committee considered given the circumstances of this case that it be reasonable to approve the Applicant's application for a new Hackney Carriage Drivers Licence as set out in the report. The Sub-Committee stressed that should there be any concerns raised about the Applicant's conduct he could be bought back before the Sub-Committee and his licence reviewed.

Cllr D Rollason  
Chair

This page is intentionally left blank