

Annex 2 – Objection from Richard Jarman, South Sefton Hackney Carriage Association

Objection to the taxi licence fee increase

I spoke with Jill Coule on the 21st March.

I am a trade rep for the south Sefton Taxi Trade.

The trade unanimously objects to an increase in taxi licence fees.

By way of explanation I am asked to point out that the document from PWC referred to in committee cannot be understood.

It neither allows us to do the arithmetic OR understand the figures.

At our trade meeting in November I said that the proposed increase may be acceptable when & if the PWC report was presented in a way the figures could be calculated & understood.

It must be the case that this information is susceptible to an FOI request so please present the information.

The minutes of our November trade meeting were corrected at our March meeting thus:

Taxi Licensing Reserve Account:

I have been asked to put in writing what I said at the above meeting by way of correction of the printed (unapproved) minutes:

I agreed that the PWC report says SMBC has *tried* to comply with legislation but it is not a joint report. I have instructed an accountant to look at the figures as well as the PWC report.

If the PWC report is accurate I have no objection to the surplus being used.

... I have no comment on or objection to the proposed increase in fees if the figures can be shown to justify this. [NOT "the panel were happy...].

You will remember that at the L&R meeting when the matter was discussed I was asked if I had instructed an accountant to look at the PWC report – I had AND I told the committee that the accountant did not understand the PWC report either.

The basis on which the PWC report was commissioned was to explain in a transparent manner the figures & accounts in question.

In these circumstances the proposed increase cannot be justified.

A unquantified assertion by PWC that SMBC is or has *tried* is not an accounting comprehensible to me or the trade.

Allegedly minutes of our November trade meeting were posted somewhere, they were not sent to members of the trade group before the notice of the March meeting was sent out – a practice the trade finds unacceptable & (possibly) disingenuous.

R Jarman
29.3.16