

Roof Sign Consultation

1.	<p>Uber will always comply with conditions mandated by a council with regards to vehicle livery/signage. It will not require drivers/vehicle proprietors to have any signage/livery etc that is not mandatory, so if roof signs become voluntary then we will not require vehicles to have the signage.</p> <p>In general, Uber is aware that private hire vehicle signage may abet plying for hire. Plying-for-hire is a challenge to the industry that negatively impacts drivers, passengers, operators and enforcement officers. Not only does it create friction between the hackney and private hire trades, it represents a safety risk to vulnerable passengers.</p> <p>Highly visible signs on private hire vehicles, which identify them as such may have the unintentional effect of increasing the incidence of plying-for-hire, in that passengers may assume that the trip is legal and legitimate due to the presence of the signage.</p> <p>If passengers have been provided with the afore mentioned driver/vehicle details, there should be no reason to require signage to assist with the identification of the vehicle.</p>
2.	<p>I recently stopped using my roof sign until several people commented "where is your roof sign it's so much easier identifying you by looking at the sign so I don't get in the wrong cab"</p>
3.	<p>Hi Think it's easy for the customer to spot their taxi if it have a roof sign even with new apps and getting reg number on their phones...</p>
4.	<p>I accept the proposal.</p>
5.	<p>Personal choice, that's what we like.</p>
6.	<p>A PHV's roof sign is about 10% of the size which a HCV uses so where is the issue? Unless of course Uber are attempting to flex their muscles once again.</p>
7.	<p>It is of our opinion that PH roof signs should be abolished. NPTTU</p>
	<p>I would like it known I strongly object to the removal of phv roof signs. When phv roof signs came into effect it was recognised this was for extra safety & security of the public & that still very much stands. A roof sign denotes a licensed vehicle & the phone number shows which circuit is the operator. A line of phv's outside the Brighton Centre after a concert is a prime example of the customer being able to identify their car almost instantly. Taxi operators still have many "non app" customers & rely on direct freephone's in many places so just because "some" taxi users call their cab via an app which gives the vehicle details this should not be the new "must have" rule. It also helps to differentiate a Brighton & Hove phv to the now many out of town cars working for █████ amongst others.</p> <p>Has any thought been given to the many visitors from all around the world that visit the city? These folk may not have access to app based organisations & may have asked a hotel or guest house to call them a cab. A phv roof sign as part of a full livery gives a reassurance that the passenger is travelling in a licensed vehicle. You mention the new ruling whereby a phv can apply for an exemption. From information supplied by the HCO this is solely for executive "collar & tie" work & NOT FOR CIRCUIT/APP cars so is completely irrelevant in this context. It cannot be recorded as a burden on any circuit phv to have a roof sign as part of the vehicles livery.</p>

	<p>██████████ had a great suggestion imho. Put the onus on the operator to ensure the phv's bearing their logo conform to the rules. This can be "policed" very easily, no roof sign (or other logo wrongdoing) & the phv knows it will be suspended until the defect is rectified. This will remove the "many" reports of noncompliance you complain of, the reports will then go directly to the operator with a copy to the HCO so you can log this on the phv's record to enable the persistent offenders to be identified.</p> <p>Are we going to be Btn & Hove taxis/phv's with clear markings to avoid any doubt or are we going to be "Ubers in disguise" operating in stealth mode? Brighton & Hove have extremely high standards in the industry & that is something to be very thankful for, to reduce these standards would be a backward step.</p> <p>One thing I would be in favour of is to remove the allowance of illumination. This will then allay the fears of the hackney trade that a phv roof sign is simply a tool to be used in illegally plying for hire.</p> <p>In closing I have to say that passenger safety has to be paramount in any decision the trade makes, taking away a crucial part of the phv livery is a very negative step & could lead to more unlicensed vehicles touting which fortunately Brighton & Hove have managed to mainly avoid due to the diligence of the drivers.</p>
8.	I accept the proposal.
9.	I disagree with an option, it confuses the public, they think it is a taxi so they should be removed, not an option.
10.	Agree and support the proposal..