

Q2 – If “no” to 50/50, what would you suggest and why?

1. It seems rather restrictive. The REAL problem in Aberdeen is there are simply not enough taxis and the taxi ranks and their timing restrictions are far too complicated

2. No need for 50/50 ridiculous

3. Any safe, under 5yr old car that can take at least 4 passengers plus driver with MOT and an independent council safety assessment should be sufficient.

4. I have been taxi driver 27 years I think after driving a wav all that time I think long term drivers should receive a saloon plate keeping fleet 50/50

5. Please listen to the drivers of WAV vehicles. They are already very over prescribed in the city. 75/25 would be more appropriate for use and demand. It is also hampering the recruitment of new drivers (as the vehicles are expensive, under used for purpose and not practical for personal use) to which the city desperately needs

6. There is zero requirement to split the fleet. 50% of passengers are not in a wheelchair

7. No need for it unless 50% of journeys are made by wheel chair users.

8. A number proportionate to the forecasted usage by wheelchair users. That's not 50%.

9. Don't penalise those who don't have a WAV or don't wish to have one

10. What % of taxi uses required special vehicle. Make it proportional.

11. Before making such a significant policy shift, we must first consider the wider context of the taxi industry in Aberdeen. The central issue is not the number of WAVs, but rather a chronic shortage of taxis and drivers. This has become increasingly evident in recent years, with growing frustration among residents over long wait times and an unreliable service particularly at night, when some people have been forced to walk home due to the lack of available taxis (STV News, 2024). Imposing a policy that mandates drivers to transition from standard saloons to WAVs adds another layer of cost and complexity at a time when the industry is already struggling. The financial burden placed on taxi drivers is considerable, with many WAVs costing upwards of £30,000 (Cab Direct, 2023). For many independent operators, this is simply unaffordable. Such costs are likely to discourage new drivers from entering the market and may push current ones out only worsening the existing shortage. It is also important to recognise that the industry is moving towards electrification, and the intersection of this transition with WAV requirements creates further challenges. Suitable electric WAV models are both limited and costly, with few financially viable options currently available (LEVC, 2023; OC Cars, 2023). It is not realistic to expect drivers to absorb the cost of switching to vehicles that satisfy both accessibility and low-emission standards without substantial support. A more rational and effective approach would be to improve the booking system, ensuring that individuals who require wheelchair access are given priority. This would allow the city to make better use of the accessible vehicles already in operation, without disincentivising participation in the industry through additional red tape or unaffordable vehicle requirements. Moreover, these issues cannot be viewed in isolation from the broader market environment. There are growing concerns about monopolistic behaviour and a culture of protectionism within Aberdeen's taxi industry. For example, drivers have reportedly been threatened with blacklisting simply for considering work with platforms like

Uber (Press & Journal, 2024). Such behaviour discourages innovation and competition, both of which are essential to improving service availability and quality. In conclusion, while the goal of improving accessibility is absolutely the right one, it must be pursued in a way that reflects the current state of the industry. At a time when we urgently need to attract more drivers and expand the fleet, adding costly and complex requirements will only move us further from that goal. We should instead be looking to reduce barriers to entry, embrace technological solutions, and make better use of existing WAVs through smarter systems and fairer priorities.

12. Max 30%. As a therapist, we often have patients with reduced mobility who are not in wheelchairs. Those wheelchair taxi are harder to get into and out of due to height. Standard height cars are better and less stressful for elderly. More issues are with low level seats such as BMW. Most people do not want to sit in wheelchairs if possible as feel more vulnerable.

13. Let the taxi drivers decide what type of car can be used. It will be beneficial to promote EV, as well as Uber. Currently taxi fares are high compared to other cities.

14. Ratio too high, there aren't that many wheel chair users anyway let alone using taxis.

15. Suggest 20% wav 20% dog friendly 60% saloon

16. Maybe 25% as not many wheelchair users and saloon car more comfortable and less noise

17. Because the requirement for wheelchair accessible vehicles in the cities population is now where near 50% so why enforce such a policy and enforce such cost on the drivers

18. There is not enough demand for this. The entry criteria for new taxi drivers should be lower so we have more taxis available at any time. What you're proposing is the equivalent of some parking lots where there's a near 50/50 split for disabled and other parking and there's never more than 10% of the parking spaces filled at the same time.

19. It's a small proportion that need was cars, some elderly can't get in and out easy in these cars .it should nearer 75/25 split

20. Less than 50/50 are required for wheelchair accessible and the council should focus on the general lack of taxi provision which would in turn then help the availability of wheelchair options

21. 80/20, most taxis do not need to be wheelchair accessible

22. One of the biggest problems in Aberdeen is the lack of taxis. Yet ACC continue to put blockers in the way of this whether it is a knowledge test that has been made irrelevant by SatNav or in this case the requirement to have to get a very expensive car that no taxi drivers want. The number of passengers requiring wheelchair access is very small and simply does not justify this huge number of accessible vehicles.

23. Have enough cars to supply hospital appointments. How many runs do the WAV complete with wheelchair users.

24. I think many fewer WAV are required

25. Excessive given the number of users. Increasing number of licences far more necessary

26. 10%. 50% is excessive and overburdensome on taxi fleets.

27. a more realistic split, not 50% of taxi users have a wheelchair

28. collect data on average journeys per day by wheelchair users, the use probability to work out how many of the total taxi numbers are needed to cover that with 80% confidence that there isn't excessive waiting at ranks

29. The Disability Equity Partnership do not feel it would be appropriate to suggest a proportionality for the composition of the taxi fleet in Aberdeen based solely on a percentage split between two types of vehicles, given the additional factors influencing and dependent on usage patterns and behaviours as explained below, and given the unintended consequences and likelihood of exacerbating inequalities as a result. These factors broadly cover geographic dispersal and demand (including time-based) on taxis, the current and potential future availability of vehicles compliant with any existing or future emissions legislation and drivers procurement considerations. At present, taxi operators registered within the City of Aberdeen provide service not only to those whose journeys originate within the city limits, but also cater for demand by those travelling, from or within towns on the periphery (but not necessarily within) the local authority's boundary, such as Portlethen, Banchory, Westhill, Ellon or Inverurie. These areas typically have insufficient independent local taxi provision to meet spontaneous demand or are served by drivers registered with service providers registered with Aberdeen City Council for operational reasons. Any change to the fleet composition made by Aberdeen City licensing authorities would therefore require cognisance on the disproportional impact this would have on residents depending on access to Aberdeen for work, study, healthcare, onward travel, or leisure, but who do not necessarily live within the city limits. Passengers in these areas who require a WAV to meet their accessibility requirements already have limited choice as the majority of accessible vehicles operating within a reasonable area and who are willing to respond to that demand are registered with Aberdeen City Council. DEP therefore submit that prior to any change analysis would be required to ensure that the effect of any change would not disproportionately impact the number of WAVs providing geographical coverage to the above areas. We place the onus on WAVs here given the specific accessibility features they provide and given that the presence or lack thereof in no way compromises their usability by non-disabled people. Any change to fleet composition must also ensure that availability of WAVs must be consistent at all times of the day and night. Evidence gathered by the Partnership already illustrates that those requiring an accessible vehicle currently have reduced choice due to the unavailability of vehicles outside times of peak demand (school drop-off/pick-up periods, morning and evening rush hour), such as later in the evenings, at weekends, over bank and other public holidays or during times when major events occur across the city or wider afield (such as concerts, sports events or cultural observances). In order to ensure the effect of any policy change is inclusive, any analysis undertaken must include scrutiny of time-based metrics through data collected from taxi operators with respect to the current availability, provision and utilisation of WAVs across all time periods.

30. This is not representative of the %population who are disabled. Also, saloon cars are easier to get in and out for many disabilities. The cost of a WAV vehicle is much more expensive than a saloon vehicle which means drivers may leave the industry. Taxis are in short supply in Aberdeen and the service is shocking.

31. There are not enough taxis in Aberdeen currently, forcing new drivers into purchasing a certain type of vehicle that could be more expensive will make the situation worse. As taxi drivers retire or leave the industry less and less people will be encouraged to join. You should be trying to encourage people into the sector not put them off

32. A reduced number of WAVS. The population of Aberdeen requiring accessible vehicles is absolutely not 50%
33. Would this waiting list not mean we have less cars on the road. Sure the larger vehicles could be incentivised? To encourage more v meeting specific targets
34. 60/40 split (40%WAV) No way 50% of taxis are used for WAV in the first place.
35. All vehicles should be wheelchair accessible
36. Higher proportion of saloon and/or 6/8 seat vehicles. Say 60-70% with 30-40% being wheelchair accessible.
37. 30: 70 - wav; saloon
38. Most drivers will opt not to have the added expence of accessibility so travel will be limited for people with disabiities. Make it 100% accessibility
39. Less need for wheelchairs, you need to be realistic. Those less able find it more difficult to get into wheelchair type taxis.
40. Saloons are comfy, WAVs are uncomfortable
41. There aren't 50% of people requiring a wheelchair accessible vehicle with it difficult enough to get a taxi in town as it is. There should be a priority line or separate service for those who require a wheelchair vehicle
42. is no requirement for the split to be as high as 50:50. Accessibility is important but the need can't be more that 25%
43. 30/70
44. 50/50 is better than the current proposal but would maybe continue to question if the split needs to be so high for accessible cars - even a 1/3 of the fleet being WAV would be acceptable?
45. That is not the way to measure success. It should be the total number of taxis not the ratio
46. Because not every person that's disabled can get in to a taxi like that as they find the step to get into the taxi to high
47. We just need cars on the road – don't add more expense just more cabs
48. I think 50% wheelchair accessible is excessive. That only makes sense if 50% of customers are wheelchair users.
49. 70/30 in favour of saloon cars...you need more of them
50. 70/30
51. 60/40 in favour of saloon vehicles
52. 80% saloons at least. Dislike riding in the vans
53. WAV require additional costs which potentially further restrict the interest of potential new drivers in an already short market
54. 30% A balance is required given the higher costs of buying and running the vehicles as well as accessibility for other taxi users.

55. 50% split assumes 50% of the population use a wheelchair. Also assumes 50% are so inambulant that they need a WAV. Some wheelchair users can transfer into regular saloon cars. I feel as though 50% split is too high. Far simpler to ensure 20% availability at all times instead of mandating fixed percentage of future licence holders regardless of the hours they work. A timetable solution is better than a mandated car design solution.

56. Leave as is. Relax regulations to get more drivers.

57. 66/33 (saloon/wav) as wav is difficult for less able people (both my parents can not get into such vehicles)

58. There must be more taxis in general, putting restrictions on types of vehicle will have the opposite effect. There will still be enough WAVs

59. No clear logic is provided by the council for such a costly rule to be enforced. The majority of taxi users in Aberdeen do not require WAVs surely so an equal split sounds like a ludicrous way of making the entry requirements for prospective taxi drivers unaffordable. Promoting for affordable taxis to increase numbers is the most important thing Aberdeen requires

60. Encourage taxi drivers to utilise whatever safe vehicle they wish. Imposing vehicle types to suit a small minority will destroy the already depleted fleet

61. Not enough taxis, this makes it difficult to enter the service. Incentives for WAV owners instead

62. Because it restricts the number of passengers overall that can be served. They are also more expensive to purchase

63. 70/30 - I don't think so many (50/50) people with mobility issues use taxis

Quality of WAV vehicle Vs other city's taxi fleet is poor and the demographic does not support this stance.

64. Larger proportion of WAV to the actual requirements. Disproportionate allocation to DDA.

65. it's a barrier to taxi entry. we need more taxis in general

66. Not representative of the demographic of users

67. Aberdeen needs more taxis and making prospective taxi drivers jump through hoops with very specific vehicle types will dissuade them from starting

68. I support the use of wheelchair accessible vehicles, but I feel that the 50/50 split is too much, something like a 30/70 split would be more favourable as I believe this could discourage new taxi drivers to become a driver in Aberdeen due to the increased costs and maintenance costs of a wheelchair accessible vehicle compared to a standard taxi vehicle.

69. We need more taxis, not a restriction that will put taxi drivers off

70. 5% WAV

71. Percentage of WAV must be representative of the taxi fleet client base. WAV are less fuel efficient and compact taxis are cheaper to operate.

72. A split as per the percentage of population that use taxis that also use a wheel chair.

73. dont need 50%, nowhere else has as much, have less wheelchair access say, 20% and give obligations to big taxi companies to prioritise if wheelchair access needed

74. I hate them, they are cold, noisy and uncomfortable. Not a good look for the city, especially as i travel to the shire

75. Because I don't believe 50% of the population use a wheelchair. This seems a bit extreme. How many taxis are required to be fit to take a wheelchair at any one time? Use this figure and add 10% for good measure. How are you collecting your data?

76. WAV are not very accessible unless in a wheelchair, and unlikely that 50% of users are

77. As a elderly person with mobility issues I find them hard to get in and out of and I don't think any need for a 50/50 split.

78. I do not think there is a need for 50% of vehicles to be wheelchair adapted as the demand for wheelchair accessible vehicles is low

79. Why 50% split? Is 50% of taxi users disabled? More taxis in city, improve public transport in city, set up dedicated phone number for wheelchair/disabled taxi requirements. Give them free taxis to hospital/appointments etc

80. It is an unnecessary over supply of disabled taxis. It is ridiculous to expect taxi owners to carry the expenses for this Bix ticking operation.

81. An assessment of the required usage of WAV in the current fleet. i.e. %age of journeys requiring WAV across the fleet. WAV are unpleasant to travel in, expensive to buy and operate and are frequently significantly older than passenger car fleet.

82. I don't think that many wav vehicles are needed

83. 60/40. Depending on how many at any given time are wheelchair exempt even though they have a WAV.

84. Too onerous and does not represent the proportion of wheelchair users in the population

85. Too onerous on taxi drivers when there is already a shortage

86. 50% of the population are not disabled. Why fix something that is not broken. Allow uber to operate in the same way it does very successfully in all other major cities.

87. How many wheel chair users have booked a taxi in the last yesr

88. Less than 8% of disabilities require the use of a wheelchair. Wheelchairs are used by an estimated 1.2 people in the UK. 1.9% of the UK population uses a wheelchair. These are facts from the UK Govt, if 1.9% of the population uses a wheelchair why do 50% of taxis need to accommodate them? It's madness, when taxis are already massively unavailable across Aberdeen to put further restrictions on them. I would argue at most 25% WAV is required.

89. I think 50% for invalid taxis us too high. I have seen people with wheelchairs pass on these wheelchair friendly vans, and have their chsir put in boot. Meanwhile I had to sit in van.

90. Publish evidence to show that this is required to meet a demand for wheelchair accessible rides in the city. What percentage of rides require a WAV?

91. 50% of taxi users are not wheelchair users, the ratio should reflect the number of users

92. No demand for WAV. These vehicles are poor quality
93. It is not proportionate with the amount of disabled taxi users. Accessibility is important but it must also be a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim.
94. Should aim for 100% accessible
95. The availability of taxis in Aberdeen is shocking and any barrier such as cost increase due to car type or preventing those with regular cars becoming taxis does not make sense.
96. Doesn't seem like a proportionate split. Also some people who are disabled, mobility impaired, etc find it more difficult to use WAVs compared to saloon cars. Also more expensive for new drivers to afford a WAV and to maintain it. Will put off people from applying when we need more drivers in the city. I'd suggest an increase of female drivers. 50% of the pop are female and some don't feel safe getting taxis as majority are male drivers
97. WAV taxi's are expensive to buy and run. They are hard to get in and out of if you are elderly or infirm.
98. There is no requirement for a 50 50 split that should be based on the amount disabled wheel chair users.
99. Less need for WAVs. They are noisy and uncomfortable
100. My family of 5 already has a tiny chance of getting in one car. I've never actually seen the wheel chair function used. Be practical.
101. Only small number of wheelchair users. I support people with different levels of disability and they require saloons. Catering to the disabled doesn't necessarily mean a WAV.
102. 50% seems disproportionately high. There needs to be a mix of vehicles, including WAV, saloon and those that can accommodate larger numbers, 5 seats etc
103. The majority of people needing a taxi do not need an accessible taxi.
104. Reduction of the WAV to 30% of the fleet,
105. A taxi driver should have the final decision as he has to purchase the vehicle that he drives and these adapted vehicles aren't cheap and worthless at the end
106. The split needs to be reasonable to the proportion of users who use the taxi service in Aberdeen (and surrounding areas). The costs are greater for WAVs and if you implement a system that forces existing taxi drivers to make a choice between livelihood and money, we'll end up in a sorrier state than we are in with an even greater shortage of taxis. 50/50 split is an outrageously high proportion of disabled friendly vehicles without justifying the need through qualified data.
107. All taxis don't need to be wheel chair accessible
108. 60/40 or 70/30 normal cars
109. I would like to see some data to support the proposed split - for example a standard of service that for x% of time a person requiring a WAV should not have to wait any longer than a customer who doesn't
110. 25% wheelchair accessible

111. 50/50 split just makes it more difficult for those who wish to become taxi drivers as they will need specialist cars. There is not a 50/50 split of wheelchair users/regular customers to justify this.

112. Why put more barriers in the way of the low number of taxis available in the city. Very poor for reputation of the city

113. More saloon cars as more comfortable for non disabled passengers

114. There aren't enough wheelchair users to warrant this and especially given there aren't enough taxis overall for people focus should be on increasing numbers overall.

115. This is not the main issue for taxi customers, as there are plenty of WAVs.

116. It's disproportionate to the number of taxis needed by wheelchair users and able bodied people.

117. 50% WAVs seems excessive. If there was data which supported this then I would reconsider this stance.

118. Eliminate Knowledge requirement for Uber drivers.

119. There is no need for 50% to be wheelchair access. The % is disproportionately high. If you measured utilisation of taxis by wheelchairs in a day the number would be very low.

120. We need more taxis in general, not creating more barriers.

121. Disabilities take different forms and the drivers should be equipped to help everyone. They are providing a service and all new licences should be required to have a WAV

122. If the council wants to address the dire state of taxis in the city then the job needs to be made more appealing, not less. This proposal will cause people not to work in the city or become a taxi driver at all and will make the situation much worse than it already is

123. It should be proportionate to the number of WAV vehicles requested daily vs not

124. 80/20

125. Unfairly disadvantages new licences due to increased costs associated with WAVs. The better way of judging would be to look at WAV bookings compared to saloons to attain the correct balance of vehicles required

126. There are a minimal amount of taxis currently available. Why make it harder to get one. It's already very expensive for them to do their day job.

127. Higher % saloon cars to match the demographics of Aberdeen

128. I find it unlikely a 50% WAV fleet is needed.

129. There's not 50% of taxi users in wheelchairs. Wav taxis cost lots more to buy and makes it unfair for owners

130. I think more a 75% of taxis should go towards standard/saloon cars and the other 25% to WAV. My dad was a taxi driver throughout the majority of my life before he retired, and as he had a WAV car, he was expected to show a duty of care, in terms of getting disabled passengers into his car, which later in his career, he struggled to do, as do the majority of taxi drivers I let through



him. The main aim should be to ensure that enough of these cars are out to provide the service, so ensuring there is a mix of standard and WAV, but maybe dedicating a priority point for these WAV cars, or creating a pre-book system for these WAVs would be a better way to utilise them

131. Far too many for the amount of work that would be needed

132. Yes, 50/ 50 split should be the minimum

133. The entire fleet should be WAV

134. Aberdeen's Population: As of recent estimates, Aberdeen has a population of around 230,000. If 6-7% have significant mobility impairments, that's approximately 13,800-16,100 people. A portion of these individuals would require a WAV, but not all (some use public transport with accessibility features or other mobility aids). Likely Estimate: A reasonable estimate is that around 3-5% of Aberdeen's population (approx 7,000-11,500 people) may require access to a WAV, whether as regular users or occasional passengers. Round up to 10% WAV 90% non Wav split.

135. All vehicles should be fully accessible

136. Do we really have that much need for that? Priority should be to get more taxis on the street. This service is appalling and putting people off coming to city centre as it's so difficult to get home.

137. Leave as is. I work in sheltered accommodation and many of our residents cannot access WAV vehicles. A normal car is much better.

138. Allow Uber to operate like they do in other big cities for crying out loud

139. Why do we need 50% disabled taxis? The standard and noise of these is poor

140. Able body can use 100% of the fleet. Those in wheelchairs can only use 50%. This will also be limited further by the accessible vehicles being off shift

141. I would suggest taxi office offer rentals that are WAV vehicles, whereby new taxi drivers could start the trade with support from an office, also the onus could be on an office to report any bad eggs to Licensing. This would also give a point of contact for anyone requiring a WAV, as on the rank there may not be any available. Some would argue that the rank does not hold an office booking charge, but this charge could be applied at the rank for setting up of the wheel chair rank.

142. Half of the taxi fleet being WAVs is hugely excessive for the amount of people who require a WAV

143. More saloon cars as there is plenty of wheelchair accessible cars already and the demand for them is considerably lower than the demand for saloons. I know elderly people in particular prefer saloon cars for easier access.

144. 50% of personnel in Aberdeen are not wheelchair users. Why would you need 50%? Surely 25% would be suitable.

145. Given the taxi crises in Aberdeen with a real lack of taxis, imposing further restrictions is unlikely to do anything but put off new applicants.

146. There is no need for the same level of WAV taxis, however these vehicles could be prioritised for disabled requirements

147. 30 non wheelchair, 70 wheelchair or higher. I am a wheelchair user and lucky that I am able to transfer into a saloon car however there are many wheelchair users who cannot and it is EXCEEDINGLY difficult to get a wheelchair taxi when you order one

148. 70/30 there is absolutely no need for 50% WAV

149. My parents are taxi drivers with WAV. They rarely get wheelchair customers . It may encourage more taxi drivers if they can use a normal car

150. Make them all black cabs

151. Yes there should be WAV but no need for 50%. It is taking choice away from taxi drivers as to what car they drive. As a non wheelchair user saloon cars are far more comfortable.

152. Why restrict it at all? Have an incentive for a "WAV" but dont just say no to other kinds of vehicle.

153. I understand why a 50/50 split would be important and I am in support of that eventually, but given that the city is struggling with a lack of available taxis anyway doing anything to potentially worsen this would be bad for all involved. Implementing a rule where any new taxis being WAVs is sensible as this will eventually pull the number up to 50/50 and then 100% but you may be improving the metric of 50% are WAVs which will look good and shiny and lovely for the DEI statistics but if it is worsening the overall fleet and leaving people stranded and standing at taxi ranks waiting for even longer than they are at the moment then it is counter productive and a disabled person will be waiting longer for a WAV since they (i assume) won't get to the front of the queue for longer

154. We do not currently have nearly enough taxis in the city so putting more barriers to entry for new drivers is ridiculous.

155. The taxi fleet is limited already this would add an additional barrier and cost. Agree wheelchair vehicles are needed for some but majority of journeys there no need for this

156. More saloons

157. A lower figure to reflect the actual need.

158. Hardly enough taxis as and there is consideration of pedicabs

159. I believe 50:50 would result in an over provision of WAVs

160. Hard enough to get people to become a taxi driver but making them be a WAV hinder this process

161. Don't believe that government should be associated with policies of this sort

162. Not all disabled people can get in and out of a higher taxi

163. While WAVs are critical, the serious decline in Taxi numbers means the city is poorly served. WAVs are more expensive to bring into the pool, thus the split will likely slow the roll out of increased taxis. WAVs should always prioritise jobs for disabled customers

164. I think 80 percent should be yellow because there are not many wheel chairs passengers, eg I picked up wheelchair passenger after about 4 months
165. I don't feel the demand is there for so many wheelchair accessible vehicles. I feel a more reasonable 75/25 split would be better and more manageable
166. 70/30
167. Seems a very high amount, even 30% WAV, only accepting WAV is limiting the amount of taxis you can have in the city as not everyone has a WAV
168. Because there should be more options
169. 75 Saloon - 25 WAV People with disabilities like poor sight or MS prefer saloon cars which is much better for them for access and egress.
170. 60/40
171. 30/70. There is simply no need for such high number of WAD
172. The majority of cars on the fleet should be saloon cars - more comfortable, more economical and lower emissions. Why should the vast majority of taxi users accept travelling in a rattly bouncy van conversion over a comfortable car.
173. There is insufficient taxis already available and such a change will discourage new drivers.
174. Does 50/50 reflect the percentage of wheelchair passengers? A split in line with that would be appropriate
175. I think 50% wheelchair access is excessive
176. I've been driving WAV vehicles now for 28 years & was told in 5 years all taxis would be WAC. To get round that drivers are changing to red plates.
177. It's not enough taxis to cover Aberdeen anyways I think taxi shortage should be addressed first and then explore other options.
178. It seems high, however I would suggest a split that mirrors current usage and predicted increases in demand over the next X years. Maybe providing this data would help the public understand the ratio?
179. WAV will disappear as cost is so much more than a saloon.
180. It doesn't seem necessary for the actual population
181. Prefer all taxi be same
182. 50% wheelchair accessible is ridiculous - what is the percentage of journeys that require a WAV - it will not be anywhere close to 50%. This will create additional cost and ultimately be passed onto the customer where 99% of the time WAV taxi will not be required
183. I don't believe there is a need for a 50/50 split, 70 saloon 30 WAV would seem to be more than enough.
184. Disproportionate to requirements
185. Not 50% of the population require WAV

186. With Respect there's probably only about 1% wheelchair hires therefore no need for 50/50
187. The demand isn't there. Most people prefer a saloon car and find this more comfortable.
188. 50/50 appears very high. 70/30 would be better as it will cost the taxi driver a lot to buy a car that fits the criteria and there are not enough taxis as it is
189. 70/30, with 30 being WAV
190. Taxi drivers should be allowed to drive any vehicle that they like
191. Have a split that is proportional to the number of disabled passengers, eg 10% of passengers are disabled, have 10% WAV
192. do we have a population in aberdeen that is 50% disabled? there is many ways to define a disability but most people are able bodied, why should a taxi driver have to adapt a car at a significant cost to accommodate where there could be an agreement to supply x amount as to the real percentage in the city
193. There is already a shortage of taxis in Aberdeen and I feel this will deter some taxi drivers from continuing.
194. what about offering ph drivers a chance to have a yellow plate
195. Prefer salon cars, never heard of an issue where people that require WAV have been waiting
196. 60 accessible because the population is getting old3 so more need for accessible vehicles
197. Don't know split, but there are many wheelchair users that can manage into a saloon car with minimal help, eg, someone to put wheelchair in boot. Past experience shows that many taxi drivers avoid passengers in wheelchairs. You need to keep an eye on such antics (at taxi ranks is the only practical location using already installed CCTV) and take these taxi drivers to task.
198. Get uber working properly. Scrap knowledge test
199. 20% WAV 80% SALOON There is not a high demand for wheelchair cars in Aberdeen we just need more taxis available but the council are the problem and undermining the taxi trade
200. No for safety black cabs for driver safety to get more at night time
201. There are far more non WAV users so a system that a WAV specifically can be booked should be available.
202. A 25 WAV/75 saloon split is more than enough
203. Don't believe there is a demand from wheelchair users to implement 50/50 split
204. 70/30 in favour of saloon cars, would be more accurate
205. Forcing 50% of Drivers to have to buy specific cars to become a taxi driver to service a tiny % of the population of Aberdeen that use the taxis is a ridiculous idea especially when we have a shortage of drivers as it is
206. 10% WAV - more reflective of demographics
207. We need more taxis for everyone

208. 75/25

209. 25 wav/75 saloon

210. Increase the amount of licenses and dropping to 25% is more that required to meet the need for wheelchair accessible requirements. Taxi drivers need to be encouraged to join the industry and a saloon car for many is much more comfortable to drive for long periods.

211. 25% wheelchair accessible should be fine

212. 90/10 split reflects better the percentage of people who require a wheelchair How on earth do you need 50% of vehicles to be able to take a wheelchair

213. Not required given relative journeys that specifically require wheelchairs. More taxis need to be added to the fleet and this is a significant barrier to entry

214. It seems a waste one person use a disabled friendly car instead of getting a saloon car

215. Answered No because I did not see any data relating to what portion of customers require an accessible vehicle, while I am not against the 50/50 split there needs to be some hard justification for it and not just a blanket 50/50 percentage which to be honest sounds like it's just been thrown out there as a number. For example is there any existing current data which would support the requirement of 50/50 split?

216. I feel that this is going to put drivers away from the industry by forcing they to buy cars they don't want

217. Should be a 40/60 split

218. Whilst I understand the need to service those with access issues the main problem at the moment is a lack of taxis. A move to 50/50 May drive even more away, suggest when cars are being replaced then through natural passage fleet can be more accessible (London cab style etc)

219. 30/70 in favour of saloon

220. 75 % > 25 % that would be a better utilaised split with less cost

221. Set split at percentage of wheelchair vs non-wheelchair taxi users

222. Aberdeen does not consist of 50% disabled people who would require access to a taxi. I would suggest a more reasonable split of 20/80 where 20% of the on road fleet is wheelchair accessible.

223. Pointless. Taxi drives have to live day to day with the cars the own.

224. An understanding of stats and % of the disabled (wheelchair) population would be helpful - is this 50%z an understanding of how many %wheelchair users use taxis over a one month period and time of day. This would help work out what % of wheelchair accessible taxis are a required.

225. a % equal to and no greater than the % of people in aberdeen suffering from disability or long term illness / no more than 20% and thats probably double the amount

226. Should be up to drivers.

227. A maximum of 25%, the need ifor more is not there.

228. Not necessary as it feels too high

229. There is absolutely no requirement for 50% of taxis to be wheelchair accessible given the relative numbers of wheelchair passengers versus non wheelchair passengers utilising taxis

230. 30% WAV 70% Saloon. The cost of wheelchair taxis is increasingly expensive and the demand for taxis in general is high. I believe the cost and requirements around having a wheelchair taxi is being detrimental to new taxis.

231. The proportion of wheelchair users compared to non wheelchair users is not 50%, but much less, and the fleet should reflect that.

232. Is that perhaps preventing more cars being available? 50% of the city donâ€™t need wheelchair access.

233. 70/30

234. Limitations on taxis already exist. A 50-50 split would just increase the limitations

235. It puts people off becoming drivers, causing a shortage of taxis overall

236. There is not enough demand for 50/50 for wavs some passengers dont like the stigma of getting into one

237. Because itâ€™s unaffordable for taxi drivers to buy wheelchair accessible vehicles

238. I would suggest nearer 75/25 towards saloons, most of my wheelchair users request a saloon car and are able to transfer into car and place wheelchare in boot.

239. Offer incentives rather than enforce 50% levels. 25% goal would better reflect customer base need.

240. I feel that all private hire cars who have previously drove WAV taxis should be offered a saloon plate also

241. No requirement for 50% wheelchair accessible. 25% more realistic

242. I donâ€™t think 50% of users require a WAV. What % of users require a WAV?

243. I think taxi companies have a 10% fleet as wav, I have had a wav taxi for 11 years and have never did a wheelchair passenger

244. Not everyone needs wheelchair access!! Enforcing this ludicrous requirement is causing a reduction of taxis on the road

245. Forcing drivers to buy WAVâ€™s when they might not ever need to use them.

246. 30% based on the number of wheelchair users in the general population

247. Let uber into the city without having to pass the knowledge test

248. There are not 50% handicapped people, I would think a 10% would be more than enough

249. The level of noise and comfort is very poor in these converted vans. Need more comfortable and recognisable taxis such as Hackney cabs

250. Why the need for so many wav? My grandparents all hated them and couldn't get up into them and preferred a saloon

251. Can't get a taxi as it is, if you want a split you will make more taxi drivers quit.

252. 50% of the passengers picked up do not require wav(in last two and half years i had less than 5 passengers who couldnt leave their wheelchair 1 from airport , 2 from hospital).. they actually dislike to be travelling in a van type vehicle. Majority of the wheelchair users are transferable and they fold their wheelchair and like to sit on comfortable seat.

253. 70 30

254. 60% saloons 40% wav

255. I would suggest a 30% Wav & 70% Saloon as there is no demand for wheelchair cars in Aberdeen i have been in a wheelchair vehicle for over 10 years and have never had a wheelchair in my vehicles which i have had on the road. People generally avoid getting into wheelchair cars as they feel they are uncomfortable and noisy due to the conversion to the rear of the vehicles.

256. 60% Saloon

257. No wav requirement

258. 70-30 split in favour of saloon

259. 50% of the population do not require wheelchairs. It should be in proportion with disability statistics

260. All taxis should be accessible to all. Drivers provide a service therefore should have the correct "tool" for the job like every other trade. Why should someone who needs a WAV need to be penalised because that's what's happening

261. Don't need as much WAV,s

262. It should be 30% disabled and 70% salon

263. 20%. I work nights and so less than 1%of my jobs are for wheelchairs yet i'm forced to buy a WAV if I want to be a yellow plate.

264. Private hire and yellow be same

265. 50% of the population are not disabled, for the population that are registered disabled are not wheelchair bound, I am myself disabled and prefer a saloon car for ease of getting in and out, I think 20/25% would be a reasonable number but I also think there should be a requirement for taxi companies to ensure that a wave fleet is available 24 hours a day

266. Always going to need more street drivers

267. 70% to 30%

268. Less WAV required

269. I would suggest that a 25% provision of WAVs is sufficient to cover the needs of the target audience

270. ALL taxis should be able to carry wheelchair and disabled passengers. A 50/50 split would mean delays in getting a taxi for both able bodied and disabled passengers

271. Being disabled myself, I feel there are more able bodied people than wheelchair users.

272. 70% to 30% There are not 50% requiring wheel chair axis

273. 70/30 split saloon/WAVs

274. 25/75

275. It would need a methodology of establishing able and disable passengers ratio that uses public transport

276. Think it should 1/3rd accessible

277. Will it make any difference, you can hardly get a taxi especially from the bus station at night