

**From:** xxxx  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 21, 2015 10:23 AM  
**To:** Tim Nichols  
**Cc:** Martin Seymour;  
**Subject:** Re: Uber

Tim,

Could I just be a little more succinct on the issue of Brighton drivers losing out. Since 2008 the number of vehicles on circuits has increased, as has the weekly subscription. Yet work has decreased conservatively by 30%

If Uber are licensed in Brighton, yes the number of jobs will decrease per car on existing firms but so will the corresponding number of cars. (Joining Uber)

If they're not licensed and the work is done by out of town cars then drivers will not only lose that percentage of work but still have the same number of cars per circuit. So in effect, double losers.

It is for me, now quite obvious why the existing companies are so against Uber being Brighton licensed, whilst happily ignoring the fact they will license out of town and still take their market share.

It isn't the market share they fear losing, it is the cars. As above they have already shown that when work levels drop the ONLY people to take the hit are the drivers.

I also believe that should Brighton licence them, this will place pressure on the firms to change their radio rental system. Uber, as you know, utilizes a pay as go system. So a driver on holiday, sick or car off the road doesn't pay a penny. Current operators are a 52 weeks a year payment. No holiday, sick leave ect.

I would also like for this to be confidential and not appear on reports. I'm sure your aware of the level of intimidation and bullying that can be exerted by the cartel. Which is ironic when they question Ubers fit and proper status!

Kind Regards

xxxx

On May 17, 2015 9:38:26 PM GMT+01:00, xxxx wrote:

Dear Tim,

Please find below confirmation of much of what I said, re the Uber application, at the last forum, with a few extra after thoughts.

I would be most grateful if you could take these points on board when either officers decide on the application, or in a report to councillors, should you choose to take that path. I would also be grateful if this e-mail remained confidential and didn't reappear on the back of any report(s).

1). Concern was expressed about Uber's policy of 'surge' pricing. Now whilst in B&H the vast majority of taxi/PH run on the same tariff, nationally that is the exception. That aside the council have no control over the rates PH operators/drivers charge, providing customers are made aware of those rates before they book or depart. Jeff confirmed that when one books a car, via the Uber app, price ranges are clearly shown. But even if a customer missed that price range, and was subsequently shocked at the final fare, we must remember all

payments are done via credit cards, so the customer has a well established credit card complaints department which are ready and waiting to deal with any customer complaints. In short Uber customer have more chance of getting financial redress than anyone dealing with any licensed B&H vehicle at present.

2). It was mentioned that as Uber don't consider themselves operators then that will cause the council problems in the future. As I said, Uber can call themselves what they like, but if someone signs the bottom of a B&H operator's license application, and that application is granted, then they are a B&H licensed operator.

3). The problem of vehicles that take wheelchair users, sitting in their wheelchairs, would be problem for Uber. So what? If the council wish to have a rule that says an operator with X amount of cars must have X percentage of vehicles that take wheelchairs, then so be it. Uber, or anyone else for that matter, will have to adhere to those rules.

4). We also discussed issues about Uber financing vehicles for drivers, and them not taking pre-bookings, but both of those issues are not, in my opinion, an issue that can be considered when determining the application. In short it's pointless waffle.

5). This point is the one that, from a B&H licensed PH driver's view, is the deciding factor why we believe Uber should be licensed in B&H. **They will not go away**. Only a fool will believe that Uber will pack up their bags and go away should the council reject their application. Instead they will try and license in Lewes, in Adur, in Mid-Sussex, or possibly them all. They will get a local license to operate somewhere, and that will leave the local B&H trade and the council with the worst possible outcome. In respect of the trade, we will see yet more local B&H work being lost to vehicles licensed elsewhere. That work which would have gone to B&H licensed vehicles will instead be given (quite legally) to non B&H licensed vehicles and drivers. I'm frankly amazed the likes of the GMB don't understand that obvious outcome should the council reject the Uber application.

But it's not just the B&H drivers that would lose out, the council itself will be left with a situation of dozen of Uber vehicles working the city with the council unable to check or enforce any of them. Is that really what we want? Do the council really want residents and visitors of our city being told 'it's nothing to do with me' should they wish to make a complaint to B&H council about a Uber vehicle? Is this what any of us want post Rotherham?

6). Following on from the point above re Rotherham, some of the features Uber have on their booking app are features the council should be jumping for joy about. A minor feature is the ability to see the face of the driver, on the app, that will be picking you up. That in itself is a major safeguard, but by far the biggest safeguard feature is the ability to follow the route on the app that the vehicle is going in real time. Can you imagine how helpful that feature would be to a parent that has booked a car to take their children out, or bring them back home? And how helpful a print out of that route would be to officers investigating any complaints?

To summarise I'm a little bit perplexed why the application hasn't been granted already, and I would hate to use the words 'regulatory capture', so I won't, but despite personally not being interested in working with Uber I know some of my colleagues would be interested, either working for them part-time or, in time, full-time.

But what none of us want is to lose yet work to non local vehicles. If the council license Uber they will have to use local B&H vehicles and drivers, those not working with Uber can put up with that. What we can't put up with is more Lewes, Adur and other areas drivers taking more of our bread and butter work.

Take care xxxx

--

Sent from My Tablet

This email was scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Vodafone in partnership with Symantec. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of problems, please call your organisations IT Helpdesk.

Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

