

The committee must also consider Fife's zonal licensing system.

The Council's own correspondence shows that its licensing officers told Uber they would need to be convinced that Uber's systems and algorithms were configured so that prohibited cross-zonal hires could not possibly occur.

Uber responded that it would investigate and might submit an appendix explaining how its technology worked.

That exchange is extremely important. It shows that the Council itself recognised that compliance cannot simply be presumed. It depends upon an algorithm which Fife Council does not control.

Has that technical explanation now been supplied? Has the system been independently tested? Can council officers audit it? What happens when boundaries, mapping data or software are changed? Will Fife Council be notified? Can Uber demonstrate from actual records that a vehicle licensed in one zone cannot be offered a journey taking place entirely within another?

An assurance that "the system will prevent it" is not evidence. The committee needs a verifiable mechanism and an enforceable commitment.

There is also the question of local management.

The application names a day-to-day manager. Under Fife's arrangements, that manager becomes a joint licence-holder. This is therefore not an honorary title or an administrative detail.

The committee should establish where that person will normally work; how frequently they will be present in Rosyth; what authority they possess; whether they can access complete booking records; and whether they can intervene immediately if an unlicensed driver, unsuitable vehicle, prohibited cross-zone booking or public-safety incident is identified.

If the meaningful decisions, booking systems, data and regulatory functions are controlled by other companies elsewhere, the committee must ask whether Uber Scot Limited will genuinely manage this booking office or whether the activity will, in substance, be carried on for the benefit of another entity.

Other councils may have licensed Uber, but that does not relieve this committee of its own responsibility. Fife has its own zonal licensing system. The character of these premises, the management arrangements and the Council's ability to enforce its conditions must be assessed on the evidence before this committee.

Our objection asks members not to confuse a locally licensed address with locally accountable control.

Before granting this application, the committee must be satisfied that Unit 18 will be a genuine operational booking office; that the day-to-day manager will exercise meaningful control; that complete records can be produced promptly; that Police Scotland and council officers will have effective access to safety information; and that Uber's technology will reliably enforce Fife's licensing zones.

If Uber cannot demonstrate those matters through documents, tested systems and enforceable commitments, the premises cannot safely be regarded as suitable for the nature and extent of the proposed activity.

The burden is on the applicant to satisfy the committee—not on Fife's taxi trade or the public to discover after the licence has been granted that the Council's powers exist only on paper.

I therefore ask the committee to uphold our objection and refuse the application. At the very least, it should not determine the application until these questions have been answered fully, independently and on the public record.

Thank you.