



## Agenda

**Notice of a public meeting of**      **Environment Directorate - Corporate Director and Executive Member - Highways and Transportation**

**To:**              **Councillor Keane Duncan.**

**Date:**           **Monday, 30th October, 2023**

**Time:**          **4.00 pm**

**Venue:**         **Via Microsoft Teams**

### Business

#### **Items for Executive Member decision**

1.        National Highways A66 upgrade – de-trunking (*Pages 3 - 40*)

#### **Items for Corporate Director decision**

2.        Procurement exercise for Fuel Cards 2023 - 2028 (*Pages 41 - 52*)
3.        Proposed Changes to the System of Prioritisation for Definitive Map Modification Order Applications (*Pages 53 - 58*)

Barry Khan  
Assistant Chief Executive  
(Legal and Democratic Services)

County Hall  
Northallerton

21 October 2023

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

## North Yorkshire Council

### Environment Executive Members

30 October 2023

### Fuel Card Procurement 2023-2028

#### Report of the Assistant Director - IPT, Licensing, Harbours, Fleet and Countryside Access

#### **1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 To seek approval from the Corporate Director, Environment, in consultation with Executive Member for Highways and Transportation to proceed with the procurement of a fuel card supplier from 23 March 2024.

#### **2.0 BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 The Council have a requirement for a fuel card supplier to supplement the bunkered fuel provision to reduce the distance travelled to obtain fuel.

#### **3.0 GENERAL**

- 3.1 We have tested the market and due to the geographical coverage of the Allstar product weighed up against competitors, it is felt that the Allstar card is the most economically advantageous and viable option due to them being the only supplier to have full coverage across the whole area.
- 3.2 The Council operate 960 vehicles across numerous sites in the course of normal operational duties.
- 3.3 The Council and NY Highways operate 20 bunkered fuel sites however there is an operational requirement for wider coverage so that drivers do not have to make unnecessary journeys to bunkered fuel sites.
- 3.4 Wider coverage is maintained by the utilisation of fuel only cards that are accepted at nearly all fuel outlets.
- 3.5 The Council's fuel volume using fuel cards is estimated to be circa 710,000 litres per annum and fuel cards will be required to be used at public charging stations as alternative fuel vehicles become more common.

#### **4.0 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 4.1 Due to the vast geographic area of North Yorkshire it is not practicable from an operational point of view for all vehicles to refill at the Councils bunkered fuel sites.
- 4.2 Employees are encouraged to look for alternative means of travel such as public transport, pool cars or make use of electronic meetings but the need for corporate fleet cannot be removed.

## **5.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 The estimated annual cost of fuel and card administration is £975k, although this will vary in line with fluctuations in fuel prices.
- 5.2 Allstar has a transaction charge of £1.65 per transaction. This can be minimised by encouraging users to fuel up at the Councils preferred forecourts.
- 5.3 The anticipated whole life contract cost is £3.9M based on a two-year contract with 2 x 12-month extensions.
- 5.4 The cost of this fuel is charged back to directorates with a 2% uplift applied to cover internal administration costs.

## **6.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 The contract will be awarded via a direct award under the 'Fuel Cards and Associated Services Framework Agreement (RM6186)'. This framework enables UK public sector bodies to purchase fuel cards and associated services.
- 6.2 The framework permits a direct award to Allstar Business Solutions Ltd. This framework is run by the Crown Commercial Service and is a compliant route to market in accordance with the Public Contract Regulations 2015.

## **7.0 EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS**

- 7.1 An Initial equality impact assessment screening form has been completed. This can be found at Appendix 1

## **8.0 CLIMATE CHANGE IMPLICATIONS**

- 8.1 A Climate Change Impact report has been completed and can be found in Appendix 2.
- 8.2 To minimise emissions the fuel efficiency of a vehicle is a key element of the vehicle replacement process. The roadside emissions and the fuel efficiency of vehicles are considered as part of the replacement process and in addition, battery electric vehicles are considered for each vehicle replacement where practicable.
- 8.3 Services are encouraged to seek alternative methods of service delivery to reduce the need to travel and to maximise the use of technology.

## **9.0 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION**

- 9.1 The Council has a large geographical area with a lot of this area in rural districts. To ensure service provision there is a requirement for fuel cards to maintain wider coverage across the road network.
- 9.2 Allstar is the only supplier on Framework (RM6186) that has coverage over the full geographical area of the Council area.

## **10.0 RECOMMENDATION**

- 10.1 It is recommended that the Corporate Director – Environment, in consultation with Executive Member for Highways and Transportation, agrees to authorise the Council to proceed with a procurement directly award a contract for the provision of Fuel Cards to Allstar Business Solutions Ltd via the Fuel Cards and Associated Services Framework Agreement.

### **APPENDICIES:**

Appendix A - Equalities Impact Assessment

Appendix B – Climate Change Impact Assessment

### **PAUL THOMPSON**

Assistant Director– IPT, Licensing, Harbours, Fleet and Countryside Access

Report Author – Kelly Baxter – Fleet Management Officer - Development

Presenter of Report – Kelly Baxter – Fleet Management Officer - Development

Note: Members are invited to contact the author in advance of the meeting with any detailed queries or questions.

Initial equality impact assessment screening form			
This form records and equality screening process to determine the relevance of equality to a proposal, and a decision whether a full EIA would be appropriate or proportionate.			
Directorate	Environment		
Service area	IPT, Licencing, Harbours, Fleet and Countryside Access		
Proposal being screened	Fuel card provision		
Officer(s) carrying out screening	Kelly Baxter		
What are you proposing to do?	Procure fuel card provision		
Why are you proposing this? What are the desired outcomes?	To provide fuel for operational duties undertaken in NYC fleet vehicles		
Does the proposal involve a significant commitment or removal of resources? Please give details.	Yes – the estimated contract value is over £500k		
<b>Impact on people with any of the following protected characteristics as defined by the Equality Act 2010, or NYC’s additional agreed characteristics</b> As part of this assessment, please consider the following questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent is this service used by groups of people with protected characteristics?</li> <li>Does the proposal relate to functions that previous consultation has identified as important?</li> <li>Do different groups have different needs or experiences in the area the proposal relates to?</li> </ul> <b>If for any characteristic it is considered that there is likely to be an adverse impact or you have ticked ‘Don’t know/no info available’, then a full EIA should be carried out where this is proportionate. You are advised to speak to your <a href="#">Equality rep</a> for advice if you are in any doubt.</b>			
Protected characteristic	Potential for adverse impact		Don’t know/No info available
	No	Yes	
Age	X		
Disability	X		
Sex	X		
Race	X		
Sexual orientation	X		
Gender reassignment	X		
Religion or belief	X		
Pregnancy or maternity	X		
Marriage or civil partnership	X		
<b>NYC additional characteristics</b>			
People in rural areas	X		
People on a low income	X		
Carer (unpaid family or friend)	X		
Are from the Armed Forces Community	X		
Does the proposal relate to an area where there are known inequalities/probable impacts (e.g., disabled people’s access to public transport)? Please give details.	No		
Will the proposal have a significant effect on how other organisations operate? (e.g., partners, funding criteria, etc.). Do any of these organisations support people with protected characteristics? Please explain why you have reached this conclusion.	No		



<b>Decision (Please tick one option)</b>	EIA not relevant or proportionate:	X	Continue to full EIA:	
<b>Reason for decision</b>	No impact on protected characteristics			
<b>Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)</b>	Paul Thompson			
<b>Date</b>	18/10/2023			

## Climate change impact assessment

The purpose of this assessment is to help us understand the likely impacts of our decisions on the environment of North Yorkshire and on our aspiration to achieve net carbon neutrality by 2030, or as close to that date as possible. The intention is to mitigate negative effects and identify projects which will have positive effects.

This document should be completed in consultation with the supporting guidance. The final document will be published as part of the decision-making process and should be written in Plain English.

If you have any additional queries which are not covered by the guidance, please email [climatechange@northyorks.gov.uk](mailto:climatechange@northyorks.gov.uk)

**Please note: You may not need to undertake this assessment if your proposal will be subject to any of the following:**

Planning Permission  
Environmental Impact Assessment  
Strategic Environmental Assessment

However, you will still need to summarise your findings in in the summary section of the form below.

Please contact [climatechange@northyorks.gov.uk](mailto:climatechange@northyorks.gov.uk) for advice.

<b>Title of proposal</b>	<b>Fuel card provision</b>
<b>Brief description of proposal</b>	<b>To inform the Corporate Director – Environment in consultation with Executive Member of the procurement of fuel cards.</b>
<b>Directorate</b>	<b>Environment</b>
<b>Service area</b>	<b>IPT, Licencing, Harbours, Fleet and Countryside Access</b>
<b>Lead officer</b>	<b>Kelly Baxter</b>
<b>Names and roles of other people involved in carrying out the impact assessment</b>	<b>Kelly Baxter – Fleet Management Officer - Development</b>
<b>Date impact assessment started</b>	<b>10/10/2023</b>

**Options appraisal**

Were any other options considered in trying to achieve the aim of this project? If so, please give brief details and explain why alternative options were not progressed.

The current NYC fleet requires access to diesel and petrol for its daily operation. The default for future vehicle procurement is zero or ultra-low emission at tailpipe wherever practicable to do so. The main barrier to the successful implementation of BEV is the provision of infrastructure.

**What impact will this proposal have on council budgets? Will it be cost neutral, have increased cost, or reduce costs?**

Please explain briefly why this will be the result, detailing estimated savings or costs where this is possible.

The cost of the proposal will vary with any change in fuel forecourt prices during the contract and the mileage operated by vehicles.

The estimated contract cost is £3.9M.

<p>How will this proposal impact on the environment?</p> <p>N.B. There may be short term negative impact and longer-term positive impact. Please include all potential impacts over the lifetime of a project and provide an explanation.</p>	<p><b>Positive impact</b> (Place a X in the box below where</p>	<p><b>No impact</b> (Place a X in the box below where</p>	<p><b>Negative impact</b> (Place a X in the box below where</p>	<p>Explain why will it have this effect and over what timescale?</p> <p>Where possible/relevant please include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes over and above business as usual</li> <li>• Evidence or measurement of effect</li> <li>• Figures for CO<sub>2</sub>e</li> <li>• Links to relevant documents</li> </ul>	<p>Explain how you plan to mitigate any negative impacts.</p>	<p>Explain how you plan to improve any positive outcomes as far as possible.</p>	
<p>Minimise <b>greenhouse gas emissions</b> e.g., reducing emissions from travel, increasing energy efficiencies etc.</p>	<p>Emissions from travel</p>			<p>X</p>	<p>Any travel using internal combustion engine vehicles results in roadside emissions. The fuel card volume for 2022 -2023 was 710,658 litres. This resulted in 1,904.6 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. The level of emissions is expected to decrease over the course of the contract as we move towards BEV and alternative fuel vehicles to meet the 2030 commitment to reach carbon neutrality.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Services encouraged to minimise the need to travel and to both maximise the use of technology for service delivery and seek alternative methods of service delivery.</li> <li>• Battery Electric vehicles are considered for use wherever practicable to do so.</li> <li>• Vehicles sourced are ULEV or the lowest emissions level possible wherever practicable                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further make use of corporate policy to facilitate homecharging of BEV where possible.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Development of driving strategy to reduce fuel use by safe and fuel-efficient driving</p>

<p>How will this proposal impact on the environment?</p> <p>N.B. There may be short term negative impact and longer-term positive impact. Please include all potential impacts over the lifetime of a project and provide an explanation.</p>		<p><b>Positive impact</b> (Place a X in the box below where</p>	<p><b>No impact</b> (Place a X in the box below where</p>	<p><b>Negative impact</b> (Place a X in the box below where</p>	<p>Explain why will it have this effect and over what timescale?</p> <p>Where possible/relevant please include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes over and above business as usual</li> <li>• Evidence or measurement of effect</li> <li>• Figures for CO<sub>2</sub>e</li> <li>• Links to relevant documents</li> </ul>	<p>Explain how you plan to mitigate any negative impacts.</p>	<p>Explain how you plan to improve any positive outcomes as far as possible.</p>
<p>Page 49</p>	<p>Emissions from construction</p>		<p>X</p>				
	<p>Emissions from running of buildings</p>		<p>X</p>				
	<p>Other</p>						
<p>Minimise <b>waste</b>: Reduce, reuse, recycle and compost e.g., reducing use of single use plastic</p>		<p>X</p>					
<p>Reduce <b>water</b> consumption</p>		<p>X</p>					
<p>Minimise <b>pollution</b> (including air, land, water, light and noise)</p>			<p>X</p>	<p>Aside from the impact upon greenhouse emissions, the use of diesel vehicles increases the level of NO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and particulate pollution at the roadside and there are adverse effects on health and the environment from these emissions.</p>	<p>The mitigations are the same as for greenhouse emissions.</p>		

<p>How will this proposal impact on the environment?</p> <p><b>N.B. There may be short term negative impact and longer-term positive impact. Please include all potential impacts over the lifetime of a project and provide an explanation.</b></p>	<p><b>Positive impact</b> (Place a X in the box below where</p>	<p><b>No impact</b> (Place a X in the box below where</p>	<p><b>Negative impact</b> (Place a X in the box below where</p>	<p>Explain why will it have this effect and over what timescale?</p> <p>Where possible/relevant please include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes over and above business as usual</li> <li>• Evidence or measurement of effect</li> <li>• Figures for CO<sub>2</sub>e</li> <li>• Links to relevant documents</li> </ul>	<p>Explain how you plan to mitigate any negative impacts.</p>	<p>Explain how you plan to improve any positive outcomes as far as possible.</p>
<p>Ensure <b>resilience</b> to the effects of climate change e.g., reducing flood risk, mitigating effects of drier, hotter summers</p>		X				
<p>Enhance <b>conservation</b> and wildlife</p>		X				
<p>Safeguard the distinctive characteristics, features and special qualities of <b>North Yorkshire's landscape</b></p>		X				
<p>Other (please state below)</p>						

**Are there any recognised good practice environmental standards in relation to this proposal?** If so, please detail how this proposal meets those standards.

Fuel supplied in the UK must meet BS EN 590 for diesel fuel, the BS EN 228 for petrol. These regulations ensure that fuel sold in the UK meets the required composition standards

**Summary** Summarise the findings of your impact assessment, including impacts, the recommendation in relation to addressing impacts, including any legal advice, and next steps. This summary should be used as part of the report to the decision maker.

There is no alternative but to continue to require fuel card provision to purchase diesel and petrol currently. However, the use of battery electric vehicles will be expanded. The use of BEV reduces roadside emissions but there are still emissions therefore services are encouraged to reduce the need to travel to eliminate any emissions from fuel.

Fleet item selection will consider the use of BEV, Alternative fuels, and default to ULEV (sub 75g/km CO<sub>2</sub>) where possible and in any event lower emission vehicles will be selected where value can be demonstrated.

### Sign off section

This climate change impact assessment was completed by:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Kelly Baxter</b>
<b>Job title</b>	<b>Fleet Management Officer - Development</b>
<b>Service area</b>	<b>IPT, Licencing, Harbours, Fleet and Countryside Access</b>
<b>Directorate</b>	<b>Environment</b>
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Kelly Baxter</b>
<b>Completion date</b>	<b>10/10/2023</b>

**Authorised by relevant Assistant Director (signature): Paul Thompson**

**Date: 18/10/2023**

This page is intentionally left blank



## North Yorkshire Council

### Environment Executive Members

30 October 2023

#### Proposed Changes to the System of Prioritisation for Definitive Map Modification Order Applications

#### Report of the Assistant Director – Integrated Passenger Transport, Licensing, Fleet, Harbours and Countryside Access

##### 1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To advise the Corporate Director of Environment of proposed changes to the prioritisation of investigation of Definitive Map Modification Order (DMMO) applications.
- 1.2 To request the Corporate Director, in consultation with the Executive Member for Highways and Transportation, to approve the proposed changes to the DMMO processes.

##### 2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Since 1949 local authorities across the country have recorded Public Rights of Way in Definitive Maps and Statements. The Council has a duty to keep the Definitive Map and Statement relating to North Yorkshire up to date by making legal orders to reflect changes made to the network, and to make amendments based on evidential circumstances.
- 2.2 Since 1983 one element of keeping the Definitive Map and Statement (DM&S) up to date is the investigation and resolution of evidentially supported applications submitted to the Council by members of the public for DMMOs to be made. In the majority, these applications are made proposing to add routes to the Definitive Map and Statement where the applicant believes an unrecorded historic route, or a route that has come into being by recent but long usage, should be recorded. Less commonly applications may be made to amend the status of routes already recorded, or more rarely, to delete routes due to a belief they should not have been recorded in the first place.
- 2.3 As is the case for many Authorities, for over 20 years there has been a backlog of DMMO applications awaiting investigation. The backlog has been mounting ever-more rapidly as members of the public became increasingly concerned that they may lose unrecorded public rights of way if they are not subject of a formal application prior to the nationally proposed 'cut-off date' of 2026, for such applications (those that rely entirely upon historic evidence). In March this year DEFRA proposed to extend the cut-off date until to 2031, though this has yet to be formalised in law.
- 2.4 For many years the average number of applications submitted per year was 12, however, over the last two years 72 applications have been submitted, resulting in a current total of 190 applications awaiting investigation. A further 35 applications are currently in progress, which means actively being investigated, or that an Order has been made but is opposed and has been referred to the Secretary of State. Applications and the subsequent made Orders have a lengthy consultation process, and the majority are opposed, resulting in a necessity of referral to the Secretary of State, which can take upwards of two years to conclude.

- 2.5 Due to the growing backlog of applications a basic prioritisation system was devised in approximately 2003 to establish the order in which applications would be dealt with. The 'points' system prioritised applications based on limited criteria and was utilised for a while but was considered unsatisfactory as it resulted in many cases having the same priority score.
- 2.6 The system was revised in approximately 2011, expanding upon the merit system, providing a more helpful, wider spread of 'point scores'. This system gave greater priority to cases which were:
- well supported by evidence
  - submitted by user groups or local community groups
  - near to population areas and which would be beneficial to more users in local communities
  - where public use had been recently prevented.
- 2.7 It was anticipated that this system would result in those more strongly supported cases being resolved more quickly having a positive effect on the backlog and would help escalate those cases which were apparently in the greater public interest. To some extent these aspirations were successful.
- 2.8 However, over time, the flaws in this system have become increasingly apparent, and a review of the situation has been undertaken.

### **3.0 THE REASONS TO AMEND THE SYSTEM**

- 3.1 The main flaws in the current system are:
- The overall position of any particular case is constantly changing within the priority list as newer, higher scoring applications are made, pushing lower scoring cases down the list, or, where additional evidence is submitted, increasing the score of existing cases, moving them further up the list, and also pushing lower scoring cases down the list.
  - The result of this is that we are unable to give any applicant a realistic timescale when their application will be commenced as it is unknown how many higher scoring cases may be submitted in the intervening period. This is frustrating for both applicants and for officers. In addition, it hinders the ability of the team to produce a clear casework programme for the forthcoming year if priority cases are constantly changing.
  - Many newer applications are now submitted with more substantial evidence in support, which is laudable and extremely helpful towards the investigation of cases. However, this is compounding the plight of the lower scoring cases which have increasingly little hope of ever being investigated in a timely manner.
  - The lower scoring cases are not necessarily relating to routes that are less likely to be proven to be public rights of way. A case with only one item of evidence which, in itself, is statutorily compelling, would still have a low score and would remain low in the list.
  - In addition to the system being most unfair to applicants with the lower scoring cases the system is exposing the Authority to a very real risk of serious challenge for failing to deal with applications in a timely manner, as some low scoring cases were submitted many years ago. Amongst the low scoring cases there are 10 which have been held by the Authority for more than 20 years. This is clearly unacceptable.
  - Old cases are becoming more difficult to investigate as evidence becomes less apparent, and witnesses providing verbal evidence may be increasing less able to partake in the investigative processes.

## 4.0 PROPOSED CHANGE TO THE PRIORITISATION SYSTEM

- 4.1 Consideration was given to amending the criteria further, to attempt to resolve the issues identified however after some discussions with other Authorities and considerable deliberation over the issues, it was resolved that the fairest approach would be to abandon a merit-based points system, and to deal with the applications in the order in which they arrive, simply dealing with the oldest first.
- 4.2 This would then be consistent with the approach that is taken for the processing of the public path order applications that we receive. The benefits of this approach would be that:
- The very oldest cases would be investigated soonest, giving the Authority the chance to test the available evidence before it is weakened any further due to the passage of time.
  - Investigation of these oldest cases would also be an opportunity to greatly reduce the risk of challenge for failing to address applications for such an unacceptable period of time.
  - A priority list can be simply devised assisting the preparation of annual work programmes and allowing us to give greater clarity to applicants on when their cases are likely to be commenced.
  - There would be assurance to applicants that all cases will be investigated regardless of the quantity or quality of evidence that the applicant was able to amass.
  - The unhelpful scope for applicants to attempt to disagree and debate the scores attached to their applications would be removed.
- 4.3 A report was put before the Local Access Forum explaining the proposals and asking for their views. After some debate around revising the existing scheme to resolve some of the issues raised there was general acceptance of the proposed change to dealing with applications on an oldest first basis.
- 4.4 The proposal was also discussed at the User Group Liaison Meeting, where nominal support was given, although following the meeting a small number of representations were received suggesting some weighting should be retained.
- 4.5 Internal legal advice was sought, and the view given was that as applicants had been advised how their applications were to be prioritised and had some understanding how their cases sat within the current prioritisation list, that it would be appropriate to engage with them regarding the proposed change.
- 4.6 It had already been established that we would not halt cases that were already under investigation, these cases were not to be disrupted by the proposed changes. The applicants for the 190 outstanding cases for which investigation has not yet been commenced were contacted.
- 4.7 Of these 190 cases, 140 had been submitted by just three British Horse Society representatives attempting to secure routes suitable for equestrians.
- 4.8 It was explained to the applicants, allowing for comment to be made, why we were proposing to amend the system to move to a simple process of dealing with all applications in chronological order.
- Applicant Responses
- 4.9 Seven responses were received, of these two demonstrate clear support, only one states that it is an objection. The remaining four responses whilst generally accepting the proposed change, also offer reasons why there should be some priority weighting in favour of higher status routes, and/or routes threatened by landowners.

- 4.10 Three responses are from equestrians who are concerned that the change will detriment higher status route applications, which they feel should be given higher priority, suggesting a weighting should be introduced to benefit these cases. However, it is their misconception that the older cases are more likely to be applications for footpaths. Of the 20 oldest cases 12 are for bridleways and byways open to all traffic.

## **5.0 REPRESENTATION MADE BY THE LOCAL MEMBER**

- 5.1 As this matter is a county wide proposal there has been no consultation with local Members.

## **6.0 CLIMATE CHANGE IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 There are no significant climate change implications arising from this report.

## **7.0 EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS**

- 7.1 There are no significant equalities implications arising from this report.

## **8.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 8.1 There are no financial implications in altering the order in which applications are investigated.

## **9.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 9.1 There is no external statutory guidance on prioritisation schemes for the management of DMMO application prioritisation, therefore, how the Authority chooses to prioritise such applications is ultimately an internal decision.

## **10.0 CONCLUSIONS**

- 10.1 Any introduction of a weighting system would open up individual case prioritisation again, and walkers would also have arguments why well used pedestrian routes should also be prioritised more highly.
- 10.2 It is appreciated that any change to the current system will be disappointing to those applicants who have been benefiting by the structure of the current system, but there will inevitably also be relief amongst other applicants who were facing the possibility that they would never see their applications progressed.
- 10.3 There may be the occasional circumstance that could arise whereby it would be desirable for a particular DMMO application to be investigated out of sequence from the simplified proposed priority system. Therefore, it is also proposed that discretion is given to the Assistant Director to permit cases to be progressed out of sequence in exceptional situations, such as to avoid delays within planning processes, to resolve particularly controversial issues in a locality, or to assist with operational efficiency gains.

## **11.0 RECOMMENDATION**

11.1 It is recommended that:

- i) The proposal to move away from the current merit-based system of prioritisation of DMMO applications in favour of applications being progressed in chronological order, giving priority to the oldest applications, is approved, and for this approach to be implemented with immediate effect.
  
- ii) discretion is granted to the Assistant Director – Integrated Passenger Transport, Licensing, Fleet, Harbours and Countryside Access to authorise the investigation of certain occasional applications 'out of sequence' in exceptional circumstances.

PAUL THOMPSON

Assistant Director – Integrated Passenger Transport, Licensing, Fleet, Harbours and Countryside Access

Report Author – PENNY NOAKE – PRINCIPAL DEFINITIVE MAP OFFICER

Presenter of Report – PENNY NOAKE – PRINCIPAL DEFINITIVE MAP OFFICER

Background papers: None

Note: Members are invited to contact the author in advance of the meeting with any detailed queries or questions.

This page is intentionally left blank