

**KENT COUNTY COUNCIL
LEGAL AND DEMOCRATIC SERVICES**

PREPARATION SHEET FOR A REPORT SEEKING AN EXECUTIVE DECISION

1. Whose Name will the Report be in
Linda Davies

2. Decision Number - if known

3. Contact Officer and Contact Details) Graham Rusling
<input type="checkbox"/> e-mail address graham.rusling@kent.gov.uk Telephone No 01622 696995.....

<p>4. TOPIC OF DECISION <i>(This should include the subject matter of the proposed decision (the location if appropriate) and a brief summary of the proposal)</i></p> <p>(NB: If the decision or report are likely to disclose exempt information please specify the relevant paragraph(s) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.)</p> <p>Byway Open To All Traffic KH219 – Experimental Traffic Regulation Order.</p> <p>Executive decision is sought whether:</p> <p>To make permanent the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order or Cause a Public Inquiry to be held, following which the authority would consider the inspector’s report before determining to make permanent the Order. or Not to make the proposed Order.</p> <p>No objections or representations to the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order KH219 Lenham were received within the objection period . Consideration of any objections or representations is required by the Local Authorities’ Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 (No 2489) regulation 13 .</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>On 15 March 2009 Kent County Council introduced an experimental scheme of traffic management on Byway Open to All Traffic (BOAT) KH219, Lenham. The scheme was introduced in response to local concerns relating to antisocial, nuisance and criminal activity in associated with motor vehicular access to BOAT KH219</p> <p>The scheme of traffic management sought to retain the rights of lawful motorised vehicular users to the use of the BOAT while addressing the issues described above that were impacting on the amenity of the area. The experimental scheme has now been in operation for 16 months. It has brought about improvement to the general amenity of the area.</p> <table style="width: 100%; margin-top: 20px;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20%;"></td> <td style="width: 20%;">Is the Report (please tick one box only)</td> <td style="width: 20%;">Unrestricted</td> <td style="width: 20%;">Exempt</td> <td style="width: 20%;">Please identify any previous Decision Number(s) Related to this Topic Decision Number(s)</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">X</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>		Is the Report (please tick one box only)	Unrestricted	Exempt	Please identify any previous Decision Number(s) Related to this Topic Decision Number(s)			X		
	Is the Report (please tick one box only)	Unrestricted	Exempt	Please identify any previous Decision Number(s) Related to this Topic Decision Number(s)						
		X								

5. Is the Proposed Decision <i>If the proposed decision is a key decision not on the Forward Plan please seek the advice of your Democratic Services contact.</i>	
(please tick one box only)	
A Key Decision on the Forward Plan	Other X

6. Who will make the Decision?

(please tick one box only: if the Decision is to be taken by the Cabinet Member, he or she will need to address the interest question. This section needs to be completed before the Decision route is endorsed by the Leader)

Leader

Cabinet

Cabinet Member (name)
Nick Chard

Has the Cabinet Member declared any interest pecuniary or otherwise in the Proposed Decision?

Pecuniary		Non Pecuniary	
*YES	NO	*YES	NO
	X		X

**If YES, please give details*

7. Has the proposed Decision route been endorsed by the Leader?

YES		NO	
-----	--	----	--

8. Is the proposed decision contrary to or inconsistent with a policy within the Policy Framework?

YES		NO	X
-----	--	----	---

Is the proposed Decision within the agreed Budget?

YES	X	NO	
-----	---	----	--

If you have any doubts, please consult Stuart Ballard or Geoff Mills in Democratic Services or the Director of Finance.

Please specify which document(s) in the Policy Framework the proposed Decision stems from (if none, write 'none')

Vehicles in the Countryside; Report to the Environmental Sub Committee – 4 October 1996
 Measures to Protect PROW with Heritage Value: report by County Environmental Management Board 12 January 2001
 Countryside Access Improvement Plan – Endorsed by KCC March 2008
 Environment and Waste Business Plan April 2010 –April 2011.

9. MANDATORY CHECKS

Is Corporate Finance satisfied with the financial implications of the proposed Decision?

YES		*NO	
-----	--	-----	--

**Comment (mandatory where response is 'NO')*

Financial implications are not considered a significant risk. The Countryside Access Service has borne the cost of the ETRO to date and the future costs of the scheme are envisaged as being lower than the establishment costs.

The following where relevant	YES	NO	N/A
Personnel:			X
Property:			X
Strategic Procurement Adviser/Corp Procurement			X
Information Systems:			X
Legal:	X		

10. OTHER CHECKS

(a) Local Member(s); (b) other Cabinet Portfolio holders affected by the proposed Decision

	YES	*NO	N/A	Where YES, give names	*Comment (<i>mandatory where response is 'NO'</i>)
Local Member(s)	X				
Cabinet Member(s)	X				

**WHEN COMPLETED SEND THIS PREPARATION SHEET TOGETHER
WITH YOUR REPORT TO DEMOCRATIC SERVICES**