

**Eggbuckland and Moorview Area Committee Meeting
23 March 2010**

Provision of Car Parking Spaces at the Rear of 36 – 60 Churchstow Walk

The Contract and Disrepair Manager was requested to meet Councillor Foster, Chair of the Eggbuckland and Moorview Area Committee at Churchstow Walk on 13 March 2009 to discuss the proposal of the creation of additional car parking spaces on the open space at the rear and between the two terraces of addresses forming 36 – 60. Councillor Foster had been approached by residents requesting that the proposal was considered.

From the initial site visit it was apparent that a number of spaces could easily be constructed by lowering the existing paved/slabbed area and extending the existing parking area; approximately seven spaces could be created.

The proposal was approved and an order was raised to spend the balance of 2008/09 budget on the provision of the parking spaces. A sum of £8115 was available and a contractor was engaged to discuss what additional area for parking could be achieved.

On 25 March 2009, a letter was sent to each resident advising them that the proposed scheme had been approved. The Contract and Disrepair Manager was tasked with determining whether the proposed scheme could be delivered within the available funds.

On 26 March 2009, the Contract and Disrepair Manager received six telephone calls against the proposed scheme and only one in favour; it was suggested to Councillor Foster that the residents vote on the proposed scheme.

On 30 March 2009, a letter from Mr Miners of 56 Churchstow Walk together with a petition was received. The petition was against the proposed scheme and had been signed by the residents of 10 -13 Churchstow Walk.

On 30 March 2009, Councillor Foster also received telephone calls from the residents as well as the petition. At this stage, it was decided not to progress with the proposed scheme.

The residents were sent a letter on 3 April 2009 confirming that due to the overwhelming rejection by residents of the proposed scheme it would not be progressed.

One resident who had supported the scheme had been unhappy with the decision. It had been explained to them that the majority of residents had opposed it and therefore the scheme had not been progressed.