

Minutes of the Committee Meeting of Camden Residents Association 27th March 2018

1. **Present:** Jeremy Labram, Nigel Sherwen, Gloria Goodsell, Stephen George, Janet Anderson, Chris Smith, Deepali Gaskell
Apologies: Nancy Coppock, Julie Platt, Nigel Pollard
2. **The Previous Minutes**
were approved.
3. **Matters Arising**
There were no matters arising, other than various contacts had been made by JL as suggested.
4. **Chairman's Report**
The Chairman did not prepare an overall report but added points to items through the meeting.
5. **Treasurer's report**
Not provided but it was presumed there was no change since the last meeting.
6. **The bus gates suggestion.** Jeremy had sent a status report in advance.

Deepali spoke about her meeting with Mark Shelford and said he had appeared to have made the offer in all seriousness, and was prepared for a trial period in 2 years. Nigel said that he was a refreshing change to his predecessor, but this was not to say that the scheme was necessarily feasible.

Steve said he saw him as a positive ally. We had not yet got a scheme and it was necessary to try out a range of options and what the implications of each would be. The Committee considered the following questions:

i) How can impeding peak traffic in Camden Rd help London Road?

It was acknowledged that the main aim of the Council was to reduce pollution on the London Road and it was hard to see how restricting traffic on Camden Rd would help that aim.

- Steve though pointed out that in some ways it might be easier to manage traffic on the London Road if there were no access to relief roads such as Camden.
- If it became a very acute problem, more drastic action would have to be taken, and would be thought acceptable.
- It was agreed that London Road was at full capacity at peak times, so it could hardly make matters worse. Already traffic was effectively being held back on the outskirts of Bath by the traffic lights system.
- If people were having to queue for even longer, this might persuade people from further afield to use other means of transport. At present, driver's frustration meant that they used a rat run such as Camden, and this would no longer be an option.

ii) It was then considered that why, if the proposed bus gates did not help reduce pollution on the London Road, why was Mark Shelford suggesting it?

- Deepali said that he was wanting to decrease traffic to the Lansdown area.

- Jeremy wondered whether he might be wanting to trial run a scheme such as this to see if it is workable, and if it were a success it would be strong evidence to promote other ways of diminishing traffic into the city.
- Janet thought it might be just a very hurried response to our traffic report in that it would be the obvious answer to all our problems.
- Steve said that we had to be realistic, and these things were not easy, especially on a political level. Mark Shelford was newly in the post and there might be a certain naivety.

iii) What form of bus gate could be adopted?

It was understood that the blockage on most bus gates was quite short. The most obvious one was from Bennett Lane to Gay's Hill, but any solution must take into account Upper and Lower Hedgemoad and Pera Place etc. The smaller the blockage, the less ambiguity there would be for Camden Rd residents.

As to the type of vehicles allowed access Steve explained that there were a great many options, each with different levels of palatability. All would reduce the volume of traffic to some degree. Jeremy pointed out that the simpler the rules, the easier the enforcement would be.

iv) If agreed, what would be the next step?

It was agreed that we should take this further, though Chris had reservations and thought we should wait until we had the promised data from the Council about car journeys in Bath.

He also asked that we should note that the main polluting vehicles are the large diesel buses which also cause major traffic jams in Camden Rd, leading to idling and further pollution. An answer to this would be to replace the large buses by mini-buses that could be electric powered; hence no pollution and removal of the main cause of the traffic jams.

SG

Steve said that he would draw up a paper by 16th April with a clear assessment of the various options as to the positioning of the gates, and the vehicles allowed admission. This would be the 'long list'.

We could all then have an opportunity to comment and reach a consensus as to how we could get to a short list and eventual preferred option to be presented to the Council.

5. The Traffic Report

Jeremy had drawn up a list of people and organisations in Bath who he felt might share an interest in traffic problems in north east Bath, and asked for help in contacting them regarding the report.

He said he would frame a basic letter for us, with a way of asking for a response, or allowing us to keep them informed of future developments.

JL

Nigel said he would speak to Lin Patterson.

NS

Deepali said she would contact Mark Shelford.

DG

Jeremy had already spoken to the man in charge of the coming road works on Camden Rd.

Nigel has a good relationship with Peter Bailey, the head of the Traffic Road Safety Engineering Department, and says he will make further contact with him.

NS

Janet said she will write to the councillors living in our area: Joe Rayment, Martin Veal and Geoff Ward.

JA

Deepali said she will make sure Wera Hobhouse knows about our report.

DG

We could also approach Jacob Rees Mogg. JL
Everybody agreed to take action before the end of the week and to report back in a couple of weeks.

6. The CRA Blog

- a) Jeremy reported there were 21 followers.
- b) He urged all committee members to sign up.
- c) He said that he had explained to Julie how to post a blog, but if anyone wanted to post something they could do it through him. DG
GG
- d) It would be very helpful to leave comments in order to promote discussion
- e) It was agreed to pay to remove the advertising
- f) Julie had emailed all those on our residents list about the blog, but we might use other methods. JL
- g) We could make efforts to email neighbours.

All

7. Wild Camden

Steve said it was becoming urgent to do a litterpick and set up the Gardening Club. He would liaise with Nancy. He would also chase up when the structural repair was due to happen. SG

8. Changes to Parking on St Stephens Rd

There were apparently no changes to parking, but two signs were missing. Deepali would contact the Council to make sure they were replaced. DG

9. AOB

Chris wondered where all the cars would park while the road was being repaired. The whole road was being closed so that the resurfacing could be done as one, rather than in two halves, which had not been successful. There was no answer to this, except that cars would have to be parked outside the zone. The Council was offering no dispensation to park in other resident zones.

Nigel had provided a history of the past achievements of the CRA which were included in a paper from JL on Marketing for consideration at the next meeting (attached) All

JL asked that AOB was for noting points which could be discussed at the next meeting supported by a paper sent out in advance (as per JL's marketing paper) All

10. Date of next meeting

It was agreed to meet in about 5 weeks time. JA to doodle JA

11. Location of meetings

It was agreed to rotate the meetings among those committee members who had space. Janet said that the next meeting could be at her house, 31 Prospect Place. JA

12. Finish

The meeting was closed at 9.25pm.

