

# Minutes of A660 Joint Council Meeting, Monday 5<sup>th</sup> Sept 2016, 7.30pm at HEART

**1. Attendance** Present: GR, RR, SS, SB, IS, CT, DCJ, GL, CR, BM. Apologies: CF, PM, NS, MS.

**2. Agreement of minutes** Minutes from 4<sup>th</sup> July accepted as an accurate record. The meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> August was not quorate so agreement of the July minutes was deferred and the business of the meeting was also deferred. BM summarized the August meeting: CF spoke to planning officer about Headingley Hill Planning App. Officer said NGT Team were still opposed to it. Does this mean they still have ambitions for a Headingley bypass? If so, it is disappointing after four years of fighting against it.

## 3. Matters arising

1. All conservation and heritage issues along the A660 are in the A660JC's remit and we should object to the Headingley Hill planning app.
2. The idea of a Headingley bypass has blighted Headingley and Hyde Park for decades and is probably still at the back of some minds.
3. We cannot propose an alternative to the trolleybus because different people have different ideas, but an alternative group to campaign for an underground for example could be set up.
4. DCJ will ask BM for the legal information regarding the 9 parcels of open space that were appropriated by LCC for transport needs. DCJ will pass this on to CF and ask CF to look into legalities of whether or not it reverts back to not being appropriated. We need to have confirmation from LCC that the land will revert back.
5. DCJ will chase up with Cllr Pryor issue of garden CPOs and other CPOs.

## 4. Treasurer's Report and Collection

Report from previous meeting:

Collection from May 2016 meeting	£52.50
No collection at June 2016 meeting	£0.00
Collection from July 2016 meeting	£64.80

Cash in hand	£134.86
Cash at bank	£836.66
Total	£971.52

A collection of £45 was taken, plus £5 which SB will pass on to TB for HEART room bookings.

**5. LCC plans for the £173m** Individuals should submit their responses to the consultations and when LCC put forward specific proposals the A660JC can respond appropriately. IS went to a consultation and was just given broad bus strategy promotional material. On 22<sup>nd</sup> Sept, 7pm at INWCC, potential uses for the £173m will be discussed. Friends of Woodhouse Moor saw Cllr Towler to express concern about the NWLTF alternative proposals. Kevin Grady has retired from Leeds Civic Trust and been replaced by former Headingley Lib Dem councillor, Martin Hamilton, who, we think, supported the trolleybus proposals. The meeting agreed that we should have our statement read out at the INWCC meeting. SB will ask NF or TS. Our July minutes show clearly expressed views by Cllr Pryor about NWLTF not being taken seriously, but he was surrounded at the July meeting by people whose views were clear. Cllr Walshaw asked at a NHPNA meeting earlier in the year if there would be much opposition to the widening of Headingley Lane, even though at the Public Inquiry arguments against this were put forward by CR, Stuart Natkus and Greg Jones, and agreed with by the Inspector. The meeting agreed to add to the end of our statement, "The money should be focused in areas that need regeneration." So the whole statement reads: *"The A660 Joint Council welcomes the Secretary of State's decision to reject the trolleybus for the multiple reasons outlined in his Inspector's report. We welcome that the Inspector and Secretary of State placed more weight on heritage, trees and open space than did Metro or the Council. We ask the Council to reject major infrastructure projects, apart from an underground, as unsuitable for the A660. We ask the Council to reject the proposals of the misleadingly named NWLTF, a small group within the much larger area of North West Leeds whose destructive old fashioned scheme allegedly designed to improve public transport along the A660 would actually increase car use and degrade the inner city environment and public health of areas like Headingley and Hyde Park and Woodhouse. The A660 Joint Council strongly opposes the NWLTF proposals. However we are not opposed to proposals such as the Marchant Plan which are based on the hierarchy of road users. The money should be focused in areas that need regeneration."* Cllr R Lewis said recently that the decision to reject the trolleybus was political. At the Transport Summit on 1<sup>st</sup> June, he said that NGT wouldn't have solved all of Leeds' transport problems...

**6. Scrutiny into Trolleybus and Supertram** LCC are going to be having an inquiry into Supertram and Trolleybus but the vehicle for this is just one of their ordinary Scrutiny Board meetings. We have already sent all the Scrutiny Board councillors links to our Wiki-look-a-like web sites. We will also notify them of the URL for all the Persona documents, the URL for the Way Back machine and for Claire's audio. In response to the email we sent in July, we've had an email about the Scrutiny Board meeting this Wednesday 7<sup>th</sup> Sep in the Civic Hall at 10.30 which is open to the public. The email also says that later in the year stakeholders will be asked for input into the inquiry and asks for the name of a lead contact. The meeting agreed we were happy for BM to represent the A660JC and to be the lead contact. Hopefully other members will attend as well.

**7. Headingley Hill Planning Application** See item 3.1. People present at the meeting to send their views on the application to BM or DCJ and the A660JC will submit an objection if the application is still live.

**8. Any Other Business** CR raised the issue of York stone theft. An analysis of Ash Road and the Langdales shows that approximately 7 out of 90 kerb stones are damaged. Councillors have admitted there is no accounting system for reclaimed stone. We will return to this issue at the next meeting.

**Date of Next Meetings** 3<sup>rd</sup> October.

Actions	
DCJ	Ask BM for legal info regarding the 9 appropriated parcels of land
DCJ	Pass legal info regarding the 9 appropriated parcels of land to CF
DCJ	Ask Cllr Pryor about the garden CPOs
SB	Ask TS or NF to read out our statement at the INWCC meeting
BM	Reply to the Scrutiny Board email and give lead name
BM	Reply to the Scrutiny Board email and give 3 URLs
DCJ & BM	Draft A660JC objection to Headingley Hill Planning Application