

LEEDS CITY COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

Held on

Wednesday, 21st April 2010

At

THE COUNCIL CHAMBER,
CIVIC HALL, LEEDS

In the Chair:

THE LORD MAYOR
(Councillor J Elliott)

Transcribed from the notes of
J L Harpham Ltd.,
Official Court Reporters and Tape Transcribers,
Queen's Buildings, 55, Queen Street,
Sheffield, S1 2DX

VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF LEEDS CITY COUNCIL MEETING
HELD ON WEDNESDAY 21st APRIL 2010

THE LORD MAYOR: Good afternoon everyone. May I ask that all members' mobile telephones and other electrical equipment be switched off when they are occupying their seats in the Chamber.

I have a number of announcements to make. It is with regret that I report the recent death of Mike Palmer-Jones, former Director of Leisure Services, who was responsible for the many major developments in leisure services, including Lotherton Hall Bird Garden, Temple Newsam's Home Farm as well as much needed sports centres in a number of areas.

I must also mention the Polish air disaster which claimed the lives of President Lech Kaczynski, his wife and many leaders of the Polish armed services. There will be a service of remembrance at Leeds Cathedral tomorrow at 7.00 pm which will be attended by the Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Andrew Barker.

I must also mention the devastating earthquake in the Chinese province of Qinghai last week which claimed the lives of many and left thousands injured and homeless.

I know that you will be aware a tragedy took place in our own city when a member of staff from the Refuse Collection Team working in Beeston was crushed to death when a telegraph pole was demolished. I would ask you to join me and stand in silent tribute, please.

(Silent tribute)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. I am delighted to announce that Councillor Patrick Davey has been selected as Deputy Lord Mayor Elect for 2010/2011 and will be assisted by his wife, Patricia, as Deputy Lady Mayoress. *(Applause)*

I wish to advise you that the following Members of Council will not be seeking re-election on May 6th: Councillors Debra Coupar, Linda Rhodes-Clayton, Roger Harington, John Bale, Alec Shelbrooke and Frank Robinson. I am sure you will join me in wishing them well for the future and thanking them for the valuable contribution to the City Council. *(Applause)*

I have a late report to announce relating to the appointment of the Chief Executive. A report was circulated to all Members following the despatch of the Council agenda.

ITEM 1 – MINUTES of the meeting held on 24th February 2010

THE LORD MAYOR: I now call on Councillor Bentley to move that the Minutes be received.

COUNCILLOR BENTLEY: I move that the Minutes be received, Lord Mayor.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: I second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: All in favour? *(A vote was taken)* This is PASSED.

ITEM 2 – DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

THE LORD MAYOR: The list of written declarations submitted by Members is on display in the ante-room, on deposit in public galleries and has been circulated to each Member's place in the Chamber.

Are there any further individual declarations or corrections to those notified on the list, please? No.

May I have a show of hands to confirm that you have read the list, or the list as amended, and agree its contents insofar as they relate to your own interests? (*A vote was taken*) This is CARRIED.

ITEM 3 – COMMUNICATIONS

THE LORD MAYOR: I hand you over to the Chief Executive for Communications.

THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE: There are no communications I wish to report.

ITEM 4 – DEPUTATIONS

THE LORD MAYOR: I have just been told that there are now four deputations, as the first deputation is not here. I will hand you over to the Chief Executive.

THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE: The four groups who have asked for a deputation to be received this afternoon are first the Wetherby Business Association, second Wetherby Town Council, third the National Federation of Market Traders and, lastly, the Access Committee for Leeds.

THE LORD MAYOR: Could I call on Councillor Bentley, please, to move that the deputations be received.

COUNCILLOR BENTLEY: I move that the deputations be received, Lord Mayor.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Could we have a vote that we receive the deputations? (*A vote was taken*) This is CARRIED.

DEPUTATION ONE WETHERBY BUSINESS ASSOCIATION

THE LORD MAYOR: Good afternoon and welcome to today's Council meeting. Please make your speech now to the Council, which should not be longer than five minutes, and please begin your introduction by introducing the people in your deputation.

MS R NICHOLSON: Lord Mayor Members of the Council, my name is Rosemary Nicholson and I am chairman of Wetherby Business Association and I am

supported by fellow members, vice chairman Sheilagh Venn and Susannah Berry from Wetherby News.

We are sick with worry about the severe downturn in business within Wetherby town. Since the upgrade of the A1 to motorway standard which necessarily involved removing the Historic Market Town brown sign, Wetherby businesses have seen a significant reduction in footfall.

Unfortunately the services area just north of Wetherby has been labelled as Wetherby Services, which has added to this poor situation.

The entrances to Wetherby, North and South, are not yet on satellite navigation systems so it is easy to understand why people are bypassing the town. What will be shown on a satellite navigation is the old slip roads and as these no longer exist people just drive by.

Historically, Wetherby has played host to significant tourist numbers on a daily basis. We have been a popular stopping off point for coaches and people travelling up and down the country.

Today, this is not the case. Since the removal of the brown sign and the introduction of the Wetherby Services sign, cars and coaches are stopping at the services area rather than them seeing the attractiveness of Wetherby through the Historic Market Town brown sign.

Shops started to close shortly after the removal of the sign. Business, as you know, has seen a dramatic downturn due to the recession and where businesses were struggling, they then were faced with an almost complete drop off of customers leading to inevitable closure.

In some instances shop owners have simply handed back their keys to the landlord as they could not make the business pay. Only two weeks ago, I received an email giving details of potentially six shops that are due to close within the next couple of months. This is on top of five units that are already empty. To add insult to injury, we have just heard that the Co-op in Market Place is to close. The Co-op is also home to our Post Office so it is particularly tragic that the Co-op finds itself having to close due to the downturn in trade.

Interestingly, our local newspaper, the Wetherby News, has been running a campaign seeking local support for the reinstatement of our brown sign. As you can just see the petition runs to several pages and this is from local residents, not just businesses. Even residents can see that the atmosphere within the town has changed and certainly not for the better.

We need our brown sign back now. We have the full support of our Ward Councillors, Wetherby Town Council and I also have a letter of support from our Elmet Member of Parliament, Colin Burgan, plus we have support from the Shadow Transport Secretary, Teresa Villiers.

We now need the support of you, members of the Council. Please do not let our town die – give us back our brown sign. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Bentley?

COUNCILLOR BENTLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I move that the matter be referred to the Executive Board for consideration.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Yes, I second that, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Could we take a vote on that, please? (*A vote was taken*) This is CARRIED.

Thank you for attending and for what you have said. You will be kept informed of the consideration which your comments will receive. Good afternoon.

DEPUTATION TWO
WETHERBY TOWN COUNCIL

THE LORD MAYOR: Good afternoon and welcome to today's Council meeting. Please make your speech now to the Council, which should not be longer than five minutes, and please begin by introducing the people in your deputation.

MR CHAPMAN: I am Harry Chapman, Town Councillor of Wetherby. We have Barbara Ball, who is the Town Clerk of Wetherby.

My Lord Mayor and Leeds Councillors, hello and thanks for inviting a Wetherby Town Councillor to your meeting.

Fellow Councillors, Wetherby is looking for your support.

Wetherby is a Market Town that is struggling in providing the right environment to ensure that visitors, tourists and its own population visit the town shops and spend money. I appreciate we are not alone with this problem. Shops are closing due to lack of business and we are looking for a way to reverse this cycle.

We have had various changes over the last few years affecting the town, especially the upgrading of the A1 and the access to changes to the town that followed.

One of our great concerns is traffic management - as getting into and out of our town plus parking when there - can be very difficult.

I could spend a lot of time talking about the various problems but the one I am looking for your support on is to put a mini roundabout at the junction of the A661 and Linton Road. The A661 is the main road the Harrogate from Wetherby and is used by Harrogate traffic as a short cut from the A1 Motorway.

At the moment we allow parked cars on this road at a very narrow point on its exit to the town on the Harrogate side and near this proposed roundabout. This restricts the road as it narrows to one lane of traffic and so stops vehicles speeding but also means that we have traffic back up right through the town to the bridge over the river Wharfe. I am sure you will appreciate this not helping to make Wetherby what we want it to be - a visitor friendly town. We have a Traffic Order for this area pending but it has not gone ahead due to lack of funding.

We feel that if the roundabout was built it would help several ways:-

- Parked traffic could now be restricted so that a clearer flow of traffic can take place and it should also meet the police requirement by acting as a Speed Regulator which is currently undertaken by the parked vehicles.
- Vehicles coming from Linton Road would have easier and safer access to the A661.

- Speeding Traffic coming down Spofforth Hill, we have had lots of complaints, should be curtailed dramatically as they would have to slow down for the traffic island.

Leeds Traffic Management Team agree with the idea of a the mini roundabout but say that it cannot be done at present due to lack of funds. The costings I have seen suggest it will cost approx £70,000, which does sound an awful lot to me for what is involved. I am sure it will actually cost less than this when fully funded.

This matter has been going on since 2001 when Leeds came up with a traffic plan and presented it to the people of Wetherby. It was voted on and was put into "The Leeds Traffic Plan for Wetherby"

In 2006 there was a traffic management exhibition at Wetherby Town Hall. 2007 the traffic plan was approved by the Highways Board. 2007 to 2010 – nothing has been actioned. Thank you for your time and I hope you will be supporting us. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Bentley?

COUNCILLOR BENTLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I move that the matter be referred to the Executive Board for consideration.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: I second that, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Could we take a vote on that, please? *(A vote was taken)* This is CARRIED.

Thank you for attending and for what you have said. You will be kept informed of the consideration which your comments will receive. Good afternoon.

DEPUTATION THREE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF MARKET TRADERS

THE LORD MAYOR: Good afternoon and welcome to today's Council meeting. Please now make your speech to the Council, which should not be longer than five minutes, and please begin by introducing the people in your deputation.

MS J WILLIAMS: My Lord Mayor and fellow Councillors, my name is Jo Williams. I am here today with Mrs Laughton, Mr Singh and Mrs Hocken we are here representing the National Marker Traders Federation Leeds Branch.

Leeds Kirkgate Market, the largest undercover market in Europe, a magnificent landmark and once a highly successful resource for the people of Leeds. Indeed the flagship for Leeds where customers and tourists came from near and far to benefit from the service this wonderful market provided.

Sadly, this is no longer the case - the market has been in decline for the last 20 years of more, as threats of redevelopment have blighted reinvestment in the Market. Market traders, many of whom are long standing businessmen and women are struggling to survive due to the low standard of the environment in which they are trading, and the high level of rents which they are being asked to pay for sub-standard conditions.

Leeds Kirkgate Market currently generated over £3m of rental income per year, with a surplus of over £1,000,000 and yet as this money goes into the central Council pot, very little comes back out as reinvestment into repairing or improving the market.

The standard of the market has fallen significantly and we need to bring it back to become a place where people want to visit, shop, stay and promote as a wonderful resource filled with quality, value for money, product expertise and a service which is second to none. If we can generate this amount of income now, just think of what would we could do if in the future we get it back to where it should be. The people of Leeds deserve to benefit from this income.

The market has approximately 400 units and a large proportion of these are currently unoccupied. Why are these unoccupied? Well for a variety of reasons, mainly due to the fact that potential tenants take one look at the market and think 'Is this a viable place to build or develop my business?' and at present, it is not. Any businessman or woman knows that for your business to survive, you need to be situated in a place that looks attractive, is clean and is safe for customers to visit. A number of the traders have had in-depth business analysis with financial experts and business link and the outcome of these investigations are that the 'businesses are successful, but their location and surrounding environment is letting them down'.

The ripple effect of the decline of the market goes much wider than the tenants though:-

- Each unit employing between 1 to 10 people
- These businesses supporting up to 50 suppliers
- Each of these suppliers employing between 1 and 350 people

It does not take a genius to see the huge economic impact that this market has, not only on the livelihoods of the tenants, but the significant impact this has on the employment market should this be allowed to continue to decline. Leeds cannot afford to support further unemployment, and if the market goes, where would these low income people shop? Out of city supermarkets? Taking further income from the City Centre? We need to take action on this and we need to take it now.

Why is the market in crisis? Well, some people would say it is due to the recession, but this is not the case as this decline was happening long before the credit crunch of 2009. The fact that these businessmen and women are still standing here after coming through the other side of not only one but in some cases two recessions surely shows that they have good business sense.

So what has gone wrong? Could it be the redevelopment strategy, which we have been advised is the only strategy which the markets have been working with for the past ten years? How can you run a market or any business without a strategy?

We need someone to take this bull by the horns, be open and transparent about the short, mid and long term plans for the market and manage this market.

- We need an immediate lift of the recruitment ban to enable proactive headhunting of an expert who has experience of rebuilding failing markets.
- We need an immediate rent reduction.
- We need an immediate reduction in car parking for the markets and surrounding areas.
- We need immediate reinvestment
- Time is not on our side.

We need to work together and rebuild this into the market and flagship for Leeds it once was and can be again – give people of Leeds something to be proud of, and you can be the ones who can look back in years to come and say ‘I played my part in making that happen..’

Thank you for giving us this opportunity.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Bentley?

COUNCILLOR BENTLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I move that the matter be referred to the Executive Board for consideration.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Lord Mayor, I have great pleasure in seconding.

THE LORD MAYOR: Could I have a show of hands in favour? (*A vote was taken*) This is CARRIED.

Thank you for attending and for what you have said. You will be kept informed of the consideration which your comments will receive. Good afternoon.

DEPUTATION FOUR ACCESS COMMITTEE FOR LEEDS

THE LORD MAYOR: Good afternoon and welcome to today’s Council meeting. Please make your speech now to the Council, which should not be longer than five minutes, and please begin by introducing the people in your deputation.

MR McSHARRY: Thank you Lord Mayor. Members of our deputation are: David Littlewood, to my left, and Linda Watson to my right, and my name is Tim McSharry.

Lord Mayor before I begin may I take this opportunity to acknowledge the outstanding dedication to the City of Leeds of our Chief Executive, Paul Rogerson, and offer Paul our most sincerest and heartfelt best wishes for a healthy, happy, long and fulfilling retirement. (*Applause*)

I stand before you today not as a representative of the many people living with ill health, injury and disability who fully acknowledge and celebrate the exemplar life changing services they receive through Leeds Social Care, but on behalf of Emily at 90 years old, Annie at 83 years old and Maggie who lived her life independently until she was 97, and also many other people who feel abandoned by a service they believed would be there to help maintain their quality of life, social inclusion and choice to live with support in their own homes and communities of family and friends.

Emily, Annie and Maggie asked for Social Care assistance, but following and assessment it was decided they fell outside the criteria with “No eligible needs” - a decision with potentially serious implications as it can leave people isolated and lost in a confusing process of signposting with no real understanding of how the system works, who to trust or where to go. It also creates additional work and inconsistencies in service delivery with individuals having to start the whole process again if their needs change.

Thankfully, in Emily and Annie’s case they had friends in a neighbourhood network who were able to give them the help they needed with the signposting process but sadly in Maggie’s case this did not happen and she felt abandoned

with no alternative but to struggle on without support and, after all, Maggie was of a generation who knew what struggle and social deprivation was about, starting her working life at twelve years old helping her mother to pack sardines in Hunslet, to working sometimes 24 hours combining shifts on a hospital ward with ARP duties during the war. Maggie worked hard all her life, but was generous to a fault and always has time to help others in her community.

Very sadly, not many months after Maggie's assessment, she was admitted into hospital and spent the last eight months of her life in a hospital bed, always hoping she could get back home.

We cannot really say for certain what may have happened if Maggie had received an exemplar joined up service that placed all customers first and respected everyone's well being, safety and quality of life. However, we can say that from the point Maggie was assessed as having no eligible needs and given a signposting process that offered no further support, Maggie's dignity, independence and quality of life were seriously compromised.

The real inequality is that this Council, in following such policies, are likely to be failing other individuals, like Maggie, who are deemed to be outside the Council's eligibility for help, and are left to sink or swim in a list of contacts and external services. This is not about the ability to pay for services; it is simply about a service that places some potentially vulnerable individuals on a cliff edge apparently without further assistance, contact, follow up, monitoring or evaluation.

The fact that such cliff edges exist highlights fundamental issues in respect to the delivery of care in our city; cliff edges that are further undermined through the actions of the council's own ALMOs who continue to deny and circumvent the mandatory rights of their disabled tenants.

In conclusion, we ask that this Council takes urgent action to resolve the issues expressed in this deputation and consider what can be done to develop the capacity of the grassroots networks that made all the difference in Emily and Annie's case.

There is no real deal when it comes to the duties this Council owes to the people of Leeds. The success of our public services are not measured against good intentions and cliff edges, but in quality of leadership and how the critical social values of respect, dignity, inclusion, care and support are afforded to all individuals regardless of age, illness, injury or disability. Thank you. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mr McSharry. I now call on Councillor Bentley?

COUNCILLOR BENTLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I move that the matter be referred to the Executive Board for consideration.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Yes, I second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: (*A vote was taken*) This is PASSED.

Thank you for attending and for what you have said. You will be kept informed of the consideration which your comments will receive. Good afternoon.

ITEM 5 – REPORT – APPOINTMENT OF CHIEF EXECUTIVE

THE LORD MAYOR: We come to Item number 5 on the agenda. I call on Councillor Carter.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. I am delighted to move the recommendation of the Employment Committee that the appointment of the Chief Executive as contained in the Report of the Chief Officer (Human Resources) be approved in accordance with Article 12 of the Constitution. I move.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: I second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: I will call for the vote, then, please. *(A vote was taken)* this is CARRIED.

ITEM 6 – QUESTIONS

THE LORD MAYOR: We come to item number 6 on the agenda, which is Questions. I call on Councillor Lowe.

COUNCILLOR LOWE: Can the Executive Board Member for Central and Corporate confirm that he is committed to transparency and equality in the procurement process?

COUNCILLOR BRETT: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am fully committed to transparency and equality in the procurement process. The rules and laws that govern procurement in the public sector are based on the principle that all contracts, regardless of value, are procured in an open, transparent, fair and non-discriminatory manner.

This Council has routinely done more than the minimum required by the law in terms of both openness and transparency. Examples would include voluntarily providing feedback to bidders before this became a legal requirement in 2006 and also voluntarily publishing advance notice of contract decisions to give bidders the opportunity to ask for further information on the procurement process before the contract is awarded.

On the matter of equalities, towards the end of 2009 the Council took part in a peer review process that looked at diversity and equality in European cities, the so-called DIVE project. As part of this review process, some of the Council's Procurement Equality Initiatives were recommended to other European cities as examples of good practice.

Where there are concerns that any of the Council's procurement activity is anything other than fair, transparent and non-discriminatory, then I am committed to ensuring that those concerns are fully investigated.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Do you have a supplementary, Councillor Lowe?

COUNCILLOR LOWE: Yes, thank you. Would the Executive Board Member then agree with me that the £750,000 that Adult Social Care has paid to Team Talk Training to provide training rooms since 2005 would have been better spent in house to develop our own training department and to allow us to keep some of our venues, for example the East Leeds Family Learning Centre?

COUNCILLOR BRETT: I think if you had wanted an answer to that in detail you would be better asking someone other than me. I will look into this particular issue and will get back to you later. I repeat, all our procurement processes are open and transparent. I am not aware of this particular case in detail and if you do have particular concerns about the way in which that was done, Councillor Lowe, please contact me and we will look into it further. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: I now call on Councillor Cleasby.

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Would the Executive Board Member responsible for Learning join with me in congratulating Horsforth Newlaithes School on their excellent OFSTED report last month?

COUNCILLOR HARKER: Of course I am going to say yes! I would also like to extend my answer a little bit. I would also like to congratulate Featherbank Primary School in Horsforth who, in their recent OFSTED, got a 'Good' grade with 'Outstanding' features. I think this should allay all fears that the rise in numbers in some primary schools in Horsforth might be detrimental to primary education. It is not.

Horsforth has excellent primary provision which will give a good foundation to young people before they move on to their secondary education.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Do you have a supplementary, Councillor Cleasby? No. We move on, then, to Councillor Lobley.

COUNCILLOR LOBLEY: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. Would the Leader of Council care to comment on the recent proposals for a high speed rail link to Leeds?

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Yes. Thank you, my Lord Mayor. I think we are all agreed that the possibility – and let us be realistic about this and call it a possibility – of a high speed train link to the city of Leeds would be extremely welcome.

There are some concerns, however. The concerns are these, that a high speed rail link would be very good indeed but not if it came at the expense of the next 20 years of investment in the current rail network. I happen to believe that it is massively important that the rail link between Leeds and Bradford and Leeds and Manchester and the other West Yorkshire cities, but Leeds and Manchester in particular, is rapidly invested in and improved.

A lot of us working in the city region and collaborating with work going on in the Manchester city region realise that actually Leeds and Manchester can work in partnership in a lot of ways and not necessarily in competition, and improved transport links are crucial to both Leeds and Manchester punching their weight as economic centres in their own city regions and working together.

Yes, I do welcome it. I am delighted that at least one political party has said that the link should go beyond Birmingham to Manchester and Leeds, although my personal view – my personal view – is that we ought to have, from whatever Government is elected on May 6th, a commitment to invest in a network of high speed rail with a clear, unequivocal statement that it will not be at the expense of the existing rail network, which I believe is crucial to providing a popular and modern public transport system in this country.

THE LORD MAYOR: Do you have a supplementary, Councillor Lobley?

COUNCILLOR LOBLEY: I do, Lord Mayor. By way of supplementary, could I also ask the Leader of Council what confidence he has in the Department for Transport and the Government in light of all of the people stranded abroad after the Icelandic volcano problems.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Thank you, Councillor Lobley. I know that Members on all sides have been affected by the volcanic cloud which appears to have brought the country to a halt. You cannot have a lot of confidence in the present Government delivering any transport infrastructure improvements, can you, really, when yesterday the Prime Minister, taking a grip of the situation as he did with the issuing of grit during the ice and snow, told people in Spain to head to Madrid where there would be 150 coaches waiting. Of course, there were no coaches – no surprise there, then. Four hours later his own Secretary of State for Transport said, “No, no, no, no, no do not go to Madrid, go to Santander where there will be three Royal Navy vessels waiting to collect you.” There was one and it was full – no surprise there either.

My Lord Mayor, I do not have any confidence in this current Government delivering anything, but I do live in great hopes that they won't need to bother anyway. I will just add, my Lord Mayor, I hope the high speed train results in perhaps cheaper travel for Members of Parliament backwards and forwards to London, so the former Member of Parliament for North East Leeds will not need to claim £13,500 in one year for travel. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: I call on Councillor Hussain, please.

COUNCILLOR HUSSAIN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Can the Executive Board Member for Leisure please confirm that he is committed to upholding the Member-Officer protocol in respect of the provision of information on the management of cemeteries, parks and countryside matters?

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Yes.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Hussain, do you have a supplementary?

COUNCILLOR HUSSAIN: Lord Mayor, if Councillor Procter is still the Executive Member of Leisure, can he please tell me why the officer in that directorate refused to see me about a cemetery in my own ward before they had consulted with Councillor Brett? It just to me seemed to be clearly politically motivated.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: I have no knowledge of the matters whatsoever. If the question had been framed in that way in the first instance perhaps I could give a proper reply.

COUNCILLOR ATHA: Failed again.

COUNCILLOR LYONS: That will be the first time, then.

THE LORD MAYOR: I now call on Councillor Gettings, please.

COUNCILLOR GETTINGS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Does Councillor Harker agree with me that, as Gildersome Junior School is about to double in size, it would be appropriate to consider providing Nursery provision at the school, especially as the other small junior school in the village has such provision and is full and children are already travelling to Morley?

COUNCILLOR HARKER: As there is a review taking place at the moment on nursery provision in the Gildersome area it would not be right for me to agree or disagree, but the Headteacher at Gildersome Primary School is carrying out consultation on nursery education with providers within a two mile radius of that school to find out their views on a proposed nursery at his school. The consultation is due to end soon and hopefully we will have a report by the end of the week.

There would on the face of it appear to be a need for an expansion to Early Years provision in the area, but we do have to be certain it is sustainable. Many parents may choose to drop their children off at other facilities in Morley, where there are vacancies, on their way to and from work.

THE LORD MAYOR: Do you have a supplementary, Councillor Gettings? No. Thank you. I call on now Councillor Keith Wakefield.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Can the Executive Board Member for Adult Health and Social Care confirm this Council's commitment to promoting health and wellbeing amongst our elderly people?

COUNCILLOR HARRAND: Yes, and I will prove it. There has rarely been a time when so many new services have been designed or coming on stream to help older people do what they want most, which is to live well and independently in their own homes with support when they need it. That is a Council commitment.

One of the most far reaching changes to help people live independently is introduction of self-directed support and personal budgets, which means that increasingly people can choose the type of support they need to live at home and, more important, choose the sort of people they want to provide that care.

It is one of the most empowering developments in social care for decades – an example of Council commitment.

We are using technology in a project that has gone from pilot to mainstream in the last year called Telecare. It is now helping 3,000 people in Leeds. It helps people stay safely in their own homes by installing special equipment, such as detectors that alert carers if they have a fall or move around the homes of unusual times of day or night, get out of bed during the night or periods of no movement at all. It means that people with dementia can avoid going into residential care and means their carers can have peace of mind in the knowledge that they are safe – an example of Council commitment.

A new specialist service for people in the early stages of dementia has been set up in partnership with the NHS, the Alzheimer's Society and ourselves. It is a support service that for the first time bridges the gap between the initial diagnosis of dementia and the point when a person needs more help from health and social care professional services. People tell us that in the weeks and months after initial diagnosis they feel bewildered and apprehensive and they say that this new service will provide them with information and support that they need to face the future – another example of Councillor commitment.

The modernisation of our day care services last year meant that we have been able to strengthen our dementia day and residential services by establishing specialist Dementia Resources Centres, day centres, respite care. That is specialist dementia centres in Leeds – another example of Council commitment.

Our Home Care has broadened its activities in introducing a re-enablement service to help people get back on their feet following a fall or a spell in hospital

through physiotherapy, occupational therapy, intensive support in the home for a short period. It is helping people regain confidence and the skills to live at home and avoid a premature move to residential care – a Council commitment.

Because of all this, the number of people moving to residential care is falling and we respond to this by developing a new kind of housing for older people which we call Extra Care Housing. This takes the form of flats, apartments and bungalows where older people can live independently behind their own front doors with bathroom and kitchen adaptations, Home Care support on hand. At Wood View, at Rossefield Manor, our housing association partners – and we thank them – are already providing exactly this kind of accommodation and we are about to achieve another first very soon. Millions of pounds of Council commitment.

There is a £6.3m extra care scheme on the site of the old Hemingway House in Hunslet. In partnership with Methodist Homes, 45 one and two bed self-contained flats have been built for frail elders from all of Leeds' diverse religious and ethnic communities. It is a first for Leeds and will be an excellent support for older people in line with the city's wish and all Councillors wish this great harmonious community to celebrate different religions and tackle inequality, including health inequalities. Another example of Council commitment.

Meanwhile in North Leeds we are getting close to the go-ahead for a £32m Wellbeing Centre at Holt Park. This will be a centre designed to help older and disabled people to stay fitter and active for longer combining the service provided by Adult Social Care, the sports and recreation service, NHS Leeds and the community. It will be one of the first such centres in the country and its services will fit alongside other kinds of support that the Council already offers to people, such as free swimming.

Perhaps that is the best example yet of our commitment to promoting health and wellbeing for older people.

I have listed a number of new developments across the city which help older people enjoy their lives and live well. I could have spoken longer and I was tempted, but those examples will perhaps do for now.

I suspect that all this evidence of work being done on behalf of us all will not be enough to prevent a supplementary. In Parliament they call these questions "Gotcha"s, because after somebody has given a long and extremely effective answer like I have just done, the questioner will leap from his or her seat and says, "Ah ha, you cannot possibly mean this" because something went wrong in a particular case. We have just had two of those this afternoon. Councillor Hussain's and Alison's questions were just exactly this. If you had told us the facts firstly you would get a better chance of an answer but you are not going to do this, Keith, are you? Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Wakefield, do you have a supplementary?

COUNCILLOR ATHA: Can you remind us of the question, actually?

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Can I express our appreciation for that succinct answer? For anybody giving lessons, perhaps if you did not abuse question time as much as you do, we would actually get on and put more constructive questions down, but every time you have abused it.

My supplementary is this, very simply relating to that and I hope the answer is shorter. Given that you have increased the cost of Meals on Wheels by 17%, increased the burial costs by 43%, increased Home Care by 50%, can you now justify to the Council your cuts to the grants to Neighbourhood Network which means that luncheon clubs will have to increase the prices of meals by 25%?

COUNCILLOR HARRAND: Cuts to grants to Neighbourhood Networks is absolute fiction. Every year while I have been in charge we have increased the
(*interruption*)

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Come out our way.

COUNCILLOR HARRAND: It has gone from about a million when I took over to just sort of two million in five years. If that is a cut, goodness knows what the increased funding is. This year alone we have put an extra £360,000 in, by far the biggest percentage increase of any budget heading I have seen. To suggest that Neighbourhood Networks are suffering from cuts is suitable only for Labour Party leaflets – these are miles from the real world. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR GRAHAME: You are wrong.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Downes.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Come out our way.

COUNCILLOR DOWNES: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Would the Executive Board Member responsible for Central and Corporate care to comment on the recent additional powers granted to Local authorities for establishments such as lap dancing clubs?

COUNCILLOR BRETT: Lord Mayor, I rise to talk about a rare case where the Government has listened. After a considerable time of talking to the Government about how current rules make it impossible for Councils to prevent lap dancing establishments setting up right next door to schools, right next door to places of worship, they have finally, after a good number of years, come up with something that we hope will be an answer to this problem.

As many of you may know, the new measures which took effect on 6th April allow Local Authorities to have a greater say and set up a local policy in this area. What has happened is that the lap dancing clubs have to be reclassified as sexual entertainment venues and we have the power to regulate those venues. I look forward to having discussions after the elections to set up what I am sure many of us will think will be an improvement in this area.

The one personal disappointment that I have with this is that the Government has still allowed an exemption, and the exemption, as I know one or two Members on my side are well aware of and are unhappy about, is that you are allowed to have entertainment - if it really is entertainment – of this type providing it is no more than twelve times a year in, basically, an ordinary club on a standard licence, and I certainly believe that that is wrong. Let us be thankful for small mercies, that we are going to have the possibility this summer of setting up our own policy and I hope Members on all sides will work together to reach what I am sure will be a better position in Leeds. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. No supplementary. Then we move on to Councillor Anderson.

COUNCILLOR ANDERSON: Would the Executive Board Member for City Development & Regeneration care to welcome the progress that is being made towards completing the Leeds Arena in time for its scheduled opening in November 2012, following selection of a preferred contractor?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Andrew Carter?

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. Yes, I would like to make a correction first of all, a correction for Councillor Judith Blake's benefit. I heard her interviewed on television where she said, when she was asked about investment in Leeds she indicated that the Government was funding Leeds Arena. That is what she said; it was included in a list of things that she said was being funded by the Government.

The cost of Leeds Arena is about £80m. The RDA was supposed to be supporting us to the tune of £20m, which is a quarter. As a result of the effective lobbying by the Sheffield Members of Parliament and the ineffective lobbying of the Leeds Members of Parliament, that amount of money was halved, so we are putting in as a Local Authority – not the Government – well over £20m, the Government is now putting in through the RDA less than £10m and the rest is being financed through private finance resources and funding streams.

Unlike the Liverpool or Sheffield arena, the arena we are going to deliver is an arena being delivered through partnership with the private sector because of lack of Government funding, not because of Government funding, Councillor Blake.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Well said.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: One of the major benefits that we are seeing already since we have announced the preferred contractor, is this: the safeguarding and completion of 30 existing apprenticeships; the creation of 60 new apprenticeships; 18 project initiated higher level skills; 80 new roles for local residents through Job Centre Plus or equivalent schemes; school and college visits promoting the construction industry as an industry in which to work; and a whole list more which I will undoubtedly be referring to later on. These are real jobs created through regeneration, not phoney training schemes for jobs that do not exist and never will. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Do you have a supplementary, Councillor Anderson?

COUNCILLOR ANDERSON: No, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. I then call upon Councillor Bernard Atha.

COUNCILLOR ATHA: Can Councillor Brett, Executive Board Member, provide an update on the future of the Royal Park buildings?

COUNCILLOR BRETT: There are eight Royal Parks – Bushy Park, Green Park, Greenwich Park, Hyde Park, Kensington Gardens, Regent's Park---

COUNCILLOR ATHA: We can do away with humour like that and answer the question, because it is not funny.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: You've gone senile, Bernard!

COUNCILLOR BRETT: I assume that the word "school" has been missed out of Councillor Atha's question. I assume he actually means Royal Park School buildings.

Following a marketing exercise which has concluded 18th January, a report from the Director of City Development was deferred on 10th March by Executive Board to allow an extension in time for the Royal Park Community Consortium and other bidders for the property to develop further their business plans and demonstrate how their proposals would be financed. The closing date of Monday 31st May has now been given to enable the report to be considered by Executive Board on 21st July.

THE LORD MAYOR: Supplementary?

COUNCILLOR ATHA: Can Councillor Brett join with me in regretting he treated this matter in a trivial manner to begin with? It is easy to score silly points but it does not make sense...

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: You are the expert on that!

COUNCILLOR ATHA: Can I ask you further if you would agree with the Area Committee which unanimously agreed to ask that the Council withdraws its demand for the costs of evicting those people who went into that building, which is the one you finally mentioned, in order to preserve it from the depredations made available and because of the Council's inadequacy in protecting it? It is wrong, would you not agree, to charge people the legal costs of evicting them when they were there to protect the building. This was the view of the Area Committee, of your colleagues.

COUNCILLOR HARKER: It is not a question. Is it a question?

COUNCILLOR ATHA: Is it or not the case that you would join with us and say yes, we will withdraw the demand for that money?

COUNCILLOR BRETT: I agree with Councillor Atha that entering a building is a very serious matter. I have a lot of sympathy with the aims of the Royal Park Committee Consortium. My party has quite a good record in Leeds in asset transfer to strong community groups.

COUNCILLOR ATHA: I was not asking that question. I was asking will you withdraw the demand?

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Sit down, Bernard.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Brett, carry on.

COUNCILLOR BRETT: If Councillor Atha will not let me finish my answer, how will he know whether he likes it or not?

COUNCILLOR ATHA: I think that to start with.

THE LORD MAYOR: Carry on, Councillor Brett.

COUNCILLOR BRETT: The question of entering a building which the Council owns and dealing with the matter in the way that not, I think, official Members of the Royal Park Consortium Group but another group did, raises all sorts of issues and I am not going to pronounce today whether or not the Council will be acting in a particular way.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Election.

COUNCILLOR BRETT: What I am clear of, Councillor Atha, is that for us to set a precedent that any group can take over a building and then, when we go to court we somehow bail them out, that is not a precedent that I am in the slightest bit happy with.

What I would like to end on, and I hope you would join with me in welcoming the fact that the two joint leaders have had a very positive discussion with the Royal Park Community Consortium and I hope that we are going, after the elections, to be able to resolve this matter in a way that Members on all sides will find agreeable, because much of what the Royal Park Consortium is saying to us is to be applauded. They are a far stronger group now than when Andrew and I first met them over a year ago and we listened with increasing interest to the sorts of things they are proposing, and we hope after the elections to be able to listen to the other two potential bidders as well, because we have to be fair to people on all sides here. I hope that when it comes to the Executive Board in July, we will be able to reach a satisfactory conclusion after a number of years to the future of this building.
(Applause)

COUNCILLOR ATHA: So you are not answering the question, are you?

THE LORD MAYOR: I call on Councillor Lyons now.

COUNCILLOR LYONS: Thank you very much, Lord Mayor. Can the Executive Board Member of Environmental Services please confirm how many tonnes of waste per year will be transported to the Council's planned incinerator in East Leeds?

COUNCILLOR MONAGHAN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am happy to inform Councillor Lyons that the amount of waste transported to the residual waste treatment facility will be significantly less than is already sent to the Skelton Grange landfill site in south-east Leeds.

Last year, 2009/10, approximately 202,000 tonnes of residual waste was disposed of at the Skelton Grange landfill site. The Council's current maximum – note I say that, maximum – annual prediction of residual waste requiring treatment over the life of the PFI contract is 163,000 tonnes.

What I want everybody to realise is that Leeds has to do something with its waste. We cannot carry on burying it in the ground. It is going to cost us money, it is unsustainable and eventually it is bad for the environment.

In your supplementary, which I am sure you will have, perhaps you could at last tell the people of this Chamber and the people of Leeds what your party policy is in waste in this city. (hear, hear) (Applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Do you have a supplementary?

COUNCILLOR LYONS: Would Councillor Monaghan please...

COUNCILLOR SMITH: Answer the question.

COUNCILLOR LYONS: No, besides answer the question.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Ask the question.

COUNCILLOR LYONS: Would he agree with his colleagues, Councillors Pryke and Hollingsworth, that no waste plant to be built except it is very far away from homes, and would he also agree that 150 yards where the fruit and vegetable - the incinerator is one of the planned sites. Would he be voting with them to say that it should not be built there or is it just rhetoric from either you or from the *(interruption)*. It is me that's speaking; you should not heckle when we are asking questions, Lord Mayor. *(laughter)* I am simply asking, what we are saying is that it should not be built near homes. Does he agree with them and will he be voting with them to keep it away from the place where you have planned it?

COUNCILLOR MONAGHAN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Of course, we will listen to all residents, including ward Councillors, when a decision is finally made and I am sure you would agree that it would be incredibly reckless of myself in the position I am in on the Executive Board to comment on any preference for the two bidders.

What I think is quite interesting you have again dodged the question of what you would do with the city's waste.

COUNCILLOR LYONS: Give me time.

COUNCILLOR MONAGHAN: If we do nothing, as you seem to be advocating, you will cost this city hundreds of millions of pounds, you will leave us open to legal action from the people who have bid to do the waste contract for this city. You will also damage the environment by putting waste in landfill which will release methane gas, which is far more harmful than CO₂ gas. Your policy would also stagnate the city's recycling rate and we would no longer have any pre-treatment of waste. Your MP is advocating one solution, your Labour MP for this area is advocating one solution. I think perhaps you should listen to him. *(Applause)*

ITEM 7 - MINUTES

THE LORD MAYOR: Questions are now over and we are on to number 7 on the agenda, the Minutes. I call on Councillor Andrew Carter, please.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: My Lord Mayor, in moving the Minutes can I just pass one brief comment, and that is to thank all those Councillors who are voluntarily retiring from the Council, and this will be their last meeting. I would like to thank them, on behalf of the Council, for all of their services over very many years. If you add them together it is a considerable length of time and I do hope that all of them will continue to play an active role in the life of the city.

In making those few opening remarks, my Lord Mayor, I move the Minutes in accordance with Item 7.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Bentley?

COUNCILLOR BENTLEY: I second, Lord Mayor, and reserve the right to speak.

- (a) Executive Board
- (i) Development & Regeneration

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. We now move on to the Executive Board Minutes and I call on Councillor Tom Leadley.

COUNCILLOR LEADLEY: My Lord Mayor, in recent months you may be interested to have seen photographs in newspapers showing Sir William Middlebrook opening the first trolleybus route in Britain, which went from Thirsk Row in the city centre to New Farnley. Sir William was Lord Mayor of Leeds in 1910/11 and Mayor of Morley in 1896/7 and 1904/5.

If the First World War had not intervened, that route would have been extended from Drighlington to Bruncliffe, Morley and East Ardsley. To New Farnley the distance was four miles, or 6.5 kilometres. The cost seems to have been around £11,000 or about £1,700 a route kilometre.

In 1985 there was a proposals to build a figure of eight trolleybus network in Leeds from Moortown to Roundhay in the north, to Belle Isle and Middleton in the south, at a cost of £9.6m for 30 route miles, or £200,000 a route kilometre for 48 kilometres. Half the cost would have been borne by central Government and half by Metro.

Following the end of Supertram I said that it was right to look afresh at new generation transport in West Yorkshire, so long as it did not begin to look like an expensive and time-consuming industry in itself. It was right that the feasibility of a trolleybus system should be investigated.

At 2001 prices the 29 kilometre Supertram system was to have cost £355m, or £12.2m a route kilometre. The scheme finally rejected amounted to 22 route kilometres at a cost of £348m, or £15.8m a route kilometre at 2001 prices.

Presumably the cost base year is now later. Even so, it is alarming that until recently amended, the NGT trolleybus network was to be 14 kilometres long at a cost of £275m, or £19.6m a route kilometre. There has been a lot of inflation since 1911, quite a bit since 1985 but not that much since 2001. It seems that £250m, which might be described as the figure of Adonis, would have been the limit of any central Government allocation, another ten per cent would have to be found locally making up to the £275m, and any cost over-run which would be added to Metro or City Council precepts.

Recent events have tended to cloud things a bit and it seems as if the latest Government offer is £235m out of £254m, after deleting the St James's Hospital and city centre loop sections, but with an extension to Holt Park. Reinstatement of the deleted sections would have to be paid for by Metro and the City Council increasing local expenditure and exposure to risk.

What has not changed is the lack of significant purpose. There would be two, or two-and-a-bit, short routes of which only a few yards in Stourton would go beyond the pre-1974 Leeds boundary. A route, say, from Leeds to Bradford through Pudsey would have gone from somewhere to somewhere else and generated varied journeys in both directions and intermediate traffic at all times of day. This, together with the immense cost should cause us to question the wisdom of the scheme as it stands.

The need for public transport improvements in West Yorkshire is self-evident but any changes must have reasonable purpose and be sustainable by way of cost and usefulness. Thank you, my Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Leadley. I now call on Councillor Terry Grayshon.

COUNCILLOR GRAYSHON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I rise to speak on Minute 228 on page 41.

Before I do that, however, could I congratulate you on your year of office, Lord Mayor (*hear, hear*) (*Applause*) and compliment you on the way you have carried out those duties with such great dignity, and remind you that shortly you will be sat next to me here and there is work to do in Morley South (*laughter*) or wherever we go.

Back to the Leeds arena. I am always delighted to read about the success of the progress of the Leeds arena. It is a long overdue scheme in Leeds and I often wonder why there was not an arena in Leeds. Having said that, moving forward, we are having an arena, we have heard this afternoon how the funding for the arena has been achieved and I know that that is down to a lot of hard work by Andrew Carter and his Plan B, I believe, was how it was described to me. I think it is wonderful, it has created jobs, apprenticeships, and I believe it will also generate around £20m per annum for the local economy, so it must be welcomed. I support it wholeheartedly. I will be pleased when it opens and Leeds can become the regional capital that it aspires to because of the work on the Leeds arena and other such schemes within this city. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Grayshon. Councillor John Bale, please.

COUNCILLOR BALE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I too refer to Minute 228 on page 41. I am delighted, indeed, with the initiation of the arena project. There has indeed been a major gap in the provision that this city is able to present to the world.

I very much commend the leadership of Andrew Carter in driving this through against ambivalence and downright bloody-minded opposition from the quarters that he mentioned.

I must admit that I had some doubts initially about the location of the arena. Having previously sat in an office on that site for five years myself I wondered whether it was the right place, but I actually am persuaded that indeed the Clay Pit Lane site is going to be an excellent site, and particularly that it will provide access on foot to a major entertainment destination for our very large student population in Leeds.

I very much commend the work that has been done in driving that project through to the position it has now reached.

As someone with a professional interest in the construction industry, I also commend the procurement strategy that has been used, and I have to say it is an exemplar of good practice, not only in terms of selecting a firm with a track record to manage the whole process of design and construction effectively, but also in the building into the brief of employment and development opportunities for the citizens of Leeds.

That really does hark back to a similar brief that must have been issued in the 1930s for the building of this great building – that we see the opportunity both to provide something very important for the city and, in the process, to provide opportunities for people, work experience opportunities for school students, employment opportunities, NVQ training opportunities, using the site itself as a shop window for what the construction industry can provide for people of all ages.

I very much commend the whole process and I believe it will be as important in its way as the work that the city fathers did in the commissioning of this building so many years ago.

Finally, Lord Mayor, may I thank Members of all parties and Council officers for your great kindness to me over the past six years. I leave here with some useful, valuable insights, some good friendships and no grudges, Lord Mayor. Thank you very much. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Lord Mayor Bale. I call on Councillor David Blackburn.

COUNCILLOR D BLACKBURN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I refer to page 29 Minute 201 regarding the Revisions to the Local Development Scheme with specific reference to page 30, paragraph (d), the withdrawal of the West Leeds Gateway AAP, which I have got to say I am extremely disappointed with the Executive doing.

Those of you may know that Councillor Leadley and myself and the Development Plan Panel the day before the Executive tried to get that decision and the EASEL decision reversed, our recommendation reversed, and we lost on the casting vote of the Chairman.

I have always supported the introduction of an AAP for West Leeds because in my belief it enabled us in West Leeds to do something that we had never been able to do before, and that is getting to pots of money. I know it is going to be replaced by a Supplementary Planning Document, but that Supplementary Planning Document, to my belief, is not going to give us the strength in West Leeds that we need and I am extremely disappointed in that decision. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Blackburn. Councillor Ewens.

COUNCILLOR EWENS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I just want to say that when we are dealing with the traffic law, I want to make sure that any route, any major route such as the ones we are talking about, will have adequate safety precautions for pedestrians and also, in light of my recent discovery that a Toucan crossing means that bicycles use it as well as people, that this will be borne in mind. The number of cyclists now has vastly increased partly, in my own ward, as a result of the university's loan process for cycling and I think the more we can encourage cycling and the more we can encourage safety for both them and for the pedestrians, the better. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Brett.

COUNCILLOR BRETT: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I want to speak briefly on Minute 201 page 29 in the book, which is about the Lower Aire Valley the area I want to talk about, where we have decided to continue with the Area Action Plan.

This probably, in Leeds, going to be the area of greatest change over the next 20 years. In the past it has been an area with industry and some low-lying land that, for flooding reasons, we have not been able to use.

The City Region, as many may know, have done some work on an urban eco suburb, and now the Government has come up with some small amounts of funding which will demonstrate some of the principles involved in this project and I am very keen on the vision that this eco suburb, I hope, will demonstrate.

This will contribute to the infamous RSS figures that we have had so much difficulty with, because the plan in due course may be up to 6,000 homes, but I am well aware of the difficulties that we have had over the Government's insistence on a very high figure for building homes in recent years.

It is my view that this could become a chic suburb – a suburb with homes with very high insulation standards, with some energy produced from alternative energy sources, with a flat walking and cycling route going into the city which, from some parts of this area is relatively close – we are talking about a mile, a mile and a half.

It is my personal view that we ought to do more work to explore floating homes in this area – to have a marina, to have perhaps 500 boats built at the side of the canal which at the margins would help the flood situation in Leeds but my biggest reason for asking for this to be explored is that, if we were to have 500 houseboats in a permanent housing situation, it would avoid green field sites and avoid building in places that none of us in honesty want to see homes build on. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Lord Mayor Brett. I call on Councillor Andrew Carter to respond, please.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. A number of things there. First of all I thank Councillor Ewens for her comment.

Councillor Blackburn knows I share his views. I think the problem at the Local Development Plan Panel meeting was that the senior officers who had briefed Administration Members were not present and the meeting got a different sort of story from the assurances that as Leader I had had about the importance of the West Leeds Gateway in the Council's regeneration thinking. I can assure you, Councillor Blackburn, that we will not allow anything to jeopardise the regeneration of the West Leeds Gateway in planning terms or any other terms. After all, it was you and I, when you were part of the administration, that piloted the concept of the West Leeds Gateway Regeneration.

I will comment on the arena again when I wind up, and I do not want to take too much time now because other people want to speak on other Minutes, but let me comment on what Councillor Brett has just said. He is absolutely right. We have to demonstrate that we can develop low cost homes in all sorts of locations and ways to stop this Government, this current Government, from allowing their friends in the house building industry to slap homes all over green field sites which can never be found again. We know on the Labour side that you had to come to the table and support us in our protests because you are so worried about your own seats, and only one of you consistently actually votes that way he feels, which is Councillor Hanley, who seems to have a view that you can build over any piece of green field anywhere and it does not matter.

Interestingly, there is a piece of land where, because of the Government's insistence on the Strategic Housing Land Availability study, has had builders' flags stamped on it, thanks to your Government, and that is the green fields around the West Park Centre. Because of your Government – because of your Government, Councillor Atha – the builders are sticking...

COUNCILLOR ATHA: It is not entirely mine.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: ...flags all over it.

COUNCILLOR ATHA: You flatter me.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Let me make it clear to everybody – I will not even bother looking at Bernard because you may as well talk to *that (banged desk)* – let me tell you that there is no way that this administration will allow speculative house builders to build houses all over the green spaces at West Park or anywhere else (*Applause*) and you, Bernard, should speak to your Ministers in the next fortnight whilst they are still in office and tell them you agree with us and not them. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR ATHA: I worry I am being intimidated by this pointing finger and that kind of finger has a significance, Councillor Carter, which is inappropriate in a Council Chamber.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Bernard, *honi soit qui mal y pense*.

(ii) Environmental Services

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we move on, please, now, to Councillor Finnigan.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: Coming back to more mundane issues, thank you, Lord Mayor, I am speaking on Minute 214 on page 35, which is about the proposed Revision to Air Quality Management Orders, one of which includes a new Air Quality Management Order for Queen Street in Morley.

As you are fully aware, Lord Mayor, we have for many, many years campaigned to clean up the air on Queen Street, where there are a lot of sheltered housing complexes which are blighted by the quality of air. Certainly some of the residents, a lot of whom are elderly or have a disability, are having great difficulties with coping with the problems of air quality outside their particular homes. Some of that is to do with the buses and we need to be exploring opportunities for cleaner buses to be using that particular section of Morley. Some of it is down to other problems with the cars travelling up and down that particular bit of Queen Street.

What we do need is, perhaps, an imaginative approach that looks at better ways of taking those particular cars off that area of Queen Street. That would do wonders in terms of improving the air quality for those particular residents and making sure that we can all breathe a lot more easily in that area of Morley. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Finnigan. Councillor Harington.

COUNCILLOR HARINGTON: Lord Mayor, this is again on page 35 Minute 214. As Councillor Finnigan has said, this is to do with air quality management and it gives details of monitoring that has been done to standards of air quality in certain parts of the city, monitoring that has been necessary because of the presence of nitrogen dioxide in these areas.

Fifty per cent of this is caused by emissions from road traffic, so not surprisingly the areas that are most affected are those areas which are nearest to the heaviest traffic places in the city and as the report makes clear, this means that the Air Quality Action Plan which is being revised, and the Local Transport Plan, which is in the process of being developed, need to be closely related together.

This report gives a list of actions that need to be taken in the Local Transport Plan and you will be familiar with the things that are listed, namely that people need to use public transport more, there need to be more park and ride schemes, there need to be more guided bus lanes, there need to be more car share schemes, there needs to be more walking, there needs to be more cycling, there needs to be cleaner

air, there needs to be better restrictions on engines idling when the cars are parked and there needs to be smoother traffic flows.

Colleagues, you will all be very familiar with that list and you will also be familiar with all the reasons people have for not taking any notice of any of them. "I need to use my car. I need to get to the school by car. I need to get to my job by car. I need to get to the sports centre by car. I need to get to the cinema by car. I need to go on my holiday by car. Public transport just is not good enough, it is not safe enough, it is not quick enough, it is not reliable enough, it does not go to the places where you want. As for walking, it would mean going through a whole lot of places I would not want to go, it is not safe and it is too slow. As for cycling, cycling is also not safe and there are too many hills and, for goodness sake, have you looked at cyclists? They go all over pavements knocking people over, they jump traffic lights whenever they feel like it and then they arrive at meetings all smug because they have not had to park and you have." As someone shouted at me many years ago when I was cycling across the States, "The roads are for cars, you dumb ass cyclist!" *(laughter)*

Yes, we are familiar with the reasons but not doing anything and we will also be, I am sure, familiar with the reasons why things need to be done or the consequences of not doing them. CO₂ emissions, if not curbed, are likely to cause considerable damage to the environment, but as far as this report is concerned, the damage that is going to be done if these problems are not sorted is through nitrogen dioxide here and now. Because of the damage that is done to people's lungs, inflaming and irritating the lungs that causes respiratory problems, cardiovascular problems, asthma problems and so on. Huge health cost, huge in financial cost as the NHS tries to meet the needs of the people affected, and also, of course, a huge social cost because these places are invariably where the most disadvantaged are living, and a 50% chance for children living there of having respiratory problems.

This report highlights things that are being done. It also highlights things which will need to be done. We are well aware of the challenge to try and bring together a green economy with an economy which is also economically viable.

There is one other challenge I would like to highlight and that is the challenge to inform and involve citizens. We know what we are up against. "There is not any problem about global warming and even if there was, the problems have been exaggerated and I do not have to do anything about it and don't bother consulting me because if you do it is a waste of time, you have already decided what you are going to do."

The challenge is to find a more imaginative way than we have done so far to inform people and encourage people to be involved in such a way that they feel enabled not just to think that this is something done unto them, but something that they can, as the jargon goes, own and so they feel more able to support.

There are some measure of things and understanding of what is to be done. It is obviously now key for the political will to be there to do it. Sometimes there can be cross-party agreement but it is obviously not possible for there always to be that – even naïve ex-vicars do not think that. However, there is, it seems, some cross-party agreement on trying to combat climate change and provide the right details for improved transport, as the vote indicated earlier this year.

I hope that in the next few weeks that nothing happens in the election campaign to prevent that joint will and so, after the elections, that will to make a difference will continue, and if it does not, if nothing else after eight years I have got all your addresses – I know where you live! *(laughter)* *(Applause)* Thank you.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Harington. I am just sorry that you did not speak today in rap, as you usually do. I think we shall miss it in this Chamber in the future. Thank you. I now call on Councillor Driver.

COUNCILLOR DRIVER: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I wish to comment on Minute 205 on page 31, the response of the Scrutiny Board (Environment and Neighbourhoods) Interim Statement into 'The Procurement of the Grounds Maintenance Contract' up to 2011.

This report is of interest to those of us who wish to know how the Council is planning to avoid some of the problems that have occurred with the ground maintenance contract in recent years and caused much annoyance to local residents in my ward and many others.

One of the areas in which the Council has failed to tie down Glendales to a suitable binding contract has been keenly felt, I believe, in the city's cemeteries. In my ward we have direct experience of this and the distress which lack of care to the local cemetery causes, particularly to grieving families in the LS10 area. Not only grass but hedges, gates, walls, all sorts of things, are not suitably looked after.

Unfortunately, it does appear that the standards for different cemeteries are not the same and this Council seems unwilling to provide that equality of standard to cemeteries throughout Leeds.

This is only part of the poor record which this administration has on the subject of cemeteries. Currently, the city is desperately running out of burial spaces, and we are still waiting for the Junta opposite to come up with a solution – something it seems again unable or unwilling to do.

In June 1998 the Recreation Services Committee approved the Whinmoor Grange Farm site as the most suitable site for a large cemetery in Leeds for reasons of size and access. This decision was subsequently reaffirmed by the Fifty Years Cemeteries and Crematoria Strategy in 2002. This solution would have dealt with two major issues facing the city: (a) the general shortage of burial space; (b) the need to provide specific space for members of the Muslim community. Unfortunately in 2004 these plans got changed by the new administration deciding that a single large cemetery was not the answer for Leeds's problems and that a number of smaller cemeteries would be a better solution.

We can debate the merits of these proposals for ever, and we are still convinced on this side that our solution was the better one. However, what is not open for debate is that, now you have decided on your plan, when is the Council going to get on with it? It also needs to ensure that the cemeteries throughout the city are properly maintained and we need to see the resources of that being put in place to counter the decay and dilapidation and, indeed, in some cases exposure to vandalism which cemeteries like Hunslet are currently suffering.

Thanks to the present levels of resources, it does seem that they will go on suffering and I would like Members opposite to comment on what is being done to safeguard them from further deterioration. Thank you. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Driver. I now call on Councillor Ewens.

COUNCILLOR EWENS: This Minute is getting a lot of stick this afternoon, isn't it? It is pages 35 Minute 214 and I would just like to express my gratitude for the

fact that the Oaklands is now having its air monitoring equipment removed because it has been found that the standard is regularly high for the quality of air. While I was listening to Councillor Harington with his detailed reply – I do not go into that sort of detail – it occurs to me that the traffic on the Sheepscar Wastes which goes down past the Oaklands estate, finishes up on the guided bus route up Scott Hall Road and it could be that that guided bus route has actually cut down some of the car traffic which goes straight out of town, down the Sheepscar Wastes and back up eventually on to Scott Hall Road, so that is absolutely splendid, isn't it?

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Ewens. Now I call upon Councillor Ann Blackburn.

COUNCILLOR A BLACKBURN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would like to speak on pages 35 Minute 214, please. I have listened with interest to what has been said. Councillor Ewens is concerned about a certain area in Leeds and Councillor Finnigan concerned about another area in Leeds, of course, which comes under the air quality changes or, should I say, revisions.

I am concerned about all of it in Leeds. I totally agree what Councillor Harington has stated. Yes, we need to get a lot of this traffic off the roads, there is no doubt about that – not just in Leeds, of course, all over but we are obviously talking about Leeds here.

I am concerned because of the simple fact that yes, I do not have a car as most people know – never have, can't even drive – and I am not into cycling either. I do support cycling but I am not much good myself at cycling. I walk a lot – it is very healthy for you and I think that a lot of people would be a lot healthier if they did get out of their cars now and again. I know you do get to be reliant on them and I know it is so easy to get into a car and pop to the shop or whatever rather than walk, but when your car is off the road, of course, you have to do something else.

I think for healthy reasons it is good for people to get out of the cars but also we need to get more buses on the road as well, different forms of transport, buses included - we need to regulate the buses. I am also concerned where buses stop and cars stop as well. Buses at bus stops – they do not turn the engine off. Cars in traffic jams do not turn the engine off. This does not help the air quality at all – it worsens it.

Also I have to say I remember quite a few years ago the Green Party doing a campaign because of children, more children were getting asthma that lived near main roads. That was a fact and parents were coming up to us being concerned when they are living near a main road because of this.

People with cars I think do need to maybe not sue them as often. I know you are going to say yes, some people need the car for their job, etc, etc, but I think we could all use them a bit less if we just thought about it, if the will was there. I say to all you Councillors here, the majority of which have cars, to think about this and think about leaving your car at home a bit more than you do. I am sure you could do it. We are Councillors in Leeds – we should be showing a good example, so I ask you to think about that and do that. Thank you. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Blackburn. Councillor Procter.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Unfortunately I was out of the Chamber when Councillor Driver launched a blistering attack on me personally and also the recreation service. It would have been useful if he had

notified to me that he intended to speak on this matter and stray into an area which is completely unrelated to the Minute.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: It was not blistering. Dead sheep came to mind.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Not as savage as I thought then. Of course, this particular Minute relates to grounds maintenance and, of course, the grounds maintenance contract and service has nothing to do with the maintenance of our cemetery provision in the city whatsoever.

What I can say to Councillor Driver, my understanding is that the charge is that the Labour administration agreed a cemetery strategy and what are we doing, we have not implemented it. If he had been paying attention to the Minutes of the Executive Board and the proceedings of the Executive Board, he would find that indeed we have had a number of papers at that Board dealing with cemetery provision right across the city - if my memory serves me right, papers that were supported by the Labour Group and their representatives on the Executive Board.

The fact of the matter is, and what Councillor Driver might not like to concede, is that when we were in Opposition a Scrutiny Board chaired by a Labour Member – a Labour Member – dominated by Labour Members, actually agreed with the view that I was putting forward. Councillor Atha was one of those Labour Members who agreed with me at the time, namely that we should have smaller cemeteries...

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: You cannot remember, Bernard, don't worry.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: ... over rather than larger cemeteries across the city. I am pleased to say that we had an opportunity as an administration to implement that particular policy and that is what we are moving forward with.

It is interesting, is it not, that Councillor Driver's view is not in accordance with other Members of his group as well – Councillor Wakefield...

COUNCILLOR LYONS: Is that why Liberals want incinerator?

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Councillor Wakefield is quite happy, as are the other Members, I understand, for Kippax and Methley that we are moving ahead with a new cemetery provision in Kippax. That is only possible under this smaller cemetery strategy. Indeed, dare I say it, we are delighted to be able to be providing a new cemetery at Kippax, something that your administration signally failed to do, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. I now call on Councillor Monaghan to sum up, please.

COUNCILLOR MONAGHAN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I think regarding grounds maintenance Councillor Procter has covered most of the points made by Councillor Driver. I just want to add, though, that I would like to thank the work of the Scrutiny Board and Councillor Anderson for looking into this matter thoroughly and also to say that we are very pleased with the positive response from the Director of Environments and Neighbourhoods on all the recommendations, so we can look forward to bringing that report back in June, I believe.

The second point is just referring to Councillor Finnigan's point. Actually, I share a profound interest in the air pollution in Morley, as I do across the city.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: For the next fortnight at least.

COUNCILLOR MONAGHAN: I agree with him and support your efforts to improve air quality in the Queen Street area and throughout Morley and we are doing a number of projects with the bus companies to put cleaner bus services on and, as Councillor Anderson said, in order to reduce engine idling which is a big cause of pollution, especially in Morley.

Thank you, Councillor Ewens. Yes, I am pleased to hear that we have managed to remove some of the Air Quality Management Orders that we have had in place and that we have obviously put a few more in place and that means we will draw up action plans to tackle air pollution in these areas.

Particularly the contribution from Councillor Harington as one of the few non-car-owning Councillors I completely agree with his points regarding climate change and global warming. I think we started it off on a cross-party footing and I hope that that will continue because it is an issue that affects all of us and that we will not continue just to do that within the political parties here but as it is one that affects all of us, we will involve other organisations such as Friends of the Earth and other residents in Leeds to make sure that everyone is engaged in tackling this problem, so hopefully we may actually carry on working with you in that forum.

Finally, just on a more light-hearted note, with the recent volcano, I just want to reassure Members that there has been no adverse effect on air quality in the city of Leeds because of the volcano. *(Applause)*

(iv) Children's Services

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. We move on to Children's Services now and I call on Councillor Iqbal.

COUNCILLOR IQBAL: Lord Mayor, I am commenting on page 39 Minute 222, the Outcome of the Consultation on the Future of Parklands School, and page 38 Minute 220, the Outcome of the Consultation on the Provision of Girls-Only Education in Leeds.

I have had to submit this comment on both Minutes thanks to the sheer incompetence and, I believe, lack of interest in genuine consultation this administration has shown. It would be impossible to comment on one without straying into the other and I do know how much you love to try and shout people down.

The consultation I want to primarily focus on is the one concerning the provision of girls-only education within the city. This consultation was fundamentally flawed from the very beginning. The original consultation document that went to the Executive Board in January this year was very different to the one that finally went out to the public. It included a brief question and answer session, including the statement that, "Research on single sex education concludes that there is no convincing evidence that it has a significant impact on pupil performance." I find it very disturbing that such a one-sided document was put forward as being suitable for a city-wide consultation, as it was the feedback from those who responded on that, they have had the decision to see the provision had already been taken. Can you imagine what they would have said if the document had gone out in its original form?

I can assure you that there is a great deal of conflicting evidence as to whether or not there is any benefits to girls-only education. I am not going to stand here and go through all of the researches - perhaps that is a debate for a later time – but I am amazed that it was felt suitable to ignore evidence in favour of single-sex

education and instead make such a one-sided and biased statement. It is not something I would expect to see in what was supposed to be an informative and balanced consultation document.

Thankfully, after Councillor Wakefield intervened, that section was removed and the document went out for consultation, so let us have a look at that final document.

It began by stating that girls-only education is not strongly supported in Leeds. This I feel is misleading. The fact is that the Parklands School is not strongly supported, not the concept of girls-only education. It goes on to say the school does not have enough money by staff or resources, making it very difficult to keep improving standards in the classroom. This means that girls at the school will not receive the same opportunity to achieve their potential as their peers who are attending other schools in the city.

Let me just remind you that this consultation was on the continued provision of girls-only education in Leeds, not on the future of Parklands School. How can you produce a document that is so clearly talking about the existing school and not the concept of girls-only education? This did not invite the informed debate that is needed, but instead served only to link the two issues. This should never have been allowed to happen. In fact, all of the information given on girls-only education in this consultation document referred to the school and not the concept. I accept that when the outcome came to Executive Board this time round, you agreed that the two consultations had become intertwined but the fact remains that you allowed that to happen.

I do not think you gave this issue the consideration it deserves. You have failed to recognise how important this subject is. It is almost as if you viewed the consultation as a paper exercise designed to tick a few boxes so you could go ahead with your plans to see the provision with the minimum of fuss.

For many people the issue of girls-only education is incredibly important not just for a faith point of view but also from a social one. Parents and pupils have a right to expect a choice when it comes to education and one of those choices should be girls-only education. I want to see a bigger, better consultation that is truly balanced and truly city-wide. I want this consultation to be on the concept of girls-only education. There should be no mention of Parklands or its falling numbers. The debate should not be about the school in any way, shape or form; it should be about the idea of girls-only schools. Only then we will be in any position to make a decision about the desire for this form of education in Leeds. Thank you, Lord Mayor.
(Applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Iqbal. I call on Councillor Dowson.

COUNCILLOR DOWSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am commenting on page 39, Minute 223, the Outcome of the Consultation on the Future of City of Leeds High School.

My colleague, the much-maligned, today, Bernard Atha - who, let us face it, has been around the Council Chamber longer than Moses existed, so has commented at some point in virtually everything that has ever happened in Leeds -
...

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: He certainly has.

COUNCILLOR DOWSON: ...questioned the administration in July 2008 about the future of City of Leeds School. We were all reassured by Councillor Brett that there were no plans to close the school and I am sure we all remember Councillor Ewens very passionate speech outlining all the good work undertaken at the school.

COUNCILLOR: Take it up with Ed Balls.

COUNCILLOR DOWSON: I am sorry to say that just 18 months later consultation took place over a decision to close the school, and it is that consultation that I wish to speak about.

Members of the public took the time to read through the consultation document and then submit their feelings about closing the school. Not only that, but on 4th March the governors of the school submitted a detailed objection complete with an alternative proposal. That was a full month before the Executive Board meeting at which it was due to be discussed – more than enough time, you would have thought, for the responses to be read and the relevant recommendations to be presented to the Board. However, you would be wrong. Councillor Harker needed to submit a last minute verbal amendment to the report's recommendations.

The whole point of consultation is that you take account of public views, a concept that this administration has not always grasped, so I want to make it perfectly clear that we are not criticising the fact that you have finally listened to the views of the public. What I want to ask is why these hugely significant amendments were tabled at the last minute. The amendment notes the alternative plan put forward by the Governors and asks that a report be brought back to the Board in July 2010 based on that plan and exploring all the options for the continued use of the site for educational purposes.

I know that sounds rather wordy but what essentially it does is recognise the input from the Governors and pledges to further consult with them – something that was missing from the original recommendations.

What I want to ask is, why did not the original recommendations reflect that input? Why last minute changes? Was it the fact that the school had arranged an embarrassing demonstration outside? People power. You have to ask, if the responses had even been read, let alone considered, before the original recommendations were made, surely it could not be the case of a decision being taken regardless of the outcome of consultation – or could it? Perhaps Councillor Harker now feels that the only way to save his own skin in the upcoming election was to curry favour by finally acknowledging the feelings of the staff, the pupils and the Governors of that school.

Is this a last ditch attempt by a desperate man...

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Yes.

COUNCILLOR DOWSON: ...in a desperate administration to try and prove that they can listen to the people? I am afraid it is too little and too late.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Talk about desperation? Listen to you.

COUNCILLOR DOWSON: The eleventh hour amendment proves this. If you really had listened to the results of the consultation there would have been no need to appease the people in this way at the last minute. This mess had exposed you for

what you really are – uninterested, out of touch and, come May, out of office. Thank you. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Dowson. Councillor Atha.

COUNCILLOR ATHA: If I can follow very briefly, that is to simply say that the Lib Dems have a record of not telling the truth. They are different from Councillor Carter's colleagues. They never lie but they never tell the truth because they only show part of it. Now, the Lib Dems over and over again have demonstrated we will say one thing, yes we will vote with you to have these costs withdrawn, the legal expenses we discussed earlier, then when it comes down to it they will not. They said at West Park about they want to retain the West Park Centre. They knew when they were saying that that this was on a list for sale in the years 2012 I think originally – now it is a little bit further. Over and over again you have demonstrated as Lib Dems something that the old Liberals never did – this ability to say one thing and do another. They had a certain amount of integrity about their politics and this does not apply now. You got in with the wrong gang.

The truth of the matter is, this paragraph that Education Leeds requested bringing a report, etc. It is a simple device to put off the firm decision until after the election. It is as simple as that. Don't think it fools anyone. I do not know how an honest man like you, Councillor Harker, can even believe that it will fool anybody.

The truth of the matter is this is a very, very cynical ploy because what happens when you treat a school like this, the children who do not meet these standards that the Government requires, the low achievers, they will be dispersed and they will go into other schools where they will fail because they do not have the same care they have in Leeds City and those children will float to the bottom and be the kids who cannot read at the end of the day, who are not socialised at the end of the day.

That is what will happen, but what will happen to the schools into which they go as they are being dispersed? Their averages will go up because these are small in number by comparison and will not affect the actual final assessment of achievement targets.

You know, Councillor Harker, as a teacher and as a person terribly interested in education, genuinely interested, you know what I am saying is true. You know that the people defending the school were telling the truth; they were telling you as it is. They got good pastoral care, a school that takes in children with such a wide variety of backgrounds, where English for many is a foreign language. How on earth can you expect them to perform as well as the kids, say in Horsforth – a very good school – or Otley – which is another very, very good school – or many of the other schools? This is what we should be fighting for.

I am disappointed in the extreme that you have gone along with the approach adopted by your colleagues in this coalition. It just will not do – it is not honest. When you go and do this I will take a guarantee that if we do not take control this May then, in fact, I guarantee that the school will close, the children will be dispersed and all the problems that have been outlined by parents and others to you – I have got here, we did a consultation and I just took off one simple run-off. This man said, "By closing the City you are cutting the throats of various local primary schools. You are also cutting the links of several sixth form colleges in the area – Notre Dame being one of them. You are overstressing the transport network by ferrying these children (*inaudible*) in different directions. The Hyde Park and the surrounding area can just become a one massive extension of the student campus."

Those are some of the points that the parents made in their observations. Please, please, have enough guts to go with us and say no, we will keep it open and, what is more, let us say again together, it is right that parents in Leeds, a city the size of this, three-quarters of a million people, they should have the right if they wish to send their daughter to a single-sex school, to send that child to a single-sex school. It is a right we should have. If I had children, I would want to exercise that right if I felt it appropriate to do so.

There are chances to go back, there are chances for redemption. I am a great believer in redemption. You can, in fact, go back and say right, let us think this again, let us decide to reconsider and withdraw the notices to close the school and the school where there is not going to be any single-sex education, and let us see if we can actually act in a comprehensive and a genuine way dealing on the basis of stark, simple principle. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Atha. I now call on Councillor Cleasby.

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Here I am standing, about to talk about the schools in Horsforth and, Lord Mayor, I am also talking about City of Leeds School. What a pity when we had a successful City of Leeds School here, right in the heart of the city where, because we have a dartboard city, everybody who came to work in the city could bring their children to and it was very successful.

The then administration, sitting on that side of the Chamber, moved it into a neighbourhood that was a daft place to put a school, and even dafter to keep the name City of Leeds School. Instead of giving it an ethos and a start all of its own, a new beginning for it that it could have built on and created, it is called the City of Leeds School. It is nonsense where it is and it is nonsense what is coming at us from the Opposition, as they are now. Many were there – you were involved, Bernard, you can grin about it now but you were involved in the decision to do these sort of silly things and – Bernard, you have had your chance – you very well know, Bernard, that the majority of the parents around there do not send their children to that school; they send them to other schools. That is an indictment of Labour re-organising, then leaving a mess for others to sort out.

Personal criticism, Councillor Dowson, of Councillor Harker is not becoming. I remember Councillor Harker before he became a Councillor and, in fact, he was a senior teacher at that school – a school that he was devoted to and cared a great deal about, and he has ever since, each day he has been a Councillor, but he is sorting out the problem that you left.

Lord Mayor, I wanted to talk about schools in my own ward which will have a lot of pressure on them now that two have been increased in size. We welcome that the decision has finally been made, having sat as ward Councillors to listen to the anguish of parents, because the exercise is a difficult one. Wherever it happens it is difficult and it has been difficult in Horsforth. We sat and listened but, more importantly, we are listening to our Headteachers, we are listening to our Governors and the parents and what is important now is that Education Leeds has made the decision as to which schools will be increased in size. What is important now is how, that those schools which are outstanding remain outstanding, that do not receive harm, that become permanent schools in the way that St Margaret's was.

I remember the magic day when we all walked from St James's to put two schools on to one site and then years later a new school was created from old Victorian buildings. That can be done at Featherbank. Newlaithes is more modern, it

needs to be increased in size in dealing with it. A proper school, parents are asking for, and I think, Lord Mayor, it is nothing short of what they deserve because they have worked together with the staff to create both schools being outstanding. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Cleasby. I call on Councillor Harker now to sum up on the Learning portfolio.

COUNCILLOR HARKER: Thank you, Lord Mayor. We have short memories.

COUNCILLOR LYONS: You have.

COUNCILLOR HARKER: We have short memories. On 6 November 2002 there was a debate in this Chamber on a Labour plan to close City of Leeds School – a debate I took part in and I have the verbatim in front of me. The plan was to close City of Leeds School and send the children to Carr Manor School, which is in my ward, and I actually opposed it. There is something in what Councillor Cleasby said about the reorganisation following when we got rid of middle schools.

When we got rid of middle schools the City of Leeds School, one of the most successful high schools in this city, particularly working with disadvantaged young people, was moved against advice to its present site and since then has declined in numbers.

I was not being dishonest when I changed the recommendations. The papers have to be published seven days before the Executive Board. I was still in consultation at that point with my officers. My officers wrote the paper; I remained unhappy with it and the only way that I could amend those recommendations was to bring a change to the Executive Board.

In 2004 when I took over the portfolio, there were a number of schools identified by the Labour Government as failing. They were part of the Sick Schools project and City of Leeds and Parklands and others were part of it. We still have to deal with a number of issues and I want to deal with single sex education. Not only was City of Leeds moved from a thriving site to a site where it began to fail – when they reorganised education at that point they put girls-only education for the whole city out in the far side of East Leeds, where people in the city could not get their children to if they wanted to. They put boys' single-sex education – and we should still have single-sex education for boys in this city, got rid of by the last administration. The school failed because boys from across the city could not get there. If we want a thriving single-sex education in this city – and I would back that – it has to be centrally located.

There was a point when I put informally to people that we should bring girls' education in from Parklands to the City of Leeds site. I was opposed in all quarters by the Governors, by Labour Members and by others.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: I think so.

COUNCILLOR HARKER: One of the problems I picked up in 2004 as I walked out of the door after the AGM were two things. We were going to have a teachers' strike if I did not do something by ten o'clock the next morning and could I meet the Trustees of what was then the Islamia Girls High School. We managed to avoid the teachers' strike and I met with the Trustees of the Islamia Girls High School. I said, "We have a girls' high school in East Leeds, so why did you feel the need to create your own? Please tell me" and they said that families did not want to

travel their children to Parklands because Parklands was in a predominantly white area, and that was said to me in front of witnesses, I am not making that up.

If we can establish – and that is what we need – a first rate girls’ high school somewhere in the centre of this city it would please me over and over again. If we can provide a strong community school at City of Leeds, I would welcome that, but let us deal with City of Leeds again. In, I think it was November or December 2008, Jim Knight sat on Floor 2 and began to hector me about the future of City of Leeds School. I tried to explain to him in front of witnesses what we were trying to do to support the school. He interrupted me on five occasions in less than ten minutes with (*banged desk*) “When are you going to close it?”

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Your Minister.

COUNCILLOR HARKER: It is interesting that Ed Balls, who says publicly he put no pressure on us, walked into the room after I had had a real pasting from Jim Knight.

We need to work together to establish good education for every child in this city and that is what I have tried to do over the last six years. We are going to have a further inquiry into all girls’ education, an independent one and that is going to be reported back and I was talking to Education Leeds this week about finding an independent group to carry out a proper scrutiny.

COUNCILLOR IQBAL: Too late.

COUNCILLOR HARKER: It is not too late.

COUNCILLOR IQBAL: It is.

COUNCILLOR HARKER: It is not too late if we can get a girls’ high school back in the city centre and perhaps Thoresby building might become available.
(*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Harker. I now call on Councillor Golton to sum up.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I endorse Councillor Harker’s comments and we move on.

(vi) Adult Health Social Care

THE LORD MAYOR: We now move on to Adult Health and Social Care. Councillor Wakefield, please.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Before I speak on page 41 Minute 226, I would like to just join in with the Leaders’ comments about the colleagues who are retiring and wish Roger and Debbie Coupar, who sadly cannot be here, all the best in their future as well as John and Frank and others and Alec who will have nothing in Leeds but I understand you are going to London. I will leave the farewell speech for James Lewis till later on – that is when we talk about a Labour Government. I know I am not saying anything to the Three Stooges here, Matthew Lobley and ...

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: That’s lifted the level of debate, Keith, well done.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: I will get to the debate because your party was responsible for this mess that we have got in in this city. Under the Joint Strategic

Needs Assessment, what it actually tries to do is actually talk about the importance of partnership when looking after our elderly in the city and there is no doubt that demographic financial and political pressures have left us, the State, nationally and locally, in a crisis of funding. This administration has taken one particular route, and what it has done over the last few years is dismantle the local welfare state. It has closed day centres, it has cut wardens and it has rejected hundreds and thousands of people for care, as we heard earlier today from the deputation. That is your decision.

What seems to have happened is all that work has been pushed towards the Neighbourhood Network, actually without the proper money as well, and I understand why there was a review needed in 2009 in order to make sure those standards were kept up and maintained, high standards across there.

The mess they got us into, the mess that this administration has got into, has actually caused a crisis in parts of Leeds. We now have seven Neighbourhood Networks – five in East Leeds – that actually have been told they cannot carry on the work. I cannot and we cannot believe all seven are not capable of doing the work. There is something fundamentally wrong with a criteria that knocks those out.

I welcome the review but in the meantime, those organisations got two letters. They got one in early March saying, “You have got twelve months to put arrangements right”, which is understandable, twelve months is fair, and then five days later they get another letter saying, “You have actually only got three months to put arrangements right.” Is that the way to treat people committed to the voluntary sector? They are absolutely traumatised by this.

I will tell you, I do not mind – in fact I congratulate Sandi Keene on trying to get this administration out of the mess because we need an independent review. I welcome also Bill Kilgallon as Chair of it. You cannot tell me that this is being done in the interests of local people and the elderly.

What it has done is favour big professional voluntary sectors. They provide a good service, I have nothing against them, but what this administration is doing is crush small organisations that actually do a lot for community development and capacity and actually do a lot for people who want to volunteer in the local community, so you crush community spirit and small voluntary organisations by this mechanism that you have done.

I think, and I welcome the letter that I have received only today because I think the pressure is on this administration to do something about it, because the one thing we should see is that big is not always better. You can have one-and-a-half people, like we have in East Leeds, who work for them. They cannot fill out the forms – they have had to pay £1,000 – but what they do is look after the elderly well, involve local people – we are talking about voluntary, the year of volunteers – and actually they provide a good service. What we have got now is a potential threat to destroy all those values and the only people who will suffer are the elderly people that rely on networks day in, day out, and they are also extremely anxious. They deserve better than this administration’s botch-up and the quicker we get it sorted, the better. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Wakefield. Councillor Gruen.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Lord Mayor, on the same Minute, I think I have said in this Council before that strategic plans are sometimes written by the most senior Council officers to be read by other senior Council officers or by civil servants and they do not by themselves touch the man or woman in the street, but your decisions

arising from that, without consultation, without any kind of trying to find out how well the current Neighbourhood Networks work in areas, touch people's lives by the minute, by the day and by the week.

The first that the Crossgates and Whinmoor Councillors knew about the decision that both Swarcliffe and Crossgates Good Neighbour Schemes would be decimated was when the decision was posted on our PCs. That is the first we know – no consultation, nothing. Within hours our call-in for Scrutiny Board was within the Scrutiny office. Within hours of that the other two main parties joined, so within a day or two it became obvious that there was absolute consternation across the Council. Barry, yes, you were a mover and shaker in this, I accept, but our call-in came in before yours, but we are grateful that you actually did some talking in your own group, as Ralph Pryke did in his group. Absolutely, credit where it is due, there was consternation across the political spectrum in this Chamber, so much so that the Director, I think, was heard to say he has never known before when all the Council groups joined together against a decision.

Frankly, I go back to what I said in Council in January, if you had not overloaded the Director for Adult Social Care giving her a second job, and if she had been able to think about the governance and direction and stewardship of her own department, this would never have happened. I have sufficient faith in the Director to know that this kind of decision would not have been taken.

I have no faith whatsoever in Councillor Harrand, who could have stopped all this. He could have stopped all this. I am sorry that Councillor Harker is not here because I think he made probably his best speech as portfolio holder for a long, long time and he was willing to stand up and be counted today. He actually pronounced about City of Leeds and other issues. I have yet to hear Councillor Harrand stand up and make a decision. Why did you not decide that that decision from the officers should not stand? Why did you not call it in? Why did you not take it to the Executive Board yourself and save misery for thousands and thousands of people in my ward and the rest of East Leeds?

There is consternation. What have these people done wrong to you? How have they offended you to such an extent that you have to continually pick on East Leeds? You closed East Leeds Learning Centre and you have not replaced it. You are now closing the Neighbourhood Networks. These are very popular. No wonder Councillor Hyde is not here today – he is still probably crying in his beer and trying to hold his head in shame in Australia probably, I think.

COUNCILLOR: Portugal.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Perhaps it is Portugal by now, OK, but having said that, the two Leaders have been moved to write at least two letters. They realise the mistakes that have been made and, as Councillor Wakefield says, for me giving people three months is like a stay of execution on death row; you are going to be hanged in three months instead of tomorrow, so hang on there, you cannot do anything, can you, Councillor Bale? How can you plan for three months? Even a businessman like you would say you cannot do it in three month, you need a period of certainty of at least twelve months.

We are calling today on the administration to say firmly, "We will give you the twelve months. In that twelve months we will have a meaningful review with consultation involving everybody and then, perhaps, we might get somewhere in terms of the fairness, the perception of fairness that ordinary men and women, vulnerable, elderly people, their views can be taken into account, not by an officer sitting in some ivory tower here making these silly decisions. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Gruen. Councillor Yeadon.

COUNCILLOR YEADON: Lord Mayor, I also wish to comment on Minute 226, page 41 of the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment Progress Report. As my colleagues have already said, one of the key issues that has come out of this report is just how important strong partnership working is going to be for the future of social care in Leeds. I think most of us here would agree that strong partnerships with other organisations are vital to the future of social care, and the powerful deputation that we heard earlier illustrated this so incredibly well.

There is no getting away from the fact that the voluntary sector is going to be an integral part of that partnership model. I, therefore, also struggle to understand the approach this Council has taken to the Neighbourhood Network Schemes in Leeds. Your procurement process has been onerous, distressing and at times extremely insensitive for many of the voluntary organisations involved.

All of us, I hope, want to see excellent social care for elderly people in this city and I am also sure that the vast majority of us recognise the huge challenges we face in order to make that reality. That is why this Council must maintain strong partnerships with the networks. They bridge the gaps in public services, help tackle socialisation and promote health and wellbeing.

Any successful partnership should be characterised by mutual respect, co-operation and responsibility. Sadly, that is not a description that can apply to your relationship with many of the Networks. Your dealings with the Networks over the last eight months have been shambolic. You have found yourself in a position where Members from across the political spectrum of the Council Chamber are forced to call-in the decisions that you have made. Adult Social Care should not have to spend the cash from what we know is already a very tight budget on an independent review. You should have got this right from Day One.

I have been raising concerns about the procurement process since October 2009 and I can confidently say that throughout the process you have ignored what is at the heart of the Network success – strong community ties and extensive local knowledge. Instead, you have pursued a one size fits all approach with the schemes subjected to inappropriate documents and massive amounts of commercial jargon.

We recognise that there was a need to create equity across the city and strengthen the schemes. However, the process to achieve this has neglected the ethos which has made Neighbourhood Networks so successful in the first place.

The Director of Social Care was right to withdraw the decision about funding. I was delighted at last Adult Social Care had started to listen to concerns I and the Networks had been raising for many months. However, that delight was short-lived. I am sure many of you can imagine my horror when a number of Networks got in touch to tell me about the letter from procurement.

I was told that an administrative error led to Networks being offered a twelve month extension of their contract funding arrangements instead of the planned three. This is simply not acceptable. It was careless, it was insensitive and it yet created more confusion for Networks. Can you imagine what would have happened to a Neighbourhood Network if they had made such an administrative error during the massive procurement process? They would have probably lost their funding.

This was an emotionally charged time for many Networks. For those that had missed out on funding your letter would be an unexpected lifeline. Out of the blue,

despite all the stress and upset that they had experienced they could be safe in the knowledge that their services could continue for another year.

What a body blow to receive your second letter days later. How cruel to announce for the second time in as many weeks that they will not be receiving the funding they desperately need to survive. What is more, many of the networks are now asking where they stand legally, having signed a twelve month contract extension in good faith.

Neighbourhood Networks rely on a dedicated army of volunteers who passionately believe in delivering excellent services for local elderly people. Councillor Brett, I do not doubt your commitment to the voluntary sector but the irony does not escape me that in the year of the volunteer, this process has systematically destroyed the faith and trust of many volunteers in this Council.

One organisation which was initially awarded funding told me it will take years to rebuild the relationships that have been damaged through your handling of the situation.

I do welcome the independent review but I remain disappointed and frustrated about the way that you have ridden roughshod over the aspirations of hardworking volunteers in this city. Thank you. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Yeadon. I now call upon Councillor Murray.

COUNCILLOR MURRAY: Thank you Lord Mayor. I would like to address the same Minute as my colleagues, 41. I have got a copy of the report here, Lord Mayor, and my first thought is, I look at it, it is a report from the Director of Adult Social Services, Director of Children's Services and the Director of Public Health Services. I think for me the first time I have seen a joint report showing and aspiring to deliver integrated, joined-up services to families in this city. Not before time.

If I look into the report and I look at the progress that is being made, I think we would all welcome those signs of progress, particularly those that have focused on the vulnerable groups that are mentioned – working to targets, programmes on health inequalities, learning disabilities, health needs, maternity needs, drugs and alcohol.

I go back to the subject of the report, which is the Joint Strategic Needs. What I am looking for is what about the needs of Betty, someone who lives in my ward? A pensioner, lives at home on her own, she is arthritic, she is not particularly well but she does depend upon the Net teams for that support and lifeline to get things done and to get through the week, and she also has non-residential services providing her with home help.

Her needs have been assessed and she let me have a look at the letter, because she has got a letter from the Council. This is the letter *here*. I have got a copy because when I first read it I could not quite understand it, so I had to take it away and I want you to just listen to one or two bits from it:

“Dear Betty,

Every year the Council increases the cost of its subsidised services. The standard contributions towards the following services are:

Homecare and supported living – 10p increase.”

Doesn't sound bad.

“Day services – 5p increase.

Transport services – no change at all.”

What does that mean for Betty in the rest of the letter? See if you can understand this:

“The last time you were assessed any increase in your contribution was capped at [twenty quid] until 31st March and you were informed that this year's increase would be capped at a further £25. This means that your contribution will not increase by more than £25 this year.

In your case your 2009/10 maximum contribution was assessed as £29.64, so however the increase in your charge was restricted to £20, your actual contribution this year is currently £20 per week. From 1st April 2010 your maximum contribution will increase by no more than £25.”

I am lost!

“This means your change from 1st April 2010 will be £29.64”.

(laughter)

I assume you want a copy of the letter, but let me go back to the fact which Betty got very quickly – or maybe not to quickly, if it is clear. Strip away the gobbledegook – what did Betty have to pay? She is now paying £20 to subsidise the service, she will have to pay for the service. It is now £29.64. In other words, she has got a 50% increase, £10 a week increase, £40 a month increase, £480 a year increase. Incredible.

I come back to the subject, Peter, this is about needs assessment, is it not, so where are Betty's needs in this particular paper? She has been assessed, she will pay what she needs to pay but she is on a fixed low income and suddenly, March 17th, by April 1st she has to find an extra ten quid a week to be able to exist.

This says it is a progress report. Betty does not see this as progress, does she? Betty does not see this as progress at all. She has to count every penny she has got. Betty cannot afford a Tory advance (*sic*) like this, she cannot afford a Tory administration. Betty and the elderly in this city need a change and it is us that should be the change in here from next May. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Murray. Councillor Finnigan.

COUNCILLOR McKENNA: Lord Mayor, may I rise to declare an interest as a part-time employee of Armley Helping Hands Network. I did submit a paper stating that interest and it has gone missing. I do not know where it is but I did submit it, so please accept that.

THE LORD MAYOR: Right, thank you. Councillor Finnigan.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am struggling a little bit to see how this particular Minute focuses on the Neighbourhood Network but seeing as it does do, let us deal with the Morley perspective and say we actually welcome this particular review that has led to this outcome. Why do we welcome it? Because for year after year after year after year Morley pensioners were left with a very poor settlement that is based on old, historical arrangements. That is why we actually welcomed it.

Morley Elderly Action, which is a superb organisation, does a great job, has been covering two and a half wards for years and has been chronically under-funded for years because of that, struggled on, we are grateful for the support that we have got. Peter has been up there to visit, we are grateful for that. He has found other ways of being able to help and finance them to make sure that they continue to do the excellent job that they get but for year after year after year they have been chronically under-funded and that is based on the history.

I did a little bit of investigation to try and figure out where we were in terms of this financing package that we received and we looked around and found that Morley pensioners were receiving ten per cent of similar pensioners in inner south Leeds. I do not know about you, even accepting deprivation and other such things, it is entirely unacceptable that a Morley pensioner is only worth a tenth of a pensioner who lives in Middleton or other areas – entirely unacceptable.

Perhaps that is down to deprivation, of course, so I did a little bit more investigation by looking at other places and I am sure my Rothwell colleagues will love this particular one, but historically Rothwell had got three times as much funding for pensioners as Morley actually had. This is a pre-2004 issue.

Taking into account the fact that the deprivation indices are fairly similar, that cannot in any shape, way or form be acceptable that a Rothwell pensioner is worth three times as much as a Morley pensioner.

I have seen this paperwork that the Networks have had to complete and I accept it is a little challenging, but if anybody – and you all should have been involved with this – has ever filled in a Lottery application form to try and help a local group, then it is no more complicated and no more difficult and no more challenging than that.

We really are in a situation where the Network is a Network and certainly our co-ordinator at Morley Elderly Action was happy to offer his help and support for any Network across Leeds that was struggling with them and to offer his help and advice. Certainly he has gone through this particular process – he did not enjoy it, was not particularly pleased about it, but got to a point where for the first time for years Morley actually got a fair amount of funding.

At this stage what are we facing? Yet another review so that Morley pensioners can hang on and hang on and hang on a little longer until they get what is rightly and fairly theirs. That is entirely unacceptable and I know there are other groups, certainly in the outer area, that are suffering the same sort of delay.

It is entirely and utterly unacceptable. We are in a situation where we believe our pensioners are as valuable as yours in every shape, way and form.

The bigger and wider issue is about who finances adult services, and we can say it at this particular point but nobody wants to talk about it. The Labour Party do not – they are not passing it till the General Election – neither are the Tories, neither are the Liberals. Nobody wants to talk about a serious debate on how we finance

adult care. We really have got two choices – you either bung up taxes or people contribute more. There is not any real choice, but until we have that serious and honest discussion, we are scratching round the edges and we have to be entirely honest with people. We have an ageing population, people are living substantially longer, we are in a situation where we have to decide how we are going to actually finance this.

I am personally disappointed that all the parties are kicking this into the long grass until after the election because it is contentious, it is difficult. We really are going to have to make some serious decisions and whatever decision you make, people are going to be unhappy. You put the taxes up; they are going to be unhappy. You talk about providing more finance from their own resources; they are going to be unhappy. We have to, sooner or later, have a serious and honest discussion about how we are going to finance this because the demographic time bomb really has gone off for these older folk. They do need a lot of help and support. We do need to figure out who is going to pay for that. Thank you, Lord Mayor.
(Applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Finnigan. Councillor Brett.

COUNCILLOR BRETT: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I too am speaking on Minute 226 page 41. I want to start by agreeing with Councillor Finnigan and point out that of the 38 Neighbourhood Network Groups, 31 were successful before the decision was rescinded. I accept what he says and I would like to reinforce that the misuse of four letter words in this context is concerning me very considerably, because the one thing this decision was absolutely never about was cuts. For the Labour Party to campaign and say that this is about cuts is total nonsense.

Let us remind ourselves how we got into this. We got into this for the best of reasons and, as far as I am aware, at the Neighbourhood Network that I am a member of – so is Councillor Harington – there was never at the time when this was being discussed in the early days any reasons why people were saying that they were opposed to more money for the Neighbourhood Networks across the piece. Nobody was opposed to trying to have a level playing field for funding for all of these groups that had grown over a good number of years and had had a number of different funding sources. Nobody was opposed to closing some of the geographic gaps in these Networks, and everybody wanted to improve the service.

I was one of the ones who was most unhappy, and Sandi Keene will certainly know that, so I am certainly not going to try and pretend that mistakes were not made. Councillor Yeadon is right, mistakes were made but it is really quite wrong to pretend that somehow we have done nothing about it. The decision was stopped. It was stopped because of pressure from all sides.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Why didn't he stop it?

COUNCILLOR BRETT: Every single party, the main three parties, were involved in getting the decision stopped.

I want to point out that, following discussions with Councillor Harrand, in the budget speech that was made in February we did, Councillor Finnigan, signal that this is a major issue, and I give you now my guarantee that whatever happens in the General Election, I will lobby the Leaders of my party to make sure that the issue of funding for vulnerable elderly people is addressed quickly and is addressed seriously because we all recognise, whatever Government we have after the General Election, this is going to be a major problem.

The nub of this is a totally new approach to procurement with small voluntary sector groups. We have still to learn how to do this right and that is what the review is going to be about. All the fuss saying "It is all wrong, it is all wrong", we have admitted that we have stopped the decision, we have said we are going to have Member involvement in looking at the terms of reference for the independent review, but it seems to me that the choices that were made about procurement quite some considerable time ago had to be made by a joint board involving the NHS – it is not just us, NHS money is involved in this – so we are not doing it just as Leeds Council. In my view, it was always going to be difficult to have active involvement of Councillors in that procurement process. How could I or Councillor Harington, as Members of the BSA Management Committee, be involved in a detailed way in the process when clearly the group that we are with and supporting was going to be involved?

I believe that the procurement process that we had, the restricted tender, was far better than the alternative of an open tender. I have to say, I still have issues with the way in which it was done and that is why we are having the review, and I hope we can all work together, listen to each other and work towards the outcome that we all want which is improved services for vulnerable elderly people without any serious dislocation in any of the 38 areas and Neighbourhood Networks involved. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Brett. Councillor Procter.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I stand to speak solely on what I think really regrettably was a stomach churning performance by Councillor Murray in this very serious debate.

What was running through my mind, and we have heard it on a regular basis, sadly, from Labour, what was running through my mind was that if he is so concerned and passionate about the care that Betty is receiving, he would have actually drawn it to somebody's attention; he would have actually been on the phone to the Executive Member responsible, actually drawn it to his attention, asked him what he was doing immediately that Betty had contacted you. Did that happen? No, of course it did not. You saved up Betty's tragic case for this meeting, for a wholly political purpose – a wholly political purpose. How is that...

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: What are you going to do about it?

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: ...serving your constituents? How is that serving your constituents?

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: What are you going to do about it?

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: All it is is trying to cling on, in Councillor Murray's case, to office in the saddest possible way.

We can see how Councillor Murray is trying to do that and it is quite ironic, Lord Mayor, that in his rather glossy leaflet extolling his virtues and everything he has done for the residents of Garforth, Swillington and Little Preston, he actually has two major photos in the new library in Garforth – a facility which I and my colleagues in this administration delivered *(Applause)* and not those Members opposite.

Lord Mayor, in Councillor Murray's leaflet he makes one very true comment. "I often quote a Rolling Stones song, 'I've been around for a long, long time'." Too long, Councillor Murray, too long...

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: What about Betty? What are you going to do about her?

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: ...and I am delighted that we are about to bring your tenure in Garforth to an end so Betty can be represented by some decent Councillors who will get some action. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lowe, please.

COUNCILLOR LOWE: Same Minute, Lord Mayor. I just wanted to talk very briefly about Armley Helping Hands, which is obviously my own ward, and the consequences of the debacle that has ensued means that organisations like that in my ward are in a state of disarray because clearly the extension by three months of the current contract is not long enough to secure the offices of the excellent staff who are currently working there. Some staff will find new jobs and even if the whole process is completed within that process, it may be that organisations like Armley Helping Hands are told that there has been some problem, you are going to lose some of your money or we are going to have to go through the whole process again, in which case how will they have enough money to meet their liabilities in terms of redundancy and all the rest of it?

Had this process been undertaken properly in the first place, vulnerable, tiny organisations like Armley Helping Hands – I think they have only got five paid staff and none of those are full-time apart from the manager – would not be in the position that they are in today.

I think it is very difficult for those organisations and we should take account of those very difficult and peculiar difficulties which very, very small organisations in the voluntary sector are experiencing, and I think some special arrangement should be brought into play through this period of review and at the end of the review period I think we need to sit down with those organisations and come up with a plan that will enable them to meet any legal liabilities and also to secure for the longer term, because it is not fair on them, it is not fair on their staff and it is definitely not fair on the older people who rely on their services. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Lowe. Councillor Grayshon.

COUNCILLOR GRAYSHON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I really find this quite an unpalatable conversation and I think Councillor Procter has probably hit the nail on the head, that these situations for people who are directly affected by it are very, very really and they need out help and support, not letters paraded at full Council meetings. I do not know what Councillor Murray has done with that letter but I do hope that you would send it to Councillor Harrand to deal with and you are not dealing with it yourself.

Can you stop making glib comments, Councillor Driver, because you are not really helping anybody, are you. You are just an exemplar of the unpalatableness of this entire situation.

The situation with regard to Councillor Finnigan pointing out Morley Elderly Action as an example of this situation, Councillor Leadley is still involved with Morley Elderly Action I know and you have been involved with it. Councillor Leadley and I were involved when it was first set up. It actually covered the old Morley South ward and Morley North ward. The formation of that, we were told that there would initially be two organisations, one for Morley North and one for Morley South. Subsequently my predecessor, Sherry Bradley, announced that there would be one covering both wards; however, we would not get two lots of money and when we in Morley pointed

out that that seemed a little inequitable for our residents, we were told that, "Well, there you are, you either like it or lump it. You either do it this way or it does not progress at all". Really one never likes blackmail but what does one do in such circumstances? It was a help at that point. Thankfully, that has now been rectified and I am pleased to say that Morley Elderly Action will receive its fair share, which will help those people in Morley who need the help.

Recently I am sure you are aware that you and I have assisted Morley Elderly Action with Fairshare Scheme which will help the elderly people in Morley. I find it intriguing (*inaudible*) and I am sure none of my colleagues would allow me to (*inaudible*) but one organisation spent a thousand pounds filling in some forms. Is that correct?

COUNCILLOR: Yes, it is.

COUNCILLOR GRAYSHON: I am sure if they had brought me the form I would have been more than happy to have filled it in at no cost to them, as I would have expected anybody in this Council Chamber to do so.

COUNCILLOR ATHA: They wanted it doing properly.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: Bring it to us.

COUNCILLOR GRAYSHON: It is an unfortunate situation that as a society we find ourselves in that some people do not care for the elder embers of their families. I know when my mother and father were ill I looked after them and that is what I expect everybody else to do.

COUNCILLOR GRAHAM: Not everybody is in that position.

COUNCILLOR GRAYSHON: I think sometimes we need to perhaps look a bit more at what we can do to help within those communities and sitting there heckling is not going to help anybody, is it?

COUNCILLOR GRAHAM: What you are saying is we do not help these people.

COUNCILLOR GRAYSHON: That is why I intend helping them rather than playing to a crowd this afternoon, Councillor. Let us move forward with this, let us get the situation right. If there is a problem it needs to be addressed but I find it wholly unacceptable that people are being brought up in this Council Chamber when really our duty is to deal with those issues and not use them as a political football, Councillor Driver, but let us move forward and see how this progresses. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Grayshon. Councillor Selby.

COUNCILLOR SELBY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. This is a further example of the attack that this administration has on the people of Leeds. I do not know why it is. I am sorry, I am speaking on the same Minute. I do not know why it is that this Council is so opposed to anything that happens in East Leeds.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Rubbish. Absolute rubbish.

COUNCILLOR SELBY: The shambles over the management of EASEL, the money take away from the East Leeds Family Learning Centre, £6m put aside for refurbishment taken away, we have the mishandling of the consultation over

Parklands and an all girls high school. Notwithstanding that we also have the attack on the people in East Leeds in that they take away our polling stations. The parties of change want change providing but if they think you are going to vote against the change they want, they take that vote away. Now this shambles.

Lord Mayor, five of the Good Neighbour schemes, voluntary networks, in East Leeds have signed letters of protest to both the Executive Member and to the Director. That includes Councillor William Hyde. We have had the shambles of Board Members, as Councillor Gruen mentioned, first we were aware of what was going on, we all saw it on the delegated decisions. We were then invited to a meeting with officers who start off by saying, "We are here to answer your questions." It would be nice if they had actually given us some information beforehand in order that we could have framed our questions.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Absolutely.

COUNCILLOR SELBY: It has gone from worse to worse. They have got the assumption, the way this review has been conducted was the assumption was that voluntary charitable organisations which many of the Neighbourhood Networks are, would voluntarily transfer assets and data, confidential data, to the new organisations is, to say the least, a little bit ill-thought. No consideration has been given to the staff of those Neighbourhood Network schemes in terms of potential redundancies and loss of jobs there or, for that matter, the viability of those charitable organisations.

They have also now set out the situation of first of all it was the twelve month extension, then it was the three month extension. The problem is – and I will be interested to hear what Councillor Harrand has to say or, for that matter, Councillor Brett, if he wishes to come back on this, is – all organisations received letters dated 10th March offering them a twelve month extension. That was an offer made to them and in most cases they accepted it that day. When the replies came in to procurement, somebody must have realised that a clanger, to put it politely, had been dropped, so they then said, "It was not our intention." Well, when the charitable organisations, the Good Neighbour schemes, received the offer of the twelve month extension, as far as they were concerned the Council intended to offer twelve months, they accepted twelve months and it may well be that that may be argued in another place.

I would also like to ask one other question. What happens if this review that is being carried out now by Bill Kilgallon takes longer to resolve than three months? What happens to the organisations then? What assistance is going to be given? What funding is going to be given? What help is going to be given to see to it that the work that they do carries on? Most of the people working in the Networks are rely on a lot of volunteers. Councillor Brett as the champion of the volunteers seems to have stabbed them in the back. We are told that as part of the big society where everybody is to take part in voluntary organisations as Mr Cameron tells us we are supposed to do – they are kicked in the teeth. That is the message that we get from the parties of change opposite.

Quite frankly, if this is how this administration treats the people of East Leeds, then the sooner it goes the better. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you very much. I now call on Councillor Armitage.

COUNCILLOR ARMITAGE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. As most of you know I am the Vice-Chair of Swarcliffe Good Neighbours – that is obviously in East Leeds. One of them did not get the funding.

I looked at the pre-questionnaire tendering procedure and for those who do not know – and you if you have never actually looked at a tender or you have never been involved in a tender, how would you expect these people, the volunteers, to know how to go about it? We in our organisation had to go out to get somebody professional who was used to procurement, who knew about tendering procedures. You have no idea some of the silly, silly questions they were asking. In the pre-questionnaire documentation, absolutely ludicrous questions were asked and I do think that the Adult Social Care have not taken together the point of the fact that there are smaller organisations that need to be looked at quite differently from the bigger organisations.

For instance, my organisation only has one and a half members of staff. One of the things we failed on, for instance, was that we did not comply with rural areas. If anybody knows where Swarcliffe is, we do not have any rural areas, for goodness sake. We also failed on language barriers. Can I point out that 99% of local people have English as their first language in Swarcliffe, so how the heck do we comply with the rural area element of the procurement? It is absolutely ludicrous.

I have got 462 elderly members who love coming to the luncheon club, love coming to the dancing club, love coming to the computer club. All this is in jeopardy because they are frightened to death that this service that is tailor made to their needs is going to be taken away and you lot ought to be a-blooming-shamed of yourselves for getting into this situation.

It is profits before people and it is all down to value for money. I do not take this on that. It is wrong what you are trying to do. These people rely on these services day in and day out and if we have not got the volunteers doing this work, what sort of a society are we? You have no right to do what you have done, the procurement stinks and it needs to be reviewed and thank God it is going to be reviewed because you will see elements in the procurement that are quite, quite wrong. You have got to understand that these people have got to be met round their own communities, what do they want? They vote with their feet first and they should be allowed to say what they want in their communities by the volunteering groups that provide that service.

I do hope that Bill Kilgallon will look sensibly at the review and I have also written in to Sandi explaining the reasons why we feel so angry at how the procurement did not work for our people. I am proud of where I come from, I am proud of our people and they deserve a better service from people like you over there. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Armitage. Councillor Les Carter.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Lord Mayor, can I just make one or two points in response to Councillor Selby and I will just give you a list. This is what this administration has been doing in East Leeds, a part of the city which they neglected for over 24 years and did nothing, brought nothing forward.

PFI in Swarcliffe. Councillor Gruen could not get it; we got it. Millions spent on decency; they did not do it. New schools in the area. The level of homelessness is lower in that area than it has been for years. New Council houses which we paid for which they could not do. We were in a position to take money from KickStart because we had the plans to do it with and, finally, Round Six, which is over there we said to them we brought them in said, "What do you want on plans?" They said, "Can we have this?" We said, "Yes, you can have it" and now they are whingeing about that.

Lord Mayor, do not listen to that lot. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: On dear...

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Carter. Councillor Harper.

COUNCILLOR HARPER: I think, Councillor Carter, all the things you have just mentioned were funded by a Labour Government, not by a local Council but by a Labour Government. You may stand there saying it was all funded by you.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: You have not learned while you have been away, have you?

COUNCILLOR HARPER: Totally untrue – totally untrue. I speak on behalf of Caring Together, an elderly persons' project in Woodhouse and Little London. Again, the procurement process was a total disaster. I have raised it with the Director as well. They actually contacted the Social Services Department and told them that 500 pensioners had been actually missed out of the figures. When they were told this they said, "Oh, we will check and look into it." They came back and said, "Yes, there has been a mistake but it will not make any difference to the actual outcome of your funding." The process was an absolute disaster as everyone else has been saying.

People in this city rely on these services and, Councillor Harrand, you have got to make sure that this does not happen again. I am not sure how it happened, I only came on to the Council recently, as you know, but we must make sure this does not happen again. People in this city rely on these services and this must not happen again. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, I now call on Councillor Harrand to sum up.

COUNCILLOR HARRAND: Lord Mayor – I have an hour and a half for this, do I? I will go through each of the speakers and try and pick out the most relevant points. It will not take long.

Councillor Wakefield had a go at the provision of health and social care services in the east of Leeds. It reminds me of the Neighbourhood Wardens which as part of health and social care in East Leeds were absolutely decimated by a cut in central Government funding.

I think Keith welcomed the appointment of Bill Kilgallon. The point about that is, he is appointed, he is accepted and we will have no criticism when he comes back. If you do not like what he says, it applies to us all. We all have to be bound by Bill Kilgallon's recommendations.

I think he also made the point – several of you made the point – that small organisations were having trouble compiling this information. There was no relationship whatsoever between the competence of small and large organisations to complete the form. It was nothing to do with the numbers of employees. 75% or probably 80% of the people in the organisations completed this form, did it perfectly satisfactorily in the time without outside help. The idea of paying £1,000 for a professional to assist is unbelievable. Councillor Kendal would have done it for nothing, somebody else said – Councillor Kendall actually did it for her care in Roundhay ward. I will come back to Councillor Gruen in a minute.

Lucinda, I think somebody pinched your speech for later on, wasn't it? You said could we have an independent review, I think. That is about a fortnight too late,

is it not? You talked about talking, listening to older people. There is a thing in this city called the Older People's Forum. I think I have seen one Labour Member there at the Older People's Forum at which we listen to representatives of older people's organisations. In the last three years there have been four or five Councillors there but there has rarely been a Labour Councillor there to listen.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Shame.

COUNCILLOR HARRAND: They meet at the church – I will give you the names and the addresses. Never heard of it? Exactly.

COUNCILLOR YEADON: I did not say that in my speech. I do not think you were listening to my speech.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: No, we know.

COUNCILLOR HARRAND: The Older People's Forum is where you can listen. There is also the suggestion that you were raising concerns for many months. My file corresponds from numerous on complaints about Neighbourhood Networks is extremely thin. If there is a lot of letters to somebody else you must show me them, I have not seen those at all.

Tom seems completely to misunderstand the purpose of it in his assessment and whether that was a political oversight or an intellectual oversight I am not here to say. It is nothing to do with individual strategic needs but the point has been made, John said, about Betty. Why did you not come and talk to me about Betty? Why did you not write tome about Betty?

COUNCILLOR MURRAY: I will come and talk to you.

COUNCILLOR HARRAND: Do it tomorrow. Individual circumstances are not appropriate for debates in this chamber.

The Strategic Needs Assessment document, which you should have been talking about under this heading, is actually one of the most interesting and important that we have had at Executive Board for a long time and that is not what we have been talking about this afternoon.

I will not embarrass Robert by saying that I agree with everything that he said, but I agree with everything he said. No major political party nationally is willing to confront it, that is our own party and everybody else's as well. Society does not want to think about how it is going to look after its older people. All the wrong people are worried about this. Elderly geriatrics like me are all right, we will look after ourselves; people in their thirties and forties want to be really worried about this because the system as it is now provided is nothing like what you are going to get when it is your turn, I promise you.

Alison said we should come up with a plan. That is exactly what we are going to do. Terry made the point about the thousand pounds – yes, we have dealt with that. Councillor Selby said nothing new and certainly not much of it was true either, really.

Suzi's point about rural areas, that surely is totally irrelevant, and the accusation of profits before people, I would like to know who is making profits out of this. Perhaps the person who charged £1,000 to fill the form in but that is the only person.

I will not comment on Councillor Selby's point on the legal position. If we have to have a legal review of this so be it, we are ready for it.

Let us get back to Councillor Gruen, who uttered the immortal Gruen-like words, "Why didn't you interfere?" and that is the message I want you to take back to all your Neighbourhood Networks. Councillor Gruen would have interfered. Councillor Gruen's opinion would be the one that the officers' arms had been twisted to listen to.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: At least they would have tried.

COUNCILLOR HARRAND: I have not interfered because that is not my job. Professional, independent objective people have made this report. Councillor Gruen would not have permitted that. Councillor Gruen said, "Why didn't you interfere?"

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: I did not say "interfere".

COUNCILLOR HARRAND: I shall not interfere. You would have interfered.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Why didn't you call it in?

COUNCILLOR HARRAND: The position of the Adult Executive Board Member is not to try and influence the results of these investigations.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Bill Hyde said the same thing.

COUNCILLOR HARRAND: I will organise it, I will endorse it and I will defend it but my goodness me I will not interfere like Councillor Gruen did.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Or Bill Hyde.

COUNCILLOR HARRAND: When we get to the result of Bill Kilgallon's review I shall not interfere but please be ready for interference and distance themselves from the results on the other side, misrepresentation. What Bill Kilgallon recommends, unless it is absolutely unthinkable – which it will not be – is what will be put in place. What we will not do is allow Labour Councillors from the other side to interfere either now or any time in the future. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

(o) Licensing & Regulatory Panel

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. We now move on to the Licensing sub-committee. Councillor Finnigan.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I wanted to comment on page 221 Minute 7. I know you have been interested in this. The Leeds Road Post Office – Application for a premises licence. Can we say from the outset that we are grateful to Councillor Hyde, Councillor Dunn and Councillor Rhodes-Clayton who treated us with absolute respect, listened to everything we actually said and we are grateful for the reasonable and fair hearing that they actually gave us, but this is a problem and wider problem to do with the Licensing Act and certainly it proves to me that the Licensing Act is totally bonkers and needs to be scrapped in its entirety.

We are in a situation here where if anybody wants to apply for an off-licence, then they can pretty much do that and the only thing you can do is impose certain conditions on them and if there is a problem that is created as a result of having a further off-licence in your particular area, you can try and unpick that at a later date. It is absolutely ridiculous.

We are in a situation where the next off-licence that is close to this particular one is probably 150 yards away and it is absolutely bonkers that in an area which has already got problems with antisocial behaviour, got problems with youths drinking under age, that we should be presenting them with a further opportunity to be able to do that and only be able to resolve that matter, resolve that problem, at a point where the problem actually occurs.

The Licensing Act really has not helped matters in any shape, way or form. If we look at the costs imposed in terms of antisocial behaviour and its impact on the police or its impact on the NHS as a result of alcohol abuse, Accident & Emergency is overwhelmed, if we look at the impact in terms of lost working days and it is clear to me that what we need to consider or we need to reflect about is not liberating the licensing legislation but looking at better ways of controlling and trying to reduce the damage that alcohol does. I think that that is something that we need to give some serious consideration to.

All credit to the Scots Nats who have been serious about looking at this particular one. They have looked at a minimum unit price for alcohol and that is something that we need to seriously think about. If anybody thinks realistically that more education is the answer here, then they really do need perhaps to see a psychiatrist. Everybody knows the damage that is undertaken, that happens to people if they do abuse alcohol. It is clear but the problem is that it is easily accessible and is far too cheap and until you deal with those particular problems, we are going to be in a constant cycle of talking to the police and talking to licensing to see about what they can do to resolve problems that actually hit us. It makes no sense whatsoever.

We ought to change the licensing legislation so that if you do want a new off-licence in a particular area you have to prove that there is a need for that particular off-licence. In this case, the applicant came along and said, "Well, if there are two off-licences in the space of 150 yards, it is great because that will mean there is more competition and the price of alcohol will fall." What is the sense in that? There is no sense whatsoever at a point where youths can get hold of alcohol, strong alcohol at very, very low prices and that leads to that cycle that we all know about and the problems that it actually creates. To be offering a further opportunity to bring down the price of alcohol in the local area – this happens to be Tingley but it happens everywhere else – and make it even more accessible than it was before makes no sense whatsoever.

To be honest, I admire the Licensing Sub-Committee because they must hear this all the time. They are doing a great job within the restrictions that they have got but you have got a Licensing Act that needs scrapping and needs to be reconsidered from scratch. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Finnigan. Councillor Hyde, please.

COUNCILLOR G HYDE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I did not know I was going to speak, actually, till I walked in the room. Thank you, Councillor Finnigan, for your comments. Obviously I Chaired the Panel. I may want to make you a suggestion which is maybe for you an impact policy for Morley and the surrounding area about the number of licensed establishments. As you said, we had a fair hearing and the decision was made as listed but you may want to look at that as a group of Members for the Morley area. I think my colleague Councillor Wilson will probably respond better than I. Thank you.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Hyde. Councillor Dunn.

COUNCILLOR DUNN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Thank you, Councillor Finnigan, for your kind comments to us. We did indeed give a fair hearing and so did the objectors alongside you. We listened to all the objections but, as you outlined quite rightly, we are bound by the Licensing Act but there are many occasions when the Licensing Act looks to be worthwhile. I do agree that for some of us it is very frustrating. I am very encouraged by the fact of ward Members now object freely without having to be consulted and that is a step in the right direction.

We can also outline the comment made about the off-licences being near to each other with the fast food outlets which, again, are equal in nuisance value. I think where the pubs were the main source of the problems, now it is moving on to the convenience stores and off-licences and we have to address that.

I do take on board his comments and I recognise the need to have a constant revisit to the 2003 Licensing Act and I am sure if he comes before us again he will get a fair hearing just the same. Thank you.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Dunn. I now call on Councillor Wilson to sum up.

COUNCILLOR FELDMAN: Councillor Wilson has asked me to do it in his place. He has not been able to look at the paperwork so I am doing the summing up on his behalf.

What Councillor Finnigan says in general is quite right, that there are lots of things regarding this Act that are not exactly what we would want. By the time the Act came out we were told in effect at one time to definitely allow 24 hour drinking. In Leeds we had more sense. There were 15 Councillors who are on the sub-committees and we took the sensible idea that if a pub was in a residential area, no way were we going to give them 24 hours. A year later we got an instruction from Government sources and we did not have to give this 24 hours, so it has been changed in the past and hopefully the Act could be changed in the future because we all know and we all agree that there are problems that as the price of alcohol comes down the youngsters drink more and more and show themselves up, because that is really what they are doing.

Our problem and the problem of everyone who chairs the meetings – and I have chaired very many of them – is that we have to listen to the evidence and decide whether or not we would give a licence.

The second problem is that if we do not give a licence and those who have applied go to the Magistrates' Court, it could cost this Authority an awful lot of money regularly, so therefore at times it goes against the grain, at times you think to yourself, "I wish we did not have to do this" but nevertheless we have to listen to the evidence, weigh it up carefully, take advice from the legal representative who is there from Council and I think all my colleagues would agree, we get tremendously good advice from the legal team who turn up. We have to give reasons particularly if we are going to object to it, if we are going to refuse it, because those reasons are vital if it does go to Magistrates' Court.

I can sympathise with you in total but at the end of the day what we are dealing with is the one case that you brought to the Panel. I know you have commented on it but the last sentence in one of the paragraphs says, "Should the premises breach its premises licence or be of serious concern to the residents, there is the right to apply for a review of the premises licence." The reason I am really

bringing this out now is I think everybody needs to know that whether or not you win or lose, if the applicants misbehave in the future, you have got come back because the licence that we give is literally for ever, so that is where you need to know that there is a come back and that is a come back. If it goes wrong you are entitled to a review and the committee will then look at it, obviously, in an even more serious way than they do.

In general I agree with the comments that you made and it is a pity that the Act is written so poorly. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Feldman. I understand that Councillor Wilson would like to speak now.

COUNCILLOR WILSON: By way of apology to the Council, I have literally just arrived so I was not aware that this question was being asked, but the two Councillors concerned, Councillor Finnigan and Councillor Hyde, I will certainly have a look at this particular one that the Morley Council is concerned about and I will contact them both. Once again, I apologise for not being able to answer and thank Ronnie for doing such a good job on my behalf. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Wilson. I am now going straight to Councillor Andrew Carter to exercise the right of final reply.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Yes, my Lord Mayor. Could I begin when I introduced the Minutes by thanking somebody? At 2.00 pm tomorrow it is Mike Wilkinson's last Standards Committee, having been Chair of the Standards Board for eight years and it would be wholly remiss and let me put this caveat in. Some of us may be very unhappy about the way that Standards have developed but that is an issue for Whitehall and not the Civic Hall and I think we should record our thanks to Mike Wilkinson for the way in which he has conducted his role as Chair of the Standards Board and indeed the running of the Standards Board in Leeds and, at the same time as thanking Mike, wish his successor every success. Some of us will look forward to a change of Government and a complete change in the regime, which is none of the Chairman's fault, I have to say.

Right, my Lord Mayor, if I could comment on the Minutes. A lot of things to comment on there and, as we are having a further debate on Adult Social Care a little later, I will just pass this comment, that perhaps the most telling intervention of the afternoon came from Councillor Finnigan, and I actually agree with every word that he said. This country faces a massive challenge in terms of properly caring for our elderly people and many of us here will be elderly, some before others, and we face in this country a massive challenge. I think it is fair to say, as Robert Finnigan did, that none of the three major political parties want to engage in meaningful discussions about it at the moment. That is quite clear. I can understand why but in the long term – not in the long term, in the very short term – we are all going to have to engage in a proper, frank discussion about how we look after properly elderly people in this country, particularly in England, I have to say.

Also, a debate, perhaps, about the fact that in Western Europe we ration life-saving drugs and other countries seem to be able to supply them to their citizens, whereas in this country we put it through a body called NICE and some of them never see the light of day.

My Lord Mayor, if I may comment now on the Minutes. It never ceased to amaze me, really, that the Labour Party over there – the Councillors over there, I will not say the Labour Party because they seem to be totally dismembered. They do not seem to be joined in any way to their own Government unless it suits their purpose.

They talk about education. I have been at the wrong end of the bullying tactics of Mr Knight and Mr Balls and Richard and other colleagues even more so. They have a view and they believe they should force their view on to this City Council and the people of Leeds.

Actually Richard, I think, very accurately set out the position in terms of City of Leeds and Parklands and I agree with every word that he has said, but Bernard Atha and Dowson, the double act – it sounds like a firm of undertakers to the Labour Party (*laughter*) – really, they direct your ire at your own Ministers. I would love to know – as you know, I am getting used to this Freedom of Information stuff now, it is brilliant, you can get all sorts of stuff back.

COUNCILLOR ATHA: Depends who you are. We cannot get anything back (*laughter*) except your letters.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: I appreciate John Illingworth now, it has become a national sport, really.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: It's a fair cop.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: I hope I am getting extra time for being diverted, Lord Mayor. No more banter from you, Bernard. You really should.

COUNCILLOR ATHA: We do.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: You are the people who set up the educational reorganisation that stuck the girls' school on the site it is on at Parklands and put the City of Leeds School on the site it is on at Hyde Park.

They were doomed to fail. You put them in places where they were doomed to fail and now your Ministers are finishing the job by telling us to close them. You cannot escape.

COUNCILLOR ATHA: Ignore them. Tell them to go to hell.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: You cannot escape. I have to say, Bernard, I do my very best to ignore your Ministers and very shortly, with a bit of luck, they will be amongst the lengthening dole queue that they themselves have created, so we may get them. It is far more serious because there is a huge attachment to the City of Leeds School and for the work that that school has tried to do, the way it has improved, and that is why officers make the recommendations that they believe are right. It is not like the days, Bernard, when you used to write the reports and pretend it was from an officer. We now actually get reports from our highly paid Executive Officers and if we do not like them, we say so in public in Executive Board and alter them, which is precisely what Richard Harker did and which all of us agreed to. In fairness, Keith Wakefield almost agreed as well.

We say we wanted to see a final report on City of Leeds that indicated ways in which we could keep an education facility on site. That is a commitment, that is something we want to do, that is what we want to see happen if it is deliverable.

That is not quite what the officers were saying but, as I say, we make it very clear, we bring the reports as they are written from the professionals and if we do not agree, we alter them in public so everybody knows what we are doing.

I will not go down too long a discussion with Councillor Driver, but it is not above six weeks ago that your party, Geoff, had the opportunity to put an alternative

budget and I do not recall there was ever mention in that budget of extra resources for either grounds maintenance or parks or the upkeep of our green spaces, so take it up with your Leader, do not bring it up in here six weeks after the event and say "You should have put more resources in there" because you are six weeks too late.

What I can guarantee you is that we will keep the green spaces of this city in far better condition than you ever did.

My Lord Mayor, I will turn finally in this part of the agenda to the arena, because I contrast it with the current Labour Government. I was horrified to hear Ed Miliband when questioned on the Labour Party manifesto and asked where the cuts were coming, to say two areas – he said regeneration and welfare.

Let us just stick to regeneration for a moment. Regeneration means highways and transport infrastructure, it means housing, it means development of brownfield sites rather than greenfield sites, it means schemes like EASEL in East Leeds, it means comprehensive regeneration that has been promised to citizens in various parts of this city for a generation. That is what it means and because they have ring-fenced so much – or say they have – other funding, the level of cuts that will fall on these very important areas under a Labour Government will be horrendous – horrendous – because it is through regeneration that you create proper jobs.

I go back to what the arena means to the city and I have to say, I do thank Members for their kind comments about my role in the arena project but I have to tell you, we have a group of very professional officers who have done a magnificent job in bringing this project to the point it is now at, and I also want to thank my colleagues certainly from *that* point round the room for their absolute support and also some colleagues over there who belatedly came to the party, so to speak.

Let me just tell you very quickly precisely what that scheme means. First of all, we are already getting enquiries about regenerating adjacent brownfield sites because of what we are doing on that site. Hugely important for the future of the city and for people currently unemployed in the building industry all around the city, from Morley to Pudsey to Garforth and particularly in the inner city areas around the site.

I am going to go through the list again of what we have signed up to because we have had comments before about different contracts the Council have let for house building or whatever and what does it do for jobs. Let me tell you what this does for real jobs and for future jobs in this city.

In conjunction with ourselves the successful contractor has undertaken 22 school or college visits promoting the building industry; eleven school or college workshops; two university research programmes to develop academic research on the project; safeguarding 30 apprenticeships and creating 60 new apprenticeships; 80 new roles for local residents through Job Centre Plus; 22 new roles for residents closest to the site in Little London, City and Hunslet through Job Centre Plus; 110 local construction jobs safeguarded; five business events held for potential sub-contractors with at least 22 Leeds businesses being engaged with a further seven businesses across the Yorkshire region. This is good news for investment in the city of Leeds and it should not be under-estimated. This project will not be – will not be – damaged by cuts in regeneration. My fear is that many others will. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Carter. I would now like to call for the vote on the motion to receive the Minutes. (*A vote was taken*) The motion is PASSED.

It is now time for tea and I invite the people in the public gallery to join us in the Banquet Hall and I would ask everybody to be back here at 5.20 to restart the Council meeting. Thank you.

(The Council adjourned for a short time)

WHITE PAPER MOTION – KIRKGATE MARKET

THE LORD MAYOR: We are now moving on to the White Paper papers. The first one is in the name of Councillor Dobson, regarding Kirkgate Market. Councillor Dobson.

COUNCILLOR DOBSON: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. It is difficult, actually, moving this White Paper in terms of the deputation that came in this afternoon from the Leeds Branch of the National Market Federation was so eloquent and skilful in the summing up of what they see as the issues and concerns that really a lot of the bases have actually in fact been covered.

I am going to offer something of a personal perspective, if I may. In moving this White Paper on behalf of the Labour Group, I have to say that under any circumstances I would be declaring a very personal interest indeed. My late father, mother and her mother before her were all traders on Leeds Market and my formative years were spent in the market around the business community in what can only be described as an extended family – words there that I hope resonate with this Council – a business community and family because, my Lord Mayor, that is what a market is. They are not a group of traders working in isolation, nor are they a shopping centre although, that said, the way they have been managed over the last six years and before would leave an impartial person looking in to think that is exactly what Leeds market is. In fact, they are a unique community of traders. That must be pivotal in this debate, the uniqueness of the market – a market and market traders and that uniqueness must not be lost through neglect, mismanagement or, indeed, under-investment.

For too long administrations (plural) of this Council have been happy to take rent receipts of in excess of £1m per annum without having the real knowledge and skill of the fundamental understanding of what a market is, what makes it tick or, indeed, how to make it thrive and prosper.

I would go further. In that abdication of responsibility in terms of maintaining a thriving and prosperous market, I think the administration has not simply let down traders but also the people of Leeds and the broader Leeds economy.

A bit of a trip down memory lane but the Leeds market of my youth in the late 60s and early 70s was a real intoxicating myriad of colour, diversity and a breadth of trading that was second to none across the region. I think people of a certain age who are Leeds born and bred will remember one of the very first nails in the coffin was the fire in 1975 and the aftermath of the fire and the 1976 extension. Even then after that, after that period when the market was resurrected like a phoenix, I can vividly remember getting on the old 68 bus, going to the Green Bus Station, visiting my mother and then going out to do the family shopping with my older sister. We would get our fruit, vegetables, fish, clothing – it was all packed under one bustling roof.

Now you could argue, and I am sure others will, that this yearning for a bygone age is simply that – the turning back of the clock that cannot be replicated in the 21st Century. I would profoundly disagree. As late as last week I had a fantastic

experience in the market when my partner and I bought our fresh seafood, fish, the accompanying spices and vegetables to enable us to prepare a delicious, wholesome, nutritious meal for all under £10.

I hear a lot in this Council and in other bodies about narrowing the gap. What better way to achieve this than the promotion, development and inward investment of a city institution that is already on our doorstep and has been for many, many decades.

What is going wrong? A phrase that I am echoing from our friends earlier. Firstly, I believe the market needs an old style market management structure with a market manager in place that understands what a market is, what the traders do, who works there and the need for the community that we all hope to represent and I think they need it now.

Let us be realistic – I think we know that the current financial climate means that the £70m Eastgate Redevelopment is an aspiration, but therefore the promise of jam tomorrow that I see as hindering the real investment in the market in terms of what we can do with the 1976 part of the building especially, has to be lifted. There has to be some significant investment now.

I welcome the £250,000 but it is for all the traders in the commercial sector under the Council's auspices and it will not equate to much money in terms of real delivery in terms of the market.

Whilst the 1904 building is still a wonderful Grade I listed building, so much more can be done with the 1976 extension and I would suggest we could do this – an immediate removal of the obsession with encroachment - as I say, it is a market, it is not a shopping centre – it is a market. The immediate reinstatement of the right of traders to shout their wares. Joking aside, there is literally more atmosphere on the moon than in Leeds market on certain days and we really have to address that. A return to dedicated rows that complement each other in trading terms and not the horrible mis-match of tenants I see on regular visits. I really do not think it is appropriate for a hairdressing shop to be on the butcher's row – it looks out of place, it feels out of place and I know traders really do not like that sort of approach.

As I alluded to earlier, there is real quality still to be found in the market and that must be nurtured and encouraged to grow if the market is to have a significant future.

I think we need the development of a market management team that understands, has empathy with and a willingness to work with traders in that really unique collaboration that is a market; a management that aids and assists and does not suffocate traders.

It is not a perfect example but I will draw your attention to what is going on in London down at Covent Garden there. You used to go down a few years ago and it was completely moribund, it was dead on its feet. Through a reasonable amount of investment but, moreover, a vision, that market has been completely revitalised and regenerated. To achieve that there was a political will and a management that understood what was required, and even in an economic downturn I think that can be a unique opportunity for us.

Why not work with local street performers, approach Leeds College of Music and others to develop a unique and diverse shopping experience for the people of Leeds and across the region?

Most importantly, a serious and urgent look at the restructuring of rents and the ironing out of the unfair anomalies. We should consider such things as a free rent period, or rent freeze, I should say, to enable traders to effectively catch up. The stories I am hearing from the market is that they have got rent to pay and they are paying that rent to their landlord – us – but in effect what is happening is wholesalers are being made to wait and made to wait and made to wait. That has a knock-on effect for the whole economy and, of course, from the market traders' perspective, they are robbing Peter to pay Paul, so perhaps some sort of freeze could be considered to help them through that crisis.

My colleagues on these benches will elaborate, no doubt, on the restrictive management processes currently being imposed on traders. They will no doubt comment on those self-same anomalies on the rental system where a transient trader coming into the market can benefit significantly from reduced rents on a second unit of up to 90% while prestigious traders of many years' standing have been forced to the wall and do not share that benefit. That must be wrong. We take premium rent and rates from traders; valued long-term tenants and traders deserve premium support from the council – us, their landlords.

Leeds, Live it, Love it. For my sins I have lived here nearly 47 years and loved every minute of it but I am convinced that Marketing Leeds loves Leeds Kirkgate Market enough. I asked a friend recently to name some Leeds city landmarks and his reply was not surprising at all – the Civic Hall, the Town Hall, Millennium Square, the Corn Exchange. Not one mention of Leeds Kirkgate Market. Try accessing Leeds Kirkgate on Marketing Leeds's website. It is there if you are computer literate and can move round the screens.

When I was a kid "Yorkshire's Number One Market" was emblazoned across buses and advertising hoardings across the city and its reputation as a market across the region was second to none. Traders are currently talking with the student body about encouraging use of the market as a place to purchase good quality food at reasonable prices. For young people living away from home for the first time, what a fantastic opportunity to come into the market, live well whilst living away from home. As a parent with a daughter going to university in September, that is something I would fully want to sign up to. Why not give them an empty unit for Freshers' Week, let them hand out some leaflets, get the kids down into the market, see what the market can offer them?

My point is, this sort of work should be coming via Marketing Leeds, not from the market traders who seem to be driving the agenda at the moment.

I do not accept "Well, you know Councillor Dobson, if you want cheap clothes you go to Primark; if you want cheap goods you go to Lidl." The market can fulfil so many functions. The Councillors, I think, with a bit of vision, drive, investment and radical revised management structures, Leeds Kirkgate market can once again hit those heights. Surely it is our responsibility to make it so.

Let us be honest, we made mistakes – they are still being made. I think the thing now is we need to start listening and we need to act and I know my group is prepared to do that. I would like to think the Council as a whole can come on this journey with us. We cannot kill the goose that for so many years has laid the golden egg. I genuinely fear for the short-term survival of the market unless something gives, and fast. Therefore, I move the White Paper. Thank you, Lord Mayor.
(Applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Dobson. I call on Councillor Keith Wakefield to second, please.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: I second and reserve the right to speak.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. I am now moving to the amendment in the name of Councillor Anderson.

COUNCILLOR ANDERSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Could I just start by pointing out one thing? Marketing Leeds does – emphasis on the word “does” – indeed use Kirkgate Market to help to promote the city to region, national and international audiences and has, for example, taken visiting journalists on tours of the market in the past, so Marketing Leeds are doing their bit.

However, it is not within the remit of Marketing Leeds to undertake bespoke campaigns for specific services or attractions. However, City Centre Management and Marketing Leeds have in recent years collaborated very effectively in promoting the city centre through festivals such as Leeds Loves Food and Shopping Leeds.

This collaboration will continue and market traders, along with all other retailers, cafés and restaurants, will be given every opportunity to participate in these events and benefit from the co-ordinated publicity.

The Council remains determined to continue to take the necessary measures to help the market not only survive but thrive.

With respect to marketing, steps are being taken to develop an official website which will feature every trader free of charge, and a marketing strategy to promote not only Kirkgate Market but district markets as well and we are also trying to identify students as well, because, like you, we do feel that the student market, not just the students we have got, are a good potential source of trade for the market traders.

Traders are also being encouraged to participate in the Leeds Loves Food Festival early July although, unfortunately, the take-up has been very slow, so maybe they need to address that themselves.

On 12 April the markets were positively featured on national BBC Breakfast News a number of times during the two hours broadcast. The markets have also been filmed in recent months for a number of television dramas. Unfortunately, some representatives of the National Market Traders' Federation have actually asked markets management not to promote the market, so some of the traders have actually said, “Do not market it” because of the concerns that they have, so we need to get clear exactly what it is that we are talking about.

One other thing, negative publicity. Some traders do seem intent – and I accept that they have the right to do so before I say anything else – to contact the YEP and the Guardian Online to make their points known, but unfortunately every negative comment does down any positive comment that has been made either by anyone in this Chamber, because I do not think there is anybody in this Chamber who would not actively support and promote the market, so we can say a whole lot of good things today but all it takes is one trader to go and point out the negative and that does down every single comment that has been made, no matter how hard we all work together, so we need to try and look at that.

There have been a number of traders constantly going on about closing and highlighting some building problems in the 1985 and 1976 sections. This is extremely frustrating for traders who are moving with the times and promoting the market positively. One bad news story, as I said, can mark things out.

Frequently the claims that are being made by tenants are at best misleading or simply wrong. For example, traders have claimed that more and more stalls are closing and that the future of the market could be under threat. In fact, new traders have joined the market, 39, and only 37 have left in the last twelve months to 31 March 2010. Also, traders leave for a variety of reasons, including retirement, ill-health or relocation to a shop. For example, recent publicity surrounding a Friends of Kirkgate Market meeting led some traders whose first language is not English to believe that the market is closing in two months' time, so they were going to stop reordering stock. Fortunately market staff became aware of this misunderstanding and were able to reassure them, so how did that get out there? Nobody can say it was the Council that misinterpreted that. Somebody must have given the impression, the negative story yet again.

In terms of the market's management, the Head of Markets, Chris Sanderson, left the Council on 31st December, although his last day of work was 30th November. On 1st December the Market Service transferred from Asset Management to Economic Development within City Development and became the responsibility of Kath Follin, the then City Centre Manager, who became Head of City Centre and Markets.

I would ask you if any other officer who is working harder and with a better team to sell the city and to move the markets forward and use innovation, innovative thinking in what she is doing. She is excellent, she is an asset to the city and promotes it at every opportunity she can, so from that perspective I think we are going well down what we are doing.

In recognition of Kath's existing responsibilities for the city centre, a new post of Markets Manager was created. However, to enable a full review of staffing to take place an Acting Markets Manager, Chris Ashby, formerly Deputy Markets Manager, was appointed on a six month contract. A review of staffing is currently being carried out and there is no Council ban on recruitment. Current procedures are that posts must be advertised internally first and only when a suitable candidate cannot be found can they be advertised externally.

While I am on this subject, I want to make one thing really clear here. Personal attacks on officers of this Council by traders or by anybody purporting to stand up for traders are not acceptable. These officers are giving their effort – yes, they get paid for doing so but they are doing everything within their power to move the markets forward. Not one of them is going into work in a morning and saying, "What can I do to cause problems today?" I have had to listen to insults on staff of this Council which is unfounded and is not in keeping with what we are trying to do.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: We live in a democracy, for God's sake.

COUNCILLOR ATHA: Bring in the secret police, that's what I say.

COUNCILLOR ANDERSON: Exactly. That is a perfect example, Bernard, thank you for making my point.

Other ways in which the Kirkgate Market and its traders have been supported. In terms of opening hours, the market is now open on Wednesday afternoons. Initially this was only the 1904 building and Butcher's Row but following representatives from the local branch of traders the whole market was opened, but again many traders have complained about sales falling but did they take it up? No.

One thing you may not be aware of, that out of one retail pound 35p of that retail pound is being spent at nights after six o'clock or at weekends. Has the market responded by being open to try and get access to some of that 35p, because otherwise they are only after 65p of that retail pound, so they need to be more competitive and look at their practices in order to get the other 35p, which I personally hope they start taking a bigger share of.

We have also, as we have said, invested – not just this administration but the previous administration as well – and, as we said in the presentations, it has been going on for 20 years, the problems that they felt they had, but the Council is investing over £11.5m in environmental refurbishments to Kirkgate Market, including the refurbishment of the stalls, roof, floor in the indoor market, installing new stalls, improved toilet facilities, automated doors, CCTV.

Then you said what about rents? We have offered a rent free period for new tenants. I think that is quite good to try and attract people in. We have offered a 90% rent reduction on additional stalls taken an existing trader so they can expand. We have developed a business support package and unfortunately we have put a lot of money into that business support package but only 20 traders have taken advantage of that to get some good advice as to how they can improve things for themselves. Then there is the LEGI scheme, which again is criticised by traders because it has taken stalls. Just look at the success that LEGI has brought. If you want full details, look at the delegated decision that was made recently and you will see all the benefits that are accruing and all the businesses that are starting up as a result of that.

We have also improved community safety. It is now safer to be in the market. Because of investment in PCSOs and reduction of burglaries and various other things, we have done really well on that, I would argue.

To conclude, what I am really saying is that it is not all bad news. Jamie Oliver's Ministry of Food is going to be opening up this summer. We must be doing something right if he is going to do it. The new street market in Brewery Wharf will help to introduce new customers to market shopping and act as a signpost to Kirkgate. Additional capital investment in the market is being made for the follow-up consultation with traders – emphasis on with consultation with traders. Nobody is saying what is definitely going to be done; we are only doing it in consultation with the traders. Possible options include, for example, some things you mentioned, the creation of event space and the creation of a craft market inside the indoor market.

One thing we need to start doing is start to reduce the number of complaints. There are a lot of complaints by the public, complaints about traders, and I think they have doubled, in fact, in the last eight years, so something has been doing wrong there and so we need to try and work with traders to sort that out.

You may or may not have asked your ward colleague, Councillor Murray. He is investing some of his time, some of his organisation, in opening a stall up there so that he can get a jobs market. I think we are doing things right in this administration and please support my amendment. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Anderson. Could I call on Councillor Campbell to second, please.

COUNCILLOR CAMPBELL: I second and reserve my right to speak.

COUNCILLOR: I don't blame you, Colin.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Leadley to comment.

COUNCILLOR LEADLEY: My Lord Mayor, perhaps I need to declare a personal interest in this matter. My father was a greengrocer for nearly 40 years until his death in 1984. He bought at Leeds Wholesale Market, which was at Kirkgate until 1966 and during the school holidays we would go there. It opened at about four o'clock in the morning in summer and I think about half-past in winter. In the 1960s there were more than 40 wholesalers who served many hundreds of greengrocers. Now there are only two wholesalers, Ernest White's and Gilbert Thompson's, who were featured in the Yorkshire Evening Post in January.

People tend to agree that the market is not like it used to be. Some say that it has never been the same since wholesalers went to Pontefract Lane; others since the big fire in 1975. Whatever the exact truth, Kirkgate Market does not dominate food supply as it once did. Fifty years ago you could have starved Leeds out by stopping the market.

One of the main problems is that it is just beyond the eastern edge of today's central shopping area, on the wrong side of Vicar Lane. If it was not for people walking through it to and from the bus station, it really would be out on a limb. What we have now is a market which is a lot less busy than it was 20, 40 or 50 years ago. It must be a long time since anyone had to push their way through the crowds. About one in six of the indoor market stalls are empty.

Labour's record on Kirkgate Market is none too good. In the 1980s they would have handed it over to speculators to be turned into an exclusive shopping mall with the market pushed to one side.

COUNCILLOR: Shame.

COUNCILLOR LEADLEY: Market traders gathered a quarter of a million signatures to stop this and only the City Council's loss of a public enquiry on narrow points to do with compulsory purchase of leases prevented it from going through.

To either side are stark signs of decay. Some buildings at the market end of Kirkgate have stood derelict for years, though planned improvements have been reported recently, including a bid to the Heritage Lottery Fund. Land between George Street and New York Road has been in steady decline since the 1960s. Within that sweep the Eastgate Harewood Quarter Project had been hailed as a great saviour, though there were doubts about it even at outline planning stage when some Members of City Centre Plans Panel voted against it.

In the current recession it is not remarkable that Eastgate Harewood has come to a halt. We must take stop and ask whether it is likely ever to go forward at all in anything like its currently permitted form. The additional retail floor space seems enormous even in boom years, especially as there always seem to be empty shops in the existing shopping area.

It would not be helpful if new life were kept out of the east end of the city centre for many more years by a scheme which failed to progress and had little hope of doing so. After the 1975 fire it was all of eight months before the replacement building was opened. Of course, things were done in a much more plodding manner in those days without much help from computers and so on.

One claim that seems to be made by traders is that the markets management has been too bureaucratic and unimaginative. It might be worth having a Market Manager and a Market Management Board including Councillors, rather like the City

Varieties and Grand Theatre. If it is run by bureaucrats it will carry on slowly dying. Thank you, my Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Leadley. I now call on Councillor Ann Blackburn.

COUNCILLOR A BLACKBURN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I, like most of us, I think, am concerned about the market. I do go in the market when I am in town. I tend to come in town on a Saturday afternoon. I do not always go in but I do go in very regularly. I buy fruit and veg and sometimes clothing there, so I do use it. I do not know how many Councillors do but I do and therefore I can say that, yes, I am concerned because there are a lot of stalls empty at the moment.

I have seen the people going through on the Saturday afternoon when it used to be thriving and it is not as thriving as it was, so we have got to get people in these stalls. I have also noticed that the fruit and veg stalls tend to be – there are a few of them but not as many as there used to be at one time. Obviously there is outside markets as well but that is another matter.

The thing I go there for fruit and veg is obviously because there is a lack of unnecessary packaging there but, of course, if you go in the Morrison's supermarket and that you will see that that is always thriving on a Saturday, so it is a case I think sometimes that there are various places in Leeds for people to go and they do not always get down to the market.

As I have said, I do support the market. I hope we all support it. We need to do something about the empty stalls. We need ourselves as Councillors to promote it. I do not know how many people use it, as I have said before, so I think we as Councillors want to promote it as well because you can get good fruit and veg there, as I say not packaged up, not unnecessarily packaged.

I like the feel of it. I go in markets as well when I am on holiday, different markets because there are always various things there, there is a nice feel and it is interesting to see the new market stalls that have opened up as well, the variety of food now is on offer, warm food from different countries and whatever.

I do support us getting something sorted out about a Market Manager. I think we need to do that sooner rather than later. I also accept what has been said over on this side that we do need to look at it if there are any complaints about traders. I am not saying that there are a lot but I have dealt with some casework where there has been in the past, which I will not go into here, but I think we do need to look into that as well.

I hope we can get something sorted out because, as I say, and get ourselves a Market Manager and get those empty stalls with people on them. I just want to see it going again, want to see it thriving again. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Blackburn. Councillor Nash.

COUNCILLOR NASH: My Lord Mayor, my opening comments are stating the obvious. Kirkgate Market is an absolute gem in two respects. Firstly, it is housed in a magnificent Edwardian building and it is one of Leeds's few Grade I listed buildings. Leeds has many Grade II * buildings but not many of premier importance.

It was given Grade I status after the Labour Council carried out a refurbishment about 15 years ago. It is, as the deputation has said, the biggest covered market in Europe and together with the open air market, it is probably one of

the biggest markets in the world, something Leeds should be proud of, but can we, as the deputation said? There has been a total lack of investment in recent years.

Secondly, the market is renowned for the sale of bargains, primarily food but also clothes, hardware, crockery and craft shops, but who knows about this and who is reminded to shop there on a regular basis? Hardly anyone.

At one time the Council's Tourism Department recognised that the market was a tourist attraction and, as I am connected with the travel trade, I have over the years seen many advertisements in the travel trade press encouraging coach companies to bring groups of visitors to it, but I have to say I have not seen any of these advertisements recently. Tourists, although they are very welcome, are really what should be the icing on the cake.

Several years ago I did chair the then City Centre Committee, unfortunately just for one year. I had discussions with a television video company to produce a film advertising the market to be televised on Yorkshire Television and to be backed by advertisements in our local newspapers. Unfortunately before this could happen I was asked to chair another committee to cover a crisis and then, very soon after I had moved on, very tragically the then City Centre Manager, Phil Green, died most unexpectedly after a short illness and the impetus was lost.

There is a mindset in this Council to take the profits and not invest in essential marketing, and I am not talking about freebie journalism, however welcome that is. What have you done recently to advertise the market? Nothing. It is not enough to believe that the market can speak for itself. If people do not visit or have never visited, they do not know what there is on offer now at this unique institution.

Marks & Spencer's had the view that they were so good in what they sold they had no need to advertise. They were an institution which everyone knew about. After a huge decline in sales they very quickly changed their tune and, of course, Marks & Spencer's started with a stall in Leeds Open Air Market.

I will just declare an interest that I am a Member of the Co-operative Area Committee and the Leeds Co-operative Society, I was a Director of the Leeds Society for years and I tried to get them to advertise, particularly on television, both its food outlets and funeral shops but they had the same mindset as this Council. Since the merger with the Co-operative the sales have soared.

My Lord Mayor, we live in the 21st Century. It does not matter how good our product is, if people are not constantly reminded of it. This is especially so if you live at the other side of Leeds from the market. If one does not pass it on a regular basis, it drops from one's consciousness as there are competing claims for our attention. We should be proclaiming from the rooftops that shopping in Leeds market is fantastic experience, not just for tourists but for the weekly shop for all of us and we should use 21st Century advertising techniques available to us. My Lord Mayor, I call on the Council to do just that. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Nash. I now call on Councillor Wakefield.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I think this evening's contributions blend very well with the contributions this afternoon by the deputation. I think first of all they remind us what a wonderful asset it is, not just in architecture but in retail opera and, secondly and more importantly, how demoralised the stall holders are about the future of the market. I think it is a timely debate.

I think it is right to remind ourselves what an important part of the retail opera it is. We have Marks & Spencer's, the Victoria Quarter, Harvey Nics and other shops almost within minutes of the market. There is no other city in Britain that offers such a compact retail opera and it is vital not only for that but to ensure that people who would not go to Harvey Nics come into the city centre and make the city centre truly representative of our great city. Quite a few people who cannot afford Harvey Nics do go in there.

We have reflected this afternoon or this evening on some of the setbacks, and it is complex, Councillor Dobson is right. Over the last two years the markets have had to put up with a number of significant challenges. One is the recession. There is no doubt that the retail recession on the High Street made their life difficult. Two – and I do not wholly buy it like Mike does as well – there are other competitors. There are Primarks and there are Lidl's and so on, but that is too simple to say it is inevitable, it will fold.

I think one of the things that we need to do is first of all understand those challenges appropriately. I think it is right also to ask what help have they had so far? It would be wrong to say no help and, in fact, the business support scheme and, indeed, the change of management arrangements are being very welcome, but you have to balance that against the experience of the market people over the last two years, and I can tell you there is far more to do.

Eighteen months ago there was a blitz on traders in car parking fines. Two traders had 20 car parking fines in six months because they were unloading and loading in over 20 minutes. That is the kind of thing that they have to face and clearly it is demoralising and the parking is something we have to sort out.

Last March in the teeth of the recession – in the teeth of the recession – stallholders got a letter saying that if they were a day late with their rent they would be faced with bailiffs the next day. Finally, when, after 40 years – people will know the stall – he gave up at three o'clock on that afternoon, that person had security people go up to him and take the keys straightaway.

These might seem trivial but actually they add the message up that they are not being well regarded or looked after. It gets worse because the marketing budget last year was cut by £30,000.

I have to say, while we mention the role of Marketing Leeds, what we have not mentioned is About Leeds. In two years of that paper which goes to every citizen in Leeds, not one mention, direct mention of the market, has been made.

I understand the market's concerns. I understand when they want more. Something has started but there is a lot more to be done in this area. When they have started to negotiate and we have heard it from Councillor Anderson this afternoon, when they start to complain they get threatened. They get threatened by people and officers that if they say anything public they will not get the support. We live in a democracy. People are entitled to voice their concerns about the management of their organisation and I say, this White Paper that we have put down today is a genuine attempt to say to people this Council needs to listen more carefully, needs to put in a management system, that can work with them and needs to give them the resources to promote them, because if not we stand the risk of losing one of the best assets this city has and we should be ashamed of ourselves if they ever, ever leave Leeds City Centre. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Wakefield. Councillor Campbell.

COUNCILLOR CAMPBELL: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I think we all have a rather soft spot for the market. Some of us perhaps use it a lot, some of us perhaps do not use it very much but it has been a feature of Leeds life for all the years I have been a Member of the Council. I look round – probably as many as Bernard as well.

I think the rosy glow of nostalgia that Councillor Dobson has has moved on. The world is not what it was 20 years ago, 30 years ago. Markets have to change and the market in Leeds has to change.

I did think at the very beginning of this we might actually have an interesting discussion about how we saw, we as a Council, saw that change happening, what we saw were the market building's function within the 21st Century. In the end it drifted away from that.

I think actually market traders and Councillors and members of the public ought to engage in that discussion and make a decision on where they want the market to go because we patently cannot keep it going in the same way it is, we cannot keep it going in the way it was in 1950 because the world has changed.

It seems to me that the market traders should really take advantage of the Business Support Scheme because that does allow them to look at innovative ways of increasing trade, look at ways of changing direction, look at ways of introducing different retail opportunities within the market, and that is a positive step, I think, from the Council.

I also think, and it strikes me as strange that we seem to have a slight down, if that is the right word, on Kath Follin's team within City Centre Management and its ability to promote the market.

One of the problems about the market is, the market has been separate from the city centre. I have always regarded it as part of the city centre but for marketing purposes the market was always kept away from the City Centre Management Team. Why? Because they had a separate Markets Manager who ran it as a market.

It seems to me that by bringing it into that particular team, you are actually allowing this building to have access to the most successful city centre marketing team in the entire country. There is no city centre country that has had the publicity and the drive and the ambition for it that Leeds city centre has. It is important, I think, that we pull Leeds Market into that and we have got the team there who sold the city centre and can sell the market.

I should go out and grasp that with both hands. There are two opportunities there. There is an opportunity if you are a trader within the market to get really expert advice about where you are going and there is an opportunity through the City Centre Management to promote the market in a way that has not happened over the last 20, 30 years and make that an integral part of the experience that is Leeds centre. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Campbell. Councillor Grayshon.

COUNCILLOR GRAYSHON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I find this an interesting discussion. One of the problems is that people's shopping habits have changed over a period of time. I and Gareth, when we are in town on Saturday, do visit Leeds Market, sometimes directly from Harvey Nichols or the Victoria Quarter, crossing that road as I dare with a Harvey Nichols carrier bag I fear not for my life. The market is a wonderful asset to Leeds and we should do all we can to maintain it.

However, there are issues, as we are all aware. One of them is what I have written down as the Iceland syndrome – nothing to do with the volcano but for people who do not know about fresh fruits and vegetables, they just know a concept of it, so they go to Iceland to buy this sort of frozen food stuff when really they could go to Leeds market, buy some potatoes and make corned beef hash which would probably be better for them than eating some pre-prepared rubbish from Iceland - if anybody has got shares in Iceland I do apologise.

The working patterns of society have changed. I think somebody has already picked up on the fact that 35p in the pound is spent after six o'clock, but how long do you want to be there because I know market traders are there normally quite early on, but society changes. Does the market need, perhaps, to change with that, or do we need to look at how we can assist with that?

You also have the effect of places like the White Rose and the Core, I believe it is called, in Leeds, so people have a higher expectation of Leeds market. The Edwardian bit is really very, very nice and I think we could do more to enhance that. I know I have concerns about the Marks & Spencer clock which to me is an asset and maybe we should be banging on more about Marks & Spencer, particularly in their centenary year, and how it came to Leeds. I sent an email to Jean Dent, we sorted that out, we sorted out some other things in the market. I did that because I saw it having walked round there.

The situation is times move on. We need to ensure that we do all we can to support this. I know Councillor Leadley suggested a sort of Board of Directors for the market, for want of a phrase. That would seem something to me that could be quite sensible, that we could have representatives from the Council and the market traders – not necessarily the Federation of Market Traders but people who are in the market and they are interested in doing something to see how we can move things forward.

We have mentioned new media. There is a gentleman there who could possibly ask his tweets what they think of Leeds Market if they could be kind enough. Tweets are people who tweet and use Twitter. I dare not use Twitter at the moment until half-past seven this evening because my life will not be worth living – the gentleman over there can. There are all kinds of new media things.

I am a little concerned that we do not actually have a website for Leeds Market. That seems a bit strange to me, I would have thought we should have, but moving forward I am sure we can sort that out rather quickly. There are things we can do and I am sure that we should do it and move forward. I know the last time I was involved in any discussion about Leeds Market may, many years ago, one of the stallholders did point out to me that the public inquiry that Councillor Leadley referred to – and I think it is only fair that I remind everybody that it was the intervention of Margaret Thatcher that saved Leeds Market at that point. You might not want to hear that but the blessed Margaret apparently saved it, is what I was told.

Let us all move forward and see how we can help Leeds Market.
(*interruption*) Sensible woman, handbag, all that kind of thing, knew how to look after a family's budget. She knew what she was on. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Grayshon. Councillor Feldman.

COUNCILLOR FELDMAN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Originally I was not going to say anything on this subject but I was phoned by a lady who said to me, she wanted to come along and join in the debate. She obviously had no idea how a Council works. She said to me, "Whatever happens, don't let them close the market because in Sheffield, where I come from, they have closed the market and we are all

terribly upset.” I said to her, “Although you cannot say anything, I will stand up and say it for you.”

In addition to that I would like to let you all know that I am possibly in a unique situation in the whole Council because I doubt very much whether any of you have ever been a market trader. I have. I used to go to Dewsbury Market, to Leeds Market, South Elmsall and to York, so I understand the market trader mentality.

Also, because I had a background of markets, I was put on the Markets Committee when I first came on the Council in 1971. In those days we had a Market Manager called Mr Doyle and when you sat there at the meeting and you said to him, “I have had a complaint from Mr Smith”, he said, “Oh yes, Row 4 aisle so-and-so.” He knew everybody literally, where they stood, what they sold and was absolutely fabulous.

I was also Deputy Chairman when the fire took place in the market. I heard about it on the Saturday evening and quarter of an hour later, idiot that I was, I was walking in the market while the beams up above were on fire, so I have always had a real feeling for Leeds Market.

I watched in those days how things have changed. In those days there were plenty of fruit and vegetable people and also clothiers and gradually – and it was actually under your administration, though I am not blaming anybody, the food traders gradually left and the clothing people came in so that it is now mainly dominated by clothing.

What you have also to understand is that markets really live – and Leeds City Market lived particularly – with Quarry Hill, which had thousands of people there. The market was their local market and from the time that that closed and went down, the market really needed to attract people. Whether they could do it or not was a different matter because gradually the numbers went down.

After the fire we got the market going in late November so that the traders could survive, and the reason I am mentioning all this is, I do not want you to think – or anybody else to think – that the only people interested in the market sit on that side. There are plenty of us on this side who also have an affinity with the market.

As has been said today, and I will repeat it, the world has changed. Nowadays, instead of the family going to the market, the grandmothers going and taking the children and when they grow up taking their children, there was this affinity generation after generation going into the market, nowadays people can go to a supermarket, buy every single thing they want there. I am sorry to say that this affinity with the market has dropped considerably.

What you have heard also is that Councillor Anderson and the officers understand that this is one of the major problems and I am pleased that they are addressing it in the way that Barry has mentioned. The important thing is a manager who understands the market mentality, knows how to deal with them. They do deserve a fair deal. I am quite sure they will get one with this Committee because Barry understands as well the necessity for keeping the market going.

When you have got officers who are prepared to help, it will make a vast difference. I think one of the things that is really missing is that we should have a Markets Committee of Members who are interested in making sure that the markets are promoted well. Whether that happens or not I leave to Councillor Anderson to decide but I was very pleased sitting here listening to the speakers who all have this affinity for the market and I think that Barry, with his team, will give the necessary boost that

is required. The world has changed, advertising is necessary. Also what I think is necessary for market traders at times to go on the initiative. Why is it that Marks & Spencer's, supermarkets, do so well? It is because they have sales. Let us make sure the market traders also have sales. Thank you very much.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Feldman. Councillor Andrew Carter, please.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. First of all can I say that, like Councillor Feldman, I go back a long time with Leeds Kirkgate Market. In fact, he took over from me as Chair of the old Trading Services Committee in 1980. That was when I first got used to going to public meetings and meeting market traders, and many of the complaints I hear today I was hearing 30 years ago except, in fairness, the situation is a great deal more serious because we have had four deputations today; two of them were from Wetherby and both referred to the effects on trade in a market town at the current time. Then we had the market traders making, actually, similar points.

What we have to accept as a Council is that all businesses, particularly small businesses, wherever they are located, at the moment are going through a very, very hard time. That is why we brought in our Relief Scheme for market traders, but not just market traders. In my ward I have a couple of estates with shops on the estates. Those shops are our shops and those traders are struggling as hard as the market traders, if not more. Some of you have a lot more of those sorts of premises in your wards, with all the people who run those shops struggling because of the current economic climate and also other economic factors as well which Councillor Grayshon referred to.

Let me just look – I want to thank Councillor Dobson for the measured way in which he presented the resolution, but it is wrong, and I will tell you why it is wrong. We should not be requiring Marketing Leeds to undertake a bespoke campaign. They, in my view, are only part of what is required and they are not the main part of a marketing campaign for the market. It has to be – and I agree there has to be a campaign to promote the market, no problem with that at all, but it has to be done by City Centre Management working with Marketing Leeds with their expertise, but I actually think it needs something else.

Marketing Leeds are there on a strategic level. We need something that markets the market to the people of Leeds and gets them back in the frame of mind to go to the market and actually I do visit the market quite regularly and I have to tell you, the greengrocery in particular, as well as my well-known haunt for buying sweets, is absolutely first class. If we could get more people going down there, then I think we would be beginning to resolve the problem.

It is untrue to say we are not investing. Barry quite rightly highlighted a number of areas. What he did not mention was the fact we are putting a quarter of a million pounds of capital investment into the market this year, and the City Centre Management staff and the staff in the market have undertaken to work with the traders about what we want to achieve with that money. In fact, when they came to see me they thought they were not getting that money. I told them, "Actually, you are getting that money and we will work with you to achieve something with it", so we are doing it.

As regards lifting the ban on recruitment, there is not a ban on recruitment, as Barry has said. We are going through a major restructuring following the departure of the previous Markets Manager, and we have to be allowed to conclude that. I have no objection – and in fact I believe it is the right idea – that we need a Markets

Manager, but we must do the restructuring first and we must do the review first. You cannot take bits and go off at half cock and say – what I have heard today is everyone saying the same thing. We all love Leeds Kirkgate Market, absolutely; we are all signed up. We all think something should be done; we are all signed up. Then we start picking bits here, there and everywhere and saying, “That will do the job.” Well, it will not do the job. We have to have a much more comprehensive look at how we can support the market.

I will give you another suggestion. It is my view that we should have, maybe from elected members, a Markets Review Group with a Councillor maybe from each group serving on that Review Group under the Chairmanship of the Lead Member for Markets, Councillor Anderson, so we can review with the traders and with the Council staff the best way forward and how we can do things. That way you will all get a full perspective of what Kirkgate Market is all about and, with due respect to everybody or some people who have spoken so far, you have not got a full perspective but I would welcome you all having that full perspective and working with us because Leeds Kirkgate Market is hugely important.

This resolution today does not address the issues. What I am suggesting will address the issues. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: thank you, Councillor Carter. Councillor Richard Harker.

COUNCILLOR HARKER: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I want to look at Kirkgate Market and all markets from the point of view of the customer. I love markets. I use them. I know most of the markets in North Yorkshire and West Yorkshire and have used them over the years. A great day out for me is to go to a market, I want the shopping experience, but increasingly, I am afraid, when I go to Leeds Market finding somewhere to have a half decent meal, somewhere to take a rest, some of the specialist stalls I am looking for no longer exist as they did I think some years ago.

We have heard a lot this evening about markets providing cheap clothing, cheap food, but that is not all that they should be there for. Yes, I would like a bargain but I am also looking for specialist stalls – good cheese factors. I have got 20 stone almost to support! *(laughter)*

COUNCILLOR: Almost!

COUNCILLOR HARKER: I come from a farming background – I like my food. I like regionally produced foods and I want to get them at markets, so I go to the markets where I can get that sort of stall. I know where the stalls are. There is nothing greater than to get a day off from this place, get in the car about ten o'clock and drive to a market and spend all day at the market, have a damn good lunch, a root around in a good second hand book stall and buy. We need to think about what it is that will bring customers in.

Really and truly, markets have got to be a total shopping experience. I do not go to markets for necessity. I want a bargain, I want a cheap bargain. I got to a market because it is a day out and I love markets – they are fantastic places. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you very much, Councillor Harker. I now call on Councillor Dobson to sum up, please.

COUNCILLOR DOBSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. A strange one this in that when we actually put this White Paper forward, personally I did not see anything that

would be too contentious. I thought a lot of the points we were trying to make in this afternoon's meeting were legitimate based on 18 months of listening to traders and traders' concerns, fleshing out those issues and really trying in a legitimate fashion to get to the problem and I was hoping – and I thank Councillor Carter for his words on the way I delivered the moving of the motion because I actually think there is so much common ground here which can be agreed.

I am going to save my comments regarding Councillor Anderson's White Paper until a little later, his amendment, because I would like just to tackle some of the issues that have been raised in the debate.

Tom's idea, I think it was echoed later on in the debate, about having some sort of genuine member involvement in the running of the market. It seems like a bit of a no-brainer, doesn't it? Perhaps going back to Councillor Feldman's time in that role and Councillor Carter's, it is something that we did and perhaps something that we have lost.

I always say – this is my big mantra – that nobody really understands the city like the elected Members and I think there has been a detachment of roles between Members and officers around the market for too many years. What I am not going to do is name individual officers, which I have been a bit concerned seemed to be like a running theme through the debate, but I would make this point. I am not going to criticise the current team that has been parachuted in to effectively try and address some of these serious issues but moving on to Andrew's point about the fact that there is a job of work in process, I am going to actually lay down a warning. I do not think we have got the time. I genuinely believe that the market is in a state of crisis.

Something that was picked up on the debate about some of the negativity that is doing the rounds about some of the comments that have been made in the media. Yes, we have all seen them in the YEP and in other journals, but I do not believe that those have come put of a want from traders to agitate, to be aggressive, to be confrontational. I sense genuine fear amongst traders for their livelihoods – a fear that is based on what they see with their own two eyes.

We can talk of the market all we want. We can talk about the improvements around the media and the advertising, although personally I still think for the massive amount of subsidies that Marketing Leeds takes from this Council, it should not be beyond their will and wit to have a bespoke service for the advertising of Leeds Market.

Taking that aside, the people who are speaking out publicly now for the first time are not doing so, as I say, through wanting to agitate or be aggressive or pick a fight with the Council. They see their businesses in jeopardy. They see a market in decline. They see it with their own two eyes. Whatever we say in this Chamber is not going to take that away.

I see so much common ground here but I also picked up on one thing that I am going to take issue with. There was a theme on these benches that was kind of saying, it is of another age, it is of another world. Councillor Campbell alluded that that was the nature of my speech. What I am saying is that actually no, it is not. There is nothing fundamentally different about the market than there was years and years ago. Yes, shopping habits have changed but surely we should be trying to attract a new type of customer.

I suppose if you take me as a typical example, when I used to go with my family it was through necessity. It was because that is where we could access the cheapest goods in Leeds and for a family of four on a limited income, that was the

economic reality. Now it is completely different. When I went down there with disposable income - I think Councillor Harker made the point about the produce he likes, the cheeses – it is a different market. It is perhaps a niche market and it is a market we are not tapping into.

One thing I do think about that Councillor Anderson said that I take serious issue with, it is not about filling units. It is not. It is about putting the right people in the market. One of the most fractious and contentious issues that market traders are finding is you have two units, 100% on one, 100% on another. Somebody is coming in who I do not believe – and I will be controversial – should not be in the market, they are not the right type of trader, they are trading cheap, they are trading at 10% rent, probably getting into a situation where they have liabilities with the wholesalers and the like and, disappearing.

Units occupied does not equate to a good market. What the Council should be doing over time is trying to tailor the sort of trader that we want in the market and tailoring that need must be about making the whole place aesthetically more pleasing. There has to be an understanding that the management get it; they must get it, they must understand what a market is. I get back to my original point. I am not speaking ill of any particular officer but for too long it has been run on uniform, regulatory lines like a shopping centre. I will say it again for the last time, I promise – it is not a shopping centre; it is a market.

The person in this debate who I have seriously taken issue with is Councillor Anderson because, Barry – I saw you smiling – I thought we had a lot of common ground and empathy here but all I heard was defence, defence, defence and attack on people who I believe, I genuinely believe, are in the cart and they are struggling and they are scared.

In my dealings with them – and I have had several meetings over several months, your experience may have been different – I found them acting with great dignity and eloquence and more than that, an understanding of what their industry needs. They are saying to us as elected Members, “Please help us. We are not saying we want a freebie, we are not saying we want hand-outs, we are not saying that. We are saying we want legitimate, long-term support in the long run.” Surely that is something that all of us in this Chamber could be signing up to.

Barry’s amendment to the White Paper is not going to be supported by this side for one simple reason. I thought it was glib and quite trite and, actually, I will go further, offensive to some of the people who came in today. They are not children, they are not picking a fight, they do not want to fall out with the Council. The deputation today said to these ears, “Help us. Please help us. These are the problems we have got, we need them addressing. We need some vision, some political lead from our political leaders” and that is what we all are. We represent these people. They are the people who we need to be supportive. Putting people in the market on short-term lets is not the answer.

What we must be really committed to doing – and I am going to make a play again for the support of this White Paper – is an understanding of what the market is, the people who trade in it, what we have lost, in effect, over years and what we can actually find again. As I say, my shopping experience only very recently was fantastic. I do not know about other people in this Chamber but I get sick and tired of going to supermarkets when you can go to any one right across the country and it is the same shopping experience replicated. Shopping should be fun. When you go into town and you are right, I think Councillor Wakefield made the point, we have got that great link, have we not, between the prestigious end of the shopping areas, the

Harvey Nics and the like, and the market is over the road – it is over the road and we are not exploiting that fantastic resource.

I am sorry, Barry, I feel very, very let down by what you have said this afternoon. I do not think you have addressed the issues, I do not think you have addressed the concerns of traders and really and truly we must seriously consider what we are going to do as a Council to help these people. Help – not hinder. Thank you, my Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Dobson. We are now going to move into the vote.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Recorded vote.

(A recorded vote was taken on the amendment)

THE LORD MAYOR: The vote is concluded. The numbers present were 89. “Yes” 47, abstentions 1, “No”s 41, so the amendment in the name of Councillor Barry Anderson has taken the day and that then becomes the substantive motion.

We are going to vote on the substantive motion. (*A vote was taken*) The substantive motion in the name of B Anderson has won the day. Thank you. That is CARRIED.

WHITE PAPER MOTION – DOG LICENSING

THE LORD MAYOR: We now go on to the White Paper in the name of Councillor Finnigan.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am moving this White Paper motion. I think it is important to try and go back and understand the background behind it, where we have come to, where we are at this particular point and basically to point out that this is to try and stimulate the debate about what we do about dog fouling.

There is no doubt all Councillors will be contacted on a regular basis by residents who are significantly concerned about dog fouling and what we can do about it, and at this particular point we can say we will send the dog wardens, we can say we will get it cleaned up, we can say we will attempt to try and take action against those who are irresponsible dog owners, but the problem continues and the problem persists.

I think we are in a situation, Lord Mayor, where we need some newer thinking about how we deal with this particular problem. Councillors will be aware that there are five dog wardens who cover the whole Leeds City Council area. That means in terms of visiting wards they cannot visit wards on anything other than an infrequent basis. If that is the case, then their ability to be able to prosecute those who do undertake the dog fouling is somewhat limited and our ability to be able to hold those people accountable is again limited – it is down to resources.

Certainly recently following this item we received some coverage in the Evening Post and I was invited to a meeting from a group of responsible dog owners who live on the Glen Estate in Morley. As ever with these things you are very reluctant because by the time you get to these particular meetings what you have said has been interpreted in so many different ways that the first ten minutes of the meeting all they wanted to do was have a good go and say that I was trying to persecute and prosecute them. That is clearly not the case. I suppose I ought to

declare an interest as a dog owner myself who understands that should this actually be carried through, if Parliament was of a view that this would be the way ahead, then I would be one of those who would be contributing to that, but there is a certain fairness in that. There is a certain fairness in making sure that the polluter pays and that those who contribute to this particular problem ought to be helping to try and clear up the mess – literally the mess – that they leave behind.

What it did do was stimulate discussion and debate. I am not saying that all of those people at that particular meeting were enthusiastic about the reintroduction of a dog licence but it got them thinking about how we try to resolve this particular problem. What everybody agrees is that it needs more resources targeting at it. It needs more money put into it so that we have more dog wardens and more dog bins and all those other issues that we would like to have available to make sure that our streets are a lot cleaner than they are at this particular point.

In fact the discussion is about how you do that. At the point where you explain to people that in terms of Council expenditure, if you need to put more into the issues of dog fouling then you are going to have to take it from somewhere else. You cannot, in all honesty, argue that dog fouling is more important than education or that dog fouling is more important than adult services or children's services. Clearly that is not the case.

The point that you drill down and say fair enough, how do we go about combating this particular problem? You at least have an intelligent discussion about the way ahead.

If we were to introduce a dog licence, then that money could be hypothecated, ring-fenced to make sure that it does a lot of things. Some of that is to do with the enforcement side of it, you would have the money to be able to increase the number of dog wardens you have got and, indeed, start to take some real action against the perpetrators. Some of it will be there to make sure that we can introduce an improved street cleansing service. Could some of it could be siphoned into organisations like the RSPCA or whoever to make sure that dog welfare issues are also assisted and helped. That might be in the form of education, it might be in the form of taking those dogs off the streets that do not really need to be on the streets and making sure that they are recycled to better homes. There is an opportunity there for a win/win situation, in my view.

What happened previously? Didn't there used to be a dog licence, people will say? Yes, there did. It was 7/6. For those of us who can convert, it is 37½ pence in new money. The reason that ultimately it was abolished was the fact that a lot of people ignored it and the administrative costs of actually collecting that were greater than what you were getting in, so it has to be set at a reasonable, sustainable level if you are going to do something about it.

I do think that it is time now seriously to look at what options are available. It is a blight to all of our communities and is of significant concern to a lot of people. Everybody agrees that we need additional resources in this particular area. We need to have a discussion about where we find those particular resources and that is why I am saying let us get central Government to reflect and consider this.

I suspect I am flogging a dead horse on this particular one and it is not likely to go through but it will at least give us an opportunity to have an honest discussion about how we raise those additional resources, and it has to come from somewhere or we will be here in another two years and another four years and another six years wringing our hands saying, "It is all too bad, something ought to be done. Something

ought to be done" without coming up with all clear plan about what we are going to do.

The community out there, I think, is pretty bored with platitudes from politicians about something ought to be done. What they want to know is what we are going to do and how we are going to pay for it and that is an open and honest discussion that we need to have.

I have had a look at the amendment and Richard tells me he has drawn the short straw and most of his colleagues have bobbed off and left him so he is stuck with dealing with the dog fouling issue but a lot of what he is suggesting on this particular point are things that we are already doing. I do not know what "Properly directed resources which should be used to enforce against irresponsible offending dog owners" – and I have a concern that that is another political platitude – which are not there, they will just say, "It is just typical rhetoric." What do they actually mean? Where are you going to get these resources from? Are you going to get them from within the Council's budget or are you going to find a new stream of funding?

"Use its powers to create no-go zones for dogs." That has already been discussed and debated anyway, we are running through that.

"c) Carry out a full thorough consultation with the public about the introduction of the above."

We are already doing that in Morley; I am sure other colleagues are already having the same sort of discussion and debate, certainly with the more vibrant and robust dog owners that I was speaking to. We have had that particular debate and they accepted that there ought to be specific, designated zones where dogs are not allowed to avoid this particular problem occurring. (b) we are already doing, (c) we are already doing. (d) is a good old 'Let's undertake a programme of public education.' If people do not know that dog crap is bad by now, no amount of education is going to persuade them at this particular point. They have had piles of education. It is like the drinking and the licensing stuff – they have had piles of education on that, or the smoking debate. Educated people more about the dangers of smoking – utterly, totally pointless. People are fully aware and fully educated on it.

What they want to see is a more structured approach that basically bears down on those irresponsible dog owners that created the actual problem and making sure if we can that we penalise them and they actually do pay for the pollution that they actually cause.

The amendment is pleasant enough – it is like apple pie, it is like anything else, you really have not got any arguments, discussions, debates about it, but it does not move us one inch forward. It basically leaves us in the same place we are at this particular point, wringing our hands saying something really ought to be done.

If the worst comes to the worst I am going to accept the amendment – at least we get some sort of recognition of the actual issue anyway, but it does not actually offer any real progress. It offers a *laissez faire* attitude that basically says, like adult care, we will come and discuss it at some later time at a point where there is a problem, when there is a crisis and we are under a significant amount of pressure to try and move the thing forward.

What we are trying to do here is trying to say this is a significant problem, it needs additional resources no matter which way round you actually cut it – how do you get those additional resources in?

The fact of the matter a dog licence may be one of those things. It will be an opportunity to improve dog welfare, it will be an opportunity to look at broadening the number of dog bins that we have actually got, of broadening the number of dog wardens we have got and we can start to take action against the perpetrators, but it is the start of a discussion, it is the start of a debate.

Everybody agrees we need additional resources. Everybody wants a dog warden operating in their ward every day of the week so that we can make sure that we have a significant impact on this. Nobody seems to have any clear thinking about where that additional resource is likely to come from.

If it does nothing more today, Lord Mayor, it at least gives us an opportunity to discuss this issue. I formally move.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Finnigan. Councillor Grayshon?

COUNCILLOR GRAYSHON: Thank you, Lord Mayor, I second and reserve the right to speak.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. We move to the amendment in the name of Councillor Lewis.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I rather think it is the wrong time of year to discuss this. There have been rather a large number of people in this Chamber have been wandering round with bandages on fingers and what have you which they do not have at other times of year. Even my colleague Judith here was walking round ET the other day. Perhaps October might have been a better time, but we will discuss it.

I think it needs to be in terms of a more rounded debate, perhaps, about the role of dogs and pets generally in terms of the positive impact they actually make on people's wellbeing and health, as well as just the issue about dog fouling, which is where we all tend to concentrate and obsess.

What concerns me about the White Paper is that actually you raise a very serious issue but then you are kicking us into the long grass, because what you are saying is this is not an issue for Leeds City Council, all we have to do is lobby about it, pass it on to Central Government, let them worry about it. They will not do anything and then we can say, "Well, at least we did the lobbying" and that is sufficient.

It is an issue that affects us day to day in all of our wards. We all walk round and we think, for God's sake, what is wrong with these people that they know perfectly well that they should be cleaning this up and clearly there are a number of people, not most dog owners, and this is where I disagree. You used the phrase "the polluter pays." Most dog owners are not polluters. They pick up the stuff and they take it home and they put it in their bin. There are a significant minority and it is the significant minority we need to deal with, not the great majority, and my big concern is that the way you are dealing with it is actually to be nice to the big majority. Those are people who you are saying to, regardless of your doing everything right, you are still going to pay more for having a dog and you might be somebody who is on a limited income and you will be saying to them, "Sorry, you have just got to pay it because somebody down the road does not look after their dog properly."

It is a huge problem that, if you were to introduce a new dog licence and, as you say, we did have one in the old days, 7/6, 37½ pence – what price would it be today? I think you have got a touching faith in Central Government being able to

introduce anything at a reasonable cost because I do not – I think they come up with an inexpensive dog licence which most people would not – or a large number of people would choose not to – pay, you have further issues with enforcement. If you think about it, look at other legislation we have had not so long ago where people just ignore it. A most blatant piece of legislation that gets ignored is mobile phone usage. Is there any day that passes, Lord Mayor, when you do not – I do not tweet, never, never – is there a single day when you do not drive down the road and see somebody not only holding a mobile phone, probably smoking at the same time while they are driving. The idea of just another bit of law, another requirement for people to undergo some bureaucracy and pay for it does not seem the way out. For us, as, Leeds City Council, it is a Leeds problem that we have to deal with.

You also mention the idea hypothecation. Again, I think you have got faith in Government because they are not very good at passing money back to us, are they? Can you imagine if we do have a new dog licence at a reasonable level that you would agree with and then we have huge arguments about how much money comes back to Local Authorities. The issue, we have to face it, it is our responsibility, we have to deal with this as an issue.

I am concerned that, as I say, you will get, if you were to go down the road you say, a lot of people refusing to pay, you will have alienation from what a Government is trying to do and that is never a good thing. You just would find that it was totally unenforceable.

We do need to say what is the deal? I think what you said is positive about having a proper discussion with people because what works in one part of the city will not work in another part of the city. There are some places where there is nowhere for people to take dogs or exercise dogs, or very few, and we have to think about, you cannot just ban dogs in those areas, you have to understand that there are good, responsible dog owners who do not have access to a lot of places and you have to take that into consideration. You have to have a proper engagement with the community about what you are doing on this issue but at the bottom of it all is enforcement and I have to say for all the conversations you have with people, for all the positive things about educational engagement, enforcement is something that we do not do.

If I look over the years at what we have done on dog fouling, probably a few people here will remember Len Royston. Len Royston was a great guy who was the first guy I knew who actually had a pooper scooper and he was great and he would proudly say that he went out with his pooper scooper and did the business 25 years ago and he was seen as a bit of an eccentric. We have moved on. Most dog owners do clean up after them but we have reached a stage where things are not getting better. We are not seeing our streets improving any longer. We still have a major problem that is not diminishing and we have to tackle that.

Dog owners do not think, whether responsible or irresponsible, that there is anybody out there who is going to stop them doing what they do at the moment. If you do enforce, your best allies will actually be the responsible dog owners because they want to see it as well. They want people to actually go out and do the business and they want to see people fined, and if that happens, they will happily back it up. Dog owners will happily go along and pointedly offer black bags to people who are not doing the right thing if they think there is something behind it, if they think that there is a Local Authority that is going to enforce something, but if they feel that the Authorities do not care, that the Authorities are not bothered about this as an issue, they feel quite, "Why should we do it? It is not something for us to take on", but if there is a feeling that there is a pressure to do this, there is a pressure to actually enforce it, they will support it.

Honestly, Robert, I cannot see how a dog licence, a State – here we are calling for a greater State.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: I have faith in a Labour Government.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Pushing for a dog licence, a dog licence that has not worked in the past is not the answer. As you say, we are probably having quite a good and an interesting discussion about it but I do wonder why you put down a White Paper that says something that you want and then you start saying, well, you are not really that bothered about it.

Yes, let us have a proper discussion but let us enforce, let us tackle the problem on the streets of Leeds, in every ward, and let us deal with the people who are causing the problem. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you very much. Councillor Mulherin to second, please.

COUNCILLOR MULHERIN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Dog fouling is a serious problem that risks the health of vulnerable groups and particularly young children who, as this advert from Torbay Conservative Council amply demonstrates, will pick up anything, and wheelchair users, when dog dirt is caught in their wheels.

It is a problem on our streets, green spaces, sports pitches, playgrounds and cemeteries. One example from my ward is the pupils at Thorpe Primary School who are required to take a second pair of shoes to school every day so that they can change them on arrival because of the amount of dog dirt on their route to school. This is an intolerable burden on parents who can ill afford to buy an extra set of shoes simply because of the antisocial behaviour of a minority of dog owners.

Signs like these from Mencams(?) have been erected along the route to school in Thorpe, to let those irresponsible dog owners know that their behaviour is unacceptable.

All the evidence we have is that the worst offenders are out before and after working hours when they know there is no chance of being caught.

At the other end of my ward we are told that some dog owners are actually driving up to the recreation ground and leaving their dogs out of the car to do their business before they go to work, not even bothering to get out of the car themselves. As a parent I am also appalled to see dog walkers out with up to nine or ten dogs at a time in our parks and public spaces. With that number of dogs off the lead there is no way one individual can actually be responsible for cleaning up the mess left behind, not to mention keeping them under control around small children.

Dog fouling is a district-wide problem and there is cross-party agreement amongst Members of the Environment & Neighbourhood Scrutiny Board that the situation has got worse over the last few years. Why has the situation worsened? Are there more dogs in the Leeds district now? Has there been a sudden upsurge in the number of irresponsible dog owners, or has the fear of being caught and fined for dog fouling sharply decreased?

Community groups, tenants' associations, parents and residents in my ward were astounded to learn that there were only five dog wardens to cover the whole Leeds district. Efforts have been made to train other officers to issue fixed penalty notices since we passed out Scrutiny Board enquiry last year. However, we are

hearing that there is some reluctance amongst other officers to use those powers. In the meantime, our dedicated dog warden team have been under far greater pressure since the power to impound stray dogs was transferred to Leeds City Council. On top of their normal duty to take action against dog owners allowing their pets to foul our streets and public spaces, they have now to impound stray dogs with travel times taken to kennels outside the city, further reducing the time they have to keep our city clean. When those powers were transferred to the Council, funding from the police came with it. That funding was not used to strengthen the dog warden team, as it should have done. It was swallowed up elsewhere, leaving our five hard pressed dog wardens even more overstretched.

If we as a city are serious about tackling dog fouling, about keeping our streets and public spaces clean for the responsible majority to enjoy, the very least that could be done is to use the funds that were transferred over with the powers to impound stray dogs to bolster the dog warden service. It is also imperative that the dog control orders that are not currently being used in the city are brought forward and implemented as swiftly as possible.

I believe there is widespread public support for measures to ban dogs from children's play areas, to ensure that they are kept on leads in cemeteries and to put a sensible limit on the number of dogs that any one individual can walk in our public spaces. I believe that, given a chance to have their say, the public, through consultation, will back this up and the measures required to enforce it.

We need to send out a clear message that dog fouling will not be tolerated in Leeds, that irresponsible dog owners will be caught and fined and that this Council takes the protection of children and vulnerable people from the health risks of dog foul and the cleanliness of our streets and public spaces seriously. Dog licences will only be bought by the responsible dog owners. The irresponsible ones who flout the current dog control orders will not bother to get one. Lobbying the Government for action when we could and should be using and enforcing local dog control orders now will only delay the action that is needed to clean up our public spaces. I urge you to support our amendment. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Mulherin. I now call on Councillor Finnigan to sum up.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: Thank you, Lord Mayor.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: We have got another speaker.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: It is past seven o'clock, Keith. It is just me, I am afraid. Yes, it is regrettable.

Just to run through a few points, it is a great pity that we did not have the following speaker because I was interested to hear what perhaps Councillor Beverley would have to say on this particular issue, because I have a black poodle so it is probably all his fault, really.

I will try and deal with some of the points that have been raised. They are very much like Tom Cruise – show me the money. It is all right saying “We will crack down, it will not be tolerated, we will do this, we will do that, we will do the other.” You need to be able to raise the resources to make sure that you do have significant enforcement and with the best will in the world, fiddling around with bits of money here and there is not going to do the job.

It is regrettable that out there they will be saying what we have is yet more platitudes. Yes, we have a call for action but without getting the resources to do any of that action at all. It is the sort of rhetoric that people get sick and tired of and they feel that the Council really just talks about it and has not got any real plan of action about how it moves things forward.

We need to have a discussion. We need to have a debate. My own view is that if it is set at a sustainable level, this is a possibility. Yes, by all means lobby Parliament and set up a working group and let us do whatever we can do locally to try and do something about it, but you are not going to avoid the problem of the fact that there are not enough resources going into this particular area and nobody, but nobody, seems to be able to point to where we can get the resources that we need to keep our streets cleaner. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Finnigan. We are now going on to the vote and we are voting first of all the amendment in the name of Councillor Lewis. *(A vote was taken)*

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Can we have a count please, Lord Mayor?

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: Can we request a recorded vote to avoid any...

COUNCILLOR GRAYSHON: Seconded.

(A recorded vote was taken on the amendment)

THE LORD MAYOR: The vote is concluded. Present 81, "Yes" 33, abstentions 1, "No" 47, so this has been LOST.

We now go to the original motion now. We are going to vote on the original motion. *(A vote was taken)* It was carried. This is CARRIED.

WHITE PAPER MOTION – GOVERNMENT FUNDING FOR LEEDS

THE LORD MAYOR: We are now moving on to the motions not for debate on page 14 of the Green Paper. Councillor Carter.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Move in terms of the Notice, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Brett?

COUNCILLOR BRETT: I second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: *(A vote was taken)* CARRIED.

WHITE PAPER MOTION – NEIGHBOURHOOD NETWORK SCHEMES

THE LORD MAYOR: Page 15 now, the White Paper in the name of ...

COUNCILLOR YEADON: Request to withdraw, please.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Agreed! *(laughter)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Have we a seconder? Right. This has been withdrawn.

WHITE PAPER MOTION – PROCEDURE RULE 3.1(d) – FORMER ROYAL PARK
SCHOOL LEGAL FEES.

THE LORD MAYOR: We are now on to page 17. Councillor Atha.

COUNCILLOR ATHA: Move, my Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Harper?

COUNCILLOR LYONS: Second, Lord Mayor.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: You have morphed into Councillor Harper! Very worrying!

THE LORD MAYOR: The amendment in the name of Councillor Brett??

COUNCILLOR BRETT: I move, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Campbell to second.

COUNCILLOR CAMPBELL: Second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: We will take a vote on the amendment, please.

COUNCILLOR: I do not believe the White Paper has been seconded properly.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: It has.

COUNCILLOR: Councillor Harper is not present.

THE LORD MAYOR: It was not the original man. We are happy that we did do everything we should do. I am calling for a vote on the amendment in the name of Councillor Brett. *(A vote was taken)* CARRIED.

That now becomes the substantive motion. *(A vote was taken)* CARRIED.

WHITE PAPER MOTION – PROCEDURE RULE 3.1(d) – CALL FOR A CITY
CENTRE KIDNEY DIALYSIS UNIT

THE LORD MAYOR: We are on to page 19 now and it is White Paper in the name of Councillor Lamb.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: I move in terms of the Notice, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: To second it, Councillor Lancaster.

COUNCILLOR LANCASTER: I second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: The amendment is by Councillor Lowe.

COUNCILLOR LOWE: I move the amendment in terms of the Notice, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Jarosz to second.

COUNCILLOR JAROSZ: I second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: We will vote on the amendment in the name of Councillor Lowe. *(A vote was taken)* This is LOST, so we go back to the original motion and I will take the vote now on the motion, please, in the name of Councillor Lamb. *(A vote was taken)* This is CARRIED.

This concludes the business of the meeting for today. Thank you very much, everybody.

(The meeting closed at 7.15 pm)