

LEEDS CITY COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

Held on

Wednesday, 14th July 2010

At

THE COUNCIL CHAMBER,
CIVIC HALL, LEEDS

In the Chair:

THE LORD MAYOR
(COUNCILLOR J McKENNA)

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 14th JULY 2010

THE LORD MAYOR: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Can I at this stage remind you to switch off your mobiles phone and other electrical equipment when you are in your seats in the Chamber. It does interfere with the electronics in front of us. If you need to tweet, please go outside or to the side. Thank you.

Can I say before we commence the formal proceedings, I have the following announcements. It is with regret that I have to inform you of the death of former Councillor Jean Searle, OBE, who represented the Headingley Ward from 1975 to 1980 and was very much involved with Social Service matters during the time she served on the Council. Jean died on 18th June after a long illness.

I must also advise you of the death of Lance Corporal David Andrew Ramsden of the First Battalion of the Yorkshire Regiment, who died while on active service in Afghanistan on 23rd June. His funeral takes place today. David came from Leeds and his parents live in Farnley. Councillor Graham Kirkland, Ward Member for Otley and Yeadon and former Lord Mayor, is representing the city at the funeral this afternoon.

Can I ask you to stand in silent tribute, please?

(Silent tribute)

THE LORD MAYOR: As you will be aware, this could be the last Council meeting to be attended by our Chief Executive, Paul Rogerson, and the Director of Development, Jean Dent, after many years of valuable services to the city Council. There is much to say about both officers who have guided the Council with their experience and professionalism and I am sure we will have the opportunity to express our personal thanks in another forum before they finally take their leave. However, I am sure you will all wish to join with me in thanking them for their long and valuable service to the city of Leeds and to wish them well in whatever they choose to pursue in their retirement. *(Applause)*

ITEM 1 – MINUTES of the meeting held on 27th May 2010

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we move, then, on to Item 1, Minutes of the Meeting held on 27th May 2010.

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

COUNCILLOR LOBLEY: I second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can I call for the vote on those minutes? *(A vote was taken)* Those Minutes are CARRIED.

ITEM 2 – DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we go on to Item 2, Declarations of Interest. 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?

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. The important matter that I am a Leeds United season ticket holder seems to have made it through, but the slightly more trivial one that I am a member of West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority seems to have dropped off Item 13. If I could have that recorded as well, please.

THE CHAIR: Thank you Councillor Lewis, that is noted.

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: I believe my wife is in receipt of an allowance, a care allowance for my 98-year old mother-in-law who lives with us.

COUNCILLOR TAGGART: Yes, Item 12, my Lord Mayor, I should declare an interest, I am a member of the Area Panel ALMO.

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: Lord Mayor, White Papers 11 and 12, I have a personal and prejudicial interest in both so I will withdraw from the Chamber for those two items.

COUNCILLOR HARPER: Lord Mayor, I am also a new member of the ALMO and I have to declare an interest in that, please.

THE ASSISTANT CHIEF EXECUTIVE (Corporate Governance): Can I just give some advice in relation to members who are ALMO Directors? If you have been appointed by the Council on to the ALMO and you are wishing to speak on that particular item relating to the HRA, then you need to declare a personal interest. However, if you are not going to speak on the item you do not have to declare an interest and you can, of course, still vote. There is no need for everybody to be jumping up to declare a personal interest if you are an ALMO Director unless you are going to speak on that specific item.

THE CHAIR: Any further declarations?

COUNCILLOR G HYDE: Lord Mayor, I need to declare I am a Director of East North East Homes.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can members please confirm by a show of hands that they have read the list, or the list as amended, and agreed its contents insofar as they relate to their own interests? (*Show of hands*) Thank you.

ITEM 3 – COMMUNICATIONS

THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE: I am pleased to report, Lord Mayor, as I have done so often in the past, that there are no communications I wish to share with the Council.

ITEM 4 – DEPUTATIONS

THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE: There are three groups who wish to bring deputations this afternoon, Lord Mayor: the Access Committee for Leeds, the Tenants of Moor Grange and the local residents of Hyde Park.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: I move that all three deputations be received.

COUNCILLOR LOBLEY: I second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we call for the vote that the deputations are received, please? *(A vote was taken)*

DEPUTATION ONE
ACCESS COMMITTEE FOR LEEDS

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

MR T McSHARRY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. The members of our deputation are David Littlewood, Margaret Belton, Judith Smith, Peter Rushton and myself, Tim McSharry.

The title of our deputation is - Please help us to save Woodlands MS Respite Care Centre, York.

It is often said that nothing is certain other than death and taxes, but when we consider the demographic changes facing society, there is one other increasing certainty that, as a result of ill health, injury, age, disability or family caring commitments, the provision of quality respite services will become a growing issue for everyone in society with the potential to impact on the lives of each of us here today.

For many individuals living with ill health and disability and their family carers, respite offers not just an opportunity for a short break to recharge batteries, it can also provide a critical life-line to maintaining independence and family relationships, which may face great challenges and personal demands as a result of 24/7 caring commitments and, of course, this is no different for anyone in Leeds who is living with or caring for someone with MS.

MS or Multiple Sclerosis affects about 1 in 1000 people in the UK. MS is an illness that affects three times as many women than men. It can also affect anyone at any age, although it is more often diagnosed between the ages of 20 and 40.

Woodlands MS Respite Care Centre in York is unique in our Region and offers specialist support, therapies and care from highly trained and dedicated staff, supported by exemplar on-site facilities that many people living with MS in Leeds have used and benefited from for many years. People like Judith Smith, who has been going for ten years and who said, "It's a real home from home. The care you receive really does make you feel a whole lot better, it gives a chance for a break for people back home and they don't need to worry about how you are being looked after because they know you are amongst friends and there is nowhere you can go to be better looked after"

Peter Rushton said, "Woodlands is the perfect respite resource, it would be a terrible loss to many people in Leeds if it closes. It is a fantastic environment, with highly trained and understanding staff which can make a real difference when you are living with MS. It has made a big difference to both me and my wife and it's important that family members get a proper break".

Margaret Belton has been using Woodlands for three years and says that, "If it closes the family doesn't get a break, it's an integral part of our lives. Woodlands specialist MS help makes a massive difference, the staff can't do enough for you. If we lost it there would be nothing on the same standard to replace it".

Nationally it has been estimated that carers save the UK economy £87b a year and there can be no doubt that the availability of such specialist respite facilities benefits many people and families across Leeds. The loss of Woodlands may also have implications for Leeds Adult Social Care and how their commissioning officers could find an acceptable or suitable alternative MS service within the Region.

The potential closure of Woodlands next year also raises additional concerns, especially given the Government cuts to public services and Local Authority funding. Many disabled people are concerned how these cuts will directly impact on the provision of essential services, like respite. The Government has indicated a hope that large charities will somehow respond to the needs of people who require core services, but clearly on this evidence there are still many questions to answer.

Disability, ill health, injury and caring commitments can become a part of anyone's life. Respite can offer a much needed break that enable families to continue to provide support and care. On behalf of our members living with MS, their family and carers, we would humbly ask for any assistance that Leeds City Council could offer to help save the exemplar resources available at Woodlands and help to maintain the dignity, wellbeing and family support of the many Leeds people living with MS.

Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Gruen?

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Lord Mayor, I move that the deputations matter be referred to the Executive Board.

COUNCILLOR LOBLEY: I second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can I call for the vote, please? *(A vote was taken)*
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 to you, ladies and gentlemen.

MR T McSHARRY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

DEPUTATION TWO TENANTS OF MOOR GRANGE COURT

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

MS W HOLLIDAY: My Lord Mayor and fellow Councillor, my name is Wendy Holliday. With me are Barbara Glover, Tony Deering, Peter Grayson and Terry Tieron, and collectively we are the tenants of Moor Grange Court, Leeds 16.

We are the tenants of Moor Grange Court and we are here today to highlight some of the current issues that collectively we are facing.

Prior to ALMOs taking over the management of this block and the introduction of Choice Based Letting (CBL), this block had an unwritten arrangement with Leeds City Council that prospective tenants should be over a certain age. Therefore we have a lot of tenants who are elderly and infirm and whom have lived in the block since it was built in the 1960s.

We understand that the CBL policy is to award points to prospective tenants. The criteria as we understand it is if you had connection with the criminal justice system, been in prison, experienced drug and alcohol addiction, are a single parent or have mental health problems requiring support from outside agencies, then you are likely to gain more of the necessary points to be placed higher on the priority list and receive more assistance in moving into any property.

However, in recent years it has become apparent to long-term tenants of this block that the calibre of new tenants has altered and we are now experiencing increasing incidents of anti-social behaviour. We now have to endure loud music, all night parties, broken windows, criminal damage to cars, bottles, cans TVs and fridges launched from balconies. Two of our tenants have now moved from the block for fear of intimidation and violence; one is living in a caravan, the other in a hostel.

We have noticed an increase of young children living on high level floors, which we believe is unsafe. These flats have balconies and we would not wish a parent to experience the pain of having a child fall from a great height. Also, individuals who have had contact with the criminal justice system seem to be given more points. It appears that the criminal element now have a legitimate reason for being in the block, as they are visiting ex-offenders who now live there.

Because of this we, the hardworking, law-abiding citizens of Moor Grange Court, are concerned for our safety while in our own homes and for our possessions while we are out. Living in close proximity with 61 neighbours, to the side, below and above, requires awareness, consideration and compromise which at the current time is not happening with all tenants.

We therefore believe that it is time to look at a change, from a Choice Based Letting policy to a Local Lettings Policy with an age restriction on prospective tenants and we have presented a petition to West North West Homes. We, the tenants of Moor Grange Court, are willing to work and compromise with any agency to resolve this problem and to ensure that all tenants of this block are made to feel welcome, safe and happy in their homes.

We thank you for your time. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Gruen.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Lord Mayor, I move that the matter of the deputation be referred to the Executive Board.

COUNCILLOR LOBLEY: I am very pleased to second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can I call for the vote? (*A vote was taken*) There are none against. Thank you for attending and for what you have said. You will be kept informed of the consideration which your comments will receive, and good afternoon to you. (*Applause*)

DEPUTATION THREE LOCAL RESIDENTS OF HYDE PARK

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

MS T CLEVELAND: My Lord Mayor and fellow Councillors, I am a resident of Hyde Park and my name is Tara Cleveland. I am here today with Yasmin Adiva, Wayne Beckford, the Reverend David Calder and Sharon Coleman.

Hyde Park is suffering. It has been suffering for years. In his book *Dark Heart: The shocking truth about hidden Britain*, Nick Davies described Hyde Park shortly after the riots when the Newlands pub was burned down. He wrote:

“It is, indeed, as if some powerful explosion has swept through Hyde Park, laying waste everything in its path, and all the fragments that have been left behind form one clear, overwhelming pattern. This community has collapsed... why... There is poverty in Hyde Park.”

A major factor in Hyde Park's suffering is its high level of population density. Hyde Park is the most crowded area in Leeds. Hyde Park has more than 1.5 times the population density as the next area down on the list. Hyde Park has a higher population density than the poorest areas of Moss Side (49 people per square hectare) or Tower Hamlets (99 people per square hectare). There are an average of 186 people per square hectare living in Hyde Park. The average per hectare in Leeds overall is twelve people - twelve people as compared to 186.

Hyde Park is full of tiny terraced houses that have been converted from family homes into HMOs crammed with as many people as possible. Many houses have been carved up with tiny bedrooms, no common rooms and no yards. This sub-standard housing is rife in our community.

The people living in Hyde Park come from wildly different population groups. There are long-term (mainly British) residents, a strong community of South Asians (some newly immigrated and some who have been in the area for generations) and a very large and growing student population. These groups have very different customs, needs and living styles and this can provoke high levels of tension in the area.

The number of students and young people has been growing each year for the last ten years and the rest of the population has been declining. Over 80% of the population in Hyde Park is aged 16-29. A quarter of the population leaves the area every year – to be replaced with newcomers. This indicates a very weak level of commitment to the neighbourhood by a large portion of the population. Such low levels of commitment can be evidenced by the lack of care for houses and gardens, rubbish and rubbish bins strewn on the streets and the detritus and debris left after a weekend spent partying.

Instead of thriving small businesses, exciting retailers and restaurants with delicious wholesome food, our main streets are lined with cheap and unhealthy take-aways, letting agencies and boarded –up shop fronts.

Hyde Park also has a hidden layer of poverty. Although it is not one of the very lowest Super Output Areas (as per the last census), the transitory population of students skews the characteristics of the neighbourhood. Once people ages 18-24 are removed from the equation, Hyde Park may compare with some of the most impoverished areas of Leeds. The jobless rate of 25 to 49 year olds is 1.5 times the average in Leeds and for our neighbours aged 50-65 the jobless rate is more than twice the Leeds average. In fact only 21% of the population in Hyde Park is counted as beings economically active. What the statistics do not tell us is the level of deprivation when students are not counted.

Crime as well, especially burglary and theft from vehicles, is a problem in Hyde Park. Where crime in Leeds overall has been reduced by over, 9% in Hyde Park, it has grown by 11% in the last year. Theft from vehicles has increased by 90% in the last year. In month by month comparison, during the ten months of this year crime had increased over past year. As well, the amount of anti-social behaviour has also risen this year. While Hyde Park is not the most violent, crime-ridden area of Leeds, the growth in crime is worrying and may indicate deeper social malaise.

There are underlying and unacknowledged levels of poverty and deprivation in the Hyde Park area – levels that are not easily discovered by reading traditional census statistics or comparing Hyde Park directly with other areas. Our community is terribly overcrowded. The diversity in Hyde Park also masks problems of social cohesion and conflict between population groups.

We ask the Council not to ignore our community and its needs. We ask the Council to look carefully at our area and help us to determine solutions to our problems and rejuvenate our deteriorating neighbourhood. Hyde Park should never again be 'laid waste' by the 'powerful explosion' of deprivation and a lack of social cohesion.

Thank you. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Gruen.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Lord Mayor, I move that the contents of the deputation be referred to Executive Board for consideration.

COUNCILLOR LOBLEY: I second, my Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can I call for the vote, please? (*A vote was taken*)

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 and thank you for coming to the Council today. (*Applause*)

ITEM 5 - REPORTS

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we move on to Item 5, Reports. Councillor Gruen?

(a)

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: My Lord Mayor, I move Report 5(a) in the terms of the Notice.

COUNCILLOR NASH: My Lord Mayor, I second.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we call for the vote, members? (*A vote was taken*)
That is CARRIED.

(b)

THE LORD MAYOR: 5(b), Councillor Wakefield.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Can I move that 5(b), the Annual Scrutiny Board Report, be moved in terms of the Notice, Lord Mayor.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Lord Mayor, I second.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we have a vote, members, please? *(A vote was taken)* That is CARRIED.

(c)

THE LORD MAYOR: 5(c), Councillor Gruen?

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Lord Mayor, I move resolution 5(c) in the terms of the Notice.

COUNCILLOR LOBLEY: I second that, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can I call for the vote on that, members? *(A vote was taken)* That is CARRIED.

(d)

THE LORD MAYOR: (d), Councillor Gruen?

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Lord Mayor, yes, I move that this report but accepted but I would wish to speak on this particular resolution which I understand we are taking as a White Paper. I refer you to your Council procedure papers on page 82A entitled HRA Subsidy Refund.

Lord Mayor, in these very bleak times of economic storm going through the country, this is the only bright news of additional money being available to the Council in terms of the HRA subsidy, the reason for that being a mathematical adjustment between the rents we actually collect and the rents we notionally collect and that amounts to £4.6m.

The former administration had the report which was ready to go and because of the election was prevented from going through. We looked very carefully at that report and decided to make some minor but significant changes.

The first of these is that we want to give particular importance and urgency to aids and adaptations. I think all of us in our own wards and in our own case work recognise that some of the ALMOs have fallen too far behind in getting aids and adaptations done, so we are proposing in this report to showcase £1m into that particular area of need, which is urgent.

The second top slicing of the £4.6m is around fire safety, which applies to all of the ALMOs and, again, there was an incident last year in London, a multi-storey block, illustrating it is absolutely vital that fire safety is properly attended to.

The third point we then wish to make is that as this is additional money, money the ALMOs had not been expecting, we could only proceed with allocating that money on the basis of matched funding and we have now had reassurances from all the ALMOs that whatever amount of money we will put into their area, they will match fund that.

On that basis, I think want to move forward with report.

I should say one more thing about the aids and adaptations. Councillor Yeadon and I are going to co-chair a cross-boundary departmental working group to ensure that those people who initially investigate and consider the need of clients in aids and adaptations do so in a seamless way and that those people are then asked to pay and execute and implement those areas of work. I think that is only sensible that there is a proper transgression(*sic*) from initiation to the execution and everybody is aware and the whole of the chain what is expected because too often, I think, the vulnerable clients at the end of this process are led to believe one level of support only to find that another level is actually provide and even though that level costs a good deal of money, if the expectations are not realised, then you end up being disappointed and we do not want that process to continue any longer.

Lord Mayor, I notice that Les Carter has put down an amendment and I await with interest the comments he is going to make and other comments before I respond in some detail to those comments.

I would say at this stage that I think this is a well balanced additional allocation, agreed with all the partner organisations and it is deliverable in this financial year. There are some issues very clearly in terms of continuity of the work and in terms of how much work is actually done, and I will come back to that at a later stage. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

COUNCILLOR NASH: I second the proposal that this report be approved.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Les Carter to move an amendment.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Lord Mayor, may I start by informing members that at the last Council meeting I handed a letter to Peter Gruen congratulating him on his appointment, and also informing him that, unlike his colleague in London, Liam Byrne, I had, in fact, left him a substantial sum of money in the budget – indeed, a total of £9.2m in the current HRA reserves.

I asked in the same letter to give special considerations to the areas of Wortley and Kirkstall. I do not think that has taken place, but let me just refer to the actual motion as it stands today.

If the Council accepts the report laying out proposals for spending half that amount, it will have enhanced funding adaptations, improved fire safety security work, extra funding for group repair schemes, help tackling non-traditional housing and also give support to the Council's key regeneration schemes. There is no mention in there about matched funding and I do not think any paper should come here that says, "You can approve something but I will not give them it unless they agree to matched funding." That is wrong, my Lord Mayor, and it should have been in the paper.

Members opposite will be pleased to know that in addition to these funds there is a further £4.6m in HRA reserves, of which £3.7m is being held in reserves for the financial contingencies during this year. This is the highest amount of reserves in the last five years.

I am therefore proposing that money be given to the ALMOs of £900,000 split equally between three different schemes and the money will be earmarked. The first is the Woodbridge Estate in Kirkstall. That it to help continue the work we started last year. This £300,000 will ensure we are able to continue this work making significant improvements to these properties. This will be in addition to the moneys shown in the report today.

My Lord Mayor, Kirkstall members should be aware that, without this funding that I am proposing today, we will continue to merely scratch at the surface and disappoint many Kirkstall residents. I also am pleased to inform Council that I have been very grateful to have the support of Councillor Atha and the Kirkstall members in my endeavours to help the Woodbridge residents. Of course, that is when they were in opposition. I do hope they will continue to give their support today.

Secondly, I am proposing £300,000 be invested in the Waterloo estate. Councillor Lewis asked me as Executive Board member when he was in opposition to part-fund some additional work. He sent me an email:

“Dear Les,

Given the relatively healthy state of the Housing Revenue Account as per the Council budget, has consideration been should be given to part-funding work on the Waterloo estate.”

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Read out your reply.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: I replied to him:

“Thanks for your email. I note your comments. You will be aware that I am getting pressure from the Kirkstall Councillors about funding for the area of the Queenswood Drive and I would be interested in your views on that.”

He got a little bit terse then. He wrote back and said:

“Les, I expect my Kirkstall members to lobby for their constituents as I will be for the good people of Pudsey. Now what are you going to do with the windfall?”

to which I replied, “Spend it wisely.”

My Lord Mayor, I hope he thinks today I am spending it wisely, the money in this area, in an effort to fulfil his wishes in respect of the Waterloo estate.

Third, I am proposing extra money for Stonecliffe estate in the Farnley/Wortley ward. These homes are known as M5 type property and are in desperate need of money spending on them.

My Lord Mayor, it was made very clear to me from Councillor Hardy, as the new members for Farnley and Wortley, that he will push very hard for extra funding in the Stonecliffe estate. I understand that he thinks that the Greens have shown a lacklustre approach to the needs of Wortley and are not very good at doing the job – that is what he said. That is what he said.

I have to say, my Lord Mayor, that in six years as the Executive Board member for Housing, not once has either of the Greens ever approached me to help the people of the Stonecliffe estate. They have totally ignored it. They have never, ever come to me – they may have done it through the ALMOs, they may have done it somewhere else but they have never come to me and that is a shame.

My Lord Mayor, we are in a position to spend this money without compromising the HRA, and that is the important part. I am not asking you to compromise the HRA. You are getting, my Lord Mayor, you are still having the largest reserves that we have had for the last five years.

Council therefore has a choice. It is a simple choice, my Lord Mayor. Members can support this amendment in the knowledge that the HRA funding is secure, or they can reject it, ignoring the people of Kirkstall, Pudsey, Farnley and Wortley.

I will be asking for a recorded vote and I will be informing the Housing Associations in these areas of the outcome of how people voted. My Lord Mayor, I move the amendment. *(Applause)*

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Leadley.

COUNCILLOR LEADLEY: My Lord Mayor, I had meant to comment on Report 5(d) which begins on page 82A that sets out the proposals for spending the Housing Revenue Account subsidy refund.

As many members will be aware, Leeds generally has a negative HRA subsidy and pays money into a national levy and then receives less in return. Also, Leeds Council houses which are in districts which never have been defined as deprived by national governments, have been denied access to many grant schemes over the years, so suffering a double disadvantage.

In those circumstances, though we are still in deficit, any refund is welcome. This one seems to have been earmarked quite quickly for spending on various schemes. Councillor Les Carter, who should know about such things, has drawn attention to a locally generated surplus of £900,000 from the 2009/10 financial year which he suggests by means of an amendment should be spent on the Woodbridge, Waterloo and Stonecliffe estates.

Sometimes I pass the Woodbridge estate when out on Plans Panel West site visits. It would be hard to imagine a less inspiring example of low rise 1960s Council housing. I support the amendment. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR A BLACKBURN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Can I start off by saying that I am a member of the West North West ALMO, so I would like to declare that as an interest, please.

I have been interested to hear that Les Carter says I have not approached him as far as the Stonecliffes is concerned. Well in fact, no, I have not, but, as I stated, I am a member of the ALMO and I have been fighting through the ALMO for the Stonecliffes and if one looks through the minutes of the years, you will see that that is correct.

In fact, Councillor Lowe, who also serves on the same ALMO, as other Councillors here from different parties do, but to be fair Councillor Lowe, because she has been a long-serving member – some of the others from other parties have only just joined us – will know that there has been heated debates about this and I have stood my ground, so that is where my arguments have been made.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: You're taking a long time to tell us you did nowt, isn't it?

COUNCILLOR A BLACKBURN: Never mind about that. The ALMOs are the ones that deliver it. I am lucky enough to be a member of that so that is what I have been doing and there is proof there.

As far as the Stonecliffes are concerned, it is just a small estate, the people that do not know, in Old Farnley. Work was done pre-ALMO, there was a discussion with Robin Lawler about doing some work, some installation work, on the Stonecliffes. The problem was that some people wanted pitched roofs because they had flat roofs and it was decided by the Council at that time, by the Housing Department, to put pitched roofs on. That did cause a problem because there are some owner occupiers there and obviously, if you have a pitched roof, then everybody on the block has to pay into that and some people did not want to do, owner occupiers, so that is why it was left and it is still being left and so roughly half is still left to do.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: You can vote for it doing now, can't you?

COUNCILLOR A BLACKBURN: My understanding, as far as the ALMO talks are concerned, is that if they got this amount of money that has been proposed, that in fact some of the houses would be done and some of the Woodbridges would as well, but as far as the Stonecliffes go, I understand that that would leave 17 houses, and this is on the ALMO figures we are talking about there, would leave 17 houses, though the likelihood is that some of those people will have probably put in the right to buy, so we might be talking about less than 17 houses to do.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Leave them in slums.

COUNCILLOR A BLACKBURN: The fact is, what we have been talking about is doing work on an estate that has been left. Some of them have got elderly people who have been in touch with us, they need doing, it is as simple as that, but I want to make sure that all are done, not just leaving 17 houses or whatever. I want all that estate done. It has waited long enough and I am not saying that the Waterloo and the Woodbridges do not deserve to be done but this is just a small estate, we can easily do it - we can easily do it. It just needs the moneys there so let us get on and get the Stonecliffes done. Thank you. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Well vote for this then and you will finish them.

COUNCILLOR A C CARTER: Rubbish – utter rubbish.

THE LORD MAYOR: Members, before I call the next speaker can I remind you that it is Councillor Hardy's maiden speech. Councillor Hardy, please.

COUNCILLOR HARDY: My Lord Mayor, fellow Councillors, it is an honour and a delight to be able to make my maiden speech on an issue of local significance for my ward. There is no better way to start in Council than to speak from the heart on behalf of one's constituents.

Like everyone, we are all aware of extreme funding challenges that face Councils at the present but, regardless of the Council's financial position, we must ensure that people have access to decent homes.

In these straitened times any funding is a massive boost and to receive £4.6m is, I am sure you all agree, tremendous news for the city. Naturally, I am delighted that a significant chunk of this money will be spent in my ward. I know we all have areas in our wards where investment is needed but I am pleased that Councillor Gruen and West North West Homes have made the Stonecliffes one of their top

priorities. I know residents of these properties will be thrilled that this funding is coming their way. Fifty-one properties on the Stonecliffes have already been improved. That still leaves 44 homes in need of work.

Thanks to the additional funding, work on around 27 of these homes will be done this year. That is great news but it obviously means there will be a handful of properties will need improvements after this year.

I now want to join with my ward colleagues in the Green Group to campaign passionately for a guarantee that the work on all properties – all properties – in the Stonecliffes will be completed as soon as possible.

I see that the Opposition have looked to amend the report, putting in an extra £900,000 this year. Putting aside such a large sum this year will eat into the Council's HRA reserve, possibly increasing the financial risk to the Council which would surely not be the most appropriate path in the economic climate we face.

This work needs doing as soon as we can but the long-term financial stability of the Council remains our key consideration, even if it means that work on the Stonecliffes run into next year. If this is the case, the estate must still remain a priority and every property must be brought up to standard – every property. I therefore call on Councillor Gruen to please look sympathetically on us and ensure that we have the necessary resources to get the job done as soon as we feasibly can. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR D BLACKBURN: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. I thank Les for his interest and putting this money forward but I have got to say, I know something you don't know.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Just vote for it.

COUNCILLOR D BLACKBURN: I would suggest he waits till he speaks to the Chief Exec of West North West Homes and possibly Councillor Gruen to find out what the situation is, because quite honestly I am satisfied that that estate, within the next twelve to 18 months or so, will be done.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Tell us.

COUNCILLOR D BLACKBURN: I am satisfied that will be done and that is without dipping into this money.

COUNCILLOR SMITH: Meetings in darkened rooms.

COUNCILLOR D BLACKBURN: As I say, we are getting there. I have got say, the three Councillors of the ward, Councillor Hardy might be of a different party to me but he is fully supportive, as we are, of getting something done and, I will put it this way, we will be at Councillor Gruen's door every minute until we get the job completed. Thank you. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR M HAMILTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I know that the Greens are now in coalition with Labour...

COUNCILLOR A BLACKBURN: No, we are not.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Yes you are.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Yes you are.

COUNCILLOR M HAMILTON: If you are not in the coalition then you will have no problem voting with us on this amendment, presumably, there is no reason why you cannot do that. I have never heard such a bizarre speech, particularly from Councillor Ann Blackburn, which seemed to be saying because we have not got the money to do the whole estate, we should not do anything. That is what you have actually just said.

COUNCILLOR A BLACKBURN: No I did not.

COUNCILLOR M HAMILTON: That is exactly what you said, Anne. Keep them in that situation. I really find that a bizarre position to take.

Then Councillor Hardy has basically said we want this money, please, so he has spoken completely against party lines, so it will be interesting to see how people actually vote at the end of this debate, because I am completely confused, I have to say, Lord Mayor, completely confused.

Lord Mayor, the approach that the Green Party seem to be taking on this is rather like the approach that the Labour Party took to road resurfacing, which was basically we will not do anything until we have got the money to do the whole city. We will not make a start on it, we will not try and improve the roads, we will not do it gradually over a period of time. We will do nothing and then, of course, all that you end up with is roads that are full of potholes. All that you end up with, Councillor Blackburn, is an estate that gets worse and worse and worse and what you have from Councillor Gruen is a promise of jam tomorrow. I have to say, I would not accept a pot of jam from Councillor Gruen – I think it might give you some serious indigestion. I think that is something you should bear in mind as you now have joined the Labour Party on the administration benches.

COUNCILLOR A BLACKBURN: No we have not.

COUNCILLOR M HAMILTON: Lord Mayor, I would urge the Green Party to support their local residents, which is what this amendment would do, to support the local residents, to get investment into that estate rather than trusting Councillor Gruen and the Labour Group who they are apparently not even in coalition with, to deliver something in two or three years' time because the track record of that party is, Lord Mayor, that when they promise something, they do not deliver. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Can I welcome Les's generosity with money he has not got to spend. I have always thought that Les was one of the most generous members of Council and I am glad to see him living up to his reputation.

I thought Martin's comments were – to be honest I was completely lost with what he was saying

COUNCILLOR M HAMILTON: We are all lost then.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: You may be; I am not.

Councillor Gruen's proposal is quite straightforward, to put money into non-trad houses in West North West.

I will just give you a little bit of history to that and why all the members in Wortley are so concerned. Back when we had Leeds West ALMO we started work on that estate. It was very difficult because there was a huge argument – I am not

sure whether Andrew was on at the time – about whether we should have pitched roofs. There is a problem because we have got a lot of owner occupation on the estate and it is terraced property, so you cannot do one property and leave the next one because you end up with a kind of Toblerone effect of roofs, so very difficult to do those negotiations and we ended up not getting the whole estate done. If you drive past now you see some blocks that look absolutely brilliant, they look smashing. They have got all the insulation, they have got everything, they look really good for what are poor quality 1960s housing we have to say that, but still popular.

Those blocks are wonderful and then next to them you have these blocks that look absolutely horrendous. They look like some of the worst housing in the city and they have not got any insulation, they are built to the standards of the day which were poor in terms of noise insulation, heat insulation and everything else. So, we have got a problem that needs sorting there. Exactly the same properties as you have on the Woodbridges – I just know the Stonecliffes better because I see them nearly every day.

The Waterloos are similar non-trad. Les, it is the first time you have called them the Waterloos, you normally call them the Wellingtons! *(laughter)*

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: He was at Waterloo, wasn't he? *(laughter)*

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Yes, there is a connection, I understand. The Waterloo estate has a similar kind of chequered history because back in about 2004/05 we demolished half the estate but the promise was then made – and we have had this discussion in the Exec Board and I know nobody is saying we should not do the work to any of these estates, but back then the promise was made to tenants that the remaining properties would be improved – not to decency because the problem on that estate was not about decency, it was not about kitchens and bathrooms, it was actually about damp because when they were built back in 1935, the local jobbing builder who built them – I think he is from Otley, no comments about Otley – he hit on the brilliant idea of only having cavity walling up to the first floor level and then it was single skin and since then those properties have been plagued with damp issues. I certainly surveyed one street on the estate and more than 80 per cent of the residents were telling me that they still had damp problems. Some of those properties I have been into, I have to say, would shame any of us.

This is money, quite rightly Peter says to the ALMOs, "We want matched funding." There is nothing wrong with that. Your Government used to that to us all the time. They never did anything else but ask for matched funding and what crippled the Housing Revenue Account for many, many years was that you would bid for funding which was always top sliced from the general pot and then they would say, "Ah, but you have to matched fund it" and back in I remember the early 1990s we had so little money to spend on what we wanted because of that matched funding agreement we had to come to.

I very much welcome Peter's initiative. Peter is actually dealing with the problem that has not been dealt with over the past six years and I support. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. A very interesting debate, really and obviously all of us agree that because of the healthy surplus on the HRA it is absolutely right, particularly in these difficult financial times, to be committing as much as possible of that windfall money to improve tenants' homes.

I would just say one thing to the new administration. They seem to have spent a lot of time so far in this debate trying to dig Councillor Ann Blackburn out of a

hole which she dug for herself. If they continue doing that they will find it to be a very self-defeating exercise and one that is not really worth the candle.

However, my Lord Mayor, the most interesting thing about what Councillor Gruen had to say was that he announced matched funding like pulling a rabbit out of a hat. I have always thought that when there was a proposal to spend money and matched funding was part of it, it was part of the report. I wonder why it is not part of the report.

Perhaps the reason is this, that Aire Valley Homes have net assets on their balance sheet of £6m and pension liabilities of £9m, leaving net reserves on their balance sheet of minus £3m. East North East Homes have net assets on their balance sheet of £11,368,000 and pension liabilities of £19,510,000, leaving them with net reserves at minus £8,142,000. West North West Homes have net assets of £14,352,000 and liabilities of £12,738,000, giving them a surplus on their balance sheet of £1,614,000. Together their liabilities against their own balance sheets are £9,541,000. Tell me, Councillor Gruen, where is the £4.6m matched funding coming from? Either you are going to cut existing programmes in each of the ALMO areas or try and make them do that, or you are going to do what your previously discredited Prime Minister and another prominent member of the Labour Party, Robert Maxwell, once did, and raid the pension funds. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR G HYDE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I was not going to speak but I have listened to a load of nonsense this afternoon...

COUNCILLOR: Sit down, then.

COUNCILLOR G HYDE: ... and I have to say – and I do not mean that nastily, Les, but this is a bit of political mischief by yourself. There are three ALMOs. You have cited one ALMO, North West. The same case I can make for East North East Homes as a director and so can the ten directors on that board and so can Aire Valley Homes.

I think there has to be an equitable share-up about how we deal with this and I have every confidence in my colleague, Councillor Gruen, to look at a fair and equitable way of dealing with it and it is not a political point. This is actually a fact, Les. I can actually go to Chapeltown now and there are houses there that have the same needs as those houses you are citing in North West Homes. It is about a fair and equitable share.

I also agree about increasing the aids and adaptations budget.

The final point which I find interesting, by Andrew Carter, is about RF17. We have been asking under your administration, as you know well, Councillor Carter, the last three years about a Letter of Undertaking which the District Auditor says you can undertake.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: So you can rob the pension fund, yes.

COUNCILLOR G HYDE: We have asked for it, it has been written in writing, you have not even had the decency to reply to my Board. I can tell you that as Vice-Chair because I deal with the finances of the company. We have actually a balanced budget if you take out the RF17 liabilities, which we have to do because this Council – and we have now written, Les, to the Executive Board member and he is now considering it with his Chief Executive to look at underwriting RF17 on behalf of all three ALMOs.

I can tell you my company's balance sheet is balanced, Les, and we do have reserves of £11m because we were asked to do that by your administration, as you well know.

I think, Lord Mayor, there should be a fair, equitable share of this brass put out to the three ALMOs so they can deliver what they have already been delivering on for the last five years.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: There you are, Greens, you have got to share it with somebody else.

COUNCILLOR G HYDE: I am not arguing with North West Homes at all, they have the same cases as my ALMO does and so does Aire Valley Homes. I think the Executive Board member is trying to approach this in a fair and equitable way and I support the resolution by Councillor Gruen. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Gruen to sum up, please.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I have here in my hand a letter which Les gave me on the evening of Mayor Making. He came across pulled this rabbit out of his pocket and I still have to learn from Les, I thought I was the only recipient of this letter because it was private.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: It didn't say private.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Oh, no.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: I have got this letter and then I realised over the days that half the Council have got this letter.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Of course.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Everybody has been given a copy of this letter of the largess that J L Carter has left us, which actually is Government money – it was then Government money. Les, thank you for your letter.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: It is taxpayers' money.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Isn't it amazing, colleagues, how quickly they have become the Opposition and how within a few weeks...

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: You haven't become the administration!

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: You haven't become the administration. You are still up to your old tricks.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: This is windfall money, £4.6m, and it is absolutely clear in terms of matched funding, I said we top sliced the money for aids and adaptations and for fire safety. For actual investment in property, if we put £700,000 into North North West, we want them to put in £700,000. Surely nothing can be fairer or clearer than that.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Where is it coming from?

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Going through the contributions, Councillor Leadley supports no further spend in Morley. We shall publicise that because by accepting Councillor Les Carter's amendment...

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Rubbish, that is not what he said at all.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: ...or spending all of £960,000 in one ALMO, you are actually saying the longest you will go to and other people that in Aire Valley Homes and in East North East Homes, you want no further money being spent there and it should all go into North North West.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: What about Beeston? What about the PFI scheme?

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Thank you for that offer, I will remember it over the coming months.

I was impressed by the passion from both the Greens and John Hardy. You know, if I closed my eyes and listened to John, I thought Alec Shelbrooke had come back, but Alec Shelbrooke is an MP now so you have got a very bright future ahead of you, John.

I think this mischief making from Les...

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Oh, that's a shame.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: ...is quite astounding. Les came to the Safer Leeds Executive the other day whether it was the police or the Youth Offending Team or the Probation Team or the Health Team, all of them, one after one, said how massively the cuts of the new Government would affect them. No CCTV...

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: You were the only one who said it!

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: He makes it up as he goes along.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: I think you were at a different meeting, Les.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: I was there.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: I think for him to now come ...

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: You were the only one who said it.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: ...and say let us spend additional money in July, not even at the end of the first quarter of the financial year is, frankly, astounding.

The very firm advice that I have received from officers is that if we are going to spend any of that £960,000...

COUNCILLOR J CARTER: Nine hundred and twenty-three – 923.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: ...now is not the right time. Now is not the right time and, indeed, we may well have a different point of view altogether looking across the needs of the Council.

What Les has to understand, I think, is that I am not going to perpetuate his divide and rule campaign with the ALMOs. I am going to work with all the ALMOs together in partnership with the Strategic Landlord and there will be a different way of consideration and working together.

I think I need to respond to some specifics. I recognise from the information before us that David, Ann and John are right – there would only be 17 properties left. The investment this year for the Stonecliffes would be nigh on £600,000; on the Woodbridges, over £600,000. There is fairness and balance. I am committed to ensuring that the 17 properties and the scheme out on site will continue into the next financial year. I have spoken in detail with the Chief Executive of North North West and her ALMO will shortly be receiving the appropriate papers to endorse what has been said.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Even though it's bust.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: They will endorse the ---

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Even though it's bust.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: I think---

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: It is trading insolvently, Peter.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: I think the answer is very clear. You cannot try and browbeat members who have integrity about their own ward (*laughter*)...

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: You're a good one saying that.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Sit down, Peter, your time is up.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: ...and how much money they want to spend and who understand the principles of fairness in the future spending.

Finally, I commend to you that this particular proposal is fair, is just, is needed and if we agree to it now, we have the time to invest in this financial year in this package. I move accordingly. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Mad, bad and dangerous.

THE LORD MAYOR: Members, can I call upon a vote on the amendment in the name of J L Carter?

COUNCILLOR LOBLEY: Lord Mayor, can I call for a recorded vote, please?

COUNCILLOR BENTLEY: Seconded.

(A recorded vote was held on the amendment)

THE LORD MAYOR: Members, there are 95 members present in the Chamber. The "Yes" vote is 47; there are no abstentions; there are 48 voted against.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Lord Mayor, you voted against, did you?

THE LORD MAYOR: I abstained, actually. You will get the list, Les, you will be able to check it out. Therefore the motion in the name of Councillor Gruen becomes the main motion. Can we vote?

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: I think we will have a recorded vote.

THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE: The motion now before Council is that the officer recommendation be approved subject to the matched funding allocation, an observation offered by Councillor Gruen, so that is the motion before you.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Can I just ask, my Lord Mayor, does it not need leave of Council to alter a motion because that has not been given.

THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE: Formally it does, Les.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Thank you.

THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE: Councillor Gruen, the recommendation at page 82G is the approval of the allocation of an additional £4.6m in accordance with what is set out in the report. You have suggested that allocation be on a matched funding basis.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: I took it that was just a question of mechanism rather than...

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: No, no.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: I am happy to amend it in accordance with what Nicole advises us to do.

THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE: You seek leave of Council to amend that.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Yes, I am seeking leave of Council to do that.

THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE: Is that seconded?

THE LORD MAYOR: Is that seconded?

COUNCILLOR ATHA: Yes, I will second.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Can I ask what the amendment now says?

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: You can never take a straight road, can you?

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: What is the wording?

THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE: As I understand it, Lord Mayor, I think, Councillor Gruen, the recommendation is now to approve the allocation of an additional £4.6m on a matched funding basis - that is my understanding – to be spent in accordance with the proposals as set out under 82.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: That is not what he said.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Subject to matched funding.

COUNCILLOR BENTLEY: £9.2m.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Lord Mayor, can I propose that we suspend the Council to have a written form of this circulated so we are all clear about what we are actually voting for, Lord Mayor?

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: I second, my Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: I think it may become clear.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Might become clear.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: We have no written text, Lord Mayor.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: What a mess. Peter, resign, I will take it over again!

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: What a start.

COUNCILLOR LYONS: I notice you are not calling for an election.

THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE: In terms of clarification now my understanding is that that recommendation, which I can just read out as it is currently framed, "To approve the allocation of an additional £4.6m to the Housing Revenue Account to be spent in accordance with the proposals as set out in this report" is varied to provide for that allocation to be on a matched funding basis in relation to the West North West property homes.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Is that £700,000?

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: I made it very clear. It is part of the £700,000 for the non-trad buildings.

COUNCILLOR LOBLEY: Lord Mayor, I must protest about this.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Just ---

THE LORD MAYOR: One at a time, please.

COUNCILLOR LOBLEY: I must protest. I would doubt very much that there is a full understanding from all of the members in this Chamber as to exactly what it is they will be voting for. There should be a circulated written form of the motion that we are voting on and I think that we need to seek leave of Council to have that written up and then circulated for voting on rather than policy on the hoof. Thank you. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Gruen.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: I am asking you to proceed to the vote.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: On what?

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: It has been made perfectly clear by the Chief Executive that that matched funding applies to the £700,000 for North North West. If you do not understand, you should not be here.

COUNCILLOR: It has not been made clear.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Lord Mayor, as a Council we have recently been in the High Court and had a decision handed down which centred around whether members were or were not clear about what they were voting for.

COUNCILLOR: Rubbish.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Whatever Councillor Gruen has in his mind, we have clearly heard that a substantial number of members in this Council are not clear exactly what they are voting on. I cannot see the problem, Lord Mayor, with having that before us so we clearly know. We might not agree at the end of the day but let us be clear upon what we are voting on.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can I suggest that we adjourn for ten minutes so we can talk to each other. I will make that decision from the Chair.

(Council adjourned for a short time)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Gruen, please.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Lord Mayor, can I continue? Before I was interrupted I was seeking leave of Council to vary the motion on the Order Paper by adding the following words – and some of you have the words in front of you:

“The recommendation on page 82G of the Council Agenda subject to the proposed allocation of £700k for property improvement for non-traditional housing in West North West Homes be allocated on a matched funding basis.”

I so move.

THE LORD MAYOR: Is there a seconder?

COUNCILLOR NASH: My Lord Mayor, I second.

COUNCILLOR LOBLEY: I do not want to get ahead of the game, Lord Mayor, but when you call for a vote could we have a recorded one, please? Thank you.

THE LORD MAYOR: You are ahead of the game but we are both new, Matthew, we understand. Can I ask if leave is given by the Council to proceed?

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: That is what we want the recorded vote on.

THE LORD MAYOR: It will be a recorded vote but we do need to ask...

THE ASSISTANT CHIEF EXECUTIVE (Corporate Governance): No, they want a recorded vote on whether leave of Council is given.

THE LORD MAYOR: OK, yes.

(A recorded vote was held on leave being given to amend the motion)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. There are 95 members present. Voting “Yes” 48, there is one abstention and “No” is 46. Leave is now given by the Council to proceed to the form of words used by Councillor Gruen.

(A vote was held on the amended motion)

THE LORD MAYOR: That is CARRIED. Thank you.

ITEM 6 – QUESTIONS

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we go, very late in the day, to question, please, Item 6. Question number one, Andrew Carter, please.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. Does the Exec Board member for City Development welcome the recent Government announcement that the Regional Spatial Strategy, known as RSS, is to be abolished?

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Lord Mayor, given the debates that we have had in Council on one particular element of the RSS, I would have to say up to a point. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: My Lord Mayor, Councillor Lewis might want to tell me why his answer now varies from the protestations we were getting from him and his Leader...

COUNCILLOR ATHA: Is it a speech or a question?

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: No, it is a question. You heard the beginning of it. Councillor Lewis might want to tell us why...

COUNCILLOR ATHA: He might not.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: ...the protestations about the RSS from him and his Leader prior to the elections were a great deal stronger than his answer just now, and he also might like to confirm to Council that his administration's robust defence of the green belt and the greenfield sites in Leeds will be as vigorous as the defence mounted by members on this side and, indeed, opposite me in the Chamber.

COUNCILLOR ATHA: And the Greens.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Whilst the Regional Spatial Strategy was positive in a number of significant respects for Leeds through their support for major regeneration projects, re-use of previously developed land, the city centre and climate change, the document also contained a number of key elements which we were not happy with, mainly the issue of numbers. As we have said on many occasions, we felt the strategy was far too rigid in that respect.

However, I do not believe that we should ever throw the baby out with the bathwater and people who think that what Eric Pickles did was other than a bit of smoke and mirrors in terms of the RSS should wait for the detail, as I wait for detail on where planning policy is under the new Government, because clearly we have a lot of mention of community involvement but nobody seems to be clarifying quite how that is going to work.

I can assure Councillor Carter that we shall be defending the green belt as rigorously as the previous administration but we shall do it in a sensible and thought out way. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Can the Executive Member for Adult Social Care confirm that she remains committed to delivering quality services that promote independent living, control and choice for vulnerable adults?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Yeadon to reply, please.

COUNCILLOR YEADON: Thank you. May I say what a fetching tie you are wearing!

I have no hesitation to confirm this administration is committed to delivering the best services we can to people who have social care needs and to promote their independence, choice and control over their lives. I would like just to take a few minutes to tell members of the Council about some of the things that we are doing to achieve this.

We are in the process of adopting as a norm the offer of a personal budget to every single person who qualifies for social care if they want it. This gives people an opportunity to take complete control if they want to of how their care plan is delivered, who delivers it, when and where.

Our Independent Living Project is in the process of transforming the lives of people with learning disabilities and people with mental health needs. They are moving from the old-fashioned hostel-type accommodation to newly built clusters of flats and bungalows where they are taking up their places in communities, deciding how they want to spend their days and with whom and learning new skills that will give them independence that they have never had before.

The new Reablement Service is restoring the life skills of people who have lost confidence and abilities following an event such as a fall, an illness or a spell in hospital. It is preventing people from being admitted to residential care prematurely; it is preventing unnecessary admission to hospital; and it is helping people retain their independence for longer.

We are using state of the art technology under a scheme called Telecare to help people with dementia stay safely in their own homes by providing detectors that alert carers if the person wanders away from home, leaves the cooker on or if they fall. This gives the person the dignity of staying at home and the carers peace of mind in the knowledge that their loved one is safe when they cannot be there.

These are just a few examples of how Adult Social Care is working hard to give people independence, choice and control over where they live later in their lives.

This administration is committed to putting forward innovative new services, to increasing independence, choice and control whilst, at the same time, maintaining traditional services for those who need and want them. Thank you. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: Lord Mayor, by way of supplementary, thank you, Exec Member, for delivering a speech that I am sure Peter Harrand must have written. Could I just therefore inform her, to quote from her counterpart in Liverpool, people are already voting with their feet and the demand for traditional services has been shrinking, which you have just said is happening here in Leeds, so could I just ask of you which Day Centres are at risk under your administration, as the paper that you are taking to Exec Board next week recognises the need to accelerate the transformation of these services?

COUNCILLOR YEADON: I do not think the paper next week says any day services are under risk. What we are trying to do is transform day services, which does not necessarily mean putting at risk.

We are always looking at new ways of delivering day services, whether that is through a traditional model or whether that is through individualised budgets, but bearing in mind that we are doing this under the announced cuts in Local Government spending, thinking about the implications of the Comprehensive

Spending Review and this Government's willingness to slash public services aided and abetted by their Liberal colleagues. We are trying to deliver day services under very difficult conditions indeed. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ronnie Grahame. Where it is not a maiden speech it has been some time Ronnie, so perhaps a bit of attention might be helpful.

COUNCILLOR GRAHAME: It has been a long time, Lord Mayor. They were all waving me goodbye but I have come back.

I would like to ask, would the Executive Board Member for Leisure explain the implications for Leeds of the Conservative and Liberal Democrat Coalition Government's decision to end free swimming for the under 16s and the over 60s? Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ogilvie.

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: Thank you, Lord Mayor, thank you, Councillor Grahame for the question. Members will be aware that Leeds received £619,000 of free swimming resources from the last Government which allowed us to offer free swimming for those under 16 and those over 60. The new Government has scrapped this initiative as from the end of July, which I think is short-sighted and foolhardy. They are using the excuse that the people who benefited from this would actually be people who would swim anyway, which is just not true.

In fact in Leeds they actually proved that that is wrong. In the areas of the city where we need to be encouraging people to be more active, i.e. in those areas with high levels of deprivation, the increase in people taking advantage has actually been the greatest. For example, in terms of those under 16, East Leeds Sports Centre has seen a 77% increase. South Leeds, 78.5% increase. Fearnville, 123% increase. Middleton, a whopping 124% increase.

Also in the last few days the Government has added to the pain by announcing that they are scrapping the free swimming capital moneys as well. That was going to be £2m which we were going to use to help refurbish Aireborough and Kirkstall Leisure Centres and Otley Chippendale Swimming Pool.

Amidst all the gloom and doom however, Lord Mayor, I am pleased to be able to say that, although we are going to have to reinstate charges for those over 60 from 1st August, we have decided to continue swimming for young people under 16 for the duration of the school holidays, and I think that is the right thing to do. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Grahame, is there a supplementary?

COUNCILLOR GRAHAME: No, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Leadley, please.

COUNCILLOR LEADLEY: Lord Mayor, can the Executive Member for Environmental Services tell us where he is going to put his incinerator? *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: And the Greens' incinerator.

COUNCILLOR A BLACKBURN: No.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Oh, there's a "No" there".

COUNCILLOR MURRAY: Lord Mayor, it is nice to be back on the right side of the Chamber.

COUNCILLOR: Extreme right. (*laughter*)

COUNCILLOR MURRAY: Just a little warning here. It has been six years since I have answered a question so it is likely that I am going to be a bit rusty, so just bear that in mind please. Lord Mayor, just excuse the pun – we are obviously talking rubbish here.

If I can just go the question so I am clear myself what I will answer, can I tell you where I am going to put my incinerator – that is what it says, “put his incinerator.” My incinerator. Tom, I did not realise that he knew that I have got one. I have got one.

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: Mick, come on!

COUNCILLOR MURRAY: I have got an eco-friendly, wood burning stove which I bought from Homebase and I have located it in the back garden. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR: Come on, Mick, you should be asking this question.

COUNCILLOR LEADLEY: Can he confirm that his administration has given serious consideration to incinerating municipal waste?

COUNCILLOR MURRAY: Yes. Maybe I should apologise a little bit, Tom, for the first answer to the first question but it was pointed out to me – and you would expect me to say this – we have been here before and it has been pointed out before that often my colleague, Mick Lyons, would often ask that same question and getting the right answers and the full answers were like getting blood out of a stone and he was often laughed at, they were often confused about what was going on.

Let us be clear. Let us be clear about this, Tom. Where we are going to put this incinerator, yes? It is not mine – in effect it is yours. It is the language of this question that is wrong, isn't it? It is not mine, it is not ours – it is actually yours. It was your group, you agreed in the last administration to put your incinerator;;;

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Just tell us where it's going.

COUNCILLOR MURRAY: ...in the Aire Valley, which, of course, would suit them – Morley is up wind of the Aire Valley and you probably were actually delighted about that. You are quite right, there is a review going on, that is the deal we are doing with the Greens. Nobody can make a decision now, the decision will come later. You will be fully informed (*interruption*)...

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: How much is that going to cost?

COUNCILLOR MURRAY: ...public will be consulted and members will be involved. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR: It is a coalition.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Sharon Hamilton. Again, Councillor Hamilton, this is not a maiden speech but it has been some time.

COUNCILLOR S HAMILTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Would the Executive Member for Adult Social Care please comment on the suspension of the Hope Park Wellbeing Centre Scheme?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Yeadon, please.

COUNCILLOR YEADON: The Hope Park Wellbeing Centre is a real cutting edge project which aims to bring 21st Century efficient public services to this area of Leeds. Just weeks before building work was expected to start we were informed by the Government that the funding for this project had been put on hold and its reinstatement was subject to the Comprehensive Spending Review this autumn. This was extremely disappointing news and a blow to vulnerable people.

The new centre would not only provide state of the art leisure and health facilities for all residents in the area; it would also bring together facilities for people with learning disabilities and older people, two of the most vulnerable groups of people in our city.

If Ministers decide to withdraw the funding, vulnerable people would not get the facilities they need. Whilst we all know that the Government cuts are coming, we do not all agree that these cuts should be aimed at vulnerable people, which is exactly the prospect that the Government has placed on the table here.

Back to the question by Councillor Cleasby – if there is a day service under threat at the moment, it is this one.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Hamilton, is there a supplementary?

COUNCILLOR S HAMILTON: Yes, Lord Mayor. Does the Executive Member agree that at a time when we are told public sector efficiencies are needed it is nonsensical to axe a project that would actually provide services in a more efficient way than they are currently provided?

COUNCILLOR YEADON: The new centre would indeed combine many services under one roof in a modern and energy efficient building. This has to be a far more economical way of providing public services than scattering them out in separate buildings. The Wellbeing Centre was designed to break the mould in which adult day services, care services, are delivered, with a focus of encouraging people to remain independent and active. This would help people to live in their own homes for longer, reducing the number of people needing costly residential care.

As I said before, we all know that Government cuts are coming and the Government is telling us we need to find ways of delivering better services more efficiently, and we believe that this project would. All the evidence is this project would actually do that and so I do agree with you, Councillor Hamilton, it is nonsense for the Government to axe this project at a time when public sector efficiencies are needed and I would like to just thank all the other members...

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: They have not axed it. You should be lobbying for it, they have not axed it.

COUNCILLOR YEADON: I am sorry, I will go on speaking. I just want to thank all the other members who signed the cross-party letter which went to the Minister and I hope that that will do the job and get this centre back to where we need it. Thank you. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Which was our idea in the first place.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor John Procter, please.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Does the new Executive Member for Leisure agree that in the current financial climate it is essential that the Council continues to support events that generate the authority much needed income?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ogilvie, please.

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: In answer to the former Executive Member for Leisure (*laughter and applause*) the answer is yes.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: By way of supplementary, Lord Mayor, when his Leader announced in the Yorkshire Evening Post on 10th June he would look to axe...

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: No, I did not say that.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: ... the German Christmas Market, was he actually in favour of this and, if he was not in favour of it, would he like to join my campaign to save the much-loved event which actually generates a profit for the city?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ogilvie, please.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: After Germany beat England at football? (*laughter*)

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: That's the grounds for cancelling it then?

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: As you would expect, Lord Mayor, as an incoming administration we are looking at every aspect of all of our portfolios and that includes the events programme. I can reassure Councillor Procter that both Councillor Wakefield and myself agree that there will be no plans to make changes to this year's German Christmas Market.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Our campaign is victorious! (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: The campaign is finished.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: We have won the campaign!

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Alan Taylor, please.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: That's what the paper will say.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: They're not that daft, John.

COUNCILLOR A TAYLOR: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Does the Executive Board Members for Leisure agree that residents in Leeds should expect the same level of service in all our parks?

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: Lord Mayor, we provide a great range of facilities and types of landscape in our parks, from sports grounds to ornamental gardens, from allotments to cafés, from playgrounds to wildlife areas. Each of these has its distinctive requirements so I would not say that every park should be the same, but

what I would say is that the people of Leeds should expect a consistently good level of service in all of our parks.

I would accept that this is not necessarily the case everywhere and I would welcome members' comments on improvements that need to be made, and I am sure Councillor Taylor will, in his supplementary, tell me something that is not quite right, so I will sit down and see what he has got to say.

COUNCILLOR A TAYLOR: Lord Mayor, by way of supplementary, does he then agree that his administration's decision to intensely enforce an outright ban on illegal disposable barbecues on Woodhouse Moor has created an expectation that the same will happen in other parks, including Horsforth Hall Park, Roundhay Park, Meanwood Park, Kirkstall Abbey Park, Woodhouse Ridge, Golden Acre Park and Otley Chevin, where such barbecues have been witnessed, and will he commit to mainstreaming the cost of this enforcement, which will cost around £20,000 per park per year?

COUNCILLOR: £2m in total.

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I think it is quite amusing after the fiasco of the last administration in terms of how they managed the Woodhouse Moor situation, but I may say more about that later.

Just to say that in terms of the issue of enforcement on Woodhouse Moor, which is working very well we are, of course, looking at how that can be funded in the future and we will report back to Council no doubt at a later date.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Akhtar again, please, and again Councillor Akhtar, it is not a maiden speech but it has been a few years.

COUNCILLOR AKHTAR: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. Could the Executive Member for Leisure explain what factors were taken into account when deciding the future of Woodhouse Moor designated barbecue area?

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: Thank you, Councillor Akhtar, and can I firstly congratulate both yourself and Councillor Gerry Harper on your successful campaign to beat the Lib Dems in Hyde Park and Woodhouse. *(Applause)*

Part of the reason for their success was, of course, their campaign with local people against the last administration's barmy plans for a barbecue area on Woodhouse Moor. The thing that has amused me over the last few weeks is hearing people on that side of the Chamber all saying, "We never agreed with the policy anyway". We have had the Lib Dems saying, "It was all forced on us by the Tories"...

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: No they do not say that.

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: Oh yes they do, and the Tories saying it was down to the Lib Dems sitting on the fence. Whoever was responsible for the bungled policy over that side, I am very pleased to say that one of the first things we did on taking back control of the Council was to stop the trial of the barbecue area on Woodhouse Moor. We campaigned before the election for the proper enforcement of the byelaws on Woodhouse Moor and that is what is now happening.

I would just like to pay tribute to the work of our Parks Watch Officers who are patrolling on Woodhouse Moor, working with local people and are successfully preventing barbecue activity and enforcing the byelaws. It is a sensible policy and what should have been done in the first place. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR AKHTAR: Lord Mayor, can I ask the Exec Member to ensure in the future no action would be taken in Woodhouse Moor without the consultation of the local residents and also the Friends of Woodhouse Moor?

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: Let me assure Councillor Akhtar that I will be meeting on a regular basis with groups, including the Friends of Woodhouse Moor – I have already met them once – and we will not have the bungled consultation exercise that the last administration inflicted on everybody.

COUNCILLOR SMITH: You will not do any consultation.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Grayshon, please.

COUNCILLOR GRAYSHON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Can the Leader of Council give an update on the situation regarding Brian, the retired show pony removed from land adjacent to Wortley Beck and Granny Lane Leeds on June 10th 2010 by a company known as PPS acting on behalf of Leeds City Council?

Would the Leader of Council agree with me that the practices employed by PPS in this matter are unacceptable and is he willing to offer an apology on behalf of Leeds City Council to the Forsyth family for the unacceptable manner in which they, and Brian, have been dealt? Can he also give his assurance that the working practices of PPS will be reviewed as a matter of urgency?

I am glad you think it is funny, Tom. I can assure you that the people who have contacted me after reading about it in the Evening Post find it anything but amusing.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Murray to reply, please.

COUNCILLOR MURRAY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am sorry if you got the wrong idea there, Terry – it is something that Adam said.

As the Executive Member for Environmental Services the Leader has asked me, of course, to reply to the question and it is, of course, as I said before a new portfolio – I am looking, I am listening and I am learning and there is a lot of work involved in that but I have not yet got to the manual which does say looking after horses – I have not got that far.

When the story came up on the front pages of the Yorkshire Evening Post, that was the first time I knew this was happening. I think I have got to say that there was poor communication within the Council within the press department, within senior officers and that message getting to me. There was definitely poor communication and that needs to be sorted.

If I go back to your first question, if I can update, the update is that Brian is well looked after, he is in stables, the vet has had a look and he is doing well and arrangements are in place to return him to the owner as soon as possible.

The second part, which I take might be your second question anyway, are we willing to offer – I think an apology has been given, an apology has been given publicly and we will give it again in Council. We are very sorry about the distress that has been concerned. Your next bit, will it happen again? It should not happen again, no, it should not, and that will be looked into a reviewed thoroughly.

Before I stand down, perhaps I ought to just mention one thing – it is not really a defence but it is something that I think members need to be aware of. The figures – let's have a look. There are about 900 sites checked, 2,000 notices and we are talking about upwards, in 2009, of nearly 3,646 tethered horses, so there is a situation out there and in the past what has happened is, horses are valuable, those people who own the horses sometimes get very angry, they have tracked down where our workers have been and there have been acts of violence in the city and nationally, so that is in some way why John Davis – we all remember John, John is your Director of Leisure - introduced a policy which introduced this secret way, if you like, of being able to deal with it and it is right we should check that those six horses that we have – we have not done this yet but we will – the six horses that have been impounded, the ones that we have brought across, that the same thing did not happen to those owners, the same thing. We have not read about it in the Yorkshire Evening Post but I think I am picking up rumours that it might happen elsewhere at some other time.

We take the incident very seriously and we have been addressing it seriously as well. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Grayshon?

COUNCILLOR GRAYSHON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Thank you for that answer, Councillor Murray. Can Councillor Murray explain to me why this service is operated in a manner that members of the general public cannot contact anyone in Leeds City Council, that the horses' email address is not mentioned on any letters? I do not think it is acceptable and can he also explain why there is neither a mobile telephone number nor a non-geographical telephone number which would anonymise the answerer of the call for people who have these horses impounded? I understand that there is an element of security of staff involved, but really, I do not think it is acceptable that this is done in the ether in 2010, particularly by an organisation which represents the third largest metropolitan district in the country. Can he explain that to me, please?

COUNCILLOR MURRAY: I think, Lord Mayor, in effect we agree. The element of secrecy has shocked us all. What happened we do not want to happen again. This idea about being able to get people to be able to contact us quietly, efficiently and effectively and get those horses back into their care, that needs to happen.

The review, how long will it take? That review might take a couple of weeks but when that is done we will come back with some of the things that you mentioned ought to be in place to be able to make it better.

COUNCILLOR ATHA: Well why aren't they now? They did it, they set it up. We should have been asking this question months ago.

COUNCILLOR MURRAY: I have answered is this is not the first incident; this is the first incident that has been on the front of the Yorkshire Evening Post.

COUNCILLOR ATHA: Does that make it important?

COUNCILLOR MURRAY: No, the point I am making, Bernard, is the whole system...

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: You are not supposed to heckle your own side.

COUNCILLOR MURRAY: ...is not working and we will look at how we can put it right.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Even more confused than usual, Bernard.

THE LORD MAYOR: I do not think you are allowed to speak again. Can we move on? Councillor James Lewis, please.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Can the Executive Board Member for Environmental Services please confirm that the figures highlighted in the YEP on 8th July 2010 regarding the cost to the Council of the bin strike last year are correct?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Murray, please.

COUNCILLOR MURRAY: Thank you, my Lord Mayor, the figure that is missing from in your question, James, Councillor Lewis, is £385,000 and that was the Yorkshire Post looking at figures from the Financial Performance Outturn report. I have got the figures in front of me, I can quote them to you, but in essence we are talking about paying out about £2,349,000 using contractors. We had an additional communications cost of nearly a quarter of a million pounds, so that ended up about £2.6m. We saved on pay, saved on fuel and the difference between the two ended up to be £385,000, so the answer to your question in short, James, is yes, they have reported what is true.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Question time has now finished, there is no supplementary.

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: My Lord Mayor, may I address you? I have reason to believe that the information that has just been given to Council is grossly incorrect. Could I therefore ask that you organise, or your Chief Executive organises... (*interruption*)

COUNCILLOR ATHA: Under what Standing Order, Lord Mayor, is he speaking?

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: ...that Councillor Murray makes his briefing paper available to the whole Council? If I am wrong...

THE LORD MAYOR: Brian, we need to move on.

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: Lord Mayor, if I am wrong, I will apologise.

THE LORD MAYOR: We do need to move on. You can write directly to Councillor Murray on that.

COUNCILLOR MURRAY: Point of explanation.

ITEM 7 – RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we move on to Item 7, Recommendations of the Standards Committee. Councillor Selby, please.

COUNCILLOR SELBY: Lord Mayor, I move the report in terms of the Notice and in doing so I take this opportunity of thanking Mike Wilkinson who served on the Standards Committee for eight years and played an important role as Chairman within that Committee for all the work he has done for the Council.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: My Lord Mayor, may I endorse those comments and second. You can't hear? I have such a gentle voice. I endorse the comments that Councillor Selby has just made in respect of the retiring Chair of the Standards Committee and also second this motion. I am not asking for it to be put in writing, I think you will all understand.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Les. Can we call for a vote, members, on that? *(A vote was taken)* That is CARRIED.

ITEM 8 – RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CORPORATE GOVERNANCE AND AUDIT COMMITTEE

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we go on to Item 8? Councillor Driver, please.

COUNCILLOR DRIVER: I move the Annual Report of the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee in terms of the Notice, Lord Mayor.

COUNCILLOR CAMPBELL: I second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we call for a vote on that one? *(A vote was taken)* That is CARRIED.

ITEM 9 – RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we go on to item 9, please, and I need to read something out here just so we are clear. It reads, to invite any individual members of the Council to indicate if they would wish a separate vote to be held in relation to any individual recommendations of the General Purpose Committee before Council proceeds to the consideration of the whole motion and amendments thereto. Is there anybody wishes that? No. Let us move on then. Councillor Wakefield, please.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Can I move the recommendations of the General Purposes Committee in terms of the Notice.

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: I second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can I call for the vote on that, members? *(A vote was taken)* That is CARRIED.

ITEM 10 – MINUTES

THE LORD MAYOR: Moving on, tem 10, Minutes. Councillor Wakefield, please.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Can I move that the Minutes be received in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 2(2)(m).

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: I second, Lord Mayor.

- (a) Executive Board
- (i) Resources & Corporate Functions

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we go to Resources & Corporate Functions, Councillor J Monaghan, please.

COUNCILLOR MONAGHAN: Thank you, Lord Mayor, speaking to Minute 17 on page 180 on the Resource and Corporate Functions, in particular reference to the environmental services budget.

I have to say I am extremely concerned that either the Labour Party are financially incompetent or they are deliberately misleading the members in this Chamber and the people in the City of Leeds. They know that the figures quoted in the YEP relating to the correct costs of the bin strike were wrong. The cost of the strike to the Council was actually £50,000. The YEP have quoted a total cost of £385,000, which is actually taken from the Outrun report relating specifically to the refuse collection service, not to the Council costs of the strike.

From the information given in the Outrun report, it would not be possible to identify the strike costs or any savings from the strike. They know this and I know they know this, because I was inadvertently copied into the response to the question that Councillor Murray (*interruption*)

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Another Exec Member caught out.

COUNCILLOR MONAGHAN: Rather than choosing to give the correct figure of what the cost of the strike was, £50,000, they instead chose to choose a figure that suited them of £385,000 that they know, and they clearly know, is wrong.

I would like to ask Councillor Murray if he will stand up and apologise to this Chamber (*Applause*) and if he will give us the correct answer that he knows he has.

COUNCILLOR RENSHAW: Lord Mayor, I would like to speak on pages 180 Minute number 16. Thank you, Lord Mayor. I wish to highlight the insidious ways in which the cuts described to the Area Based Grants impacts not only on current jobs and employment but also on our future workforce.

The claim by the new coalition Government that the private sector will in some way step in to mop up our job losses from the public sector is misleading on so many levels, not least of which that much of the private sector in Leeds and for the major cities relies on contracts which are the result of major projects funded by the very grants that the Government has cut.

Perhaps this is not so immediately obvious but what is, however, is that those furthest from the job market, for reasons of disadvantage, lack of education or training, struggled to find work even before these cuts were announced. These people, many of them young and unskilled, relied on the very interventions such as the Future Jobs Fund and Connexions to help them access employment. These funds, just as they began to make a difference, have now been drastically cut with the consequence that the programmes will suffer hugely or cease to exist completely, including the Council's own apprenticeship scheme.

To put this into meaningful context, as of 2008, 10.8% of the working age population in Leeds had no qualifications. As of April 2010, this city has, according to Connexions latest report, 1,677 young people not in employment, education or training – commonly known as the NEET figures, plus a further 1,334 not knowns. Together this represents 14.8% of all young people 16 to 18 years old. In some wards, such as Gipton and Harehills or Middleton Park, there are over one hundred young people registered as NEETs. Across the city, therefore, young people are already being let down by this Government. With one in five young people nationally

unemployed, how can this Government justify cancelling the young persons' grants (*inaudible*) scheme, now cut short. What of the young people who embarked on this programme in good faith? These are the hopes and aspirations of a generation of young people being dashed with little regard for the knock-on effect of their enduring worklessness on this generation and generations to come.

Across the city an average of 18% of children live in workless households and in deprived areas like Beeston this figure is over 38%. The implications in terms of child poverty, social breakdown and exclusion, with all the associated complex problems this causes, will cost this country and the city many times the amount saved by this cut in funds. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: Thank you, Lord Mayor, also speaking to Minute 16 page 180 regarding reduction in grants to local authorities.

Just to continue the area that Councillor Renshaw has started, I would like to inform Council that the impact of these cuts on children's services amounts to £5m. That is £5m coming out of this year's budget. I have to tell you, these grants and targeted specifically to support the most vulnerable children and young people in our city. I think it is worth just taking the time to list some of the schemes that are funded by this Area Based Grant.

These include, as well as the schemes highlighted by Councillor Renshaw, extended school start up funds, teenage pregnancy work, school improvement partners, child death review processes, child trust funds for looked after children, positive activities for young people which, of course, includes the Breeze projects.

Lord Mayor, I cannot possibly cover the full impact of these cuts in just five minutes. While it is too early to say exactly how each and every one of these schemes would be affected, it must be obvious to all that the effect will be immense.

This Government has put us in the position where we have to make some extremely difficult decisions about where to save this huge amount from some very worthwhile projects and, of course, this all comes on the back of the emergency budget that was rushed through by the Government that has already proved how out of touch it really is. This was a budget that has seen a huge burden put on families, removal, for example, of the health in pregnancy grant, the abolition of the planned toddlers' credit, the baby element of the tax credit, Sure Start maternity grant restricted, the freezing of child benefit and let's not forget the removal or reduction indeed of tax credits and, of course, this comes even before the spending review which we can expect to further decimate the services we provide.

Let me remind you that these are in-year cuts - cuts affecting your budget, the budget that you set, your programmes and I just want to ask you, how does it feel to know that the spending commitments you have made have been totally undermined by your own Government?

It is important not to under-estimate the impact of in-year cuts. How can departments and organisations be expected to plan for the future, provide much-needed services? We are talking about commission of services with contracts in place to the voluntary sector, with budgets committee and work programmes in place.

I have to tell you, one section of our city who are already too aware of the impact of these cuts are young people themselves. As recently as last week we heard that the Youth Capital Fund is being slashed by 50%. What sort of message does this send out to young people about how your Government intends to continue

to treat the future of our country? This money was committed, the young people were busy themselves working out how to fund schemes.

I want to take some time to focus on one specific group of people for whom the consequences of these cuts will be far-reaching, and I am talking about our city's looked after children. We know these children already under-perform at GCSE level. Over recent years we have seen some improvement, but not enough and the gap between looked after children and the Leeds average is still too big.

If we ignore the gold standard of five or more GCSEs A-C including English and Maths, only 4.4% of looked after children achieve this. We know that work has been continuing to improve this and I have to say that the Care Matters funding it has been proposed to remove will have a devastating effect on the work that is done in this area.

My Lord Mayor, another group that is really going to be affected by this is the voluntary and community sector. So much of this money has already been put out to them and they risk losing a huge amount of support to deliver services across the city.

Let us be clear, Lord Mayor, these cuts are indeed savage. Let us be clear, they will affect front line service but even more – and shame on you for not speaking out about this, we expect this from the Tories but not you sitting over there – these will have a direct impact on those vulnerable children and families in our city. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR DRIVER: Lord Mayor, I too wish to speak on Executive Board Minute 16 on page 180, dealing with the in-year reductions for Government grants to Local Authorities.

I do so in my new role as a Lead Member for Neighbourhoods and Housing and want to focus the Council's attention on the impact of these grant reductions upon a section of the population of Leeds who will be imminently affected by the Lib Dem/Tory coalition Government's brutal and draconian cuts in funding for the services provided by this Council. I refer to people who are homeless, those threatened with homelessness because of the announced cuts, and those who depend on benefits and allowances to help pay the rent of properties in which they live and who will now lose some or, indeed, all of that support.

Let us just say a word about Local Housing Allowances, which have been especially helpful to poorer tenants in the private sector in paying their rents. The Lib Dem/Tory coalition Government has already announced changes to the Local Housing Allowance scheme which mean that 40 per cent fewer tenants who rent privately can expect to receive the allowance. Since about a fifth, or 16,000 of the 80,000 housing claimants here in Leeds are in private property, that means up to six or seven thousand of our fellow citizens are affected and can expect to lose their allowance next year; as a result maybe also many of them will have to quit their homes for something cheaper.

This will inevitably increase pressure on the Council's housing resources and very likely lead to serious overcrowding, family breakdown and social misery for hundreds, maybe even thousands who in Leeds will become the victims of this particular coalition cut.

Housing benefits more widely we might turn to and look at what we have already been told by the Clegg/Cameron coalition Government, that from 2011 there

will be reductions in the housing benefits which those tenants already in the poorest quarter of the population, will be entitled to claim.

Not content with that, the Lib Dems and Tories in Government have already decided that from 2013 they will cut housing benefit by ten per cent for people who remain on Jobseekers' Allowance for more than twelve months, whether or not it is their fault. The Lib Dem/Tory coalition also says it will cut housing benefits to those tenants deemed to be living in properties larger than they need or, if they are held to have non-dependent people living with them. If ever there was an axe-wielding assertion that the poor must pay by the Lib Dem and Tory junta now in control of Whitehall and Westminster, surely this is it. If ever there was a recipe for the cultivation here in Leeds and elsewhere in our country of family disruption, human misery and squalid slums reminiscent of the 19th Century, surely this is it.

Lord Mayor, in view of such drastic Government cuts in housing support, I call on every member of this Council to restate their commitment to the protection of our city's most vulnerable residents by expressing our opposition to the Clegg/Cameron coalition Government cuts which will hurt most of all those of our fellow citizens who are least able to bear such pain - we heard from some of them this afternoon from Hyde Park, did we not? – and will create greater divisions between rich and poor to the long-term detriment of the city in which we live. Thank you, Lord Mayor.
(Applause)

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: Thank you, Lord Mayor, I would like to also speak on Minute 17 page 180, Financial Performance – Outturn 2009/2010.

As we have heard, the new Lib Dem/Tory coalition is making swingeing cuts across all departments and these are having a very dramatic and unfortunate effect on some very needed programmes. Like Councillor Blake, I am curious to know how it feels over there, because many of these programmes were your programmes – to see your Government slashing and burning their way through them all.

One such programme is Find Your Talent, a scheme set up to encourage and enable young people to engage in culture and also to help us identify and nurture any young people with a particular talent. This is a project that is very dear to my heart, as encouraging more people, especially those in certain hard to reach groups, to take part in cultural activities is vitally important.

A key strand was to work with each children's home in the city to help looked after children access the cultural facilities that we have in the city. Leeds was one of the ten Pathfinder Authorities chosen to take part in the programme and was set to receive £2.4m between 2009 and 2011 from the previous Government. The decision to end the scheme means that a number of very important projects will have to be cancelled. However, thanks to the diligent work of the Find Your Talent team in the Council, some of the most important have been saved, which is good news for the young people involved.

It is, still, though, very unfortunate that a number of schemes will cease, such as the Beck NEETs project which works with 13-19 year olds in East Leeds who are at risk of involvement with crime, antisocial behaviour and substance abuse. Another scheme to go is the Morley Visual Arts Project, which aimed to involve disengaged young people, including two youth groups aged 11 to 16, in creating a new visual work in their local area.

Both of these schemes have grown out of excellent work by the Find Young Talent Co-ordinator, who had worked across a wide range of agencies. They had previously been incredibly popular and were doing excellent work so it is a terrible

shame and an outrage that the Government has made the decision to cut these projects.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am speaking on Minutes which are involved with reduction in grants to Local Authorities and also in terms of performance indicators.

I want to talk about performance indicators because part of the performance indicators are expectations on the Council to increase involvement, engagement and participation in the communities and also to increase choice so that customers can access services in more convenient ways, which employs embedding value for money and also implementing an approach which delivers value for money and ensuring the best provider.

I just thought I would point out the formal indicators because I am referring to Compact for Leeds, Lord Mayor, which is a document which has been compiled in partnership between the public sector in the city and the voluntary sector in the city, and it is a blueprint to ensure that when we are making decisions about when we prioritise services and how we deliver services in our city, that we do so in an arena of respect and realism.

I only point that out, Lord Mayor, because this has not been emphasised before. It is a very important document for this city, I know a lot of work has gone into it from all different sides, but in terms of that realism and prioritisation, it needs to be mentioned because of the comments which have been made by some of my colleagues opposite.

Councillor Renshaw gave a really good representation about some of the challenges that we hear in the city about some of our young people, especially people who are NEETs. What I need to remind Councillor Renshaw is that it is a really sad situation that that situation is there in the city, but not just in the city – around the country. We have been working very hard on things like NEETs to ensure that the rates that we had, which were higher than the national average, actually came down and now they are actually below the national average, so it is an issue which is around the country.

This is after 13 years of a Labour Government – a Labour Government which, as we have seen because the coalition nationally has had to implement such draconian cuts, as you call them, has been in the midst of a public spending orgy and in the midst of that public spending orgy we actually have a situation where, after 13 years of Labour Government, the poverty gap between the richest and the poorest in this country is higher than it was when they came into power in 1997, so no wonder there is that situation that Councillor Renshaw so eloquently put forward in terms of the challenges which face this Council, whether or not it is subject to cuts which are imposed by a coalition Government or whether it would have been cuts that would have been imposed by a Government led by your party because they also had those on the cards, so do not make out that they are coming out of the blue.

What I have to say as well is, all those areas which have been talked about here in terms of the Area Based Grants and what specific things are going to get cut, one of the things that this coalition has said to Local Government, it has said these are very hard times, it is very trying, it is very challenging. Local Authorities need to be given far more decision making about where they spend their money and these Area Based Grants given to you were un-ringfenced and also other grants which were given to you were also un-ringfenced, so all this stuff about how looked after children are unnecessarily going to lose out, about how our voluntary sector are going to lose out because they were specifically mentioned in what the Area Based

Grants were before, is wrong. This Council can make priorities of its own. We can set what we think are the important things to take forward over the next two to three years and what are the things that we cannot prioritise over that period, and that is a decision that you will need to make as an administration.

One thing that I have to say, when we were in the Exec Board at the last meeting, we were given an assurance that at the next Executive Board meeting there would be a paper when your administration would respond to the challenge of public sector cuts which are going to come. I have the agenda in my possession and there is no paper there. Not to have that kind of indication, not to have that kind of prospectus is a let-down for all the community in Leeds, all those in the voluntary sector which are hoping to be treated like adults in a professional manner through things like the Compact. You are letting them down because you are not setting out what you are deciding in your priorities so they can work with you to achieve them, and what things are going to be less so, and you need to give that to the people of Leeds as an honest prospectus. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR LAMB: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am also going to speak on page 180 Minute 16. I did not have any intention of speaking on this minute until I heard what the members opposite were going to talk about.

Councillor Renshaw, as Councillor Golton pointed out, listed a whole list of challenges facing young people around unemployment and NEET where we have made a lot of progress in the last few years. Of course, the worst possible legacy you could leave to the next generation is a national debt of £1.4 trillion which has to be paid back by them over the course of their lifetimes. That is the legacy of your Government which has been running a deficit budget, do not forget, since 2001, of three per cent year on year on year. They have been borrowing money since 2001 when the economy was growing. That is why we are in the mess. The cuts that are coming are Labour cuts, they are your party's cuts. It is because of the financial incompetence and fiscal incontinence of Gordon Brown as Chancellor and then as Prime Minister that we are in this mess, so it is no good you sitting over there trying to lay the blame at the doors of the current Government who have got to clean up the mess, as every Conservative Government that comes into power in history has had to do.

Councillor Golton is absolutely right to point out, you have got choices to make now. It is funny, you know, you did not make such a fuss when the last Government cut £15m from the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund.

COUNCILLOR: You forgot about it.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: I do not seem to recall the outrage of all the projects in some of the most deprived parts of the city that had to be cut as a result of that, but this council and this administration took decisions to try and keep as many of those things going as we possibly could.

You have got choices to make. The ringfencing, as Councillor Golton has pointed out it has been removed from many of these schemes and the other thing you need to remember as well is that many of these cuts were already planned by your Government. Of the £5m that Councillor Blake was referring to, there are quite a number of those – I do now know the exact figure but I think it is a couple of million pounds – that were already planned by your Government and you were not very quick to criticise them in that case. *(interruption)*

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: You have no proof.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: No proof? Ask the officers, they will tell you. I have asked them. They can identify the numbers, they can go through line by line and tell you which items were going to go. I know they do not want to hear it.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: That is a different matter.

COUNCILLOR RENSHAW: You support the cuts then?

THE LORD MAYOR: Members, can we have some attention, please? We have listened to everybody speak so let us carry on like that, please.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: Thank you. What I support is the fact that we need to deliver a balanced budget for the country. The worst thing you can possibly do is to keep spending – spending and spending and spending with nowhere for the money to come from.

The new Labour mantra was buy now, pay later. The bad news is, later is now. We have to start paying back for all the wasteful spending. What you have got to ask yourselves is, where has all that money gone? The national debt has doubled and doubled again and will double again. Do not forget, £1.4 trillion. Do we have a world class education system at the end of it? No. Do we have a world class health service at the end of that? You will remember John Prescott famously said he was going to deliver a fully integrated transport system fit for the 21st Century. He could not even deliver a fully integrated sentence. *(laughter)*

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: That was really funny, ha ha.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: Lord Mayor, the cuts are coming. They are Labour cuts.

COUNCILLOR LYONS: They are your cuts.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: They have got to make choices. They can decide which projects they want to cut and which ones they want to keep, but let us remember every time when things are being cut it is Labour cuts. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: The voters will decide.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: The voters will decide.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: Thank you. I am going to bring a bit of calm and rationality to the Council meeting now after that rather unhinged outburst. *(interruption)*

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: That's a good one coming from you! Pots and kettles.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: If I can be heard, thank you, I am speaking to Minute 17 on page 180, the Financial Performance - Outturn 2009/2010. In speaking to this Minute I note in our Minute Book that neither Councillor Golton nor Councillor Carter abstained or voted against the Financial Outturn paper, so I was quite surprised at the rather sad little charade we saw from Councillor Cleasby and Councillor Monaghan in questioning the figures from that paper that was not challenged at Executive Board when they were quoted by Tom Murray and quoted in the YEP.

I think this is more not because they do not believe the figures are accurate, because they know they are accurate. It is because they do not like the figures quoted in the report and they do not like the fact that we finally got to the bottom of the cost of this disastrous bin strike that this administration oversaw. That is what they do not like.

Let us remember their part in trying to give us a figure. We had Councillor Brett came to a Scrutiny Board and gave a figure; Councillor Monaghan later gave a completely contradictory figure. They could not get the figure straight and what they do not like is we have now finally got an answer to the cost of their bin strike and all this charade about who knows what will not wash away the fact that they were they only political administration – no other Council of any political administration of any party in control had a strike in relation to the Job Evaluation Scheme that went on as long as their strike did. I think that is what they are trying to wash away.

They are trying to wash away the fact that they were the employer who were responsible and oversaw the longest strike in Yorkshire since the Miners' Strike. That is what they are trying to wash away.

I think what they really do not like as well, and I think this comes to the nub of a lot of the little complaints we have seen over there, when it came to the Job Evaluation Scheme we faced as Councillors, in last May's election the people of Leeds elected 20 members of the Labour Group and only eleven members of their party. The people of Leeds evaluated their job and threw them out. That is what they do not like and as many pathetic little charades about figures that they cannot challenge will not wash that fact away as well. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: Lord Mayor, I am speaking to the same Minutes as Councillor Lewis has just spoken to.

Everybody in this Council knows that when I was Leader of Council, when I made errors – and I do make errors – or when we had to change things, sometimes under pressure from the Opposition, I apologised in this place. I am on record, members of the current administration are on record for agreeing that I apologised. We have got a very serious issue before us now in respect of what Councillor Lewis has just said and in respect of what Councillor Murray said in response to Councillor Lewis's earlier question on the bin strike.

It may not *(inaudible)* and come into our possession but it has. We have, dated yesterday from officers in Environmental Services, the written response that was given to Councillor Murray in respect of Councillor Lewis's question about the net cost of the bin strike to the Council and I have got it here. The answer, written answer given to Councillor Murray, was to say that the report in the YEP was not correct. I will not read it all but it is here and it ends up by saying that the net cost to the Council of the bin strike was £50,000 – not the £300,00-and-something quoted in the YEP or used or confirmed unequivocally by Councillor Murray a few minutes ago and again used by Councillor Lewis.

Here is the briefing note. The briefing note from Street Scene Services clearly says the net cost of the strike to the Council is £50,000 and the situation is clear – either Councillor Murray and Councillor Lewis were not in possession of that information, in which case it is remarkable, or shall we call it incompetent on the part of two senior members of the Labour administration that they did not know what their officers are telling them, or alternatively they have colluded to ignore the written advice given to them by officers.

It is one or the other and both can now, in this Council, apologise for being incompetent or apologise for colluding to mislead the Council and mislead the people of Leeds. It is a reasonable request.

I give fair warning. I will be magnanimous if both apologise for their incompetence and/or apologise for misleading Council. If, however, neither or both apologise for misleading Council or for being incompetent, then matters will flow from here and we will start with a Freedom of Information request to understand what the paper trail has been, what one or both members of the administration were told on this matter and then, depending on what we find, but I have to say it looks pretty bleak at this moment, the matter will be referred to Standards.

Senior members of the administration cannot stand here in this Chamber and lie to us. I use the word advisedly. We have the written evidence. They cannot do it and if they have not lied they can apologise for incompetence. If they have lied, they can apologise for lying. It is one or the other. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR LYONS: You are going to apologise (*inaudible*)

COUNCILLOR HARDY: Lord Mayor, I would like to speak on Minute 17 page 180 concerning the Financial Performance - Outturn Report 2009/2010.

Firstly, I am aware that we are currently presiding over a budget cut and restraints and spending cuts across the whole of the public sector. Indeed, the budget that was approved at this very Council in February of this year confirmed it.

However, after consulting the Financial Performance – Outturn Report, I am very concerned about the impact that further spending cuts by the coalition Government will have upon the Local Authority, particularly on Environmental Services.

My experiences dealing with constituents in Farnley and Wortley is that the issues that fall under Environmental Services are very important to them. Things like refuse collection – not another strike – street cleaning, anti-graffiti services and provision of public conveniences. These are widely seen as the bread and butter services paid for by the Council tax. Indeed, in a recent national survey carried out by the LGA, only one per cent of those who took part – one per cent who took part – said they would like to see money cut from front line services such as street cleansing.

There are undoubtedly very serious challenges ahead for this Council. I am concerned that further Government spending cuts will impact upon the delivery of these key front line services and the local residents will be the ones who suffer when their streets are not cleaned and the graffiti is not removed. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I think this is one of the most remarkable debates I have ever heard in this Council Chamber. We have got a group of members over here who, for the last 13 years have clearly been somewhere else, had their heads in the sand, not understood what has been going on. Here they come today saying, "Oh, the nasty Tory/Lib Dem Government, oh, the nasty coalition, oh aren't they all nasty? Oh, isn't it all terrible? Oh dear, oh dear, oh dear."

For goodness sake.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Is that a Welsh accent?

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: For goodness sake, it is all about the state of the economy that your Labour administration got us into.

COUNCILLOR LYONS: Load of rubbish.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: If you cannot honestly, plainly, clearly see that, you do not deserve to be in this place, I have to say. (*interruption*)

We had runs on banks, banks that were nationalised. Look at the state of Northern Rock. Just look at the state of the economy and what do we hear? "Oh, oh dear, oh you should not cut this and you should not change that, you should not do anything", so what is to happen then? Stay as we are? Stay as we are, stay spending in the same way that Labour were spending? Keep spending money that is not there? Surely you all know from your own personal finances, you simply cannot keep spending money you do not have because at some point in time the bank will say, "Well, I am not lending you any more money" and you cannot pay it back. What do you do then? You go bankrupt. You go bankrupt unless you take strategic action and, very sadly – and I regret it as well, I regret an incoming Conservative Government in coalition with the Lib Dems having to take these difficult decisions, but at least they are taking the decisions.

Councillor Wakefield in his press article to the YEP said "Difficult decisions have to be made." He brought a paper to the Executive Board, it is here, Councillor Golton mentioned it, 16B – "There will be another paper back to Executive Board at the July meeting".

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: And there is not.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: And there is not. Where is the paper? Where is it? What are you keeping from the people of Leeds? Why are you not telling us where your cuts – your cuts – are going to be? Are you afraid? Are you afraid of telling us where those cuts are going to be, because we want to know and it is only fair that the people of Leeds should know as well.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Hear, hear.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: I have got a little game I want to play with you here now. Who was this? It is a guessing game. Who was this?

"I have got to say I think about two days after we took control we all sat down. There is only one thing that came out in front of us. You know, this basket case, this basket case that you have left us. This total disaster. You know, you talk about, oh, well, there were some budget pressures. Well, I do not call £18m budget pressure."

Who said that? Councillor David Blackburn said that, calling your last administration a basket case. You did not know how to run the finances of this Council six years ago and you do not know how to run the finances of this Council now. David, you knew they could not do it then. Come on, you know they can't do it now either. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR MURRAY: Can I make a little comment about what has been said and the accusations that have been made? The information that I have got from officers, that is correct, Mark, the information is here, I have got that, and my interpretation...

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: You lied to Council.

COUNCILLOR MURRAY: I did not lie to Council. I did not lie to Council at all. *(interruption)* Can I just try and explain this calmly, Lord Mayor?

Obviously what I looked at what, I tried to explain...

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: Lord Mayor, point of order. The comment that I made, there is a precedent for this because it has happened...

COUNCILLOR ATHA: My Lord Mayor, they have to say which Standing Order he is speaking to. *(interruption)*

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: On a matter of personal explanation, Lord Mayor. There is a precedent. *(interruption)*

COUNCILLOR ATHA: It is not a personal explanation. It is a misuse of the meeting.

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: There is a precedent.

COUNCILLOR ATHA: Misuse.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Harris, can you sit down, please? It is not a point of personal explanation. Maybe if we will hear what Councillor Murray is going to say it might solve your problem.

COUNCILLOR MURRAY: It is quite simple. There has obviously been a misunderstanding but I will explain that misunderstanding through what happened. What I did is, I had a look at whatever information I had from the officers and I have got a break down of the cost of the bin strike to confirm what that cost was and in the way that the Yorkshire Evening Post reported it, and I think that that is what I did and I think that is fairly accurate, that is fairly true. That is understandable.

I then basically had to sit down, really, and wait because you called the end of Question time. The end of Question time, there is a response there and I can go through and add some of the things that I was going to add.

Mark, the opportunity did not arise to be able to colour in the thing properly. You will have to believe that or not believe that, but that is the way it was going.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Standards. Absolutely appalling.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we move on?

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: Without a microphone I am disadvantaged compared to everybody else who can shout. There is precedent for this. The verbatim minutes can be read back. I request that the verbatim minute be read back in respect of Councillor Murray's answer to Councillor Lewis's question in which he unequivocally said that the information given in the YEP was correct. I ask for the verbatim minute to be read back. There is precedent for this, Lord Mayor, because it happened to me.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: This is a matter of record for another day. It is not for today. *(interruption)* We do not read back verbatim minutes during the Council meeting. I am sorry, we should move on. *(inaudible)*

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: Lord Mayor, that is incorrect. There is precedent for this. The verbatim minutes have been read back at the request of Labour in Opposition to verify a point I made when I was Leader of Council. There is precedent for this.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: That is true.

COUNCILLOR ATHA: My Lord Mayor, I wonder if we might accept a motion that can be moved without delay, that we proceed to the next business? I so move. Was there a seconder?

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: We have already had a motion from Councillor Harris which was seconded. We have to deal with that business first.

COUNCILLOR ATHA: This I understand takes precedence over...

THE LORD MAYOR: It is not a motion that is included in the rules. That one is. I am seeking advice.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: I have sought advice and in order for Councillor Harris's request to be put forward as a motion, there has to be a suspension of Council Rules.

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: Lord Mayor, I ask leave of Council to suspend Rules of Council in order that my request be put as a motion and the verbatim minutes to be read back.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: I second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: There is a seconder for that. Can we vote on that then, without further ado? I think we might need a recorded vote on this one, an electronic vote. It looks very close to me, is what I am saying. Can we have a recorded vote? That solves the problem, thank you.

THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE: The motion is that Council Procedure Rules be suspended to allow the answer given by Councillor Murray earlier this afternoon to the question relating to refuse costs to be read out to the Council. That is the motion.

(A recorded vote was taken)

THE LORD MAYOR: There are 95 members present. The "Yes" vote is 47, there are two abstentions and there are 46 "No". That means it is CARRIED.
(Applause)

Can I inform you that for practical reasons it is not possible to do that? We will do it immediately after tea. What I suggest now is that Councillor Wakefield sums up.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I know Mark has got a smile on his face but I cannot help thinking that this has actually this afternoon been more about losing the election and losing control than it has been helping the people of Leeds. *(interruption)*

If I can help Councillor Mark Harris, do you remember PJ Proby? I thought I was giving my age away then but he used to make a record called 'I Apologise' and I

think that, Mark, it is good to hear that song again about you apologising. If I can help this debate, which I find unnecessary, is to say that the YEP figures was correct in terms of the cost of contractors and communications and saving made, but the overall figure that Councillor Monaghan quoted is correct at 50k.

COUNCILLOR MONAGHAN: Which is the question asked.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: No, what you are doing, you are actually mixing the story. You are also calling YEP liars as well and that is an interesting challenge if you go to report them.

Why are we caught on the cost of this? Everybody knows that it is one of the most shameful periods in our history when it was the biggest attack on the low paid ever in this city, resulting in the longest strike ever in this city, resulting in the biggest chaos ever in this city and it was your administration did that. I would rather keep quiet and move on because we have got some real challenges ahead.

On June 10th, as my colleague said, we got notice of a £15m revenue cut and, as my colleagues have pointed out, those cuts are in front line services. I know what the Liberals said when they went into coalition, that they would protect front line services but you have heard my colleagues tell you that all the support to the most vulnerable, to the young, Supporting People to the elderly, Connections, Future Jobs Fund, all the things that address NEETs, were cut by 24 per cent. You are absolutely right, they said it is up to you and it is like the surgeon saying, "Look, you need one of your legs cutting off. You do it yourself." It is frankly – well, it is a clever move because we will have to make that decision.

I would hope that when you saw that cut, that you will come round and say, "Can we do something on behalf of the people of Leeds?" I cannot help thinking if people were packed out there they would be pretty embarrassed at our response to one of the biggest cuts facing us in October ever experienced in Local Government. We are now seeing the dismantling of the post-war Welfare State both locally and nationally. (*interruption*) Never have we witnessed senior economists – you know, Councillor Lamb has given us I think it was a party piece and a pantomime. How can you give a five minute speech and not once mention the role of bankers and the structural deficit that was caused? If you strip that to the bankers actually our public expenditure would be more or less normal. It was the banking crisis that caused the structural deficit, (*interruption*) nothing to do, but we never heard a thing from Councillor Lamb about the bankers. What we see is the Conservatives, with the collusion of the Liberals, actually beginning to rubbish public sector. Here it is.

I agree with, actually, Margaret Eaton, who is an ex-Conservative Leader of Bradford, when she told people at a recent Conference, Dame Margaret Eaton told delegates involved, "We need national politicians to stop chasing cheap headlines at our expense" and I could not agree more. The rubbing of local Government in terms of (*inaudible*), the rubbing of public servants, the rubbing of all of the people that work for us, is a national disgrace.

I do not buy, by the way, if we were talking about the 600,000 that are going to be employed, I do not buy that you can do a Sweden and a Canada. If anybody remembers those countries, when Sweden recovered using a model advocated by yourself, they did so in a climate of European boom, particularly in Denmark. When Canada recovered, they did so in a climate of an American boom. The difference here and the reason why the IMF, Blanchflower, Hutton and others say that, is because we are not recovering. The recovery is fragile. Listen to any economist and they will tell you that we are risking ourselves for a double dip and I do not buy that the public sector is bad from private sector, it crowds it out.

If you look at the spending here over the last few years, you will see that actually the private sector has gained by public sector investment. Just look at Holt Park – 260 jobs will be lost in the private sector if we do not go ahead with Holt Park Welfare. It is obviously that the public sector is vital to the recovery of the economy and I do not buy the Doomsday story.

When we come together, when I was asked by Scrutiny a very easy question like, “What is your financial strategy to deal with the cuts”, I said to them, we first of all have got to wait till October. We have got to wait till October until we get clarity on whether this is just a sick and ugly spin about the scale of the cuts, or whether it is genuine and we all have to sit round and start to look at doing things that are unthinkable.

Councillors here today talked about saving the day centre. If those cuts go ahead, we will be closing endless day centres. That is not scaremongering, that is true. If those cuts go ahead, we will be closing community centres, we will be cutting wardens, we will actually be ending any discretionary spend that we have.

I was also asked a question about, couldn't we just cut discretionary spend and keep and protect statutory services? Everybody knows that our discretionary spend, as Councillor Procter will tell you, is on leisure, it is on activities for young people, activities for old people under the broad umbrella of Leisure. You cut that and you start to break down the fabric of our societies. We already know that as a result of the cuts in supporting NEETs, we will have in this city up to 20 per cent, in some wards, unemployed youth between 16 and 18. I say to people, it is already eleven per cent, twelve per cent – don't nod your head, Alan, look at the facts. I say to people, what is our role in public life, what is our role in Local Government if it is not to protect the vulnerable?

Seriously, I could have come in at the start of this speech saying you have left us with £15m in debt, you have done this. I was not going to intend to do that but sadly the tenor of this Council has degenerated and it has degenerated into something I would feel deeply ashamed of.

What we need to do – here is the challenge to you – what we need to do is sit round and talk about things that we value and prioritise – our elderly, our young and the people who need our support.

In Liverpool the Lib Dems have started to do that. They have started to protest about the cuts. In Newcastle the Liberals have started to protest about the cuts. Even the Conservatives in the south are starting to talk about marching on the Parliament.

I say to colleagues, here's your chance. If you care – and I believe you do – if you really want to protect the vulnerable, as we are all here to do, and the elderly, let us stop playing these silly games and let us get round the table and look after the people of Leeds which we are elected to do and let us see if we can soften the savage cuts that are about to come in October. I move you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Can I call for the vote on receiving the Minutes, please?
(A vote was taken)

Can we now have tea, please? I am told 20 minutes and we have a lot of business, so can we try to get back here for quarter-past five, please. Thank you.

(Council adjourned for a short time)

THE LORD MAYOR: Members, may we resume our meeting, please? Can I firstly ask Miss Jackson, please, to read out the verbatim that we have received?

THE ASSISTANT CHIEF EXECUTIVE (Corporate Governance): If I first read out the question from Councillor James Lewis:

“Can the Executive Board Member for Environmental Services please confirm if the figures highlighted in the YEP on 8th July 2010 regarding the cost to the Council of the bin strike last year are correct?”

Councillor Murray responded:

“My Lord Mayor, the figure that is missing from in your question, James, Councillor Lewis, is £385,000 and that was the Yorkshire Post looking at figures from the Financial Performance Outturn Report. I have got the figures in front of me, I can quote them to you, but in essence we are talking about paying out about £2,349,000 using contractors. We had an additional communications cost of nearly a quarter of a million pounds, so that ended up about £2.6m. We saved on pay, saved on fuel and the difference between the two ended up to be £385,000, so the answer to your question in short, James, is yes, they have reported what is true.”

THE LORD MAYOR: I am very aware the Councillor Murray did not fully get the opportunity to answer the question, there was no supplementary which he was preparing for, so at this stage could I invite Councillor Murray to make any comment he wishes, if he wishes it himself?

COUNCILLOR MURRAY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I have got no intention of misleading the Council about the cost of the bin strike and there are a whole range of figures that we need to have a look at and to check, so what I would like to do, then, or would suggest is that I go away, get those figures, reflect on what has been said and done and write to every member of the Council about the outcome. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: You have got them.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we now go back to White Paper Motions, please? Councillor Gruen.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Lord Mayor, in consultation with all the Whips I would like to move a change of order of business to allow the White Paper motion number 14, I think, regarding Mr Rogerson and Miss Dent, to be considered as the next White Paper.

COUNCILLOR LOBLEY: I second that.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we vote on that, please? (*A vote was taken*) That is CARRIED.

ITEM 14 – WHITE PAPER MOTION – P ROGERSON & J DENT

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we then move straight on to White Paper 14.
Councillor Atha.

COUNCILLOR ATHA: Lord Mayor, it is with mixed emotions that I have been given the honour of moving this motion – mixed because there is pleasure that I have the opportunity of speaking on behalf of us all to pay tribute to outstanding officers; sadness that we are going to lose two exemplary officers at a time when we need that kind of quality to guide the Council staff; and concern about the successors that we may be getting, although I think with the new appointment we have made to take over from Mr Rogerson, we have great confidence that a very sensible decision has been made. One hopes that the other post to follow Jean Dent, a most singular large hole to fill, again that must be done in the proper way and hopefully will attract the correct candidate.

In science there are lots of natural laws of, say, gravitation, of thermodynamics and so on. In Local Government there is a natural law that if you have got a problem and you do not know what to do about it, you restructure. I remember when the restructuring took place which created this enormous portfolio for which Jean Dent was then going to be responsible, I said, quite seriously, to many, it is too big for any man. I should have said for any woman and have been wrong, because quite clearly this enormous portfolio has been handled with enormous skill and confidence by Jean Dent and she has shown exactly how good management can bring together a host of previously disparate bodies and organisations.

Jean can leave the Council with the knowledge that all over the city, if she comes back in ten years' time or 15 years' time with the younger generation, she will be able to point to that and say – if she was minded to do so, which she is not – “I was responsible for that. That would not have happened if it had not been for me. That is something I established.” That fingerprint is so important and we ought to recognise that we owe a great deal to people like her and people like the former City Architect who have left their imprint on the city.

We can say about her, no public servant has exceeded for the city the same passion and ability that she has employed, until we come to Paul Rogerson.

Moving up – I am not sure if it is moving up or moving down but moving to Paul, he is a man who is one of a distinguished list of Chief Executives, starting off with, some of you may remember him, Potts, who was a flamboyant, rather portly but very effective. I remember him saying just the thing you want to hear when you are a Councillor, “You tell me what you want to do and I will tell you how to do it.” Frequently today it is the reverse – you tell them what you want to do and then they tell you you can't do it! (*laughter*)

He was followed by Jim Rawsley, a man that came from part of what is now Leeds, a very quiet, unassuming but highly efficiently and enormously respected individual. Then Mr Ashworth came and went – a very competent, highly skilled person, did very well in the private sector - and then Phil Smith, who had worked his way up and had the unique distinction of having enough guts and I was going to say courage – I was not because there was another word – he had the courage to say “No” to George Mudie and “No” to John Trickett and that required a lot of courage if you are in that position. It indicates that each one of them has had the same degree of integrity that we have come to cherish in our current CEO.

He has been universally respected. He has always been quiet, authoritative and has a nice sense of humour which has acted as a lubricant at moments of friction between parties. His uncanny gift of saying “No” but leaving you with the general

impression that he has just said "Yes", this is a gift I wish we had had much more.
(laughter)

He has presided over a remarkable period in the Council's history, the political dominance of one party or the other, a combination of people in a grouping that we never expected to see, and the dissolution of local Government as it really was so good previously; the 2000 Act which completely scattered Government at a local level, that in fact introduced a system of scrutinising actions and decisions after they had taken place rather than before they had taken place; a ludicrous situation which I must confess was the brainchild of some of the people in my own party.

He has presided over all those and then a welter of further legislation that has come to alter local Government, not necessarily for the better.

One can say that he possibly has not one enemy left in the Council because he has earned the respect of almost everyone that he dealt with or has been dealt with inside the Council.

So it is with, I have been told to be very brief so I am finishing now. I say to them both that we enormously respect the work you have done, respect you as individuals, respect the integrity that you brought to the jobs and the fact that you were prepared to treat members of one party as equally as members of any other party, whether in the ruling group or not in the ruling group.

We have been blessed by two good officers. Let us hope that that blessing continues in the future with people that follow their example. On behalf of us all, we say thank you to you both and have a drink afterwards! (Applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Carter, please.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. I am delighted to be able to second Councillor Atha's resolution today. I am not going to go on for long and I would hope that neither our Chief Exec or our Executive Director for Development will be offended by that, but they unfortunately will have to put up with me again tomorrow and again the week after at the actual formal leaving dos for both of them, and I am greatly looking forward to both those occasions and I have no intention at all of revealing any of the things I am going to say at those two particular events.

What I will say today, however, is that it has been a great privilege and a pleasure for me to work with both of them over very many years in Opposition, in control and back in Opposition again. I particularly want to comment about the years when the Liberal Democrats and the Conservatives were the joint administration of the Council.

I suppose it is quite appropriate today, having listened to one or two of the things that have gone on, that a piece of advice I would give to all Exec Members is, you should remember that the senior officers, the Executive Directors of the department or the Chief Executive, are highly professional, unbiased public servants who want to do their best for the future of the city and they are a support to elected members in making sure that we all carry out our duties in the right and proper way, and certainly in the case of both Jean and of Paul that is absolutely the case. Their service to the city of Leeds cannot be over-estimated – I never know which way round that is, under-estimated, but you know what I mean.

They have been absolutely dedicated, in Jean's case for a whole working lifetime to the city to which she has shown such dedication and I do hope that Jean will go on taking an interest in some capacity in the city in years to come.

Some of the officers at City Development did say at one stage to me which did I enjoy the best, being Leader or Exec Member for City Development and, actually the answer was Exec Member for City Development – a great team of officers, a commitment to driving the city forward, to reaching out the ambition, to reaching the pinnacle of success that we can reach as a city and that is down to the drive and the foresight of Jean Dent, and we shall miss her greatly.

As for the Chief Executive, let me just comment on one thing and that is the work in the City Region and the work not just in the City Region but the work with our partners. The Chief Execs of other Local Authorities, senior civil servants, they all respect him and listen to him and it has made the job of leading the Council, particularly with those outside bodies, so much easier, and I am sure Richard and Mark would agree with me. You go along to those meetings with a man who is held quite rightly in the highest esteem. It has been a huge pleasure and privilege to work with Paul and I wish him, both of you, all the very best in the future and I hope that, too, Paul will maintain a huge interest in the life and work of the city. Thank you both very much indeed. It has been a personal pleasure and a privilege for all of us to have worked with you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Elliott, please.

COUNCILLOR ELLIOTT: Thank you, Lord Mayor. It is my very great pleasure to add to the tributes and express the gratitude of the Morley Borough Independents to Paul Rogerson for the work which he has done and the advice which he has given whenever asked.

During my year as Lord Mayor, Paul and I met on a whole host of occasions and in a variety of situations and it quickly became apparent from the roles which he played and the respect in which he was held, just what a likeable, intelligent and esteemed person we were fortunate to have as our Chief Executive.

His quiet presence, unflappability and sheer professionalism shone through in all that he did and I must say that when sitting in the big chair and attempting to control Council meetings, the fact that he was there sitting alongside was a tremendous comfort and, I imagine, that many others besides me have felt that and benefited from it over the years.

What has become clear to me in the last year is the respect in which Paul is held locally, regionally and nationally. The work which he did in establishing and developing the Leeds City Region continues to be of great benefit to our region, while the fact that he has been asked on his retirement to hold the fort at Kirklees speaks volumes.

I also know that he quietly and unofficially helps his wife Eileen she is seeking to support the weak, disadvantaged and vulnerable members of our society.

I was speaking quite recently to a well known national figure when Paul's name cropped up. This person immediately said, "Paul Rogerson is a man who you can do business with. He is straight, able and likeable, everything you are looking for in a person in authority." That to me says everything, why he is respected and why he is successful and why he was honoured with the well-deserved CBE.

Paul, thank you for having been our Chief Executive for so many years, for having made a wonderful job of it and all our very best wishes go with you as you move into the next phase of your life. *(Applause)*

It is also my pleasure to say farewell on behalf of the Morley Borough Independents to Jean Dent. Jean has served this Authority for many, many years in a variety of departments and at a number of levels, culminating in her filling the role of Director of Development. I have not until recent times really met Jean, but I have met a lot of people who have and they all say the same of her – able, imaginative, reliable and has added value to every department in which she has worked.

When we met at the Chelsea Flower Show, I found out just how true those words were. How fitting then that at the end of a long and successful term of employment with Leeds City Council, Jean and her department walked off with that coveted and elusive gold medal.

Well done, Jean, and thank you for that which you have done for us and we wish you all the very best for a long and happy retirement. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Golton, please.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. We are talking about two people today who are committed to the city and are personally very modest people and so will be embarrassed by a lot of what has been said today, so I will not go on and on and on because I know that their primary purpose here today is to be active officers making sure that we discuss public services and make decisions in this Chamber that everyone will benefit from. I know that is their core purpose here today.

First of all, I would like to talk about Jean Dent. I have been on the Council now about twelve years and I have had personal contact with Jean throughout that period, whether it has been in Opposition as an ordinary back member talking about things in my ward, whether it has been in administration as one of Andrew Carter's deputies in the Development Department and latterly as a member of the Executive Board.

I have written down some words which I think sum up Jean. They are she is professional, always professional, she is knowledgeable, she is very well respected – I know this through the different people I have talked to within the business sector in the city who you have to keep in touch with to make sure you know what is going on. They all – all – respect Jean and what she has done for the city in her position as Director of Development.

I know that she is committed. It is obvious she is committed because, as has been said, I think it has been 38 years or something like that in terms of her employment by the Council.

I get told off for spending a little bit too much time worrying about outward appearances and what I wear *(laughter)*. One of the things that I have noted about Jean is that she has always been an elegant and colourful ambassador for this city, whether it is within the city or without, and in that form she set the precedent for an assault on the grey male establishment of senior officers, as you can see. *(laughter)*

In the same vein, Paul Rogerson *(laughter)*...

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Who is not grey!

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: I have to say that when I first came on the Council it was Phil Smith who was Chief Exec and as a new member you do not know what is what and that was my idea of what a Chief Exec should be – he was big, he was loud, he was bullish. Then came Paul Rogerson and he is the epitome of keep calm and carry on, as far as I am concerned. He is a quiet person, he is unaggressive and he is encyclopaedic in terms of his knowledge of his field and what is going on.

As you know, it is always the quiet ones that you have got to watch out for. *(laughter)* He might say it very quietly but he has a sharp, lethal wit and I am sure I have been the subject of it out of earshot. Also, of course, he is renowned for his prodigious husbandry *(laughter)* but most of all it is for his dedication to public service, which was recognised by the Queen, of course, with at CBE, but most of all was recognised by us as people who have been helped, aided and enabled by Paul Rogerson during our time with him. Unfortunately you will not be getting a medal from us, I do not think. It is usually a gilded owl which comes in as a very useful doorstop but it is only a symbol to know of the esteem that everyone in this Chamber feels for you personally, so thank you for all your years of service, Paul. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ann Blackburn, please.

COUNCILLOR A BLACKBURN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I think most things have been said about these two very efficient and well thought of officers. I would like to say on behalf of my party that we wish Paul and Jean well in their retirement and I know that both of them have served us well over the years and I am sad to see them go because to me Paul and Jean, the calibre of Paul and Jean does not come around very often.

I would like to personally thank Paul for the help that he gave when David and I found ourselves that we did in the position that we did a few weeks ago *(laughter)* *(inaudible)* He was very good and I thank him for that and I hope that, as I say, both of them have a long and happy retirement. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Members of Council, we have heard those very genuine tributes and we all, I know, agree with it. I have a feeling we will not need an electronic vote for this one, so can we do it in the usual way with a show of hands, please? *(Show of hands)* I will not insult Paul by asking against, so that is unanimous. Well done, Paul, you have been a credit to our city.

ITEM 11 - WHITE PAPER 11 – MICROGENERATION ENERGY SCHEME

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we return to White Paper 11, please?

COUNCILLOR MONAGHAN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Whilst I am up I will also pass on my congratulations and thanks to Paul and Jean and I will express my feelings to them personally rather than talking at lengthy now.

Climate change is a topic that has been debated a number of times in this Council Chamber, and rightly so. It is one of the biggest threats that our city, the country and the world faces. Even those who are sceptical of climate change – Les has gone somewhere - must acknowledge that it makes sense to take steps to become more sustainable and we are discussing just that in the next White Paper on household insulation, which has environmental, economic and health benefits.

If we are to meet the emissions target of reducing CO₂ emissions by 40 per cent by 2020 that this Council agreed with some degree of cross-party support, we must continue taking proactive steps as a Council to show leadership and we must

create opportunities for businesses and residents across Leeds to play their part in reducing our emissions.

The Council has already set ambitious targets to reduce its own emissions, meet our own energy needs from renewable sources, insulate homes, reduce the city's ecological footprint and more, but there is always more that can be done.

Microgeneration is exactly the sort of low carbon technology we should be supporting, as it enables residents across the city to do more to reduce their own personal emissions, reduce their energy bills, provide some energy security and provide protection from rising utility bills.

Microgeneration has also been discussed a few times in this Council Chamber and is in limited use across the city, but I believe that the time has now come for this technology. For those not familiar with microgeneration, it is a process of generating renewable energy at household level from such technologies as solar thermal panels, solar photovoltaic panels, air, ground and water source heat pumps, biomass, microcombined heating power generators, wind turbines, hydroelectric power and probably one or two more new technologies that I am not yet aware of.

Even in the UK the power of the sun is enough to use solar thermal panels to reduce your water heating costs by up to 60 per cent and reduce CO₂ emissions by one tonne a year. Microgeneration has been around for a fair few years now and I know a number of members of the Liberal Democrat Group have solar thermal panels installed in their houses, as may have other members in the Chamber, but what makes the technology more appealing now is the introduction of feed-in tariffs. The UK currently lags well behind countries on the continent in renewable energy generation where they have had feed-in tariffs for some time now. Feed-in tariffs at last came into force this year and will mean that anyone generating renewable energy from microgeneration will receive a payment for every kilowatt hour generated, an additional payment for every kilowatt hour exported to the Grid, and they will save money for every kilowatt hour generated on site that they use rather than getting it from the Grid.

If the average household installed solar photovoltaic panels that generate electricity, the feed-in tariffs would provide the following benefits – the electricity generated would pay the home owner £838 tax free and the remaining electricity costs would drop from £450 to £350, giving a benefit to the householder of around £986 a year.

The introduction to fee-in tariffs makes microgeneration more affordable for homeowners but also opens up some exciting opportunities for the Council to support homeowners in installing microgeneration that were not available until now.

In 2008 Kirklees introduced a pilot with the aim of making microgeneration more accessible to householders. That was done in Kirklees and was called the Recharge Scheme. The scheme was a pilot for testing the popularity and deliverability of the second charge as a funding mechanism for the purchase of renewable energy and low carbon technologies. They allocated £3m to the scheme with homeowners being able to apply for an interest free loan of up to £10,000 to install renewable or low carbon technologies on their property. The loan is secured and is repaid to the Council when the property ownership changes or transfers.

Whilst the Recharge Scheme has its merits, it also has disadvantages and would be too expensive to implement in the current financial climate. There are now, though, better ways to address the issue using the feed-in tariffs and an opportunity

for Leeds to be one of the first in the country to implement a scheme to support residents to install the microgeneration technology and generate renewable power.

What the Liberal Democrat Group is proposing is to establish a similar fund to support a scheme to offer householders money to install microgeneration technologies on their properties. Finances are particularly challenging at the moment but this fund can be delivered using prudential borrowing powers requiring no Council capital investment. This would enable householders to apply for Council funds to pay the up front costs of microgeneration installation. The householder would then sign over any income generated from feed-in tariffs to the Council to repay the initial capital back to the Council. Legal agreements and second charges on properties would be put in place to reduce the risk to the Council to virtually nil.

Put simply, we are proposing a fund that can be set up at very little cost and with very little risk to the Council, that would enable householders across the city to install microgeneration technology and generate renewable power at no up front cost to themselves and then to repay the costs from the energy they themselves generate.

Feed-in tariffs came into force on 1st April and it is now possible to introduce such a scheme, something that would not have been possible before. This is an ideal time to bring a report to the Executive Board so officers can outline how such a scheme could be set up, costed and offered to householders across Leeds.

I have seen the amendment in Councillor Murray's name and I will not comment on that until I hear from him, especially referring to the issue of all party climate change environmental working group when hopefully he will actually tell us what it is and what it will do.

The Green Party have been fully aware of the Liberal Democrat Group's support for the introduction of such a scheme and I hope that the Greens will support this White Paper. Whilst there has been much talk from the Greens of insulation schemes, which are important and necessary, there is so much more Leeds can do to lead on it with regard to the environment and I will be disappointed if Ann Blackburn was seduced by Peter Gruen and Keith Wakefield on the comment of an insulation scheme (*laughter*) because it looks like the Government will support the Council anyway and talking shops on the review of the waste strategy and climate change.

Voting against this White Paper will let down your supporters and voters and you will show a preference for talking about green issues over concrete actions to reduce the city's carbon emissions and a green stimulus to our local economy.

I know too that members of the Labour Party are deeply concerned about the environment and climate change and want to see quick action, which is why we were able to vote together to set the ambitious targets to reduce CO₂ emissions and support Friends of the Earth's Get Serious about CO₂ campaign at the previous Council meeting, but if we are to reach the 40 per cent target by 2020, we need to make important decisions now and I would urge you to vote for our White Paper rather than kicking this issue into the long grass. Lord Mayor, I move the White Paper. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR ANDERSON: My Lord Mayor, I would welcome the principles behind this White Paper but, as has been highlighted, the devil is going to be in the detail as to how it can be implanted and how it can be afforded and that is one thing I think we have all got to bear in mind.

One of the things I have learned today is not to follow Councillor Monaghan because he said most of what I was going to say, so this is going to be a classic this one now!

That said, I am here to put a bit of context into where we are coming from. As a country we need to generate round about 15 per cent of our energy, renewable energy, by 2020, so we have got to start doing something about it now. We cannot keep saying put it off until tomorrow.

If I can make one or two brief political points. One is we now have the demise of the RSS, which I applaud, but one of the things in the RSS was setting a renewable target in terms of energy and so there is no target now. What I am saying, what I am putting a call out today is, let us show some leadership as Leeds, as a city, set a target and let us do everything we can to work to it and microgeneration is one way of trying to do that.

Where are we? Why are we here today? The previous Government did come up with a very strong message. The problem was, they did not actually deliver, the actions did not fit the rhetoric that came out. I was very happy with the rhetoric but what we have now got to do is start pushing this forward.

I do not think anybody here is going to disagree that if you want to generate microenergy, then you should be allowed to do it and we have got to make the facilities free and easy to do so. However, there are some problems. The equipment and the infrastructure – is it being properly tested? Do we know, is it value for money? That is one thing that our Government this side and your Government as well kept banging on, so are we sure that the technology can deliver?

What my answer to that is, there are a number of entrepreneurs in the audience here and the people outside. There's a challenge for you. There's one way of going out to make some money for yourself. Invest in the technologies, come up with something that is affordable to every person in this city, not just the rich because one of the major drawbacks is the pay back period for some of those things, the up front cost means that it is very difficult for some people to actually invest in it, so that is why I think it is vitally important that as a Council we actually look to getting help from the entrepreneurs in the city. We are leaders in most things in this city and I think this is one thing at we can work cross-party together by doing everything we possibly can, working with officers to move things up.

As I say, just to come back again, we need leadership but we need more information. We need to develop affordable products. We need to make sure that we actually train and upskill staff so that they can operate the machinery so that if something goes wrong it is not going to cost too much to get it maintained or repaired, because again sometimes I have done it as well, I have bought things and then the cost of repairing makes you wonder what was the point of doing it in the first place? You need to make it affordable so you keep the benefits going.

Let us all together save some money, both for ourselves and for the city and for the businesses that can benefit from it, but most of all let us protect the security of our energy because unfortunately we are getting more and more reliant on bringing in energy from abroad and we need to be sure as to what we are doing.

On behalf of the Conservative Group, we do support the motion. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Murray.

COUNCILLOR MURRAY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. In essence I think this debate, as it has been described, as we are hearing, is about how this Council gets more deeply involved in the climate change debate. I think we would all agree, really, there is quite a bit of confusion out there but mainstream scientific consensus is more likely to be right than wrong so that global warming is really happening.

Of course, that leaves us with that nagging fear, does it not, that unless we do something we could end up messing it up for future generations. In other words, as a Council it is obviously prudent and it is wise to look at all that we can do and microgeneration is one of those things that we can do to be able to look at these.

If you look at what we are doing and have been doing in recent years - and dare I say that the briefing is here - we do have a small number of microgeneration schemes already running. We have got them in schools, we have got them in corporate buildings, we have got them in social housing and we have also got them in private housing, so we have got voltaic cells and turbines out there already – some sense on which we build and move forward.

It seems that locally – maybe nationally, I do not know, James – but Kirklees seems to be a really good example of what to do and they are prioritising and moving forward very well over recent years. They have got a scheme where the Council invested £2m in a loan-type scheme and residents were able to buy a whole range of systems and put them into houses. They did not, though, pay the loan back. The deal was when they sold the houses the loan got paid back. In other words, the generation was with the house rather than with the people in it and it was contributing, was it not, to what was going on.

James has mentioned about the feed-in tariffs and I think it is right to say that there are different approaches to that and we should encourage greater use of that and get into that. It is a scheme that is still available, pays for the electricity generated, the rates are favourable, it is there for 20 years and you get the benefit of not paying for the electricity as well, so I suppose what I was thinking about that, this is a scheme where we could all be planning voltaic cells and solar panels on our homes. We would all want them.

I must say, James, you are right about it actually, we have discussed it before, we have had a previous paper about climate change and sustainable energy and I suppose what you might be saying in that, I think it was by Councillor Downes and it was a way back, I am not quite sure what progress was made following that White Paper up and doing things that were said in that, but I suppose what it does say is that we should be more joined-up the way that I am probably trying to argue in the alternative motion.

Can I just mention one other thing about what Kirklees is doing? They are planning to use prudential borrowing to get a £5m scheme going. The thing is though, James, the next motion that we are going to do, loft insulation and cavity wall insulation, when you talk about small amounts for households but if you multiply it by the number of households we have got in Leeds we end up actually looking, do we not, at a bill of nearly £30m, so to be able to replicate what Kirklees have done we have got to find somewhere around £30m and the schemes that you are talking about, if I look at what Kirklees are doing, its loan scheme, they are more millions and millions, aren't they?

What we are proposing then, and in some sense I think fits in quite neatly, believe it or not, with the Department of Energy and Climate Change and the newsletter that was around yesterday about a strategy, about consultation around microgeneration and about how we can tackle that together.

What we are tackling, of course, includes, a list of technologies which you have not mentioned. There is a whole load on the back here and I suppose the bit that I need to highlight is, let us produce something where interested parties in the Council can act in a joined-up way, get those priorities sorted out, we will get the people who know most, we will get the experts who are available to us and get together and draft a strategy which we can drive forward in the future and take with us to the partnerships that we have got set up in this city – the healthy partnerships, the strong partnerships that are already there - but we need to know what we are contributing to it quite solidly and in a joined-up way rather than in a piecemeal way that perhaps I read and understood in this motion. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR D BLACKBURN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I have got to say I am quite encouraged by the debate so far and I have to say there is not much between the lot of us. In fact, actually, while I might be seconding the amendment that would not mean that I am not in favour of the principles of the motion. In fact, through the discussions that have been taking place regarding the proposals for the insulation scheme, we have discussed how the city can move forward with insulations schemes on hard to treat properties and how we can increase renewables and microgeneration.

One of the reasons of the idea of setting up the Climate Change and Environment Group, an all-party think tank under my Chairmanship, is to fast track those ideas. There are lots of things out there, lots of funding out there. There are actually some schemes which Councillor Wakefield and I have been investigating where actually we could do something and it would cost us no money at all.

How successful it is, how it works out for the householder, that is what we are investigating but there are tons of things we can do. I knew exactly what Barry was saying – let us get there, let us do it. Let us get people together who want to do something. As I say, I know from the past with James, I have worked with him in the past and they are as thoughtful on this as I am and I think what we can do, if we do it properly, take the silliness that we had earlier on out because there is more that joins us together than drags us apart, and see if we can do something really important, because the fact is, it is a time like this we have got to do it. We are strapped for cash, our people are strapped for cash and what we can do to help those people by cheaper bills, in fact in some cases very small bills and earning a bit of money on the side. What we can do for them, I think we have got to do that and there are ways and means of doing that, but not just by the resolution.

I have also got to say that bearing in mind the currently – and the motion in a few minutes – we are trying to draw up a scheme, a free insulation scheme on the Kirklees model which will come in, if passed, will come into operation next year and last for about three years, similar to what happened in Kirklees, the time that has been spent on that and trying to draw the money down and the stuff we are learning from that, we need to do that as the first priority. My colleague in Kirklees described the motion and I have spoken about this, I am not doing any Liberal bashing but what a colleague of mine said is it is somewhat like trying to run before you can walk because the things go together. The insulation scheme is a must to get on the road. If we can get something through that group to the Exec Board that moves things forward faster on microgeneration, I would be happy. Of course, remember this as it happened earlier, the Chair of the committee is one of those that has the balance of power in Council so I can use a bit of pressure on the administration.

What I have got to do is ask you to accept this amendment and let us work together and let us try and get something done. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR MATTHEWS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I welcome Councillor Monaghan's innovative White Paper on microgeneration. I want to talk about the coalition Government though – we have all been bashing them today but actually there are quite a lot of positives coming forward and driving the green agenda. It is pleasing to see that the Government is tearing down the structure of centrally set targets and returning genuine power to local authorities on issue such as this one. I think that is what Barry alluded to.

It is also good to see the Government set an example by cutting carbon emissions in Whitehall by ten per cent over the next twelve months. The Green Deal that the Energy and Climate Change Secretary Chris Huhne set out will make it easy for individuals and businesses to save energy, reduce emissions and to cut their costs.

The coalition Government has set out its strong commitment to renewable energy schemes and to allow communities that host renewable energy projects to attain the additional business rates that they generate. It is ridiculous that the 1976 Local Government Act prevented Councils from selling electricity from wind turbines and (*inaudible*) and this Government, from what we are hearing at the moment, is going to repeal this Act, so not only will these schemes tackle climate change but they will create jobs and much needed local jobs.

There are companies such as Eco One, CS Rose Solar Plumbing, Sunuser Ltd, all here in Leeds that could expand and create employment.

Leeds should be leading the way on schemes like this and I pay tribute to the work that Councillor Monaghan was doing as Exec member because some of the stuff that came forward, Councillor Monaghan put the ball rolling on the Warm Zone scheme. We have seen it happen in Kirklees – we should not be following their lead, we should be leading the way. I must say, Councillor Ewens behind me has actually been leading the way for many of us because she has had cavity insulation in her house for 30 years and solar panels for 20 years, so it can be done and she paid a local firm to do that for her, so it can be done.

It is schemes such as outlined by Councillor Monaghan in the Liberal Democrat Group and schemes that the Government are bringing forward that show we are committed to extending renewable energy to everyone. I hope that the Green Group here today will show their true green credentials and back this White Paper for urgent and radical action to save the environment and create much needed local jobs, particularly in West Leeds, rather than support a Labour amendment which is effectively kicking this into the long grass. I am sorry to break the consensus because there is – Glendales' long grass, yes! I do expect the debate to be really interesting but it is a shame because this is a typical New Labour solution to this radical policy, let's set up a steering group to discuss a working group to possibly think about a way forward. I think that is not the way we should be doing this. If the Green Party here in Leeds for for this sidelining and inaction, then they have let down their supporters and they have let down the people who voted for them and their constituents.

I thought the purpose of the Green Party was to be green. It is no wonder Friends of the Earth said the Liberal Democrats are greener than the green party. A number of Green groups in my area and across the city have said to me privately they are very disappointed with the Green Councillors here in Leeds.

It is interesting that you are backing this amendment. Does that mean that you are now backing the Mick Lyons incinerator? I am not sure – we will wait and see the shape of things to come.

The crucial thing for me with this one is to compare and contrast the White Paper in the name of Ann Blackburn and the White Paper in the name of Councillor Monaghan. Councillor Blackburn's White Paper has been referred to the Executive Board for action. Councillor Monaghan's has been referred to a steering group or a working group, whatever you want to call it. You are sidelining one and you are favouring another. I wonder why?

Here is an opportunity for the Councillor Blackburns to make a real difference after all the talk in the local press that you are the power brokers here in Leeds. We now know that you are just Labour's poodles if you back this amendment. *(interruption)* but you can change this – you can change this by backing Councillor Monaghan's radical White Paper. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR DUNN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Lord Mayor, I want to speak in support of Councillor Murray's amendment regarding the introduction of new microgeneration energy schemes in our city. Lord Mayor, we as a Council have a massive responsibility and, indeed, a massive opportunity to make real difference in the fight against climate change. Residents in Leeds, quite rightly, are looking to us as a Council to lead the way and set an example on how to meet the challenge head on. This is a challenge that must be met. We simply cannot stand still because, if we do nothing now, it will impact on the lives of countless future generations.

As a Council we took the positive step this year of agreeing a 40 per cent reduction in carbon emissions by 2020 but this is, of course, just a start. I know that there are dedicated teams of officers who are working very hard to help us to achieve this goal and their expertise will be absolutely vital in the upcoming months and years.

With regards to the microgeneration schemes in our city, the Council has already introduced a number of projects. For example, the Authority has installed photovoltaic cells and wind turbines in a number of schools and buildings, a wind turbine at the John Charles Centre and solar thermal PV and air source heat pumps in social housing. As Councillor Murray has outlined and Councillor Monaghan in his White Paper, other Local Authorities, such as Kirklees and Barnsley, have also undertaken some useful, successful projects but, of course, there is always one that we can do and the question is, what next steps will be to move the microgeneration projects that are offered in Leeds on to another level.

To reach this goal we will have to initiate forward thinking and also at the same time be practical, especially when it comes to the issue of cost. We will also be ready to listen and learn and look at what other Local Authorities have been doing and such as Kirklees, see if the methods they use can be implemented and how if possible we have to improve them and make them accessible to a great number of people.

Looking round the Chamber I know there are a lot of people in all parties who care passionately about the issue of climate change who undoubtedly have a lot to contribute on how best the Council and we can tackle climate change head on. This is why I am delighted to see in Councillor Murray's amendment that we would like to see the subject of microgeneration schemes to be referred to the newly formed all-party Climate Change Environment Group. This will be a fantastic issue for the group to get their teeth into and it will place officers, who are working very hard to help us achieve this goal and their expertise will be absolutely vital in this group. It

will also involve elected members into where I think they should be - at the forefront of this development.

We have addressed also in the amendment that a future paper will be brought to the Executive Board outlining the findings of the group. The opportunity is there to put together proposals that could be implemented not just in the Council but also for residents right across the city.

With the help and support of our dedicated officers, this is a fantastic opportunity for members representing all political parties to play their part in driving forward not just this microgeneration agenda but the issue of how we tackle climate change as a whole. It is a challenge that I hope this Chamber will embrace and I hope you will support Councillor Murray's amendment. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR DOWNES: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Councillor Murray referred to a previous White Paper a few years ago. That is correct, it was me that brought it here and I have done work since then to try and introduce microgeneration to my ward with the previous administration's Ward Based Initiative funding. Ward Councillors in Otley and Yeadon helped fund PV cells for Otley Ashfield School which were launched last month and within the first few weeks of them being installed we did the math and we had already saved the equivalent weight of a full class of children in CO₂.

During the summer months when, of course, you produce most electricity, the school is not open and so they will be selling that back to the Grid. To me, microgeneration is a no-brainer. There are renewable resources there which we should be using, especially considering that the old carbon coal, gas, etc, they are going to run out one day and so let us use the earth's natural resources to replenish them. As I say, this is a no-brainer.

The only difference we have got, I think, in this Chamber, is how we go about delivering this and I am often frustrated by red tape and bureaucracy; I would rather get things under way and get things done so we have got a clear vision here in Leeds so that Leeds can lead the way.

It has only recently been announced, as Councillor Monaghan said, in April, that these schemes can go ahead, so let us be pioneers, let us be at the forefront of this. Let us press ahead and let us go for this and show our green credential and I think the best way of doing that is Councillor Monaghan's way, otherwise we could be discussing this and discussing this and I would like to see the new administration grasp this and actually run with it and deliver something for Leeds so we have got something to show for it. Surely you want to do that. This is simple.

I understand what you are saying but let us try and bring it back the way that Councillor Monaghan is saying so that we can all work together and so we can protect the future for the people of Leeds. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Tom, you are having a really bad hair day today, aren't you? You start off by accepting – which in a sense is the essence of the White Paper – this Council notes the success of microgeneration energy schemes in other Local Authorities. You have accepted it – success in other Local Authorities – so why are we going to put it through the mangle? Why are you going to put it through the mangle in this Authority to a body that does not exist, to a self-appointed Chairman when the members have not been decided upon yet, the agenda is not decided? I see it is a working group – it is not a committee. Where will the Minutes go? Will we see the Minutes? Will we have a chance of openness or is this more of you choosing what to tell Council, like you exhibited earlier, when we

know what the truth is and you know what the truth is and yet you were prepared not to tell your colleague what the truth was, that the figure is 50k. You know why it came about and I know why it came about. It is because when the Outturn figures went to Exec Board the Labour Party put a press release out about it – not a complete press release with the whole story but a political one and misleading---

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Cleasby, can you stick to the subject matter, please.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: We are on a White Paper.

THE LORD MAYOR: You are going off the subject.

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: I am not going off the subject, Lord Mayor, it is relevant.

COUNCILLOR ATHA: Do not argue with the Lord Mayor.

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: In this amendment, Lord Mayor, we are being asked to agree on a White Paper that is pretty decisive for this Authority that agrees to do what others have already done. Just to look at it – self-financing opportunity, not a cost to the Authority – to put it to a body that does not exist. If that is going off the subject, Lord Mayor, then Councillor Murray really is having a bad day.

THE LORD MAYOR: It was not that bit, Councillor Cleasby as you well know. Can you please speak to the amendment?

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: I know you do not like your party to be maligned, Lord Mayor, but you make the choice when---

COUNCILLOR ATHA: I move that this person be not heard. You are attacking the Lord Mayor. Absolutely disgraceful.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Disgrace.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Gruen, please.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Lord Mayor, I am sure you can deal with those kind of indiscretions from Councillor Cleasby. You do not need our help.

The interesting part of this debate is what the seconder of the resolution, Councillor Anderson said, when he said, "We support this in principle but the devil is in the detail and you have to think about the costs." What we are saying is, we have confidence that Councillor David Blackburn will chair this working group to which all parties have been invited to contribute in a professional and straightforward manner and that he wants to actually make progress. Why else would we want to set up an all-party working group? You have had six years to bring forward proposals – six years with different Lib Dem portfolio holders on this portfolio. The first time we put forward a White Paper you belittle it. Now that we are saying everybody working together, it is suddenly New Labour kicking it into the long green grass – but of course we would not do that, just the long grass.

Seriously, just participate. Some of you have greater knowledge in these areas than others of us, so those are the people who should come together. If then it says put a report to the Executive Board, it can be done within three months if you get together and find a scheme and want to put it forward, or it may take slightly longer, but the idea is not in passing White Papers here and then forgetting about

them like you did in so many of them when you were in administration. The idea is to actually agree the actions for the White Paper and we shall monitor the actions, because I know you will not do it but we will monitor the actions and make certain that officers act on them and bring these matters back into the Exec Board and the Council.

This is an issue we all feel strongly about. We do not actually have to spend an hour and a half debating it, seriously. Just trust us (*laughter*).

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor James Monaghan to sum up, please.

COUNCILLOR MONAGHAN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Just quickly to address the point Councillor Gruen made. We could not actually have introduced anything sooner because feed-in tariffs were not actually in place for us to use and as Councillor Blackburn will know, we were actually drawing up schemes to do a similar proposal like this and actually a lot of the work has been done.

I think Councillor Cleasby was right, I am going to talk about retaining the first paragraph in the amendment and I am pleased with that part of the amendment, that the Council notes the success of microgeneration energy schemes in other Local Authorities, and pretty much everyone in this Chamber has said and pretty I would imagine what everyone in this Chamber believes, is that is the right direction we should be going. We are all heading in the right direction. It is really positive, that, and actually I hope we will be talking about what Leeds is doing, not what Kirklees has done – what Leeds is doing.

The second part of the amendment is what I take issue with. What the Opposition is proposing is taking this to another talking shop. We already have the Leeds Initiative Climate Change Partnership, which is a cross-party group which does good work. It has only met a few times so far but has representation from groups across the city, not just the Council. We also have the cross-party Leaders' Waste Strategy Group, which is still in existence, to discuss some environmental issues, so we do not really need to set up this group to actually progress this issue.

What I would say is, David, you have got the right green ambitions for this city. You want to move this city forward. It does not have to be energy insulation or microgeneration. It can be both.

This White Paper that we are moving will commit this administration to take a White Paper and actually achieve the ambitions that you want. I ask you to convince your group to support the White Paper in our name that will actually see action happen now rather than whenever it is decided by a talking shop. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Can I call for the vote on the amendment in the name of Councillor Murray, please? It might be better if we do it electronically. It will be easier for the officers to count, I can assure you.

COUNCILLOR GRAYSHON: Can I propose we have a recorded vote?

THE LORD MAYOR: Is there a seconder for that?

COUNCILLOR LOBLEY: Yes, seconded.

THE LORD MAYOR: OK, we will have a recorded vote.

(A recorded vote was taken on the amendment)

THE LORD MAYOR: There are 94 members present. Voting “Yes” 48, abstentions 0, “No” 46. That means that the amendment becomes the substantive motion. Can we proceed to that vote, please?

(A vote was taken) That is CARRIED, thank you.

ITEM 12 - WHITE PAPER MOTION – INSULATION SCHEME

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we move on to White Paper 12, please? Ann, can I invite you to move this, please?

COUNCILLOR A BLACKBURN: Yes thank you, Lord Mayor. You might ask why a free insulation scheme. You might say money will be wasted on people who can afford to pay. The principal advantages of a non-means tested area based scheme is the reduction in administrative costs and significantly higher uptake rates compare to a heavily discounted scheme.

We know that despite the saving that householders can make, very few insulate their homes voluntarily each year and everyone pays the price of their increased emissions. The Warm Front Scheme, though it has done a lot of good work, of course only covers people on benefits. Leeds operated an area based insulation scheme across five of the most deprived wards between 2007 and 2008 with very limited success. Major barriers were the price, because the scheme was not free, the lack of publicity and the shortage of suitable properties.

Around the same time, Kirklees committed around £9m of Council money into a free insulation scheme across the whole district. This has insulated over 40,000 properties, generated local employment, increased access to benefits for vulnerable people, they have had smoke alarms installed and it has resulted in excellent PR for Kirklees Council.

This initiative we are proposing expects to provide free loft and cavity wall insulation to all suitable privately owned and privately rented properties across the whole city. This will deliver multiple benefits, the most important of which are a positive impact on the local economy through the creation of new local jobs, energy and financial savings to Leeds householders and an increase in benefits uptake level, significant reduction in domestic CO₂ emissions and a reduction in fuel poverty levels.

The initiative would be delivered through the existing fuel savers team and will contribute to many of the Council's and our partners local priorities. The most important are social, of course, reducing cold-related ill health and increasing income levels for deprived people through the Leeds Strategic Plan by contributing the Local Improvement Priority N1187, which is the reduction in fuel poverty levels; economic, job creation and retention of money in the local area; and environmental, reducing energy use and carbon emissions which are two of the Council's top 15 priorities in the Leeds Climate Change Strategy.

It is estimated that between 88,000 and 104,000 households will benefit by receiving between 107,000 and 122,000 main measures of loft and cavity wall insulation. It will create generation of between £11.2m and £18.3m per annum for the Leeds economy through reduction in Leeds residents energy bills of between £8.8m and £13.4m and from under claimed benefits of between £2.4m and £4.9m per annum. It will create an extra 200 jobs, maybe more, reduce CO₂ emissions by between 48,500 and 65,700 tonnes per annum.

At least half the money to pay for this scheme will come from an energy supplier under the carbon emissions reduction targets, CERT, and about £15m will be needed from the Council over three to four years.

The Benefits Team and the Pensions Service would work with the Delivery and Assessment Teams to make sure that appropriate benefits are claimed by eligible residents. We would look to work with other partners, including West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue, Care and Repair, Utilities, Warm Front and many others so that a health check is done on the houses visited.

This scheme would be the most significant private sector domestic energy efficiency activity that the Council has ever undertaken. It will be twice as large as the one at Kirklees and therefore it cannot be undertaken lightly. The job has to be done thoroughly to ensure that the scheme is a success, but we know it can be done. We have taken advice, we have had meetings about this and we have got the information there. It can be done and there is a will to do it. I just hope that all of you see where we are coming from here and it would be nice if we could have all-party backing.

I hope that you will support me and vote for the motion and Leeds will then go down as history as not just talking the talk but walking the walk. Thank you.
(Applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor David Blackburn to second, please.

COUNCILLOR D BLACKBURN: I second the motion and reserve the right to speak.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor James Monaghan to move an amendment.

COUNCILLOR MONAGHAN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am moving this amendment because I have great frustration with the original motion by Councillor Ann Blackburn. Myself and my group completely support efforts to provide free insulation across the city of Leeds and believe it will have many benefits from job creation and local economic stimulus to reducing carbon emissions, tackling fuel poverty and reducing health inequalities. However, this could have been an issue that gained the full support of the Council. Instead, Councillor Blackburn's White Paper is worded in a way that deliberately prevents us from backing the original motion.

The amendment in my name is one which I would hope all members in this Chamber can support. It puts aside political differences and allows this Council to show political unity in a scheme that benefits all the people of Leeds and our environment.

There are many benefits of an insulation scheme, as Councillor Blackburn has mentioned. Over a third of CO₂ emissions in England come from energy use to heat and power our homes. If we are serious about cutting CO₂ emissions and if we expect to meet the ambitious targets that this Council has itself set to cut 40 per cent of the city's CO₂ emissions by 2020, then insulating homes is a great place to start.

By our estimates, if the city implements a scheme the same as the Warm Zone - which, by the way, was a Lib Dem led initiative in Kirklees based on a scheme piloted in Lib Dem run Newcastle - if we implement a similar scheme, Leeds can reduce its CO₂ emissions by 65,700 tonnes per year. This figure is substantially different to the one quoted in the White Paper motion by Councillor Ann Blackburn

which concerns us that the scheme that is being touted by the Greens may not be everything they say it is and this is one of the reasons why our amendment calls for a people to be taken to the next Executive Board outlining how the administration attempts to implement its free insulation scheme.

Implementing a non-means tested free insulation scheme will mean reductions to the city's emissions can be tackled both effectively and quickly whilst at the same time reducing domestic fuel bills and helping many households in Leeds that are in fuel poverty. If a free insulation scheme is rolled out across the city, we estimate that the annual reduction to residents' utility bills will be in the order of £13.4m a year. This is money in people's pockets that will benefit the local economy.

Additionally, if the administration is totally serious a Warm Zone scheme, then they will also follow Kirklees' example and go door to door, as Councillor Blackburn mentioned, to advertise the scheme and raise awareness of other Council services, leading to a significant uptake in benefits from some of the most vulnerable citizens in Leeds. This might generate a further £2.4m in additional revenue for Leeds residents from under claimed benefits.

Then there is the job creation that, if the Council rolls out a Warm Zone-like scheme, we believe 400 person years of employment will be created based on the assumption of one additional person year of employment per £100,000 spent on the scheme. Again, this does not seem to correspond with the figures the Greens have quoted in their White Paper and highlights the importance of getting details of the scheme on paper for us all to see.

Lastly, there is the health benefit that comes from enabling many vulnerable residents in Leeds to live in better heated accommodation more affordably.

For those reasons I have mentioned we completely support attempts to implement the scheme city-wide. It is certainly something that the previous administration, with other grant providers and the former government, have worked on in previous years and there have been many schemes to install insulation to some of the most deprived areas of our city.

However, we acknowledge that the best way to ensure that a city-wide insulation scheme is successful is to deliver a non-means tested scheme like Kirklees. It was for exactly these reasons that the previous Council administration approved a £250,000 pilot for a free non-means tested insulation scheme earlier this year. I would like to pay tribute to Councillor Anderson who worked very hard with me on that to try and get that through.

A city-wide non-means tested insulation scheme is clearly the logical next step and has the Liberal Democrat Group's full support. If the administration's free insulation scheme were only to be introduced in deprived areas, there would be concern from our Group that the take-up would be lower because of the works previously undertaken by this Council and other grant providers in those areas and that the energy efficiency savings and carbon emissions reductions would be lower per installation.

The administration costs for installation would also be greater than a full city-wide scheme and there would be a risk that many elderly people in fuel poverty in larger houses would be missed out by the scheme.

Our amendment asks for a report to be taken to the next Executive Board to identify how the scheme will be implemented and to quantify the benefits for the city and clear up the discrepancies that currently exist between what we feel can be

achieved through a free city-wide insulation scheme and what has been proposed by the Greens.

I just want to raise one other thing, and I think it is a shame that in this instance the Greens are calling for the paper to be brought to Executive Board to action this. It is a shame they could not have done that on the previous White Paper, because they obviously want action on this but not action on the previous one, which was very frustrating.

I could have referred to the work of the new coalition Government in the wording of our paper but I chose not to. Let us put politics aside so all of us in this Council can work together to get this scheme implemented for the benefit of all the residents across the city as soon as possible.

I move the amendment. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Anderson to second, please.

COUNCILLOR ANDERSON: I will repeat what I said at the beginning when I said that the devil is in the detail. I will not repeat much else. We probably would have found it a lot easier to have accepted this if again, unfortunately, Councillor Blackburn, you had not played politics. If in your original motion you had reflect back the good work that had been taken by the previous administration and if you had also reflected back the good work that was done by the Fuel Savers Board Partnership and how we started to deliver those things, instead of trying to play the politics of it, we probably could have gone the consensus that you achieve, but you chose to play the politics here.

We are genuinely trying in the previous White Paper and this one to get a consensus. You are the one who has chosen not to do it this time. If you want the political consensus, accept Councillor Monaghan's amendment and then you can get the consensus that you achieve.

To get down more to the detail, I have been told that this could – could – cost anything up to £30m of capital. Could do. What else could that be used for in this council? We heard earlier on today that there have been cuts. There are cuts that you are going to have to make and there are cuts that my government and their government have been making as well. It is a choice of priorities.

If you had this £30m – and I am told if you have to borrow £30m that is the equivalent payment of £1m-worth of interest, so that is £1m out of revenue you are going to have to find for something else as well. If you can deliver it free of charge and at no cost then fantastic, but I think that is why it would have been better if you had got the detail when bringing forward this White Paper and you might have found it a lot easier to get the consensus.

There is also concerns as to whether this is going to be affordable over the medium term as well.

Who will qualify? What are you going to do about private landlords? Are you going to force them to do it, because that is, as you know, Councillor Blackburn, from the Scrutiny Report last year, the private landlords are where we have the biggest problem trying to reduce fuel poverty in the city. How are you going to do that? Are you going to force them? I personally believe in choice. I personally believe in choice. You need to think how you are going to do it because they will want some sort of incentive, so what are you going to do about that?

I am also concerned as well as to any constraints that you will put on the scheme as to where you are going to start delivering it. Are you going to look at the wards that are in the greatest fuel poverty or the ones that are going to save the greatest amount of carbon? As a Green you want to do both, I accept that, but different wards are at different ends. I am not making a Special appeal for Wharfedale here. What I am pointing out is that, as the Fuel Savers Board did, we identified the ones who had greatest fuel poverty and we started in my ward for the ones to reduce the carbon, so we now need to go into the wards in the middle. Garforth is actually one that is not quite one or the other, if you see what I mean, and that is – are we going to start targeting Garforth? Is that where we are going to start piloting it out? It is things like you have got to start piloting it somewhere. Someone has got to be first, someone has got to be last and, as an ex-Director of an ALMO, I know what that is like because you had to decide who was going to be the first to get Decency and who was going to be last. The ones that were towards the end did not like it, the fact that somebody else was getting it, because there was only a finite amount of money available so you need to make sure that you have thought it through. Sometimes green politics can be done – oh, everything in the garden is going to be rosy. Unfortunately, as the Labour Party know and we know, when you get to power you have got to make decisions. Some will be popular, some will not be popular and it is not easy to go for the easy sound bite that you are talking about.

What is the bureaucracy going to be like? What form filling is there going to be? Where are you going to get your introductions from to decide what is happening?

I personally support – and so does the Group – the thrust of what you are doing but where does this run in conflict with or is it going to run alongside the new coalition's great deal? Is it going to be on top of it? Is it going to use the same money? Are the energy companies going to be able to spend the money on the Government initiative and yours, and is there going to be sufficient money available to do it?

I do ask you to think thoroughly about the detail when you actually come forward with it. Thank you very much. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR ILLINGWORTH: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Lord Mayor, over the next 20 years residents in Leeds must respond to three very serious global threats. First of all, increased demands for fossil fuels from the new industrial economies of China, India, Latin America will inevitably lead to substantial energy price rises, bigger bills for people to pay and the depletion of global fuel reserves.

At the same time the rise in CO₂ will raise global temperatures, increase sea levels and alter rainfall patterns across the world.

The third point, there is likely to be a loss of productive agricultural land at a time when the global population is still increasing, threatening the reliability of our food supplies.

It is therefore essential that the demand for fossil fuels must be cut and our national target is a reduction of 80 per cent by 2050.

Lord Mayor, demand for energy in the UK is split into three approximately equal headings. Roughly one third is used by transport, another third is used by industry and commerce and the final third is used for space heating in domestic residential properties – it is that final third which is under attack here.

Free home insulation will improve comfort levels, it will reduce heating bills and it will contribute to the required reduction in CO₂ output. It will help to reduce fuel poverty in Leeds, improving living conditions for the worst off people in the city.

Having said this, Lord Mayor, the task ahead is not going to be easy. Insulation is an essential first step but insulation alone is unlikely to deliver the required reduction in CO₂. Additional measures, such as heat pumps, microgeneration and alternative energy sources will also be necessary.

A further problem, Lord Mayor, is that for a significant proportion of Leeds houses, improved insulation is far from easy to achieve. Many thousands of houses across our city are ex-back-to-back converted houses, solid non-cavity walls, low grade dormer windows or non-traditional construction which can be extremely difficult to modify.

Having said this, there is still excellent reason to try. This will indeed generate local jobs, it will stimulate the local economy but it is unrealistic to resolve all these issues in time for the next Executive Board. I therefore urge the Council to vote against the amendment and instead support the original White Paper proposal from Councillor Blackburn with this active support from the Labour Group. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR CHASTNEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I think this should be hopefully – hopefully – a straightforward debate and I am getting the sense that we are all largely agreeing on the merits of the free insulation scheme. People have said today and in the earlier debate talking about climate change, most people are agreeing in the economic, social and, of course, the environmental benefits that we have got there, they seem to be incontrovertible. Even on the details of what we are hoping to achieve and the methods of that, in this paper, unlike the last one, we are even agreeing on the methods in this paper. All I am trying to say is that there is a very small difference between Ann, your paper, and the amendment here and I am just trying to bring out that really all we have sought to do here is two very simple but important things while we hope that there should actually be some agreement here.

First of all what we have tried to do here is tighten up the language to be what we think is clearer and stronger about the Council's intentions. We have made clear that we wish the Director begins immediate investigations and it is setting them a specific date of the next Executive Board by when we want to see progress.

I suppose our argument is that surely anyone who wants to see genuine ambitions for the free insulation scheme - and it is pretty obvious that we all share that – would want to insist on that kind of speedy action. I take John's point that things cannot be done that quickly, we will not have some of the details and even Barry has listed some details of concern, but I do not see any reason why we cannot bring this straightaway to the next Executive Board as we have in our paper, even if that is to get the initial progress report of where we are up to, but I think if we do not start setting these important dates - and that is really the only difference we have got here in our amendment – is that we are setting down a clear date by which we already want to start seeing the next step of this, the next step along the line and that we are already making progress. If we do not set a date, then the fear that anyone is likely to have is that the risk of inertia and inevitable slippage is something that I think we have all seen that we are supportive of.

I think all we are trying to do here is to impress the urgency of the policy with a bit of greater clarity and again, Ann, if you are looking at the two pages of which one talks the talk and walks the walk, I just like to think ours is a little bit stronger on that.

Of course, the other key rationale of the amendment concerns that dreaded word “consensus” which we all want to be breaking out here. We think we will simply achieve that by just removing the party political rhetoric which, let’s be honest, it may be difficult for us to support it but also really added nothing constructive or of substance to the wider environmental debate which we are all agreed is much more important anyway.

Really we just want to see a paper that promotes exactly the same positive policy which we all hopefully seem to be agreeing on, but that we can actually all openly support. The point is that if we actually do agree on free insulation, then let us actually say that we do instead of finding a bit of discord amongst the harmony that we have got, which I think David pointed out on the previous paper, you saw a lot more agreement than you saw disagreement, and I see that exactly the same here with free insulation.

Why do we not just stress how seriously we all take the issue and that we all think free insulation is to be part of the climate change solution and how supportive we all are? Let us promote it across the city.

I am hoping that every member can support the amendment that more clearly commits the Council to taking action on free insulation now and more clearly demonstrates how united we actually are behind an ambitious but thoroughly worthwhile project. Thank you.

COUNCILLOR MARJORAM: My Lord Mayor, I think members will be aware that my speeches in Council are fairly rare but they are also fairly brief and I wish to make a short, serious point about the term “fuel poverty” which I have regarded with considerable distaste since I first heard it coined. Of course, it became necessary because we have had 13 years of a Labour Government with a shameful disregard for our energy policy or our energy security policy which has resulted in us using gas to generate electricity in order to reduce our CO₂ emissions, which are both included in these various White Papers, and also which has resulted in importing ever-increasing amounts of gas, which is ever more expensive, and making it increasingly difficult for people to heat their homes adequately in winter months.

The reason I regard fuel poverty as an unhelpful term is that although I am sure it was well-intentioned, it is completely wrong. The point I wish to make is this, my Lord Mayor. Whatever we do to address fuel poverty we ought to remember that people who cannot afford to heat their homes are not living in fuel poverty – they are living in actual poverty and we should not just explore whatever alternatives come out of these two White Papers or amendments this evening, but the full range of things which we can do as a Council to lift people out of poverty. Fuel poverty, I believe – and I passionately believe this – is a very unhelpful term. If you cannot heat your house you are not in fuel poverty, you are in actual real and no doubt very depressing poverty. Thank you, my Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR D BLACKBURN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I have got to say – and we might say this all the time but I am somewhat confused - you might say I might be confused the rest of the time – about this amendment. Quite honestly, what is in this amendment if you put it in front of anybody who knows anything about the system, the thing they have got in Kirklees, would say that the amendment will not achieve the Kirklees scheme. It will not draw down the money. That is not the point about how much money it costs. The point is you need to put the scheme together that draws the maximum down and that will not do.

I have got to say I think it was James who mentioned about the Warm Zone in Kirklees. I would just like to put you right about that. The Warm Zone, yes, was a Liberal Democrat idea but it was not free. It was a Green Party amendment taken on with the support of the Conservatives that actually put the scheme into operation and from what I can understand from the Leader of the Green Group on Kirklees Council, the Liberal Democrats were not over enamoured with the idea we came up with.

He said something about what we have already done. I know back in 2007/08 – and I know a bit of that because I was on Fuel Savers with Barry at the time – we did some work in the five most deprived wards that were not very successful and that is one of the reasons why you need to do something across the board so that you take in richer areas and poorer areas because what you can do then is, the money you are pulling in from the places where you are reducing the carbon most you can spend it and take it into the more deprived areas.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: We have already got insulation, do you realise that?

COUNCILLOR D BLACKBURN: The thing is, the scheme – and I suspect you are talking about the pilot scheme which was £200,000, wasn't it? Again, that was in a limited area of deprived localities and I am sure I have seen a paper – and anybody who has been at meetings with me - that is Councillor Ann Blackburn, Councillor Lewis and Councillor Wakefield – regarding putting together this scheme, I am sure that the problem with doing that was that the procurement mechanism for doing it was to procure insulation that had to be paid for with it. The idea here to get the price down and to get the most out of CERTs and the advice we are getting from the people who have done it in Kirklees is we need to do it altogether as one contract because we will get the best deal. With that I will close. Thank you, Lord Mayor.
(Applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ann Blackburn to sum up, please.

COUNCILLOR A BLACKBURN: Yes thank you, Lord Mayor. I think to be honest that – I would like to think that all of us would see the advantages of having a free scheme to the households across Leeds. I would not like to think there is a Councillor here that does not think it is a good idea, but I agree that it is how you go about it. I agree that it has to be gone into. We have started taking advice over this with Council officers and, as David has said, our colleague, Councillor Cooper in Kirklees who has a vast amount of information on this because, of course, Kirklees were the first to put it into operation.

We are trying to get, we are getting information, we want the best deal but we know it can be done and I think we have to do it. It is a fantastic opportunity. Leeds, as I have said before, is twice as big as Kirklees. It has proved it can be done in Kirklees and all the benefits it has brought and we know that we can do it in Leeds as well. There is a will there to do it. I have just brought this today because I did hope that the will was there not just on some Councillors' side but I did hope that the will was there with everybody.

Obviously I have seen the amendment. I do believe that the Lib Dems that spoke feel as passionately as I do about having such a scheme but what it says in the amendment is that you ask where the funding is coming from. As I said, we are going into the matter thoroughly, we are trying to get a good deal with energy companies and you cannot just do that overnight.

When you say bring all the details back to the Executive Board, that is what I cannot agree with you about because you cannot bring all the details. We have been

working on this for a few weeks. If we did bring details to you, they might not be right – they might not be right because you will not be giving us the time and also we need to get a good deal from an energy provider and that is what we are trying to do, so it cannot be done overnight. I am not saying it can be done for the next meeting of the Executive Board but what I am saying is, we are serious about doing this. It will not be a talking shop and as far as the scheme that has been put forward in the last White Paper, when you think that that will just go away and be a talking shop, actually we have spoken to Kirklees who are also looking to do something although, of course, they have done this insulation scheme, they are looking to do the scheme you proposed on top of that, so those houses are going to be really good, having an insulation scheme and then having the scheme that you propose as well, and that is what we would - we would love to do both things, so it is not either/or, it is not that we are saying that we will just say yours will be to a working group and we will talk about it for ever and a day. No, we believe that both schemes are good schemes.

I hope that you take on board what I say. This is something to me we need to do everywhere and if we can do both, that will be good but we are seriously looking at both and I hope that you will support me on this today and then it can go forward properly. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Can I call for the vote then please for the amendment in the name of James Monaghan.

COUNCILLOR BENTLEY: Can I ask for a recorded vote.

COUNCILLOR GRAYSHON: Seconded.

(A recorded vote was taken on the amendment)

THE LORD MAYOR: Again, there are 94 members present and voting. The “Yes” vote is 46, abstentions 0, “No” 48, which means Councillor Ann Blackburn’s motion now goes forward for voting, please.

COUNCILLOR D BLACKBURN: Recorded vote, please.

(A recorded vote was taken on the substantive motion)

THE LORD MAYOR: Present and actually voting 83. The “Yes” vote is 72, abstentions recorded 7, “No” vote 0. The White Paper is therefore CARRIED.

ITEM 13 – WHITE PAPER MOTION – NEW GENERATION TRANSPORT

THE LORD MAYOR: We are now in the winding up session under Rule 4, it is now seven o’clock so can I invite Councillor James Lewis and you do need to seek leave of Council.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 14.10, seek leaves of Council to alter the motion, deleting the word “all” in front of the word “party”. Of course, it is replacing all party and cross party in the first line of the first paragraph and the first line of the second paragraph, Lord Mayor, for accuracy there, so it is making that amendment please, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we agree on that, Council. *(Agreed)* That is agreed. Can we have the seconder, then, Richard Lewis? You have got to move it formally now.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: Lord Mayor, I move the White Paper.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we have the other half of the Lewis act, Richard Lewis, please?

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: I second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can I call for the vote then please? *(A vote was taken)*
One recorded against. Brave enough to vote against, it should be recorded, well done. CARRIED.

ITEM 15 – WHITE PAPER MOTION – PROCEDURE RULE 3.1(d) WORLD
CUP FRUIT TREE PLANTING SCHEME

THE LORD MAYOR: We are now on what we all the ‘noddors’, are we not?
White Paper 15, Councillor Cleasby.

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

COUNCILLOR MONAGHAN: I second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we have a vote on that? *(A vote was taken)*
CARRIED.

ITEM 16 – WHITE PAPER MOTION - PROCEDURE RULE 3.1(d) - LEEDS
UNITED FC PROMOTION

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we move on to 16, then? Mark Dobson?

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

COUNCILLOR PARKER: Second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can I call for the vote? *(A vote was taken)* That is
clearly CARRIED.

Can I thank members for their attendance? We do not have a meeting till
mid- September so I hope you have a very good holiday in that time and can we
once more show our appreciation to Jean Dent and Paul Rogerson, two wonderful
officers who now leave the Council. *(Standing ovation)*

The Council meeting closed at 7.11 pm
