

LEEDS CITY COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

Held on

Wednesday, 26th March 2014

At

THE COUNCIL CHAMBER,
CIVIC HALL,
LEEDS

In the Chair:

THE LORD MAYOR
(COUNCILLOR T MURRAY)

VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

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

VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF LEEDS CITY COUNCIL
MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 26TH MARCH 2014

THE LORD MAYOR: Good afternoon, everybody. Let me welcome you to today's Council meeting and begin by making one or two announcements. Let me remind Members that this meeting again is going to be webcast (it is getting quite popular). Remember the cameras, there are four cameras around the Council Chamber.

Could I also mention we have Richard Horsman today from Trinity University with some media students, they are in the gallery, they normally come once a year to observe what is happening and make notes but, in line with the new protocol, I think they are open today for third party recording. Those guys, I think, are on my right.

Let me also mention retiring Councillors, in alphabetical order. First of all we have got Bernard Atha (*Applause*) 1957 (*laughter*), Labour Councillor for the former City Ward until 1968. Then the wards were redistributed and in the year 1968, which was a famous year because the Chief Exec was born that year (*laughter*), it saw Bernard standing as one of the three Labour Councillors in the West Hunslet Ward, but all three seats were taken by the Conservatives.

COUNCILLOR J McKENNA: Those were the days, Les!

THE LORD MAYOR: Bernard's undoubted talents were missing for a year because he bounced back in 1969 to 1974 when he was the Councillor for Holbeck Ward. Then, in readiness for the creation of the new City of Leeds, the District Council from 1st April elections were held and Bernard was elected for Council for the Kirkstall Ward in 1973. This guy has been a Councillor in this city for 56 years. (*Applause*)

Moving on, Councillor Neil Taggart. Neil was elected as the Labour Councillor for Chapel Allerton in 1980 and he was there up to 2004 and he has represented Bramley Ward and Stanningley Ward since 2004. Neil was Lord Mayor in 2003-4. he has been a Leeds City Councillor for 34 years. Neil, on my right. (*Applause*)

Finally, Councillor Martin Hamilton. Martin was elected as the Liberal Democrat Councillor for Headingley in 2002 to 2014. He has been with us for twelve years. Councillor Hamilton. (*Applause*)

Some may be retiring but some are just arriving. I am delighted to announce that Councillor Rebecca Charwood has given birth to a baby boy on Monday. Both mother and baby are doing well, there is no name for the baby but I think if Council agrees with me we will suggest Bernard! (*laughter*) Do I need to vote on that!

ITEM 1 – MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD 26TH FEBRUARY 2014.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can I move on to item number 1, Minutes of the Meeting held on 26th February 2014. Councillor Harper.

COUNCILLOR G HARPER: Lord Mayor, I move the Minutes be received.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: I second that, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: All those in favour? (*A vote was taken*) I think that is CARRIED.

ITEM 2 – DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

THE LORD MAYOR: Let us move on to Declarations of Interest. Does any Member want to declare a disclosable pecuniary interest? This is your moment. As I look round, no-one is declaring that interest.

ITEM 3 - COMMUNICATIONS

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 3, the Chief Executive wants to report on communications.

THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE: Just one to report, Lord Mayor. Nick Boles, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Planning in DCLG replied to the Council with regard to a White Paper considered at Council in January 2014. That has been circulated to all Members.

ITEM 4 - DEPUTATIONS

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 4 is Deputations. Again, the Chief Exec.

THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE: Yes, there are four Deputations: Leeds Dance Community and the ambition to make Leeds the UK's top city for dance; second, Meanwood Road Safety Campaign regarding 20 mph zones; third, Leeds Student Union regarding the creation of a Standing Council of Student Union reps; and, fourth, the Morley Heritage Centre regarding a permanent location.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Harper.

COUNCILLOR G HARPER: Lord Mayor, I move that all the Deputations be received.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: I second that, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: All those in favour? (*A vote was taken*) That is CARRIED. We will hear the Deputations.

DEPUTATION ONE – LEEDS DANCE COMMUNITY

THE LORD MAYOR: Good afternoon and welcome to today's Council meeting. I know you have already started performing in the Banqueting Hall, I think those who saw, wonderful, it was an enjoyable start to this afternoon. Please make your speech to Council, which should not be longer than five minutes, and please begin by introducing the Members of your Deputation.

MR M SKIPPER: Lord Mayor, Leader of the Council and Councillors of Leeds, my name is Mark Skipper, I am Chief Executive of Northern Ballet. I am accompanied today by Wieke Eringa, who is the Chief Executive and Artistic Director of Yorkshire Dance; Sharon Watson, who is the Artistic Director of Phoenix Dance

Theatre; Balbir Singh, who is the Artistic Director of Balbir Singh Dance Company, and Janet Smith, who is Principal of the Northern School of Contemporary Dance.

Thank you very much for giving us this opportunity to ask Members for their recognition and endorsement of the Leeds dance community and to share with you our collective ambition to make Leeds the UK's top city for Dance.

As you have seen, today we are launching the Leeds City of Dance map and we wanted to show how Leeds is a city of dance and how the city is connected to the rest of the UK, and to the rest of the world, through dance.

Leeds has the UK's richest dance ecology outside of London. Last year, dance generated an income of more than £11.5m and 300,000 people were an audience for dance in Leeds or dance from Leeds. There are three dedicated dance buildings with a total of 20 dance studios and three theatres, two international touring companies, one of the first national dance agencies, the only Government-funded dance conservatoire north of London, six theatres that programme dance and scores of dance companies, independent artists and commercial dance schools.

Dance is important in education, health, social cohesion and regeneration. People dance for fun, for fitness, to meet others or to express their creativity. Research tells us that dance is a popular activity for five million participants, or close to 10% of the UK population. Dance is second only to football as the most popular activity for school children.

There is a rich mix of diverse dance flourishing in Leeds, representing a wide variety of cultural traditions. Thousands of people are dancing everywhere from dance gymnastics led by RJC to Kathak dances led by Balbir Singh Dance Company and professional classes at the Northern School of Contemporary Dance.

Leeds is a brilliant place for young people to develop their talent and make dance part of their lives. Young people from diverse social and economic and cultural backgrounds have a breadth of opportunity from grassroots participation in a wide range of dance styles to quality pre-vocational training.

Our touring companies are proud ambassadors for Leeds, a rich mix of international dance artists and students regularly visit and live in Leeds, adding a vibrant dimension to its cultural life. We support exceptional talent and future leadership through world-class training, education and employment. Art form development is driven from Leeds through nurturing new creative talent within companies but also through other opportunities, such as Yorkshire Dance's unique Juncture Festival.

In some of the city's showcase events dance regularly takes centre stage: the BBC's *Frankenstein's Wedding* at Kirkstall Abbey; Phoenix's *Ghost Peloton* in the Yorkshire Festival; the 2012 Cultural Olympiad Project, Leeds Canvas, and the Olympic Torch procession.

The city attracts world class talent. Northern Ballet's premier dancer Martha Leebolt won the National Dance Award for Outstanding Classical Female Performance and Tobias Batley has since been nominated twice for Outstanding Classical Male Performance. Recently, over a thousand professional dancers applied for positions with Phoenix and Northern Ballet.

Long term investment in dance in Leeds is a success story. Several iconic organisations have led three decades of learning in schools and communities and

given performances which have developed audiences who feel that access to dance and attending a dance performance is a vital part of their lives.

We want to let the world know that Leeds is united in its ambitions to make the city the UK's top city for dance. A number of the dance companies in Leeds are supported financially directly and indirectly by the City Council, for which we are all very grateful. You will be pleased to know that we are not coming here today asking for money, although... *(laughter)* However, what we would like is for you to consider what promotional and marketing support you could give to promote Leeds as a brilliant city for dance. Perhaps this is through the work of your Marketing teams or through the work of Leeds and Partners.

Finally, should Leeds bid for the European Capital of Culture 2023, the dance community will 100% back the bid and work with you to make the campaign a success. Thank you. *(Applause)*

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

COUNCILLOR G HARPER: Lord Mayor, I move that the matter be referred to the Executive Board for consideration.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: I second that, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: All those in favour? *(A vote was taken)* That is certainly CARRIED.

Thank you for attending and for what you have said. You will be kept informed of the consideration which your comments will receive. Good afternoon and enjoy the rest of the day. Thank you. *(Applause)*

DEPUTATION TWO – MEANWOOD ROAD SAFETY CAMPAIGN

THE LORD MAYOR: Hello, good afternoon and welcome to today's meeting. Please now make your speech to Council, which should not be longer than five minutes, and can you begin by introducing your colleague in your Deputation. Thank you.

MS Z WALKER: My name is Zoe Walker and I represent St Urban's Primary School Parent Teacher Organisation.

DR H BRYANT: I am Helen Bryant, I am an orthopaedic registrar and the Treasurer of the PTA at St Urban's Primary School.

MS Z WALKER: We are here to present a deputation for road safety measures in Meanwood. To quote Leeds City Council's Child Friendly Leeds statement, the top priority for young voices in Leeds was children and young people can make safe journeys and easily travel around the city.

Following numerous incidents involving cars failing to stop at the zebra crossing on Tongue Lane we, the parents at St Urban's Primary School, are campaigning for road safety measure outside the schools on Tongue Lane and beyond.

Currently the speed limit is 30 miles per hour – there are no signs to this effect. Traffic comes off the ring road from outer Leeds and uses these roads as a cut-through to Leeds city centre and other areas of Leeds with little regard for speed limits and those who live here.

We understand that the Council has plans to introduce 20mph zones outside all schools, prioritising those identified as being at higher risk. Tongue Lane should be made a priority. The introduction of the lower speed limit will reduce the risk of injury to children. We would also like to see the speed restrictions and a crossing introduced at the roundabout at the top of Church Lane and beyond. The left turn into Parkside Road is a blind corner. There is currently no safe place to cross. Church Lane and Tongue Lane have been described by local residents as being like a race track with traffic whizzing up and down and must be doing at least 40 mph. There have been several crashes causing serious damage to cars and property. Earlier this year a motorbike came off the road on to the pavement on Tongue Lane as children walked to school; thankfully, no-one was seriously hurt.

Of the pupils at St Urban's Primary and Cardinal Heenan, over 200 children walk or cycle to school every day, most of whom will need to cross Tongue Lane and/or Church Lane or Parkside Road. We feel that if these roads were made safer, then more children would walk, reducing traffic congestion further.

In addition, there are a large number of children who use public transport to travel to school. They board and alight on Tongue Lane. Cardinal Heenan expects the number of children who walk or travel by car and public transport to increase this September when the free school bus service is cut, increasing the risk of incident.

For most parents, including myself, witnessing speeding and failure to stop at the crossings have become a daily occurrence. In order to avoid crossing at the blind corner on Parkside Road, we usually wait for several minutes to cross the road on Church Lane, then walk on the opposite side of the road to school and use the zebra crossing at the top to return to the school side of the road. Most days we have to wait at the zebra crossing for cars who refuse to stop.

Recently, a van slowed down to almost stopping at the humped zebra crossing but continued to drive over the crossing. My two sons and another child had already begun to cross there. Lightning reflexes resulted in avoiding a disaster as I pulled my children to safety and held out an arm for the other child as a barrier to her crossing. Incidents like these tend not to be reported to the police as insufficient evidence is gained at the time but this was not the worst. On driving up Tongue Lane I stopped at the crossing to allow pedestrians to cross, only to be overtaken by the car behind. Imagine my horror watching the pedestrians crossing, only the beep of a horn and a fast-acting parent avoiding disaster.

I have watched as groups of children from Cardinal Heenan risk life and limb to cross the road at the mini-roundabout unaccompanied by grown-ups, buses and cars screeching to a halt only centimetres from children crossing. Every day I see children alighting public transport on Tongue Lane walking in front of the bus and proceeding to cross while cars overtake and speed past, just to gain an extra minute on their journey. I see childminders with furrowed brows allowing older children to walk responsibly but concerned that a car may just take a corner too quickly. This is most definitely not a child friendly area of Leeds.

I and others could report similar incidents to you every day of the school week. We, the parents and local residents, urge the Council to seize this opportunity to avoid a child being seriously hurt or killed. Our concerns have been echoed by the community as a whole and since January we have gathered over 500 signatures of local residents in support of our campaign, with many comments of similar incidents.

We have also engaged West Yorkshire Police, who are able to assist us in delivering road safety education and increasing driver awareness.

Trauma is the leading cause of death in children. If you hit a child at 40mph you will probably kill the child; at 30mph the child has an 80% chance of survival; at 20mph the child is likely to survive with minor injuries.

Please do not wait for a child to be hurt or killed. Now is the time for Leeds schools and residential areas to be made child friendly.

In summary, then the action we would like to see: a 20mph zone outside St Urban's Primary School and Cardinal Heenan School; a Pelican crossing or school crossing patrol; speed restrictions on Tongue Lane and Church Lane at the roundabout; and a pedestrian crossing beyond the roundabout.

Thank you for your time and for this opportunity, and for listening. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Harper.

COUNCILLOR G HARPER: Lord Mayor, I move that the matter be referred to the Executive Board for consideration.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: I second that, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you both for attending and for what you have said. You will be kept informed of the consideration which your comments will receive. Good afternoon. Thank you. (*Applause*)

Sorry. All those in favour? (*A vote was taken*) I think that is CARRIED.

DEPUTATION THREE – LEEDS STUDENTS UNION

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

MR F O'BYRNE: Thank you Lord Mayor and Councillors. My name is Frankie O'Byrne, I am the Community Officer at Leeds University Union and today I am joined today by Millie Cooper, who is the President of Leeds Met Students' Union, and by Miki Vyse, who is the President of Leeds Trinity Students' Union.

I am here today to speak to you about increasing the representation of students in the city to a policy making level. The city has a great record in youth engagement from its members in Youth Parliament to the Youth Council. However, there is no way of getting involved in local politics for the hundred thousand HE and FE students across the city and I think this is a great shame.

There is currently a lot of rhetoric around young people are disengaged, they do not care, they are not going to vote because it does not make any difference. I would not be here if that was true and I do not think it is very accurate. 69% of students believe that we should be driving change in the city and this is what we are here for. (*Applause*)

That is always good! We would like to create a Standing Council of student representatives where a member from each student union would regularly meet with the relevant Council Executive Officers to discuss how we can make this city even better.

One in seven people in this city is a student and they deserve to be properly represented, as well as given the opportunity to help make Leeds the best city in the UK by 2030. Our ideas fit with your vision but we have not been explicitly mentioned, nor have we had services tailored to best fit our needs.

We asked our students what areas they wanted to improve. They want to see a sustainable city with better recycling infrastructure (of course) as well as a healthier city. They want to feel engaged with the city from their arrival through volunteering, through local politics and having campuses that community members feel a part of. They also want to feel safe through an extension of the zero tolerance policy across the city. However, that is only a small fragment, that is not all. We also want a forum flexible enough to discuss any issues that may arise in the future. Ultimately, we do want a partnership.

Now we do not want just something for nothing, we believe that we can help you. If you will allow us to be a little bit smug, we do like to think of ourselves as the experts of talking to students. Using Leeds University Union as an example, during a Leeds City cuts consultation we actually consulted 500 students on what they actually wanted to save, what they thought was most important. We also recruited 500 students to the Citizens' Panel and through our Leave Leeds Tidy Scheme have managed to divert 70 tonnes from landfill.

If we were key partners, we can help you meet your targets. Also, we have a hundred thousand students who are learning from the most up-to-date research available and they are also keen to make a massive difference. If we harnessed the potential of those bright minds, I think we can create innovative services that work for the city and for its residents.

All the student unions in the city already meet on a regular basis (as you can see) to discuss the issues that affect us. We have shared problems but we also have shared goals. We believe that the city of Leeds is a great place and that we can help to make it even better.

Each student union works in partnership with this institution and it has allowed both of us to flourish. Now we are asking for the same opportunity with the city because we want to make each other flourish. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Harper.

COUNCILLOR G HARPER: Lord Mayor, I move that the matter be referred to the Executive Board for consideration.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: I second that, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Let us vote. All those in favour? *(A vote was taken)* I think that has been CARRIED.

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

DEPUTATION FOUR – MORLEY HERITAGE CENTRE

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

MR P TRIGWELL: My Lord Mayor and Fellow Councillors, good afternoon. My name is Pete Trigwell. I am the Chair of the Morley Heritage Centre and I would like to introduce you to Mr Bob Beach, who is the Secretary of the Heritage Group, Mr Peter Aldred, who is the President and founder of the Heritage Centre, and Adele O'Donohue, who is our Treasurer.

We would like to express our thanks for this opportunity to speak to you today and I would ask that Leeds City Council listens sympathetically to our concerns that we are going to be raising today about the future and permanence of Morley Heritage Society and that you, as a body of elected officials, give further consideration to these concerns and hopefully will be able to see your way clear to assisting this wonderful group to move forward.

A little about ourselves to start the ball rolling. We are at present a small group of volunteers, eight in total, who assist Peter in the day-to-day running of the centre. You will probably also be able to deduce from our title that we are fully committed to displaying and preserving a written, photographic and oral display of the heritage of Morley and its surrounding areas.

Next, I would now like to tell you a little about how the heritage centre came about. The collection that we have at present on display in a pop-up shop in Queen Street in Morley is the brainchild of the President of the group, Mr Peter Aldred. Peter is a well-known local man who has collected everything and anything to do with Morley for the last 50 years.

Peter has been waiting for more years than he wishes to remember for the opportunity to be allowed to display this collection to the people of Morley for their benefit and enjoyment. I know if it was Peter who was up here speaking to you today he would be the first to admit and say that he is not getting any younger and his wishes are that his collection be preserved for the enjoyment of not only the people of Morley but for the people of all the surrounding areas.

Our vision as a group is that not only do we display this collection, but that we also expand it and we aim to do this by:

1. being committed to further local heritage research in Morley and its surrounding areas;
2. by passing on the experiences of the group and its friends to the younger members of our community by the local schools and youth organisations, whereby they have an understanding of what the local heritage means to them in their present day, and what it means to their parents and grandparents growing up in the same town and areas.
3. We also envisage that we will be able to help people of all ages within our community who may find themselves isolated, for whatever reasons, a place that they can call their own and visit on a regular basis to pass on their own life experiences to different age groups.

As we do not at the moment have any funding, we are for the present a nomadic group. By this, I mean that we have no permanent premises for us to display and carry forward the aims of the group, which we have outlined already. We are currently supported by East Street Arts and it is they that find us the temporary accommodation that we are using at the moment. However, these premises are always subject to availability and, as the local economy seems to be recovering, we expect in the near future we will have nowhere to house this wonderful collection.

Just to prove that we are not only here with a cap in hand expecting the Council to sort out all our problems for us, can I let you know that we are in the process of seeking funding from the Lottery Heritage Fund, and are at the moment awaiting a reply from them.

As a group of committed enthusiasts we feel that the centre as we all see it can play an important part in the continuing development of Morley. It has become very apparent in the short time that we have been open to the public that it is a well-supported project. The footfall we are now seeing has steadily increased into hundreds of visitors per week, with over 347 positive and no negative comments having been placed in our visitors' book, which has only been in operation since mid-January.

It would seem that the people of Morley are very much of the opinion that they want somewhere where they can go and look around and talk about their history and heritage. This is only made possible by having such a display within the town centre of Morley. Having it in such a position makes the whole project more accessible to local groups, businesses and schools. It also becomes a place where local people can relate and record their experiences of local events and heritage.

Since applying to appear before you and actually getting here today, we have once again been moved from the premises that we are using at the moment, which was a small shop right in the heart of the town centre. The new premises we occupy, although much bigger in size, which is ideal for the expansion of the collection, is on the second floor, which is by no means an ideal setting for the large number of elderly and vulnerable visitors that we have been attracting. This outlines what I said earlier about us being a nomadic group.

In conclusion, if we are going to progress with this project, then a permanent location is paramount for success. If we have permanence then this centre can continue to develop into the focal point that can be woven into the very fabric of Morley town centre itself. To reiterate on what I said earlier, at this moment in time we do not have the revenue to secure premises, especially in the town centre, where our experience has shown that such a centre would thrive. We would therefore ask the Council to consider allowing the Morley Heritage Centre a permanent location within the town centre and within current Council owned property.

Thank you for allowing us to appear before you today and stating our case for permanent premises. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Harper.

COUNCILLOR G HARPER: Lord Mayor, I move that the matter be referred to the Executive Board for consideration.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: I second that, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: All those in favour? *(A vote was taken)* That is CARRIED.

Thank you for attending and for what you have said. You will be kept informed of the consideration which your comments will receive. Good afternoon and thank you for coming. *(Applause)*

ITEM 5 – RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD – LOCAL FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 5, Recommendations of the Executive Board.
Councillor Richard Lewis.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. In moving the Recommendations of the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy which everybody has got in their pack, can I just draw everybody's attention to a couple of pages. One is page 10, which lists the increased frequency of flooding within the Leeds District over the past few years, which I think in itself is incredibly telling not just in terms of the big schemes like the River Aire, where we have obviously had flooding on three occasions in this Millennium, but many of our smaller becks and rivers. Wortley Beck, three times since 2000 we have had flooding; high rainfall in a large number of areas of the city over 48 or 24 hours causing flooding. The list, I think, would affect most of our communities in one way or another.

I would also draw people's attention to page 19, which is the projection of increased winter precipitation for beyond 2055. I think both are incredibly telling in terms of things we need to worry about. We need to worry about the increased frequency of flooding within the Leeds district and we need to think long-term about where we are going to end up with both frequency and geographical spread.

The document also does a great job of explaining quite how the responsibilities for flooding fall, which is not an easy thing to do. It is not a document that is largely about the Flood Alleviation Scheme, it is something that covers all of our communities and I think it repays attention by all of us who have either been affected by floods up to now, who might potentially be affected by flooding in future years.

We have a very good team who work on flooding, led by Peter Davis, who works very closely with local communities. I think we are great at actually communicating with communities under risk and tackling problems when they occur but we have to face up to the fact that we will need to put more resources in and we will have to work better with all the partners who are involved.

If I can just say, this is a document that does what it says on the tin, it explains what our strategy is and I wholeheartedly recommend it to Council. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Harper.

COUNCILLOR G HARPER: I formally second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Leadley? Can I move on to Councillor Iqbal.

COUNCILLOR IQBAL: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I have just been summoned to move my car, so good timing, Lord Mayor!

My Lord Mayor and fellow Councillors, I am speaking on the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy. This winter we have seen the devastation that flooding can cause up and down the country. A flood in our city centre and the surrounding area would be a disaster. A major flooding event could wreak £450m of damage and place 4,500 properties at risk.

As a city we have experienced various near misses with flooding. It was not so long ago that the city centre came within four inches of being flooded. There are currently no formal flood defences along the River Aire. With over 25 tributaries upstream of the city and a very narrow flood plain, this is a problem that we cannot

ignore and a huge worry for the city, especially in my ward. There is also a significant risk of surface flooding from drains and sewers which are unable to discharge when the river level is high.

Our Local Flood Risk Management Strategy has been a long time in the making. I am pleased that now we have an agreement which will protect our communities from the awful social and economic effects of flooding. We have adopted a phased approach and the first stage aims to increase our standard of protection to one major flood every 75 years. You will be aware that flood alleviation works are already under way at Woodlesford. The scheme will also include the UK's first moveable weirs which can be lowered to reduce river levels as well as further river widening works. These place us at the cutting edge of flood technology and I am sure that our innovation will benefit the surrounding area.

The aim is to have these elements in place by the end of 2015 with the works at Woodlesford on target to be finished by July. I hope that our residents and businesses will be reassured by the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy which will bring them more protection from flooding than ever before. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. I will stick to the order and ask Councillor Leadley if he wants to contribute later. Councillor Taggart.

COUNCILLOR TAGGART: It is difficult because I was going to respond to Councillor Leadley. I wonder if I may, to use a Parliamentary term, give way to Councillor Leadley in these circumstances with your permission, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: OK. Councillor Leadley.

COUNCILLOR LEADLEY: I do not know what Neil suspects. Surely I cannot say anything horrific about flooding! It remains to be seen, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Off you go, Tom.

COUNCILLOR LEADLEY: My Lord Mayor, I would like to speak in support of the Flood Risk Management Strategy set out by Peter Davis and his team between pages 39 and 149. Perhaps the length of the report matches the importance now being given to the threat of flooding. Things have changed since 2004 when David Sellars headed a tiny Land Drainage Service which had a yearly capital works budget of £20,000. No doubt last winter's floods in the South of England will bring about a flurry of activity. David Cameron and Nick Clegg will spend the Easter Parliamentary recess personally dredging the Somerset Levels and Ed Miliband and Ed Balls will be out and about in the London suburban marginal's gulley emptying and clearing fat blockages from sewers.

COUNCILLOR: I would like to know what Morley Independents are doing.

COUNCILLOR LEADLEY: Even so, not enough is actually being done. We have seen before that after a couple of years flood management begins to slip down the list of priorities, budgets are cut and projects are delayed. We must acknowledge that if last winter's storms had tracked 150 to 200 miles further north, much of the middle of Leeds would have been flooded for weeks on end, which would have been distressing for owners and occupiers of riverside properties and disastrous in both the shorter and longer term for the regional economy.

Funding has been agreed for the Leeds Flood Alleviation Scheme which will manage the River Aire, but nothing has yet been done on the ground. There have

been delays and the 75 year recurrence of risk which it is meant to deal with is about the least that could have been got away with. Once the agreed scheme is in place the next objective must be to get funding for upgrading to deal with a one in two hundred year occurrence of the type seen in the south of England only a few weeks ago.

Much of the report sets out what needs to be done rather than what has been done or is being done, so we must not be complacent. Public sector capital investment will be in short supply in the years ahead and pickings from Section 106 payments and Community Infrastructure Levy will be limited. Investment to deal with flood risk must be set far above and in front of many other projects. Thank you, my Lord Mayor, and thank you for indulging me, even though I was not present in the Chamber when I should have been. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Pleasure. Now we have Councillor Taggart to reply.

COUNCILLOR TAGGART: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. First of all, can I thank you for your kind words about me at the beginning of the meeting. Members are always interested in my health and, since my operation for cancer last summer, the good news is I carry on getting better and my plan is, Labour Party and the good Lord willing, I will be a Labour candidate a year from now. That is my intention.

However, I think a lot of people will be absolutely surprised to learn there are no formal flood defences in Leeds. There are none at all. It is quite extraordinary, is it not, that here is a major city, economic hub of the north of England, and in the city centre we have no formal flood defences at all. We have been very lucky, we have had some near misses in the early 2000s and there is one night I can remember hearing the water tipling over into Neptune Street as the River Aire actually was having a little bit of overflow. We have been very lucky.

Tom mentions Dave Sellars, a very old friend of mine. Dave is someone who knows more about the sewers and the drains in Leeds than any person on this earth. He wrote a fascinating book which is out of print, but if people want a copy I will send them an electronic one. If you were not interested in sewers and drains before, you certainly will be after you have read David's book.

I would like to pay tribute to Councillor Elizabeth Nash, because those of us involved in Planning were involved with the previous proposals put forward by the Environment Agency for the city centre. The idea was to stop flooding from happening but actually it was quite a grotesque design that would actually have hidden most of the waterfront from view for the majority of people. Elizabeth was the one Member – we all had concerns but Elizabeth was the one who had the most concern and was most vociferous in opposing that particular design – not that she did not want to stop flooding, because we all wanted to stop flooding. The good news is, of course, that the scheme we have now given approval for and which Elizabeth was happy to vote for at City Plans Panel is much more sensitive and much more realistic. The engineers have come up with the moveable weir, which is another first for Leeds. There are not that many moveable weirs in the world at all but this is going to be something new, something different and will result in greater safety for people living and working in the city centre.

We all saw the appalling images on television, did we not, in recent weeks in flooding in the south, south-west England – terrible scenes – but can you imagine if that did happen in Leeds, particularly in central Leeds, the devastation that would cause?

I suppose the thing I am going to ask Council to do is keep their eye on the ball on this one because we have been in the queue for Government funding for spending on flood defences previously and we have slipped and we have slipped and my great worry is with the current review that is taking place of all the capital schemes on flooding around Britain, that the south and the south-west, even though they clearly need some capital funds to be spent, we must make sure that Leeds is not neglected and we do all we possibly can do to make sure we get the best possible flood defences to stop Leeds from flooding. Thank you very much. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ann Blackburn.

COUNCILLOR A BLACKBURN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I wish to speak on agenda Item 5, the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy. I welcome this report. Obviously a lot of work has gone into it and it is quite a good read.

As some of you will know, some houses were flooded in Wortley in 2007 due to the beck overflowing because of the torrential downfall we had and I remember seeing the water, I have never seen it like that before, so high – in fact, you could have got a boat out. You could not cross near Branch Road and quite a way up the ring road. We know these things happen and with climate change you never know when it might happen next.

Anyway, I am pleased that the Wortley Beck Flood Alleviation Scheme is mentioned here in Appendix C of the Management Strategy. Whilst I realise there is no money to do the work at the moment, I hope that the bid for moneys from the Environment Agency will be successful so a feasibility scheme can be progressed next year and hopefully the work will be carried out in 2018. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Robinson.

COUNCILLOR M ROBINSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would just like to echo some of your comments and express my thanks and good wishes to Councillors who are retiring, especially Councillor Atha, who was always very generous to me with his time and advice when I first joined the Council. Somebody said to me the other day, sad to hear he was retiring, he was the star of Kes or something, so I know that. *(laughter)*

Speaking of the Flood Risk Management Strategy, I also join my fellow Councillors in welcoming this report. I think it is crucial that the report is robust and one thing that I think is missing which is mentioned on page 76, it talks a lot about resilience before a flood but actually very little about prevention. We will all know with the Core Strategy and LDF being developed that the potential to build on flood plains is something that threatens our city. I know from Collingham, in my own ward, where a PAS site is under threat with potential flooding problems, that this has caused a great deal of concern locally and that is expressed across the Chamber in every other ward.

The UN is mentioned in the report around sustainable development and I think this has to be put at the heart of what we do when we look at Planning issues. I commend groups like the Collingham Flood Group who have drawn to Peter Davis, who has already been mentioned, drawn to his attention regularly flood problems in the ward, but I know not every ward will be as lucky to have groups who are as active as the residents in Collingham. I would like to draw that to officers' attention and I am pleased that Steve Speak is here as well to hear that.

With over 500 kilometres of ordinary water courses, it is key to mention some of them as well. Collingham Beck is mentioned in the report, as is Church Lane in Bardsley, within my own ward, but I imagine that a lot of areas that we know flood might be missing from here. One of them was the Cock Beck. Interestingly, in the most recent floods that affected the south-west, Collingham Beck did not have a flood warning on it, as did many water courses; it was actually the Cock Beck that had a flood warning on it and that stretches all the way from Cross Gates and Whinmoor out to Aberford and beyond to North Yorkshire, so there is a big threat on many communities across a wide area.

I hope that the comments have been useful. I hope that the Executive Board Member will take them on. A question I just wanted to ask, how much more resources has been put into the flood risk from the last budget, if he knows that? Thank you very much on that. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lewis to sum up.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Can I thank everyone for their comments. Just in terms of something Tom said about the Flood Alleviation Scheme, work has started, it has just started at Woodlesford rather than on the City Centre bit, but we are cracking on. I think we all share the same view, we want to get a move on with this scheme. A moveable weir is a first for the UK; it is not just a first for this locality. It is a big change in thinking about how you can deliver flood schemes in this country and the potential of Leeds being the centre for that kind of new technology is another big plus for us as a city.

We are working in several areas of the city currently; Garforth, Kippax, Otley as well as Woodlesford. Work is ongoing, it is about every part of the city and I think Ann's point about Wortley, I was equally shocked when we saw the flooding down and even bits of Pudsey, which I always considered as being up the top and not in much danger, you realised there were a number of properties that were very close to the edge at that time.

It is a matter for all of us wherever we are, whether we are in the north-east, south-east or whatever, it is a huge concern, and I think the unpredictability is the huge concern, that you could have a mechanical failure somewhere that suddenly within 24 hours has caused utter mayhem and misery for people. As Councillor Iqbal was saying, yes, it is about the economics, it is about the disruption and the damage that that does long-term or medium-term to the economy, but it is also about the human cost, which is horrendous. We have all been watching the news over the past few months and thinking how could any of us cope with our houses being out of action not just for a couple of days, not just for a week but for months, for our whole communities to be isolated. I think we all realise that it is a very serious issue.

I will not say I am glad that there has been flooding down south but in many ways it has been a wake-up call for people to see it down there and I do wonder if we had had more flooding in Hebden Bridge or Todmorden or parts of Leeds, whether people would have been so bothered as where it has happened this year.

Again, I thank everybody for their comments and this must be a huge priority for the city. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Recommendations of the Executive Board, the Flood Risk Management Strategy. All those in favour? *(A vote was taken)* CARRIED.

ITEM 6 – RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE –
2014/2015 PAY POLICY STATEMENT

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 6, Recommendations of the General Purposes Committee. Councillor Wakefield.

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

COUNCILLOR G HARPER: Second, Lord Mayor.

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

ITEM 7 – RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE –
JOINT HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 7, Recommendations, again, of the General Purposes Committee. Councillor Wakefield.

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

COUNCILLOR G HARPER: I second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Varley to comment.

COUNCILLOR VARLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am speaking in support of the establishment of a Joint Health and Wellbeing Overview Scrutiny Committee at Yorkshire and Humber in relation to the new congenital heart disease review.

I fully endorse the decision to confirm the mandate previously given by full Council regarding this matter. So much time and effort has been spent on this extremely important subject. The unsatisfactory responses which have been received to requests by Councillor Illingworth and Councillor Mulherin have been frustrating (and this was, of course, regarding the previous review) to say the least.

This Council must continue to fight to retain the successful heart congenital unit in Leeds, not only for our citizens but for the huge demographic deficit in which the population of West Yorkshire and the Humber and the North Midlands would be placed if this unit was not to be retained.

Also of equal importance, if it is not retained, the whole surgical heart unit in Leeds would be in serious jeopardy. We must continue to do all we can in order that we have a sustainable heart disease unit in this city. Thank you, Lord Mayor.
(Applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Illingworth.

COUNCILLOR ILLINGWORTH: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I think one of the reasons for the success so far of the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee is the very effective cross-party collaboration and collaboration in different parts of the region that has taken place over the last four years now and we should try and maintain that, Lord Mayor, in the years to come.

The JHOSC played a major role in referring the issue of children's heart surgery to the Secretary of State and in advising the Independent Review Panel and providing evidence for the High Court. I think it was instrumental in changing the

decision. It also uncovered a major unfairness in the allocation of funds to specialised services between different areas of the country, London doing exceptionally well and Yorkshire and the Humber doing exceptionally badly.

I want to remind Council that NHS England is not merely consulting about children's heart disease or consulting about adults and the whole gamut of specialised services across the country, and that money for specialised services is the difference between our hospitals staying open and closing. The hospital would not be viable without it so it is a major consultation of much importance to Leeds.

Last week saw the publication of two reports on the emergency closure of the Children's Heart Unit almost exactly a year ago. JHOSC will be meeting tomorrow and in a fortnight's time to discuss those reports. It is reassuring to learn that after detailed enquiries the Leeds unit is recognised to be safe and fully comparable with the rest of the country.

The second report last week on the patient experience raised some serious issues and those are being addressed, but it also reflects a second serious problem with the excessive secrecy and news management by NHS England. It would have been helpful, Lord Mayor, if this second report had consulted the staff as well as the patients and it would have been more valuable if it had considered other specialities and other hospitals so that we could judge how well we compared.

Members will see from their email today how the JHOSC has struggled for the last twelve months to uncover what really happened when our hospital was closed. As we speak, this Council is moving to seek counsel's opinion about forcing NHS England to disclose relevant documents that the JHOSC needs to do its job. Next month I shall take part in two separate appeals to the Information Rights Tribunal because of non-disclosure by NHS England.

Lord Mayor, today the Department of Health is consulting on the duty of candour for health providers, and I hope that the message from this Council to the Secretary of State will be that NHS England needs to take this duty of candour very much to heart. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Mulherin.

COUNCILLOR MULHERIN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I will keep this fairly brief, just to say we have had two of the three reports that we were expecting following the closure last Easter of the Children's Heart Surgery Units. We are expecting a further one. We have asked when that will be and we expect it to be produced in May, from what NHS England has told us, and we will be holding them to that, of course.

The accounts of the families in one of the two reports that were produced just in the last week or so are quite difficult to read. As John has said, there needs to be a broader look at that in terms of how that compares with other units and also to get the balance of the views of those families who have been served extremely well by the Leeds Heart Unit and also of the staff.

For me the most important thing that came out was the NHS England report into the mortality review, and I will just quickly read from their statement. The Deputy Medical Director of NHS England stated:

"We are confident from the findings of the Mortality Review that clinical outcomes at the Trust are in line with other similar heart

units in England. I am happy to say on the basis of the evidence that services in Leeds are safe and are running well.”

That is the most important message for those families and children who are using that centre today and who will be using that centre in the months and years to come. I think it is crucially important that we reflect as a Council cross-party and all of the groups that we have supported across the region and through the Regional Scrutiny Board who have campaigned and were right to campaign and are right to continue to campaign to keep that unit in Leeds. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Buckley.

COUNCILLOR BUCKLEY: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. I too intend to keep this fairly brief but positive, as have the other speakers.

It is good news that the review into the Children’s Heart Unit in Leeds has confirmed that the unit is safe. Obviously it is very good news indeed. The overwhelming majority of people who have been treated at the unit have had a positive experience, and this is to be welcomed by us all.

I hope, as others have, that NHS England will learn some lessons from this experience and in future will only resort to suspending surgery at a unit when there is clear and sound evidence for doing so.

The experience also demonstrates the vital work of the Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Health and Wellbeing Scrutiny Board in scrutinising the NHS reviews.

I am also pleased that the remit of the Joint Committee is to be extended and I hope that they can continue with their excellent and important work as the new review continues to move forward. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Wakefield.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Again, very briefly, I would like to express our appreciation for the comments made by Councillor Varley. I think what she said about the future service of such an important age for many parents is the one that we all share. There is five million people in Yorkshire who face losing a very valuable service to their children.

I think the way that the campaign has been run has been excellent because it has been cross-party and it has been focused on the right issues. I really think that people like Councillor Illingworth and Councillor Mulherin have done a fantastic job in holding them to account.

It is not going to be easy, I think we now know that the NHS England, as well as being the largest quango in the country, is probably one of the most unaccountable bodies in the country as well, and I think the reaffirmation of the continuation of the Scrutiny will allow people like John and colleagues and others with parents and staff to continue that pressure to make sure that we do everything possible to keep that service in this city. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 7, the Recommendations. All those in favour? *(A vote was taken)* That is definitely CARRIED.

ITEM 8 – RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STANDARDS

AND CONDUCT COMMITTEE – ANNUAL REPORT.

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 8 is the Recommendation of the Standards and Conduct Committee's Annual Report. Councillor Nash.

COUNCILLOR NASH: My Lord Mayor, in moving the Annual Report of the Standards and Conduct Committee I should like to draw Council's attention to two aspects. Firstly, there was some nervousness from Members discussing issues when they were being recorded by either the Council's own recording mechanism or by members of the public, not only in this Chamber but also and especially in quasi-judicial panels of Planning and Licensing. Members of Parliament have absolute privilege when speaking in Parliament. They cannot, for example, be sued for defamation, whereas Councillors do not have this same measure of protection. Under these circumstances it was felt that a proper and frank discussion could be inhibiting.

The Committee was reassured to hear that as long as a Member believes what he or she is saying is true, and that any statement was not made maliciously but made in the interests of the general public, then that Councillor will be protected by qualified privilege.

Secondly, I am pleased to report that this year the Monitoring Officer has received only twelve complaints about Leeds City Councillors and two against Parish Councillors, all submitted by members of the public and all were rejected by the Monitoring Officer as invalid at Stage 1 of our procedure which we introduced just over two years ago.

These complaints range from relating to a member's personal or private life not related to the member's code of conduct, legitimate casework by one member, one relating to correspondence when not sufficient information was supplied and an interest that was not required to be registered. Members will know that for those interests that are required to be registered, it is a criminal offence not to do so.

This differs from the time when this Council wasted a great deal of time and money investigating frivolous and vexatious complaints when even members of the Standards Committee were being called to meet to decide whether or not to proceed. Under our new procedure the Committee has not had to meet to take decisions on the validity of the complaints.

I think the report demonstrates that we, Leeds City Councillors, may justly be proud that we have always had a tradition of high probity in public life.

My Lord Mayor, I am pleased to move acceptance of the report in the terms of the Notice. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Selby.

COUNCILLOR SELBY: Formally second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 8, Recommendations. All those in favour? (*A vote was taken*) That is CARRIED.

ITEM 9 – REPORT ON APPOINTMENTS AND NOMINATIONS TO THE WEST YORKSHIRE COMBINED AUTHORITY

THE LORD MAYOR: Item number 9, Appointments and Nominations to the West Yorkshire Combined Authority. Councillor Wakefield.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. In moving this report perhaps I ought to inform Members of the Council that the House of Lords has today passed the last remaining piece of legislation to make sure that the Combined Authority becomes a Statutory body from April 1st. That means we now have an organisation that hopefully will take on devolved powers from Whitehall to improve the economy.

We all know that is not going to be easy. You only have to look at the profile of the Yorkshire economy to see how difficult our challenge is and, despite Leeds' success, despite recovering some of the jobs from the recession, we still need 35,000 more jobs in our region to be on the national average. We still have, as you probably noticed last week, the second highest amount of unemployment. Worse than that, we have the lowest inward investment of 2%. We also have the lowest exports. We also have one of the lowest incomes.

I know it is a harsh profile but I think it is important to face the challenges that we have as we see it rather than what we would like to do.

I am quite optimistic that if we can actually get that focus we can make a serious difference to our economy and I think when you see the potential of the Yorkshire economy, you will hopefully agree. We have got three million people – in other words, we are bigger than eight European countries. We have got still, despite all that I have just said, a £55b what we call GVA, measure of our wealth, and we have got, more importantly, eight universities with 120,000 students to offer their contribution to our economy and innovation.

One of the things that we really need when we have now signed a deal two years ago, now we have got this organisation, is actually we need real freedoms and powers and resources. We have proven on the skills, the 16-18, that we can do better than Whitehall, I have mentioned this before here, but we have proven that we have got 69% of 16-18 people in jobs – far higher than the 30% Whitehall has got.

We have actually with the LEP, we should remember, created 2,000 jobs, hundreds of apprenticeships by our investment strategy, but the one thing that makes the difference will be freedom to raise our own money to do transport and it is that connectivity.

If you remember, the deal that we signed up two years ago with our colleagues in the region was to allow us to raise a billion pounds. Sadly, that has been strangled at birth by the referendum by Pickles, but we are looking at other ways. Frankly, if we are going to reduce the gap between the north and south, if we are going to do the regional connectivity that we clearly need, then we need that freedom and that money to make those improvements there.

I am optimistic that we can do it. I think it is vital that we do it because I think the future should be about devolving Whitehall down to Councils and down to local Members to make our own differences to our own communities. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Harper.

COUNCILLOR G HARPER: I second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor James Lewis.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I wanted to follow on from what Councillor Wakefield said in moving the report by specifically focusing on the challenges of transport and the challenges of transport investment that we face in West Yorkshire and right across Yorkshire.

I think it is a thing that has been raised many times in this Council Chamber that we are at the bottom of the league for the amount of transport investment per person in this region and that is a legacy of decades and decades of under-investment and decades and decades of national Government pouring money into London and the south-east.

What we need to do is we need to demonstrate that we are prepared to address that. I do not think the answer is going to come by moaning to Government and I do not think the answer is going to come by complaining about how hard we have been treated – we have got to find the answers ourselves and that is what the Combined Authority is about.

The Transport Fund is about getting a much better infrastructure, about making the economy more productive by reducing congestion and making journey times around the region more reliable and quicker. It is about expanding the workforce meaning that more people are able to access more jobs and when it comes to particularly tough challenges, getting people back into work, making sure that people have the maximum number of employment opportunities available.

What we hope to achieve through the work we have already done in establishing the baseline for the Transport Fund is demonstrate that we can create 20,000 new jobs; demonstrate we can create billions and billions of pounds more of economic growth by opening up key employment and housing sites and putting the infrastructure in that sometimes through the traditional planning structure seems very, very hard to achieve; by making sure we have got those employment and housing sites linked together so people are able to access more and better jobs because the transport is there, it is efficient, it is cheap, it is reliable and people can use it.

That is not where we are at the moment and that is what this report is about, it is about making those reforms so we can make it happen. We have shown that we are prepared to change what we do, we have shown we are prepared to change and I think the challenge is down there to the Government.

When the Deputy Prime Minister came up here in July 2012 and made a number of announcements, and obviously the Deputy Prime Minister launched NGT on that day but he also signed the City Deal and this said that the Government was going to change its attitude. I think some of us suspended our belief about what happens when Clegg goes round the country signing promises. What we have seen is a lot of those ambitions have been squashed by Eric Pickles sitting on them (*laughter*) but our challenge to the Government is this - we have changed, now you change. I hope people support this paper to move towards a Combined Authority and support the work moving forwards. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Carter.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. It would do us good, I hate to say this, to take a leaf out of Manchester's book sometimes because we do not want to become known as the Combined Authority that is top of the pile when it comes to whingeing. I very much agree with a couple of the comments that James Lewis has made.

If this Combined Authority is to be successful, first of all people have to realise it is a job only partly done. If it remains as it is, which is effectively the five West Yorkshire Authorities plus an Associate Membership of York, then it will not achieve what we want to see for the economic footprint of which Leeds sits at the centre, and we have a long, long way to go. We need to start putting to Government a very positive message about what the Leeds City Region can deliver, what the LEP within that and the Combined Authority within that can deliver and, more particularly, it is a job only partly done and until we set up some form of organisation that can take action to stimulate the economy and transport across the whole of the economic footprint that is the City Region, we will not fully compete with the north-west centred on Manchester.

We are in competition. I wish them well over the Pennines but I want us to do a lot better and I think we can do a lot better because we have very many things going for us in this area and it is about time that the Local Authorities involved all began to sing more often off the same hymn sheet and not look at each other with envious eyes saying, "Why have they got that and why have we not got it?" What is good for one is good for all, actually in the context of the economic footprint and the City Region.

Unless we give a positive message Governments of any persuasion will take little notice of us, so we ought to stop the whingeing and start looking at what we can positively offer and make the Government realise that because that is the way to move our area forward both economically and in every other way as well, my Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Wakefield to sum up.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Yes, Lord Mayor. I think they were very helpful contributions. Just to let Andrew know that actually our GVA is bigger than Manchester's GVA. They are £52b and we are £55b but you are right, there is a slight competition but, frankly, if we got the connectivity between Manchester and Leeds right we would be very strong partners and I think that is how we should look. The one statistic that always stands out in my mind is actually if you could electrify the line from Manchester to Leeds, that one single act would create 27,000 jobs, so we know how important transport is not just between across the Pennines but here to Birmingham, here to Sheffield, here to Huddersfield. The lines are not fit for the 21st Century as they stand at the moment.

Just to build on this, because it is the elephant in the room, HS2 has changed its terms of debate recognising that what is just as important to us in Leeds is actually making the better connectivity between the cities across the Pennines. They recognise that because what they say is this, it is not just about how fast you come from Leeds to London, it is also about how you can connect across the Pennines. The potential of two big LEP areas like Manchester and Leeds could actually transform the northern economy.

The whinge, if it is me who is whingeing - I cannot remember that but all I know is that when you are offered a deal and that was freedom to raise your money, then it works both ways. We will do our best to be held to account and they need to allow us and trust Local Authorities to do it. It may not sound, the Combined Authority there, but we really can make a difference to the northern economy, to northern people by boosting our GVA but the one thing we really need is support for our transport. The Regional Economic Strategy which is going down could find another way round that but I think the quicker we get on with it the quicker we narrow the gap between the north and the south. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: The Report on the Combined Authority. All those in favour? *(A vote was taken)* That is CARRIED.

ITEM 10 – LEEDS AWARD

THE LORD MAYOR: I am now on to Item number 10, which is the Leeds Award. Councillor Wakefield.

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

COUNCILLOR G HARPER: I second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Elliott.

COUNCILLOR ELLIOTT: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. Many thanks to Councillor Atha for his sound chairing of the Leeds Awards Committee. Congratulations to the worthy recipients, Mrs Jean Johnson and Professor Losowsky, of the prestigious Leeds Award given by our wonderful city, an award to be truly proud of, as we are of them. Thank you, my Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Atha.

COUNCILLOR ATHA: Lord Mayor, a few animadversions on this. Pardon the sexy voice – I do not want to excite any women! It does not come naturally and it is ironic it has come today.

Just a word about these awards. They are important. We have the top award, Freedom of the City, and that has gone to individuals who have been quite outstanding in more than one way and often across the Empire, as it was, the country, the wars and so on – names like Churchill, Atlee, Lord Milner and now Mandela on that board indicates the value that that award is to the people of Leeds in giving it.

The Leeds Award was meant to be for a group of people who do not quite match that standard for entry into the Freedom of the City Award but are deserving of the highest award apart from that the city can give. It follows that that award has to be given sparingly, otherwise its value is devalued, and so we have to look very carefully to ensure the people who get the Leeds Award are outstanding in many different ways to justify that award.

I would suggest, however, further for those looking forward to the future on the Council which I am not, that we ought to be considering having a jamboree kind of occasion, which we have from time to time, where we actually get people to nominate people in their own communities, people who do outstanding work throughout the year, people who have done an enormous amount of voluntary work, looking after people, looking after the disabled and so on, going to food stores and so on and working there. There are a lot of saints in our city and it would be very nice if we could, at that third tier level – not a diminished level, just a different level – say to these people “Yes, once a year we are going to give a big bash and you are going to be the ones we are celebrating”, because so often those marvellous folk who work in our communities without any recognition really do justify an award which is often higher than the Freedom of the City, in some respects.

My hope is that thought will be given to that. We did something very similar to that some years ago which was very successful but when we come to these two,

these two are outstanding. The lady, the first on page 201, if you look at the number of years she has contributed – 60 years in this, 50 years in that, 40 years in that and she still can go and visit two old geezers who are desperately lonely and desperately low and desperately needing care.

I just take my hat off, figuratively (because I do not possess one) and I do not want any sent to me either. I had one in the office which was a hat but it was named “Dunce Cap”. I kept that because it reminds me of the fact that yes, people do not all share the high estimation of myself which I deserve (*laughter*) and so I keep the hat.

With that I am happy to support this nomination. We have got some more to look at and we are referring the question to the Chief Legal Officer to ensure that when we look at the qualifications for this award they are more precisely worded because at the moment there is some dubiety about one or two of those matters, but that will be coming back to the Committee, hopefully before I depart the coop – “depart the coop” means leave the Council, not anything else! (*laughter*)

COUNCILLOR: You are not going to Heaven, Bernard.

COUNCILLOR ATHA: Thank you. There is one thing said, if I do I will not see you there! I would hope to do.

I will take this last opportunity to say thank you for those kind words said to me by my colleague previously. I appreciate them very much as I am sure my colleague over here appreciate the words said about him. It is very nice when people say nice things about you because it comes as such a strange experience. (*laughter*) (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: You finished, Bernard, on a red light. Most appropriate.

COUNCILLOR ATHA: I do not know what that means!

THE LORD MAYOR: Yes, you have only been here 56 years!

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Why break the habit of a lifetime, Bernard?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Wakefield to sum up.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Yes, thank you, Lord Mayor. I think Councillor Atha has summed up the purpose of this and on behalf of the Council I would like to thank all those people who serve on that Panel and give this award, because it may not be the Freedom of the City but it means an awful amount to people who work tirelessly in the community.

While we are talking about awards and people retiring, perhaps I could offer our Group’s contribution to the comments made, given that Councillor Atha is going to skive off for an hour a bit later on.

Firstly in terms of Councillor Hamilton, I think our Group would like to wish him all the best in the future. He has served the Headingley Ward for twelve years, as the Lord Mayor has said, and he has probably had the hardest job in this Council. Out of all of us in this room he has been the Chief Whip of the Lib Dems (*laughter*) and believe you me, that cannot be easy! I actually enjoyed working with him when he helped to set up the Social Enterprise in Headingley because I think that is probably one of the best social Enterprises in the city and I think Martin was very much at the forefront of doing that, so on behalf of the Group we wish you all the best, Martin, and look forward to you coming back as an Alderman. (*laughter*)

The second person, of course, is Councillor Neil Taggart, who has already said a few words about that, but I think we are losing a great contributor to the life of this Council and, as we know, he has served 34 years so between him and Bernard it is 90 years. I do not think that will be repeated very easily but most of you will remember Neil as Chair of the Police Authority and Planning. One of the things I think Neil stands out in my memory for is that he was very passionate about anti-Fascism and very passionate about Leeds being a friendly, warm place for asylum seekers, and he has always stood up for those people fleeing violence and intimidation from countries. That for me shows a lot of humanity in the person as well as his ability to speak here.

Of course, Bernard is just a legend in this city. When you have done 56 years there cannot be many things you have not experienced in this Chamber. I think this city owes him a great debt in terms of the cultural heritage we have in this city. If you look at the West Yorkshire Playhouse, if you look at the Grand, if you look at the Hyde Park cinema, if you look at all the things that we are immensely proud of, Councillor Atha has been behind that.

The one thing I really do think he needs recognising more for, because he never really talks about this, but 2012 and the Paralympics was a real accolade to him because we all know that Bernard nationally and internationally has been a passionate advocate of disability sports and really campaigned to make sure they got full recognition that they deserve. I thought the success of 2012 was a real tribute to the long years that he has been quietly going about, travelling around and campaigning and advocating for equal rights for people with sports disabilities.

As we all know, both of them are incredibly witty and intelligent speakers and have kept us informed, entertained and angry sometimes for many years and I think we will miss them both in terms of their contribution to the Council.

I move the Minutes on that, Lord Mayor, thank you. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you very much. The Leeds Award, all those in favour? (*A vote was taken*) That is CARRIED.

ITEM 11 - QUESTIONS

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 11, Questions. We are going to move on to Question time where, for a period of 30 minutes, Members of Council can ask any questions of the Executive Board.

Councillor Carter for the first question.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. Is the Executive Board Member for Development and the Economy able to inform the Council how much funding Leeds will receive from the two Government funding allocations to carry out extra road and footpath repairs?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lewis.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. The Leader of Council received a letter from the Secretary of State for Transport on Thursday of last week, 20th March, awarding Leeds the sum of £949,426 to, and I quote, "help repair damage to the local road network caused by the recent severe weather."

This allocation is the Leeds share of the £103.5m additional funding made available for road maintenance to English Local Authorities. The allocation is awarded on a formula basis, primarily on road length.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer announced in the Budget that a further £200m was to be made available to help tackle potholes and surface deterioration in local roads across England and Wales. It is the Treasury's intention to run a bidding exercise to access this fund and further details are expected from them within the next few weeks.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Carter, a supplementary?

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. The £900-odd thousand, approaching a million, represents about 10% of what we are spending on the IMS programme this year. Can Councillor Lewis assure Members of this Council that the whole of this money and any money that comes from the bidding process on the second tranche of the funding made available by the Chancellor will be spent on the purpose he intended, which is to contribute towards repairing the rapidly deteriorating state of our roads and footpaths in the city?

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Lewis to reply.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Yes I can, Lord Mayor.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: We will be watching.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Golton.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Does the Leader of Council agree that the Council must consider proposals such as an increment freeze, cuts to mileage payments, ending pay protection and altering the redeployment process in order to retain essential Council services in a period of prolonged austerity?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Wakefield.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Yes.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Golton.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Thank you for that. By way of supplementary, Lord Mayor, therefore we are at a loss as to why you voted against our amendment to do quite a lot of that and therefore – here comes the question – does he not anticipate that the unions will actually come to agreement with him in those negotiations that are taking place before the end of this year and therefore can he precisely tell us what the Leeds taxpayer gets for its half a million pounds a year trade union subsidy which is supposed to create a spirit of partnership?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Wakefield to reply.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Councillor Golton is like a standing clock that has stopped. Occasionally, once a year, he is going to be right. On this one, he is half right.

When you introduced your amendment at the Budget, I think you were going to implement that straightaway without any discussion, without any negotiation, without trying to treat people who work here with a bit of respect and our approach

actually is trying to consult with them about a range of measures that we want to look at for some very important reasons.

Firstly, I think it is important that we now, when we are faced with a further 15% cut to our grant, still aim to provide public services that are affordable and sustainable.

The second thing, which you never mentioned in your amendment, what we are very committed to doing is to continue to try and avoid compulsory redundancies. I think that is the least this Council can do when people who have worked for us for so many years have given such loyalty and that is what we aim to do with these discussions and negotiations.

I think the third point is that we really want to try to implement our commitment to introduce a living wage to the low paid workers of this Council, to those women who provide Meals on Wheels, to those workers who do school meals, to those people who clean our buildings and clean our streets – again, given the treatment that this Government has given them over the last few years by wage restraints and they are actually dismissing them in terms of their genuine demand for a pay rise, I think it is the least we can do.

The negotiations have not really started yet but what we are doing in the early stages at the moment is actually putting what we call local conditions to unions to come back and respond. I will let you know how the progress goes when we get there. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Hanley, question 3.

COUNCILLOR HANLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Lord Mayor, please can the Executive Member update Council on how Adult Social Care is coping with the issues identified by Age UK's recent 'Crisis in Care' report? Thank you.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ogilvie to reply.

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I thank Councillor Hanley for the question.

Earlier this month Age UK published its Care in Crisis report and, indeed, today Nuffield Trust and the Health Foundation have published theirs too. All of these reports highlighted the massive cuts to Adult Social Care funding nationally, coupled with the massive demand for Adult Social Care services, and we know in Leeds our own figures show that the number of over 85s is projected to increase between 2012 and 2020 by around 54%.

Recently commenting on a case highlighted by the Yorkshire Evening Post, Councillor Golton's best mate, Greg Mulholland, implied that the Care Bill and Better Care fund would resolve all of these problems. However, Age UK begs to differ and they say, and I quote, "There is a huge risk of the reforms being fundamentally undermined by wholly inadequate funding."

However, here in Leeds, Lord Mayor, we as an administration are doing all we can to protect both Adult Social Care Services and Children's Services, recognising we need to protect them as vulnerable citizens. At the same time, we are forging ahead with a number of innovative projects so whether that be our work on integration or leading the way with integrating with Health as recognised by our National Pioneer status, whether it is our innovative work with leisure where we are opening up as many of our leisure centres to people with learning disabilities and

older people, including the new Holt Park Active Centre, whether it is our Reablement Services that are helping over 1,200 older people to regain independent lives living in their own homes, or the work around the establishment of a staff led mutual to run our Learning Disability Community Support Services.

Lord Mayor, the Age UK report says that caring for older people is one of the most important things that we can do. Perhaps, therefore, national politicians should spend a little less time on short-term crowd pleasing gimmicks, such as Osborne's pension ruse, or the suggestion from Cameron that inheritance tax threshold should go up, and instead start to lay out clear plans on how we properly fund the care of our ever growing numbers of older people. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Hanley, have you a supplementary question? You do not. Thank you. Question 4, Councillor Hamilton.

COUNCILLOR S HAMILTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Can the Executive Member for Environmental and Parks comment on the value and importance of the changes made to refuse collections over the past two years?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dobson.

COUNCILLOR DOBSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I think the importance around the changes is twofold, really. First of all, the vast amount of benefits to the environment. As a city we were burying 200,000 tonnes of rubbish a year, many of which were recyclables. Clearly that is absolutely unsustainable in terms of the city, and also the huge impact it has had and will have on the city's finances going forward.

We have now got 169,000 households on alternate weekly collections. That has been a huge impact on tonnage that is going to landfill. Somewhere in the region of 50,000 tonnes since the scheme has been implemented has been diverted from landfill, which is excellent – still a lot more to do.

Actually, in terms of the recycling rates themselves we inherited around 31% recycling rates; last year we have hit 44% with a summer peak of 50% and, again, there is still more to do. When you look at our recycling rates of 55%, I think when we get up to 80% of the city on alternate weekly collection we will hit that target. It will also save this city somewhere in the region of £2m to £2.5m per annum in landfill charges alone that would have gone straight to the Government in terms of landfill taxes. Again, unaffordable and certainly money that can be spent better elsewhere.

We have also done that with the backdrop of removing nine routes so, again, I think there is a huge piece of praise for officers and staff who have made that a reality.

I will touch on one thing though in terms of the strategy, because it is more than about changing bin services. We took the decision to implement energy from waste, the incinerator that will be live from 2016. That will also give us a further 5% recycling from front of house processes before we actually incinerate any materials which, again, is extremely good news for the city.

When we talk about the incinerator, I have to say I was handed this the other day – it is a shame Councillor Golton is not in the room, it is his latest leaflet in Rothwell, Oulton, Carlton, Woodlesford, focusing on the fact that we are not doing enough on food waste and we are wasting money on incineration.

I would say this, in terms of our recycling aspirations and ambitions, I think the figures speak for themselves but, moreover, to suggest that we are wasting money on incineration simply is not factual. It will save this Authority somewhere in the region of £16m per annum for the next 25 years. That is going to be money that is essential to keep the wheels of this city oiled.

We go from I was going to say the sublime to the ridiculous – the ridiculous to the further ridiculous – when we are picking up reports, this is the Daily Telegraph and I am reading from an article on 18th March last, David Laws, Lib Dem Minister:

“Councils must start taking responsibility for themselves and charge residents for such services as bin collections, saying that these painful decisions for residents have to be put forward and Councils must start to take responsibility for themselves.”

I think every one of us would wholeheartedly disagree with that and I can say in terms of Leeds recycling strategies and targets, we are taking responsibility for ourselves, we are making these tough decisions, we are doing it with the co-operation of the people of Leeds who I would like to thank for their endeavours on our behalf. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Hamilton, do you have a supplementary? No. We move on to question 5, which is Councillor Wadsworth.

COUNCILLOR WADSWORTH: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Given the increases in the number of families who cannot afford to bury their relatives, why has the Executive Board Member for the Environment again increased burial charges?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dobson to reply.

COUNCILLOR DOBSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I think a 3% charge also does sit in line with Council strategy but also what I would say is that those increases are actually used to put back into front line service delivery in terms of our bereavement provision. It is fair to say, we all know, we are a growing city. We have to look strategically in the now and here, in the medium term and in the long term, as to how we address our burial and cremation provision.

We have got the first municipal cemetery in Leeds for 70 years at Whinmoor Grange, we have also done essential upgrading work on mercury abatement at Rawdon, there is work at Cottingley to come, so I would say that the money that is being charged is being put back into those services.

Moreover, we are fully aware of the pressures that families face, sometimes in the most trying and tragic of circumstances and because of that I can report to Council that there are mechanisms within Adult Social Care to help people on vulnerable and low incomes arrange to help meet costs, low income and qualifying benefits through the Department of Works and Pensions for people who find themselves in that situation, and finally for people in that really tragic situation who find themselves without any kin or family who die in the care of the NHS, the NHS will cover those costs and pick up those fees. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Wadsworth, supplementary?

COUNCILLOR WADSWORTH: Yes, Lord Mayor. Would the Executive Board Member agree with me that it is wrong for the people of Leeds to have to pay significantly more for a funeral to take place after 3.30 due to overtime payments?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dobson.

COUNCILLOR DOBSON: I think again what has to be said in terms of any strategy and any costs, we have to balance them, as I am sure you will agree, against the needs of the staffing requirements that we have to provide at those times of the day but, again, this is something that I am always prepared to look at, always prepared to re-examine.

I would say this, in terms of the costs and the charges associated to burial, it is clear to me that the Council with the 3%, we are not simply using this as a cash cow or profiteering. I look at some of the previous increases over many years, this is actually a very modest increase so certainly for me in terms of a growing city, in terms of some of our more intricate burial provision – people from different faiths need to be buried very quickly, which is part of their religion, at different times – we have to have a tailored service that suits those requirements and, sadly and unfortunately at times, with those has to come associated costs because of associated staffing needs.

I think the broader charge, if it is around profiteering, there is certainly no evidence of that and if there is a charge on that score I certainly think there is no case to answer, it is simply this is a diverse city, a growing city, a city that needs to accommodate a whole multitude of people in different circumstances for burial needs and requirements and sometimes, unfortunately, the charges have to reflect that. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Question 6, Councillor Jonathan Bentley.

COUNCILLOR J BENTLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Is the Executive Member for Planning, Neighbourhoods and Support Services satisfied that the out-of-hours service is providing a quality response to the tenants of Housing Leeds?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Gruen to reply.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: Lord Mayor, Council knows I am always eager to answer questions I am asked as long as I understand the question. This question talks about the out-of-hours service and it could refer to noise, it could refer to house repairs, it could refer to ASB, it could refer to safety. To be helpful I am going to interpret it as meaning noise.

I can tell him that there were 30,737 calls last year and 93% of those were answered on time. If you forgive me for one moment I will turn to my colleagues on this side to say I am very pleased to report that in Headingley we answered 927 calls, in Woodhouse 610, in Harehills 597, in Burmantofts 541 and in Seacroft 379.

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

COUNCILLOR J BENTLEY: I do, Lord Mayor, thank you. I am afraid Councillor Gruen misinterpreted my question. The out-of-hours service is the one that he is responsible for within Housing Leeds, which is the so-called repair service. Recently a resident in a high-rise block of flats reported in the early evening that another resident had allowed their dog to defecate and urinate in the passenger lift, making it unusable for residents and their families to use for the rest of the night. An out-of-hours service said they had absolutely no discretion or flexibility to deal with this emergency issue, as it was clearly an emergency issue, and refused to deal with it. Is this putting the needs of the tenant at the heart of the service?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Gruen to reply.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: Lord Mayor, I am also responsible for the services I have just mentioned, hence the confusion, but I am very happy to take away the details you have now provided and give you a written response.

THE LORD MAYOR: Question number 7, it is Councillor Iqbal.

COUNCILLOR IQBAL: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Can the Executive Member please update Members on the actions taken by the Council to reinforce its significant role in aiding the city's economic recovery?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lewis.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. If Councillor Iqbal will let me I will avoid talking about the Arena, the Trinity and the usual suspects and talk about some of the things that perhaps do not come to the attention of the Council as a whole.

We are growing business and creating jobs through the Business Growth Programme, which has provided £3.2m funding to 96 businesses in Leeds, creating 1,077 jobs since February last year; the key account management work to support over 70 businesses in Leeds, including addressing issues they may have, supporting them on growth projects and responding to any threats of disinvestment and job losses. If I can give the example again of Airedale International, finding them temporary premises after their fire and persuading them to rebuild in Rawdon, safeguarding 440 jobs. The Business Rates Relief Scheme that was approved by Executive Board in March through which we will provide support to businesses facing hardship, new start ups, strategically important inward investment and social enterprises; supporting Leeds and Partners who attracted inward investment to Leeds which has created over 700 jobs in 2013/14.

We are supporting businesses in key sectors. In manufacturing, we have teamed up with the Manufacturing Advisory Service to provide advice and support to manufacturing companies across Leeds. Manufacturing employs 30,000 people in the city. We are working with companies as diverse as Hainworths at Stanningley, Laxtons of Guiseley (a textile firm), ATV Morley, engineering, Symingtons in Cross Green, which is food, Allied Glass of Hunslet (I am sorry you missed the visit on Monday morning which Councillor Nash and I made to the company) Harrison Spinks of Beeston, which is a bed company.

In the health and medical field we have forged links between the NHS, the teaching hospitals, University of Leeds, informatic firms such as EMIS and TPP, and medical devices manufacturers. We have assisted Depuy in securing RGF funding to help fund their schemes in Beeston safeguarding over 400 jobs in Leeds, and Surgical Innovations will be using RGF to fund their new state of the art research and manufacturing facility at Thorpe Park.

In Creative and Digital we are working with the film and TV sector to seek to attract more TV production to Leeds. We have made the Council's data available as open data to the Leeds Data Mill Project. We are supporting innovation, we are working with the three universities to develop memoranda of understanding and proposals for a Leeds Innovation Fund to facilitate joint working with business. We are supporting the plans of the universities to develop incubation and draw-on space for the spin out companies.

I could go on to talk about broadband, I do not want to trespass on people's time, but I think I have indicated that we are, as a Local Authority, doing a huge

amount to preserve and create jobs within the city. Thank you, Lord Mayor.
(Applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Iqbal, do you have a supplementary? No. We will move on to question 8 and it is Councillor Maqsood.

COUNCILLOR MAQSOOD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Does the Executive Member for Children's Services have any comment on the impact of changes to the Careers Service?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Blake.

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Apologies, Councillor Maqsood, for speaking in front of you.

I think the question actually follows on very well from Councillor Lewis's in terms of all of the opportunities that we are creating in Leeds and how we can make sure that young people in our city have the full opportunity to secure the opportunities that are created. I know that this is an area of key concern to all Members, particularly the quality of the advice that they get in schools.

I think we are all dismayed by the fact that key Ministers at Government level are indulging in words that I feel are really inappropriate when coming to look at this key important area of work. The latest one was Mr Vince Cable who put the issue of some of the concerns about the Careers Service saying that teachers know absolutely nothing about the world of work. That is insulting enough for teachers but the real issue that he was getting to was the fact that Michael Gove, in the 2011 Education Act, removed the responsibility away from Local Authorities and gave it directly to schools, obliging them to provide access to independent and impartial guidance for students aged nine to eleven, and last year extended that to Years 8, 12 and 13 but, of course, gave no additional funding.

The truth of the matter is that the Government has dismantled the Connexions service at national level and introduced the National Careers Service in 2012. It does not help when Michael Gove goes to the Commons Education Select Committee and talks about the people working in the Careers Service as "self-interested careers lobby composed of people who lack rigour and talk garbage." That is the sort of level that we are up against.

The problem is, as the CBI noted, 93% of young people surveyed are very unhappy indeed about the Careers Service in England and regard it as being in a state of severe crisis.

Our response in Leeds is that we have actually kept our Connexions service and it is with this in mind that we have invited you to come down to look at Connexions at Kirkgate. You have all received an invitation on 24th April. I do hope you will come down to Kirkgate to actually see what we are trying to do in our schools. It is absolutely crucial that we get the element in schools right so that young people can go on to access all of the opportunities through jobs and skills, have a full understanding of what we are creating in terms of the apprenticeships. At the moment nationally there is a complete vacuum, it is a shambles. We are doing our best in Leeds to offer a service as best we can for our young people but I urge you all to get involved and to help support us improve a very difficult situation. Thank you.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Maqsood? No, so it is question number 9, Councillor Anderson.

COUNCILLOR ANDERSON: Given the Council's intention to deliver in excess of 50 new gypsy and traveller pitches through the Core Strategy, when will the Executive Board Member consult Leeds residents about the location of these new sites?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Gruen to reply.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Name the sites. Name the sites.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: Councillor Anderson, of course, knows the answer because, as my Shadow, he goes everywhere I go, so he hears me speak in other forums.

Core Strategy Policy 8.7 identifies the need to allocate sites for gypsy and traveller accommodation purposes. Leeds residents have already been invited as part of the Site Allocation process to be consulted to identify sites that could be used. A Site Assessment exercise is currently ongoing and any potential sites that are to be included in the Public Draft Site Allocations Plan will be subject to public consultation during this year and/or 2015.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Anderson, a supplementary?

COUNCILLOR ANDERSON: I do not know if the Leeds residents will have been consulted on it but anyway, the supplementary that I would like to put to you is that hopefully you will accept that the last time your administration went out on consultation on this they made a pig's breakfast of it, they were not open, honest, they did not set out the criteria that they had got and so hopefully you will learn the lessons this time and hopefully you agree that you will not make the same mistakes, that you will explain to the residents where they are going to be going, you will set out clearly your criteria so that we can have a proper debate and not worry communities unnecessarily in terms of where they may or may not go.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Gruen to reply.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: Lord Mayor, I do not recognise that description whatsoever.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: You might not but we do.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: I think you are living in a different part of the city in a different world.

COUNCILLOR J McKENNA: He has got lots of spare land.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: What I will say is that I very readily will listen to ward colleagues who wish to offer me any sites in their wards and, Councillor Anderson, if you wish to come forward with some suggestions, you have my ear right now. I wish to say, you should follow the leadership and example of Councillor Finnigan who, at the last meeting when we discussed this, showed real leadership and said he would welcome a site in Morley North. I have listened very carefully to that.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: Cross Gates, we have got some.

THE LORD MAYOR: Question 10 has been withdrawn so I am going to move on to Question number 11 and I am going to ask Councillor Congreve to ask his question, question number 11. Question number 11, Councillor Congreve.

COUNCILLOR CONGREVE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Will the Executive Member responsible for the Planning services please update Council on the 'Leeds Standard for Housing'?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Gruen to reply.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: Yes, I am pleased to do so and thank you for the question, Councillor Congreve.

The development of the Leeds Standard reflects the drive to secure excellent quality housing through the Council's own investment and that of its partners. It is an overarching approach to deliver sustainable new homes which meet current and future needs, are cost efficient for residents and make a positive contribution to neighbourhoods through good design. Specifically, the principles of the emerging Leeds Standard relate to high levels of thermal efficiency in addition to a focus on good environmental design which will enhance and support neighbourhoods.

New housing often represents significant investment in communities and it is therefore important that the layout, the materials, the design of the properties makes a positive contribution and that it incorporate place making facilities, access, providing green space and so on. We wish to set a standard now in advance of a major housebuilding round.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Congreve.

COUNCILLOR CONGREVE: Can the Executive Member confirm how this compares to what can be built using Central Government's Affordable Homes Programme?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Gruen.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: That is me. Thank you, Lord Mayor, for remembering!

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: The rest of us are trying to forget, Peter!

THE LORD MAYOR: That is very difficult, Councillor Carter!

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: It is a very difficult and taxing supplementary question because the Homes and Communities Agency, in their most recent communications with us, really has set such a low standard of quality of space, of energy, of grant towards new homes, that it is in marked contrast to what we as an Authority and our partners, our housing partners, want to do. We want to achieve decent space standards.

It is the right time now to look to investment over a lifetime period of a home, not just the initial capital costs and all these seem alien concepts and principles to the Government.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Gruen. We have now come to the end of Question time. If you turn to the top of page 8, we are going to move on to the Minutes.

ITEM 12 – MINUTES

THE LORD MAYOR: Comments on the Minutes of the Executive Board Committees established by Council and Joint Authorities to which the Council makes appointments. Councillor Wakefield.

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

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

(a) Executive Board
(i) Health and Wellbeing

THE LORD MAYOR: We are looking at the Executive Board Minutes to begin with, Health and Wellbeing, Councillor Taggart.

COUNCILLOR TAGGART: Thank you, Lord Mayor. The Better Care Fund. It is a Government proposal to pool existing Health and Social Care budgets. That is about £3.8b nationally and I think the Leeds share is somewhere around £50m.

As a principle, integration does make sense. The trouble is the way the Government has done it alongside those cuts in acute services of around £2m, which is very worrying. However, we are going to make the best of it here in Leeds.

One of the advantages of the scheme will be that patients and service users will have the equivalent of a one-stop shop. Instead of relating their story again and again to different professionals, the plan is they will be able to do it once and to a fewer number of professionals. The plan is also to keep people healthy longer, keep them independent longer, keep them out of hospital as long as possible and also do something about reducing the pressure on bed blocking in Leeds, which is severe, that problem, the same as it is in the rest of the country.

Already across the city we have established twelve Health and Social Care integrated teams. They are based in GP practices where GPs, district nurses, community nurses and physiotherapists work alongside social care staff including social workers, occupational therapists and home care teams.

I have mentioned already the big cuts that are coming in acute care. The other problem is that despite as a principle this makes sense, it does make sense to have more of this partnership working, at the same time the Government is hell bent on seeing more competition and privatisation in the NHS. One of the consequences of that is a fragmenting of NHS services rather than integrating them.

We will make the very best of the new arrangements that have been imposed upon us. As I said, they, to some extent, do make sense, we wish the proposals well but we fear for the future because, like all things, this Government is always squeezing money from Council budgets. Thank you very much, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ogilvie.

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would also like to comment on Minute 196 on page 208 on the Better Care Fund.

If I can start by saying "thank you" to the team within the Council who helped to put together our submission – a very small team, it has to be said, Dennis Rhodes, Dennis Holmes, Steve Hume and Lisa Gibson and Rob Kenyon in Public Health and Adult Social Care, as well as partners in the Health Service.

We got details of the Better Care Fund a few days before Christmas and were told that the submission date was February, so there has been a lot of hard work over a very short space of time to put together the submission, so thank you to everyone who has helped to do that.

I have to say I have been impressed by how the different bits of the Health and Social Care system have started to come together in the city. Clearly there will be disagreements going forward but there does seem to be the beginnings of a shared agenda on how we will tackle some of these challenges. I guess the challenge is how we can get more of the bits of the health system to buy into this shared agenda, particularly I am thinking about GPs. GPs have a pivotal role in this and our other agendas, whether that be tackling poverty or health inequality and I think it is fair to say that there is still a patchy engagement of our GPs in these various agendas.

I think we all share the aims of the Better Care Fund in as much as they encourage much more close collaboration between Health and Social Care but, as I mentioned in the answer to the question on the report from Age UK, there is an issue with funding. Some people claim that this is new funding when we actually know that it is funding that is already in the system, funding that is both in the Local Government settlement and in the CCG's settlement.

The issue around how we continue to fund our Adult Social Care system is really important. I mentioned the report from Age UK and the Nuffield Trust and indeed today Sandie Keane is in front, probably as we speak, of the Public Accounts Committee in the House of Commons as they look at the future funding of Adult Social Care.

One of the questions that we will have to face going forward is will the Better Care Fund allow us to find ways of addressing the £100m funding gap in the Health and Social Care system that we have got in this city? Will we need to look at how Health and Social Care pool our entire budgets in the city, so not just the £54m but potentially over £1b and, if so, what are the governance issues that would follow from that?

I think we are all mindful that the timescale set by the Government for the Better Care Fund...

THE LORD MAYOR: It is the red light, Councillor Ogilvie; that means can you wind up, please.

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: Lots of challenges and no easy answers but I think we are all determined that there is a shared approach to tackle these challenges.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Ogilvie. It is Councillor Lay now, please, your contribution.

COUNCILLOR LAY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I also intend to speak on Minute 196 page 208 on the Better Care Fund.

I had a speech here that I think I am probably going to refer to less and less. I would just like to clear a couple of points. Firstly, Councillor Taggart, this attack on funding for the NHS, we must not forget, despite your collective amnesia over that side of the Chamber, this £20b the NHS has to make in savings was actually authorised by the former Health Secretary Andy Burnham in October 2009, so let us at least accept where we are and say to ourselves these are the conditions we have

to work under, how are we going to make the best of it, rather than making political, petty political points.

In that vein I would like to say that I endorse the Health and Wellbeing Board's approach with regards to minimising hospitalisation and facilitating better, timely and more appropriate discharge from hospital.

I would like to ask them, though, to ensure that they get full buy-in from our provider partners, primarily Leeds Community Healthcare, Leeds Teaching Hospitals and, perhaps most importantly, the GPs in their provider role.

At Monday's Better Life Board, which I attended with Councillor Ogilvie and Councillor Graham Latty, we heard service users and third sector providers raise concerns regarding how we communicate the care and service in this city. There is concern that increasingly ourselves and our major partners are tailoring our messages to websites only. Examples include the LTH five year strategy and our own soon to stop About Leeds and About Leeds NHS newspapers. Maybe we could use some of the Better Care Fund to support retaining those valuable sources of information so that they reach all members of our Leeds community and not just those online.

We also discussed an Opportunities Fair at one of our landmark venues, most likely in Elland Road. Rather than a large one-day event like this, which will in all probability appeal to the same old suspects, could we not use some of the money to support a bus that could go out into our difficult to reach communities and provide the outreach work to support our broader Health and Wellbeing Strategy?

At yesterday's Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Board, we had a very interesting discussion regarding providing white goods - primarily cookers, ovens, fridges - to those suffering a hard time. It was borne out of a conversation that the Chair, Councillor Procter, had with a GP...

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lay, we are going to have to wind up.

COUNCILLOR LAY: The three minutes already?

THE LORD MAYOR: You have.

COUNCILLOR LAY: It just flies by! (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you very much. Councillor Latty.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Lord Mayor, I too am speaking on Minute 196 page 208.

Lord Mayor, to me the Better Care Fund looks like an opportunity for ensuring that the people of Leeds are going to have a better chance of living healthy, active lives as long as possible no matter where they live in Leeds, whichever part of Leeds we live in. It is a chance to keep people healthy in their own homes and reduce the need to be taken into hospital; to ensure that if people do become hospitalised they are treated well with the maximum of care and respect, and that they are out again as quickly as possible, and that when they do get home they are re-abled to resume life to the best possible level.

This fund is not new money but it will draw several budgets together and enable that money to be directed at providing seamless working - or we hope it will provide seamless working - between the NHS, Adult Social Care, Children's Service,

Public Health and the Third Sector. Instead of a scattergun approach to spending, we should be able to experience the benefits of targeted spending.

In Leeds we have had the best of all aspects of care and by enabling the many and varied aspects of Health and Wellbeing to work together, we should be able to create an integrated service with people at its heart; a service where Adult Social Care works seamlessly with the NHS, where Neighbourhood Networks are valued as an essential part of keeping people in their own homes and where a GP does not have to think that the first place to send somebody is A&E.

I think the sad thing is that we have got the capability to do this now but it is still, if you are an older person at home needing some sort of care, the first port of call if you should fall ill or show any signs of illness is A&E. You are straight in there and once in the system you are quite likely to stay in for quite a long time. I personally have experience with neighbours, elderly neighbours who have had some sort of trauma at home, a fall, and they found themselves in A&E for a couple of weeks, then they go into some other sort of care for three weeks and by the time they come out again they are totally and utterly unable to cope for themselves.

I think that by easing the burden on the services by reducing putting people into hospital we have got a reasonable chance of making the money go a bit further.

The last point, the Health and Wellbeing Board, a committee of Council, has oversight over the implementation of this fund which gives us as a Council a measure of control. I think this is a bit of control we should not waste, we should make sure that we do see that the Better Care Fund does result in a city where everybody has got the chance of living a healthier life in their own homes and with control over the care that they receive when things go wrong. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Harrand.

COUNCILLOR HARRAND: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Same Minute, same page, real world. Working with the NHS – a health warning. It is if Councillor Mulherin, Dr Cameron and Councillor Ogilvie in particular, and more Town Councillors might be interested as well.

Four years ago we were aiming to put together the statistics about health and health provision for the whole of Alwoodley Ward and we found that in Cranmer Bank area, which is in the lowest 10% of Super-Output Areas including the Fir Trees, the Lingfields, the Saxons, they had the most old-fashioned out of date surgeries in the city – not the north of Leeds, the whole of Leeds.

Ronnie Feldman got his teeth into that and you can imagine what that did, but after two years we found a potential site, we found a potential developer and absolutely no doubt about the interest of the GPs, three surgeries involved were delighted we were making this progress.

In 2012 we had a few meetings about this and the NHS made some warm, generally favourable comments about it. Towards the end of 2012 they all went to sleep. The NHS was being reorganised. For the last six months – this is no exaggeration – of the old NHS pre-reorganisation, they could not talk to us because nobody was there to make a decision. For the first six months of the post-reorganised NHS they still could not talk to us because they were too busy, there were lots of parking spots to be allocated, coffee machines to be tested and things like that. We had no contact for six months. Who said it is the most unaccountable body in British public life? Councillor Wakefield, absolutely right. He is asleep! *(laughter)* I am agreeing with you, Keith.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: That is a rare one. I am shocked.

COUNCILLOR HARRAND: In November last year we convened a meeting here where the practices sent representatives, the Council was there, the NHS sent two bright young men and I think the developers (I cannot honestly remember that). Nobody came from Councillor Mulherin's directorate, although we asked her, and nobody was able to come and deputise for her that afternoon either.

They told us, "We are on with the budget, do not worry, Councillors." I have been around too long, I know how it works. In December it is, "It is a bit too soon to make decisions" and in February it is, "It's too late, Councillors, too bad, we have missed it." So I wrote in January and said, "Let us have some action, what is going to happen?" Of course now, only four months after that letter, we have had a response. There is going to be a non-invasive topographical survey of the site on King Lane. It sounds medical, does it not, but what that means, whether there is going to be a new medical centre or not I do not know.

I am saying Lisa, Adam, Dr Cameron, there will be a question down at each Council meeting from now on asking about the progress about this non-invasive topographical whatever. Perhaps you could outline when you reply, did you know about this? Did you know we were going to have a medical centre on King Lane to deal with the most deprived part of Leeds? I suspect you did not. Be careful working with the NHS. Perhaps Councillor Illingworth would like to nod once or twice at this stage. It is a non-accountable body with its own priorities and it is not comfortable working with elected representatives. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Mulherin to sum up.

COUNCILLOR MULHERIN: Thank you, very much Lord Mayor, and thank you to Councillors Taggart, Ogilvie, Councillor Lay, Councillor Latty and Councillor Harrand for their comments not all of which, of course, were actually relevant to the item for discussion, but there again.

The £55m that has been allocated to the Leeds Better Care Fund is made up of £51m from Health and £4m from the Council. None of that is new money, it is all money that was existing money being used already in the system and most of that will continue to be used on existing services where they were already being spent. I would like to thank the team in the Council – Dennis Holmes, Lisa Gibson, Steve Hume, as Councillor Ogilvie did, and Mark Bradley and Matt Ward in particular from the Clinical Commissioning Groups in Leeds for their work in the very short timescales that were set nationally to achieve a programme of work that over this shadow year will start to combine the changes to services that will be needed, given the cuts to key services that Councillor Taggart referred to, and the significant pressures that are already within the system demographically and the additional unfunded challenges of the Care Bill that Councillor Ogilvie referred to earlier in this session, and the additional pressures of seven day working. All of this has to be found from the £55m that is not new money and was already being spent in the system.

The double counting that Councillor Ogilvie also referred to should not be under-estimated. That £55m was set out both in our Local Authority Budget Settlement and in the Clinical Commissioning Groups' settlement for the city. Whichever one you take it out of it means that there were cuts to their overall budgets.

The history of funding that Councillor Lay refers to, the Nicholson challenges, they are further exacerbated by the effects of cuts to the Clinical Commissioning Groups' budgets, made worse by that double counting if you take it out of theirs and put it into ours it makes our £43m cuts over the period of austerity to the end of next year even worse. If you take it out of their budgets they are already on a sliding scale downwards over the next few years which is being (I forget the word) phased in very slowly. If you take the Better Care Fund out of their budget that means that that slow phasing is effectively speeded up considerably.

Do not just take my word for it. There was a letter to the Telegraph – the second time the Telegraph has been referred to today – from the LGA, ADASS, SOLACE and the Care and Support Alliance. I will just read a couple of sentences from their letter. It opens:

“Not only has care been chronically under-funded but there is a £135m shortfall in new money being given to Councils to implement the Care Bill.”

- and that is just one of the under-funded elements within this programme -

“The legislation could end up”

- according to this letter –

“being funded from money otherwise used for acute services. Essential care services that people rely on will inevitably suffer.”

That is the view of the LGA, ADASS and SOLACE and the Care and Support Alliance. Age UK, as Councillor Ogilvie referred to earlier, referred to this as a huge risk of the reforms being undermined by wholly inadequate funding.

Whilst I do welcome the support for the Health and Wellbeing Board and the support for the whole of the Health and Social Care system that has been referred to in the comments on this, in terms of us all trying to pull together to actually make the system sustainable and one in which people will get services around their needs not around the needs of organisations, we need to be absolutely clear that there are big risks attached to the programme that we have put together because of the funding situation. Thank you very much, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

(ii) Leader of Council's Portfolio

THE LORD MAYOR: Moving on to the Leader of Council's Portfolio, comments from Councillor Jonathan Bentley.

COUNCILLOR J BENTLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would like to speak on Minute 197 on page 209, the financial health monitoring. Lord Mayor, I would particularly like to draw Members' attention to the projected surplus on the Housing Revenue Account.

The Housing Revenue Account has benefited from the integration of the ALMOs into the new Housing Leeds, leading to significant savings in staff and operational costs. It is important, though, that the change in management regime and the savings realised are used to improve the service being delivered to the tenants of Housing Leeds.

Firstly, the customer service offer has to be improved. Staff must show more empathy and flexibility when dealing with tenants. I know this is accepted by

Councillor Gruen and his senior management team and everyone on the Housing Advisory Board, but I am not convinced that the message has got down to customer facing staff who often seem still bound by inflexible rules.

In December the Executive Board approved a policy endorsed by the Housing Advisory Board that would allow flexibility and bidding for additional bedrooms in certain circumstances. One of the specific benefits was to allow households with a child approaching the relevant age threshold to bid for a house in advance of that with an extra bedroom yet as recently as only a few weeks ago this policy was still not being operated and a family with a child a few weeks short of their sixteenth birthday was told they could not start bidding for a larger house until she was actually 16. A mother with a young child whose neighbour had a large dog was told she could not have a fence between her house and her neighbour's house because she did not meet the criteria in the fences policy. That little girl spent the whole summer indoors because she was frightened of the next door neighbour's dog. A group of pensioners in sheltered accommodation asked if they could jointly rent a garage to store their mobility scooters and were told no because the policy said garages could only be used for cars.

Are these the sort of attitudes that are really putting the tenants' needs at the heart of the service, which is what the new housing regime is supposed to be doing? Once we as Councillors hear about these ludicrous examples, senior managers do the right thing, but it is no use the strategies, the philosophies, the policies remaining in the heads and on the desks of senior managers at Merrion House and Westfield Chambers if there is no connection between the strategic intent and the actual deliver of the service by front line staff.

We have a huge opportunity with the bringing of housing services into the Council and the finances have been freed up to resource a real change in service delivery. Let us make sure that the real beneficiaries of this opportunity are the tenants of Housing Leeds. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR M HAMILTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. First of all can I just thank the Lord Mayor and also Councillor Wakefield for the kind comments earlier on. I have thoroughly enjoyed my time in the Council. I would say being Chief Whip in a joint administration of three parties was interesting, wasn't it, John? Not the most relaxing of occupations but I have had a good twelve years and really enjoyed it. Also, best wishes to Councillor Atha and Councillor Taggart as well for the future to two excellent and hard working Councillors.

I wanted to shoehorn an issue into this minute and I think it is legitimate to shoehorn it because financial health monitoring does, it seems to me, reflect the fact that Council has a huge budget and that over the course of a financial year things do change. Expenditure goes up in some areas and there are underspends in other areas, and what that allows the Council to do at fairly short notice is to allocate resources to initiatives and projects that come along that could not have been predicted. The HEART project actually, the social enterprise in Headingley, is a case in point; something that came from the community, they wanted to preserve the school building, to turn it into an enterprise, an arts centre. The Council was able to chip in a small amount of money, other money was found from elsewhere and as a result we have an extremely successful centre, and that is one thing I am particularly proud of from the last twelve years. It is an example of where the Council can invest a small amount of money and really make a difference to the community.

The Royal Park Primary School, a similar thing was obviously hoped. Unfortunately, despite various attempts over the years it was not possible to deliver a

similar scheme on that occasion and, of course, the school is now pretty much demolished. When I drove past this morning there is very little left of it.

What I wanted to do on this final Council meeting was just to raise one last time the issue of Leeds Girls' High School and the Victoria Road playing fields. These are playing fields owned by Leeds Girls' High School, subject of a planning application, and whatever happens to that planning application (that still has to run its course) the only way to preserve those playing fields is really for the Council to chip in and help the community to buy that land.

I would say to Councillor Wakefield to have a look at that particular issue one more time and to see if there is anything we can do to preserve that land. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Carter.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. I wish to refer to page 119 item 210 first and then, if there is time, 197/209.

First of all on the Local Welfare Support Scheme, which I support and am happy to support a joint letter to the Government – I do not believe that if Governments are going to give us money, if they are going to take it away in a short period of time, no matter what party they are and they all do it, they ought to give us notice of that at the beginning so we know where we are.

However, it is interesting, is it not, that as we sit here today, in another place what passes as Her Majesty's loyal Opposition is about to vote in favour of the Welfare Cap. I have to say that is interesting because, in the highly unlikely event that Mr Miliband will even be Prime Minister, or even Leader of the Opposition in 2015, should we not be sending a joint letter to Mr Miliband because, you see, the voting for the cap, they have already announced they are going to take steps that will create a black hole of £450m in the Welfare budget, so having voted for the cap, how are they going to plug the hole? Surely, Mr Miliband and Mr Balls should be telling the people of Leeds which other benefits they intend to cut as they have voted for the cap to fill the hole.

I am sure Keith would agree with me, and I am sure he will agree, we will sign a joint letter with myself and I am sure Councillor Golton and Councillor Finnigan – even Councillor Blackburn will agree – that we write to Mr Miliband and ask him to explain to the people of Leeds which benefits he proposes to cut to fill the £450m gap.

As I say, I appreciate this is extremely fanciful on my part, as the likelihood, if ever there was one, evaporated last week of Mr Miliband becoming Prime Minister.
(Applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Robinson.

COUNCILLOR M ROBINSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I wanted to speak on Minute 197 as well, following the Leader of our Group and, this being on the financial health of the city I think it is worth looking at the financial health of the country following last week's budget.

When we have managed to see a Coalition Government that has increased the tax-free allowance with our Liberal Democrat colleagues as well involved in this policy – I will give credit where credit is due – it has been increased and it is going to go up to £10,500 as well. Actually the threshold for the 40p rate to be paid is also

going to go up. We have managed to see a penny being taken off beer, the rate on spirits to be frozen, fuel to be cheaper, the rise in fuel duty has gone, growth forecasts on the increase, an extra £140m for flood defence repairs following on from Councillor Lewis earlier, £200m to fill the potholes. There is lots going on that is cause for confidence in our national economy. As Councillor Carter has just said, with the Welfare Spending Cap now being agreed cross-party, it is very interesting times.

I have two questions for the Leader of Council. Given that one of the residents of my ward today has contacted me asking about business rates and asking why as a new business being set up in the area they are going to be potentially paying £4,500 per month, what more will the administration be doing to help new businesses and, given the underspend that the administration is projecting, will they follow the Chancellor's lead where he projects an underspend of £5b and a surplus there and give people more of their own money back in the city of Leeds? Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Selby.

COUNCILLOR SELBY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Minute 198 page 209, Social Fund Consultation.

Lord Mayor, this scheme will see further investments and projects to support the Council's anti-poverty priorities and strengthen wider efforts to tackle social and economic exclusion and clearly the proposals are the right choice for the city.

This move comes at a time when many people in Leeds face the pressures of the rising cost of living crisis and Leeds is not alone. Families on the lowest income spent 22% more on food in 2012 than five years ago. Energy bills have been rising and real wages have continued to fall.

As with all our anti-poverty initiatives, targeting support is aimed to help those who continue to face the choice between putting a meal on the table or keeping warm. We must ensure that we do not find ourselves in the situation similar to that of the US where food banks are seen as a formal part of the Welfare State but for the moment with so many people in need, we cannot turn off that support.

That, Lord Mayor, is but part of it. What I cannot understand is why this Government continues to deny the reality of need in many of our communities. When there was a discussion only a few days ago in the House of Lords about food banks we had the famous Lord Tebbit's comment deriding and denigrating people who use food banks. We see the wide-ranging work that local Authorities are undertaking to tackle that challenge head on.

The Social Inclusion Fund is one of a number of projects within our wider anti-poverty strategy and I am proud of the Council's commitment to tackle social exclusion locally and to continue to prioritise resources to help those on the lowest incomes.

Lord Mayor, at a community meeting last night Members were told by the police that theft from shops, particularly theft of food, has increased substantially. Why? Many of those people who have never been involved in crime before are involved in this. They do so as an act of desperation because the Government's austerity programme leaves them little hope and little money. People using food banks have increased from 441,000 to half a million. Many of those people who use and benefit from these banks are children, a fifth of those are families in work.

Lord Mayor, food banks are not the answer but what does concern me is that the Government's decision in December to reject EU support for the cost of food banks is alarming. There could be no justification for ignoring the needs of those struggling to survive. Many people in this community have benefited by this. The decision has got more to do with anti-ego ideology, a fear of the Daily Mail, a fear of UKIP than any consideration of families in this country. It is a warning to anyone who believes that Mr Cameron's wish to negotiate our membership of the EU is for the majority of people in this country. Mr Cameron and Mr Osborne are both very keen to protect the bankers' bonuses rather than help feed the disadvantaged.

This, Lord Mayor, is the Bullingdon legacy for this country. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Hussain.

COUNCILLOR HUSSAIN: Thank you, Lord Mayor and fellow Councillors, I am speaking today on Minute 199 page 210, further review of the Local Welfare Support Scheme.

I am not disappointed but surprised that the Central Government is cutting funding for local welfare schemes. Councillor Wakefield made clear his concern that this would happen when the scheme was created in March last year.

I think the system we have developed in Leeds is well targeted and helps people at the hardest time of their lives. Of course we want to spend each penny wisely, which is why it is so rewarding to see that administration costs of this scheme are reducing this year.

I am sure we have all seen residents who need help straightaway. People approach us when their benefits have been unexpectedly sanctioned, even when in many cases they have done nothing wrong. They contact us when their disability or sickness benefits are cut based on a flawed medical process provided by a contractor who does not even want the job any more. They contact us when they need to move in an emergency, such as to get away from an abusive partner.

Alongside our work with individuals we have also invested in preventing hardship by funding credit union initiatives and taking a stand against high cost lending. What will happen if our ability to support these individuals and organisations is limited?

We are putting £25,000 from this fund to help foster and grow food banks so that the people can access emergency food when they need it but do not forget, the Trussell Trust has stated that 43% of these referrals relate to the benefit changes and delays. On top of the cuts to Council Tax Support, the bedroom tax and changes to disability benefit, this is just a further Central Government reduction that will impact upon the poorest in our society.

It is such a shame that the truly localised scheme will not give a fair chance to develop. Removing the funding will not remove the demand. I know we will do what we can to assist people wherever possible and that we will try to maintain a scheme, even if the funding is removed.

I support the cross-party approach. We are taking a lead and hope Central Government will listen to us about the impact of removing this funding. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Maqsood.

COUNCILLOR MAQSOOD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. My Lord Mayor and fellow Councillors, I am speaking on Minute 199 page 210, Further Review of the Local Welfare Support Scheme.

I welcome the news that we are continuing to effectively use Local Welfare Support to mitigate the impacts of welfare reform but children are still being hit hard by the Government's tax and benefit changes which we estimate will increase both relative and absolute poverty.

According to the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, the number of households living on incomes below the level needed to afford an adequate standard of living has increased by a fifth – that is 900,000 homes in just three years. Leeds has the lowest percentage of child poverty in the eight Core Cities which is a testament to our work as a Council, but we must not be complacent. 22% of our children are still living in poverty. In three of our wards, including my own, over 40% of children live in poverty. We cannot stand by and let the Government's policies damage the lives of our children, so while they squabble over how to define child poverty, we have been working on actively tackling the problem in our communities.

I am sure that Councillor Blake will be referring to the wider measure that we have implemented in the debate after tea, so I would like to focus on our five blocks. These are our main priorities in our current approach to tackling the problem. We want to give children the best start in life and narrow the developmental gap at the foundation stage. To do this we need to improve the support offered to families and many of our children's centres, now including debt and personal advice. We have made it a priority to protect our 57 centres from cuts. We want our children to have safe and secure homes and are working towards cutting the number of children in temporary housing. It is important we work with our neighbourhoods to protect our children from substance and alcohol abuse as well as domestic violence. We are also in the process of allocating funding from the Local Welfare Support Scheme to provide infrastructure to facilitate the development of food banks. We also want to help parents to help their children by providing support for employment and adult skills through partnerships with Job Centres and businesses and work experience programme.

Finally, we want to promote financial inclusion, helping people to access affordable banking and advice on debt, finances and benefits. We need to work to protect the most innocent victims of the Government's policies and I am proud to support the work the Council is doing to achieve this. Thank you, Lord Mayor.
(Applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Hardy.

COUNCILLOR HARDY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. My Lord Mayor and fellow Councillors, I am speaking on Minute 200 page 210, Best Council Plan.

The Best Council Plan speaks about the importance of housing management coming back into the Council's direct control. As the Council's Lead Member for homelessness I thought I could share some of the ways we have been successful at working with residents to underline our success at this time of economic pressure on both individuals and the Council.

Not one family in Leeds is in bed and breakfast. There is no 'Kathy Come Home' in Leeds today. These families who need immediate housing help are placed in housing with support provided in order to assist them through this difficult time. What we have learned is that preventing homelessness through early intervention is better than trying to help people when they are homeless.

Through our Homeless Prevention Fund we are able to help and respond quickly and creatively to problems. That allows us to have someone at the risk of homelessness stay in their own home or move quickly between properties. If you go to Housing Options today, you get seen today and help starts today. No-one needs to be homeless in our great city of Leeds today.

We also help people who are at risk of domestic violence through our sanctuary scheme. This means people, where they choose, can stay in their own homes and with their own support networks rather than have to flee to avoid their abusive former partner.

We also go well beyond our legal duties in order to help people. This Council does not see a private tenancy of six months or a year as fulfilling the housing need. Only a long-term tenancy, three years or more, meets our test as a permanent solution for someone threatened by homelessness.

The Homeless Accommodation Leeds Pathway has been developed to help people due to be discharged from hospital to get the support they need and to avoid homelessness. This partnership work includes support from NHS Trust, homeless charities and officers both from Housing Options and Public Health. This is a genuinely supportive scheme that ensures people receive medical help in their community and my praise goes out to John Walsh on that as well. Those who know him know the good work he does.

Alongside our creativity we must also be attuned to people's individual circumstances. We work with some of the hardest to reach homeless people, including those who have been homeless for some time and have made an active choice to maintain this lifestyle. I know working with officers, charities and going out to meet the homeless myself, an individual solution is needed in each case. This is not just an offer of housing but working with partners in order to ensure a full package of support tailored to the need of the individual is provided.

As we continue to look at our housing management policies, I hope they will empower housing managers to be creative and responsive to individual needs as they are with the homeless. My thanks go to the Housing Options team that is doing such excellent work. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Yes, thank you, John, for your contribution.

(b) Joint Committees

(i) Leeds City Region Leaders' Board

THE LORD MAYOR: I am going to end the comments on the Executive Minutes and move to page 10 and look at the Minutes from the Joint Committees Leeds City Region Leaders' Board first. I think that is Councillor Golton. Councillor Groves is not present this afternoon, she is ill, so you are up first, Stewart.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am going to refer back to the conversation we had earlier, there were Combined Authority appointments mentioned earlier and we were talking about the capacity for the city and its partners to really go to the next level if we were given that little bit of leeway, that little bit of ownership of authority of access to funding.

We talked about the City Deals. I can remember feeling exactly the same way as other Members on that side where we thought crikey, this sounds like Central

Government gets it and they actually do want to release us and enable us to create growth for the national economy through developing our own local economy.

I was as dismayed as they were that, after we had spent a lot of time negotiating and a lot of officers had spent a lot of time on it too, and a lot had been achieved in different areas, that Councillor Pickles...

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: He has been promoted!

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: ... decided to stick another level of bureaucracy on top of what was meant to be a freedom related project.

However, I also concur with Andrew Carter about not whingeing too much about setbacks that we get. We should really be speaking up on what we can do better. One of the things about the City Deal is, it is a deal. It basically says Central Government does not quite trust you yet but if we are really to gain their trust, we need to deliver and this is where I feel that instead of just talking about the structures that go behind it and talking about the money that we might be able to raise, we should be looking at some of those areas where we have made a deal with the Government to say, "If you give us the power we will do a better job than you would in your own centralised way."

One of those things that they have given us is the Apprenticeship Training Academy. I am almost on red, I will have to shorten this one. Basically, we said that we would deliver around about 680 jobs by September 2015 and that we would have around about 200 businesses on board in 2013. So far we have only got small and medium sized businesses engaged 24 and total apprenticeship starts 19. I could not believe those figures, I thought they were perhaps not quite right. They are the official figures that have come from the office and they have been verified twice to make sure they are the right figures. If we are to get what we need out of our Combined Authority we have to deliver what we promise because if we fail at this stage, then we will not get the growth that we want in terms of our freedoms and in terms of getting our economy going in our area. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Councillor Golton. Councillor Wakefield, are you going to sum up at this stage?

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Carry on, I am very happy. I will sum up.

THE LORD MAYOR: You will sum up at the end.

(iv) West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority

THE LORD MAYOR: West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority, it is Councillor Harrand.

COUNCILLOR HARRAND: Thank you, Lord Mayor, again. I am not quite sure why this is on our agenda. We do a pretty good monitoring job, elected Council, in that Authority down at Birkenshaw, so perhaps we could question that.

Ten miles from here there is a body which has increased its efficiency every year for the last ten years, which has reduced the number of senior management, now has part-time members of senior management, has exemplary budgetary control, has the strongest reserves of any Fire Authority in England and has reduced the number of deaths and injuries to the public in West Yorkshire. All this has happened with a real term reduction in the costs to taxpayers. It can be done. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Cummins.

COUNCILLOR CUMMINS: I am grateful to Councillor Harrand for his question. What more can I say? Thank you.

(c) Scrutiny Boards

(i) Scrutiny Board (Resources and Council Services)

THE LORD MAYOR: Scrutiny Board, which is Resources and Council Services. Councillor MacNiven.

COUNCILLOR MacNIVEN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. My Lord Mayor and fellow Councillors, I am speaking on Council Resources and Services Scrutiny Board Minute 75, page 247, Grant Expenditure with Third Sector Bodies.

As a Council we are constantly finding new ways of engaging with organisations from a variety of sectors to support the delivery of important services for the members of our community. While the Council has many strengths, sometimes it is valuable to tap into specialist or community knowledge for the provision of certain projects and services. Central Government cuts mean that it is particularly important to use our limited resources in the most efficient way possible. Working with other organisations in our communities is a fantastic way to do this.

Members of my own North-East (Inner) Area Committee have recently been able to allocate funding to a number of projects, including Moorallerton Elderly Care, to promote inter-generational partnership and reduce social isolation for older people. This is an excellent example of how we can make our money go further by engaging with existing projects in our communities.

If we look at culture there is some brilliant work being done by grant-funded organisations - we saw some of it just before this meeting – in and around Leeds. We provide considerable funding to large organisations such as Opera North, the West Yorkshire Playhouse who act as the cornerstones of the promotion of arts in our city and they work proactively also to provide people who are not usually given the opportunity to engage with the arts, a chance to get involved. For example, they work with young people and they work with non-able groups.

However, in the context of Local Government cuts, it is important that we justify our spending on such projects. Council Resources and Services Scrutiny Board recently invited officers from City Development, Environmental Housing and Adult Social Care to attend to further our understanding of grant expenditure in the Third Sector Bodies. Members welcomed the drive via directorates away from grants to commissioned services and recommended that all existing grants be reviewed to ensure that conditions for grant giving still exist, or whether a contract is now more appropriate.

I welcome the Board's recognition that the appropriate use of grants enables community organisations to become new contributors to the Third Sector economy en route to becoming fully commissioned service providers. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dawson.

COUNCILLOR DAWSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am speaking on Scrutiny Board Minute 75 page 247, Grant Expenditure with Third Sector Bodies.

Council support for local communities and the Third Sector is vital in this city and one of the effective ways we can support communities is through grant aid to voluntary bodies and other groups that deliver better outcomes for people in our city. Third Sector organisations, voluntary and local groups, are the lifeblood of our communities. Many grants support and generate more economic activity for the city and are vital. We need to continue to support key bodies that do so much for culture, arts and the economy of our city.

Last year Leeds City Council spent £8.9m on Revenue and Capital grants and payments to the Third Sector. This support ranges from very large items such as Opera North, at £760,000, to very small amounts; the smallest I could see in the Scrutiny Board notes was £20 to Boston Spa village hall for a tea and pea forum. I am not quite sure what a tea and pea forum is but I am sure it was good value for money!

There is a “but”, though. The Council is being forced to look at all aspects of expenditure and reduce overall spend. Some may argue that this is partly due to an unfair allocation of Government grant but that is not for me to comment on. The amount we will be able to spend on Third Sector support is likely to reduce in future years, therefore we have to be careful and ensure we get value for money from every pound that we spend.

The Scrutiny Board review is providing guidance and help on how we should do this. We need to ensure that there are rigorous checks on the viability of organisations, especially for large grants, ensure there is no double funding from different departments, and ensure elected Members and Leeds Councillors are aware of the grants that are being made on behalf of the Council.

We need to ensure that Council Taxpayers’ money is spent in a way that helps communities effectively and promotes the objectives and policies of this Council. There are some examples in the past where this has not been the case.

We need to be rigorous on governance, cut out any duplication and seek feedback to check that public money has been spent carefully and wisely. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Grahame to sum up on the Scrutiny Board.

COUNCILLOR P GRAHAME: Thank you, Lord Mayor, thank you Councillor Dawson and Councillor MacNiven. I think that you have given a good description of the Board’s work and especially concerns regarding grants. If you remember, at the meeting we were concerned that when it was asked about duplication and the organisations repeatedly putting in for grants, was there a check on this and did they actually exist and were still functioning and giving value for money. We did not really get the response that we expected, so we are waiting for a response back regarding that.

I would just like to bring to the Council some of the other work that we have done, because sometimes Scrutiny is not always recognised. Through the request of the Leader, the Executive Member and Board Members we have looked at the Contact Centre, agency and overtime, appraisals, pay-day loan companies, welfare reform, community centre lettings, night-time levy, grants, income generation, ICT support to Members, contact procedure rules and translation services.

I am going to go back to the income generation. This came from a request from Councillor John Hardy. Two years ago we visited Torre Road to see how the fleet service operated. We were so impressed that we asked if it could be put out to

the public in the area; also regarding jobs if any could be created. Through the support and guidance for Scrutiny, fleet services equipped an additional private MOT line and through advertising on LCC pay slips generated an additional £15,000 of income through 2013/14.

This should be of interest to many of you here, Cross Gates Good Neighbours have recently, through funding and grants, got the money to purchase a minibus. I contacted Councillor Hardy to see if we could get help from Torre Road. From that connection they have sourced a bus for them, it will be serviced and MOT-ed and any other work that needs doing to it. They are going to pilot this service for a year and then open it up to the rest of the city. Also, there are two apprenticeships per year, there are local jobs being created and I would just like to say thank you to Councillor Hardy and the rest of the Board Members who have brought forward for us to do the enquiries and you can see the responses to the others in our annual report. We are going to let Mr Pickles know that we have generated some income from Councillor Hardy. *(Applause)*

(iv) Scrutiny Board (Safer and Stronger Communities)

THE LORD MAYOR: Moving on to Scrutiny Board – Safer and Stronger Communities, Councillor Finnigan.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Speaking to Minute 74, page 234, which is about the role, number and allocation of PCSOs in Leeds. Certainly many of us, when PCSOs were first introduced, had a certain scepticism as to whether they would be effective, me being one of those. I have clearly been proven wrong on this particular issue. PCSOs have been particularly effective certainly at a community level and I am sure we would all agree that we would struggle without them at this particular point.

The proposals that are doing the rounds at this particular stage are suggesting, no matter which way round you put it, a 20% cut for those who are likely to be in the outer wards as PCSOs are *(inaudible)* to the rounds. Certainly in Morley one of the reasons that the crime levels have dropped is the fact that PCSOs are part of a very effective Neighbourhood Policing Team, they do an excellent job and you cannot remove the link between having a high presence on the streets and the fact that those crime levels go down and continue to go down.

We are basically saying from a Morley perspective that we would like this to be reconsidered and that the allocation of five PCSOs per ward is one that is a hard and fast guarantee, because outside that we cannot see that it is anything other than a cut in policing, certainly in our area. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Gruen would like to comment.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: Lord Mayor, thank you, on the same Minute in terms of PCSOs, I think when it came to Exec Board I recognised the role that Councillor Anderson had played in keeping all his Scrutiny Board almost together in avoiding to take a vote between two options and coming to Exec Board with two feasible options.

The budget issue, as Councillor Finnigan knows, has now been settled and I am grateful to the Leader and other Leaders and the PCC who have made additional funding available in terms of policing for this Authority.

In terms of distribution, again we had a useful and positive discussion at Executive Board and our view was that this is driven by intelligence, it is driven by

operational issues from the police and therefore it has gone beyond the discussions that the Scrutiny Board had and I do not recognise again any talk of cuts and diminution of service.

All of this is speculation, none of that is going to happen. We are and have been the architects of PCSOs with the Police Service and we are very pleased to continue that. In Leeds we have the highest number of PCSOs of any district in the region and I hope Councillor Anderson will confirm that. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Anderson to sum up.

COUNCILLOR ANDERSON: Will I confirm it? Well, can I first of all agree with you about the effectiveness of PCSOs. In respect of PCSO numbers, I had to leave our Area Committee briefing early the other day but I am advised that at that it was confirmed that certainly in Adel and Wharfedale and in Horsforth and in Guiseley and in Otley we are getting additional PCSOs, but I am advised in Outer North-East the number is being reduced down from 17 to 15, so I honestly do not know the position.

This came at a briefing at Area Committee so if you are due to get one soon, you may find that the Chief Inspector will come along and give you a detailed briefing as to what they are planning to do, but I was not present at the other one so I do not exactly know what was and was not said at it.

In general, I think what this has shown is that Scrutiny Board, yes, was divided. There is no doubt about that but at the end of the day good sense has been seen by the Police Commissioner, by the Exec Board Member and most of all by the police, because I would say that privately the police spoke to a number of people raising serious concerns at the effect that this could have on policing and in terms of the improvements that they have made to crime within the city and that this was going to put it at risk.

It is all tied in, as far as I can understand, with this Locality Working where they are going to go into hubs and so they can make things more effectively, but hopefully that does answer the question that was raised. Thank you very much. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Wakefield, you have the right of reply now for the Minutes that we have covered. Ten minutes.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Let me first start off with the opening comments by Councillors Ogilvie, Mulherin and others on probably the biggest challenge that we face as a country and obviously as a city and that is seeing the transformation of the Health Service.

I think it is a real tribute to us that we were chosen as a pioneer city – the only city to be chosen for a pioneer city - to get the integration between Adult Social Care and the Health Service. If we get it right it will look like a service we can all support because it moves the Health Service from being reactive to being proactive, keeping people in the community and keeping them out of institutions.

I have to smile at I think the sincerity of Councillor Latty. You cannot do this if you cut the Adult Social Care budget. You cannot do this if you work at the pace that you are trying to meet those deadlines, and you cannot do it if you try to privatise it. This needs focus from all of us and needs resources to carry it through.

I think unless we do get that support, unless we get those resources we will be destroying the Health Service that we have all fought for, we are all proud of in this country.

I think there is a long way to go. If anybody can achieve this integration I think it is this Council. The Leadership of Sandie Keane, Councillor Ogilvie and in the past but I do think we are a city that people want to look at. If we cannot do it it will be extremely difficult for elsewhere.

On Councillor Lay, I have to say it was a very typical, sadly, Lib Dem trick to blame somebody four years ago. Stop looking for excuses and take responsibility for bad decisions. It is your Government that is cutting this service, it is yours cutting doing. (*interruption*)

COUNCILLOR: We will blame Margaret Thatcher.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Bloody hell, that is a bit rich, Keith.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Let me come to a positive.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Come on!

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Actually I was bowled over by Councillor Harrand agreeing with me but he has been always a more positive and constructive Member of the Conservative Party and I am looking forward to him coming over very soon (*laughter*) because he seems to agree with everything.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Why, where are you going?

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: He is right about doctors. He is right about doctors. It is very hard to get doctors' practices in poorer areas and that is something that needs to be addressed during the reform. You are absolutely right, we have seen it in other parts of the city where you try to get a doctor in and they will not move into highly deprived areas and we need to change that system because, frankly, none of this will work unless we get the primary care right and the doctors should play a leading role.

In Councillor Jon Bentley's comments then I think there is nobody in this Chamber as a Councillor who does not get slightly frustrated with Housing Services at the level you are talking about. I am pleased to hear previously that Councillor Gruen is coming back with a paper to the Executive Board and therefore to Council not only talking about building new Council houses for the first time in 20 years, which is something we should be proud of but, more importantly as well, in trying to change the culture of our Housing Services because that, quite frankly, no-one is going to deny, is long overdue and it is a task that I am pretty sure we all would agree with needs to move quickly.

On Councillor Hamilton, yes, I think a couple of the answers to your observations is that we need to devolve more to Area Committees so that you can make those interventions locally. We do need more powers and responsibilities and resources and I think that is something we should look at as we try to save money.

I get the Royal Park. I think Richard and I would probably say ten, eleven years of waiting was a very patient act by any administration to give them a chance. Sadly, they could not raise the money they needed. We continued to pay money. It is a sad day when you lose a building but I think this administration, like the previous, gave them a very long time to do it and we had to do what we had to do, but there is

something good come out of it because the community has got some of the commitments to make sure that does not turn into houses or flats, becomes a green area.

On your comments on the Girls' High School, I think we all recognise that area needs green space to play in. (*hear, hear*) It really does need Councillor Akhtar, Councillor Harper and Councillor Christine Towler, they have been very, very passionate advocates about improving the green space in their ward for people who live there. You only have to look at the health profile to see that it is long overdue. It is an issue, Martin, that I think we will look at.

Let me come to the Welfare Reform. I am pleased Councillor Carter said that he is happy to continue campaigning on this but, as Councillor Selby said, this is probably again all the fingerprints of a Lib Dem Minister, Steve Webb, about one of the most despicable acts I have seen inflicted on the poor. Last October they announced that we were going to get funds for two years and they would look at the level of support needed. It was £2.9m. Last December, without any publicity, they announced the withdrawal. This February they said, "Well, sorry, it is up to the Council."

You have heard from Councillors Selby, Maqsood and others, this money is crisis money. It is not luxury money, it is keeping people fed, it is providing fuel, it is providing furniture, it is providing support for people on high cost lenders. It is absolutely vital and to pull it away at the last minute is totally unforgivable from any Government, from any Minister. I am glad that we are going to carry on that campaign because it is worth £2.9m.

I will come to Councillor Carter's statement because I have got an answer to him. We have just been given it. Councillor Blake must be in touch with the Front Bench of our Party because she has just shown me a statement to say they are going to find that money (that money you have referred to) and they are going to find a billion pounds by closing loopholes in tax avoidance schemes by hedge funds. (*Applause*) Isn't that something that they could have done? Isn't that something that has been long overdue? I will tell you what, this side will sign any letter if it is a social injustice. We have done it in the past and we will do it in the future as long as if it is a cap you sign a letter...

COUNCILLOR: Ringfenced it.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: ...with us about abolishing the bedroom tax. (*hear, hear*) (*Applause*) That is the deal. That is the deal.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: That is utter rubbish.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Now, Councillor Robinson, he just popped up out of nowhere and I thought he does not look like George Osborne, he does not sound like George Osborne but to be honest, what I saw out of the budget...

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: He sounds like Alec Shelbrooke.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Well he may be after Alec Shelbrooke, I have not seen him either.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: You do not look like Ed Balls or sound like Ed Balls but you talk like him.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: What we saw was no money for local Government, no money for the north, no money for the unemployed but what we saw is big handouts for rich families for childcare. The richer you are the more you got, £300,000...

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Nobody believes you any more.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: ...that is what we saw, and what we saw...

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: You are miles behind again.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: ...was the most patronising comments about bingo and beer that we have ever seen. It is an utter disgrace. I did not see anything for families who are £1,600 less off. I did not see anything about tackling tax avoidance. I did not see anything on social justice, Matthew. I just saw a party that looks after the rich and forgets all the working poor. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: What a load of rubbish. A load of rubbish.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, everybody. It is now time to vote on the motion to receive the Minutes. (*A vote was taken*) That is CARRIED.

ITEM 13 - BACK BENCH COMMUNITY CONCERNS

(1) Back Bench Community Concern

THE LORD MAYOR: We are now moving on to discuss any Back Bench Community Concerns submitted by Members of Council. There will be six concerns this afternoon, lasting no longer than ten minutes, and the first will be presented by Councillor Dawson.

COUNCILLOR DAWSON: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. I welcome the opportunity to raise this concern with fellow Members of the Council.

In Leeds and Morley we have a very proud manufacturing history, especially in the printing industry, which has been and still is an important part of our city. There are nearly 30,000 manufacturing jobs in our city and nearly 4,000 jobs in printing and publishing. We have had some iconic names across the city involved in printing – Petty's in Holbeck, Tapp and Toothill in Bramley, Alf Cooke and Waddingtons in Hunslet to name but a few.

The Kodak site in Morley is also part of that rich tradition. Kodak's Leeds operation began life back in the late 1800s as an ink manufacturer called Frank Horsell in Holbeck. It moved to the current site in Morley in 1970 and now manufactures lithographic printing plates. The plant in Morley exports to Japan, North America, South America and throughout Europe; 95% of its production is exported.

The operation at Kodak Morley has changed with the times. For the last decade Kodak have invested heavily in the site with multi-million pound upgrades to infrastructure, plant and processes. A changed culture and a high-tech flexible workforce have shown that they continually improve quality control to match with anywhere in the world. However, Kodak announced on 3rd March they would cease operations at their Morley site by 2016 and the plant will be closed with the loss of 210 jobs.

Kodak has had financial difficulties but came out of Chapter 11 bankruptcy in 2012 and its website boasts about its future prospects and it is now turning the corner. It says, and I quote:

“As a result of reorganisation, Kodak is leaner, financially stronger and ready to grow”

but apparently not in Morley.

The Chief Executive, Leader of the Council and Morley's MP, Ed Balls, had a meeting with the UK Chief Executive of Kodak a few days after the closure announcement. They expressed disappointment at Kodak's closure and its implications for Morley and the workforce and asked to understand the rationale for the decision to move production away from Morley.

Kodak's view is that it has existing and under-utilised capacity at other facilities in the United States, Germany and in China. Relocating production to these sites, principally Germany, is seen as more cost-effective in terms of distribution costs and overall production costs.

I have had meetings with trade union reps from Unite the Union who have met three times with UK management. They have said it is very difficult to obtain the full business case for closure as it has been made in a board room in New York and not in the UK. One suggestion is that it could be easier to make workers redundant in the UK. Perhaps Kodak have decided to close the plant in the UK where it is easier to process redundancies. The statutory period for redundancy notice was reduced from 90 to 45 days last year in the UK.

Unemployment hits individuals 100% and can be very traumatic and soul destroying. Continual rejections and a lack of response to applications for jobs, money worries, a feeling of not being able to support your family are some of the feelings that arise from unemployment. Around one in twelve of our population are unemployed. In many ways the unemployed become forgotten and are not seen of interest to the rest of society.

My Lord Mayor, I hope this Council will lobby and do everything possible to keep this efficient, profitable and high quality manufacturing plant in Morley open. If that fails, I hope this Council will do all it can to ensure the workforce can be supported in looking for alternative employment and that we do everything possible to avoid the talents of this very skilled workforce being wasted through long periods of unemployment. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Richard Lewis to reply.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. As Councillor Dawson knows, there was a meeting between the Leader, the Chief Exec of the Council and Ed Balls with the UK Managing Director of Kodak to discuss the issue only a matter of days after the announcement was made and there is to be a further meeting of the MD with Outer South Area Committee Members and I think you will get a better feel there as to quite how firm their intentions are.

It is incredibly depressing that a firm that has come out of Chapter 11 insolvency, in a city where we are seeing new jobs being created, at a time like this you have a body blow like this of 200 plus jobs potentially going. I suppose the only positive bit is that it is not until 2016 so there is plenty of opportunity to go and do all the work that needs to be done to prepare people for unemployment and to see what we can do as a Council.

I would just go on to that. We will obviously be having those dialogues with Kodak to see what can be done, whether there is any possibility of saving jobs, but I think, as you said, the analysis is from their point of view we have spare capacity elsewhere, the market for our goods is going to be closer to that spare capacity so why do we need a plant up in the north of England? We would sooner invest in Germany. I suppose I put it in that category of no hard feelings but it makes more sense for us to do what we are planning to do than to maintain the plant here. As I say, that is desperately sad.

The positive bit is that we will be working with Kodak if the decision is final. The Council's Employment and Skills Service will work with them to ensure that affected staff are supported in seeking employment opportunities where appropriate, and it is a skilled workforce. That again is a positive. They are a workforce with a lot of experience, a lot of skills and we have other plants doing similar things, so we can look at it in a purely negative way but there are opportunities there for the workforce that I think we can exploit and we will be talking to other firms doing similar things to see what the opportunities are, and some of those conversations have already taken place because even if there are not vacancies now, there will be vacancies over the coming couple of years that people can take advantage of.

We have also asked Kodak to identify the support they intend to provide to their workforce so that we are not duplicating what they are doing, so that we are adding value to their efforts and we can identify any skills gaps there are and try to fill them in the meantime.

There is the other issue, of course, of their supply chain because we do not want other firms to be affected in a critical way by this. We need to understand fully are there any firms that are wholly dependent on Kodak for their work and what work we can do to sort that out in the meantime.

We are liaising with other Business Support Agencies and partners including BIS Local, City Region, LEP, Chamber of Commerce, UK Trade and Industry and others to access the widest possible network of businesses which might be in a position in the short to medium term to recruit staff from Kodak.

Kodak have not talked about future plans for the site and obviously that is something that follows on and will be of huge concern to local Members to ensure that it is put to the proper use.

Depressing but we as a Council are doing all we can to ensure that there is a soft landing for people who work there if it comes down to it and this is a final decision, and we will continue to work over the next two years to mitigate the impact on all the people who work in the Kodak plant and anybody who is affected by that closure. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Richard. Councillor Walker.

(2) Back Bench Community Concern.

COUNCILLOR WALKER: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would like to raise an incident that occurred on 12th into 13th February at Headingley. At the height of the gales a tree was uprooted from a private property and it lay blocking the arterial route through the ward and into Leeds. This blockage was still in place on the A660 during peak time morning traffic the following day, that being 13th February.

The incident had a huge effect on traffic that morning and even with diversions in place during the times around the already very busy corridor were extended even further. However, whilst I will be seeking reassurances and mechanisms to be put in place to improve the intelligence around incidents such as this, it is only fair that, having looked into the night in question, the Forestry section is publicly praised in this Council for the work undertaken at that time.

Our Forestry team dealt with an amazing 55 major incidents that could have had serious and significant implications on public safety if they had not been dealt with swiftly. Twelve of these included obstructed A roads and 90 incidents in total were dealt with. I think we all owe the Forestry team a huge vote of thanks for keeping the people of Leeds safe.

That said, the tree on the A660 was not picked up as an issue by the Council until 7.15am on the morning of the 13th. Including attending, assessing the situation and dealing with the tree the matter was resolved by 9.00am but it leaves the question, why did it happen? Clearly, unlike every other incident we deal with, the flow of intelligence was not sufficient in this case. Had it been, I am convinced it would have been dealt with.

Councillor Walshaw and I have been asked to raise some questions by concerned relatives. Have we the statutory powers to remove fallen trees with regard to the owners? Following debriefs on the night in question, what lessons can be learned from the incident? Finally, how can our responses be even slicker and what role is there for other agencies?

Sadly but all too inevitably as a Council, despite our team's work valiantly through the night, this is the incident that hit the headlines. We all want to shout about our successes as an Authority and it would be good to know that, Heaven forbid, should we experience another night like that, we will be able to come out of it with 100% success rate our efforts on the night in question so clearly deserved.

It is also vital to give the public the confidence in the service that is so clearly justified. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dobson.

COUNCILLOR DOBSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor, and thank you, Councillor Walker for not only raising this community concern but actually beating me to the punch and actually focusing on one or two issues that I wanted to pick up on in my answer, not least – I am glad certain Members find it amusing because for the people in question on the night in question it was anything but. I do not think anyone would like a tree falling on to our property or, indeed, one of the public highways.

In terms of these particular incidents I think it is fair to say that there is a good news story here just desperate to get out and we kind of just missed it by default. I will come to that. Like you say, 90 major incidents through the night. I have got the list here and they are far and wide from the Outer North East right through to the Inner North West, Outer North West – all over the place there were major incidents so our team was stretched to the limit. I too am extremely proud that within a hair's breadth they managed to cope with all those incidents, 55 major incidents and, as Councillor Walker has quite rightly said, twelve on A roads, so they do indeed deserve our thanks.

In terms of our statutory powers they are in place and, believe me, we do use them. Under Section 154 of the Highways Act 1990, we can remove trees that

belong to private owners if they are causing a hazard to the public or are detrimental to the traffic movement.

As part of our Tree Emergency and Business Contingency Plan, which is a 24/7, 365 day a year service, we are always available to remove trees from the public highway whoever's ownership they lay in if we deem it necessary.

Moving on to the night in question, as has been quite rightly said, we were first made aware of this incident at quarter-past seven the following morning. There was a team on site within 20 minutes and the incident was removed and cleared by 9.00am. Good going. However, it has to be said that the question I have raised with officers is why didn't we know? I suppose when you are looking at 90 major incidents across the piece and as a multi-agency approach including the emergency services, it is fair to say they were pretty hectic that night.

That said, there was an incident in Headingley on Chapel Lane where a tree had fallen on to the highway. We had been out and assessed it, it was a minor road, we blocked it off, that is going to be moved in the morning and there was talk in the information flow around the Headingley tree that needed attention. It first came to our attention at 7.15. Within one hour and three-quarters it was gone.

That does leave the question, however, what can be done to improve our intelligence flow and information sharing. I think I am also going to give a huge amount of praise to all the other external agencies and especially the emergency services who collaborated brilliantly with us that night but there is always room for improvement so that that end, Councillor Walker, I have asked the Head of Forestry to meet with Highways, the multi-agency approach and the emergency services, to really try and simplify some of these. When we get a tree falling in Headingley or any other part of the city, where is it, where has it fallen, what sort of tree is it so that we will know what equipment to bring, and the time and the exact location.

We are going to get those systems in place very quickly indeed so, as Councillor Walker says, Heaven forbid we have another such incident, we can give those assurances to the people of Leeds and we will give the 100% that we just missed by a fraction on this occasion. Apologise to the people of Leeds who were inconvenienced on the morning in question. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Dobson. More good news – it is tea time. I would like to invite our guests in the public to come down and join us in the Banqueting Hall and can we aim to be back by 5.25. Thank you, folks.

(Short break)

THE LORD MAYOR: Back to business everybody and it is Councillor Downes, I think.

(3) Back Bench Community Concern

COUNCILLOR DOWNES: Thank you, Lord Mayor. My Community Concern is about policing in Otley and Yeadon. Recently the Times I believe, the Sunday Times, has released a report to say that one of the best places to live in the country is Otley and one of the factors in deciding that was down to the low levels of crime, and one of the reasons for the low levels of crime is because of the PCSOs that we have got and the fantastic job that they do. I have been out several times with them on the beat and if any other Councillors have not done so I would urge you to do so, to speak to the local police and ask for a day out with the PCSOs. It is quite enlightening as to what they do and how valuable they are.

I was pleased in the Budget recently at the last Council meeting that Councillor Wakefield said that there were not going to be any cuts to the PCSO budget. I welcomed that, that was one of the concerns that we had. However, I did ask him to confirm whether or not the policy of equal distribution around the wards was to remain, and I know Councillor Finnigan has raised this already. When we were running the Council we ensured that every ward had their equal number; we all pay the same Council Tax so we all should get the same Council services. At the time a Labour Councillor did mention that if they got back in power they would ensure that they were taken away from some of the outer, more affluent areas and redistributed in Labour wards. That was something that has always concerned me. So far it has not happened and I am very pleased with that.

When I posed this question at the Budget meeting, Councillor Wakefield did not answer. I now it has been to Executive Board and it is still up for discussion, so today's question is to Councillor Gruen, and I know he has already answered Councillor Finnigan, but just for clarity it would be lovely to hear from a politician a simple "Yes" or "No" answer – are we going to have an equal distribution of five PCSOs funded by the council per ward? I would just like to hear him say "Yes" or "No". Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Gruen.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: Maybe. *(laughter)* That is the one real answer. I stand by what I said earlier. It is not a question of the budget, it is a question of effectiveness which is an operation decision we are discussing with the police, but we are talking about not just the PCSOs we pay for, or partially pay for, but also the PCSOs wholly paid for by the police, by the Police Commissioner, and then there is the reorganisation into one Division that the police are carrying out. There is not a straightforward and easy answer but we are working our way through in genuine partnership and I think as soon as that has been done we will come back to Executive Board with a proposal.

There is nobody who does not appreciate the value and the public perception and confidence in PCSOs and therefore the importance of PCSOs, so all of that is common ground and I hope you will find at the end of all of this that, having gone, as Councillor Anderson said, through a rigorous assessment and a rigorous process of examination, that we will come up with something that everybody is content with.

(4) Back Bench Community Concern

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Blackburn.

COUNCILLOR A BLACKBURN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. My Community Concern is housing repairs. I want to raise the concerns I have regarding, as I said, housing repairs.

To illustrate this, one of the tenants in my ward reported damp in her flat. I asked the Council Surveyor to go round and he visited in the middle of February and put an order on for fungicidal wash but when the workmen came on Tuesday 4th March, they said more work needed doing and so they did not do anything because they said another order would need putting on.

The tenant was told by the Housing Office six days later (which is the following Tuesday, 11th March) that they were waiting for a Works Order to come through. On Friday 14th March, ten days later, the tenant still had not heard when the work was to be done.

I contacted the contractors myself on behalf of the tenant and on Monday 16th March a new order was put on but I was told the contractors could not do it until 8th April but, as it happens, the tenant is happy with that, so hopefully it will happen then.

Another order relating, as it happens, to the same flat was access to the flat above was needed to do work on the balcony drain because water was coming down into the flat underneath. There was a problem gaining access to the flat above and the matter was left with Housing just as "No access". Again, I took the matter up, the contractors gained access and did the work the same day. Those are two illustrations for you.

What I am trying to highlight here is there seems to me to be glitches in the system where matters are not followed through and I hope these glitches can be looked at and rectified. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Gruen.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: Lord Mayor, thank you. In the West Area there is a 99.8% satisfaction by tenants with reactive repairs and a 95% satisfaction with responsive repairs. 87% of responsive repairs are fully completed at the first visit, so overall in strategic terms I am satisfied that that is a good performance.

I have to say to the Member that this is not your local surgery. If you want problem solving then, like Councillor Hardy or other Councillors, either you follow through with your local management or you go to Jill Wildman, who is the Chief Officer for the West Area, or by any means you are welcome to write to me and tell me. I have got about eight different addresses that officers guessed you might raise. Is it 15, Stonecliffe Close? Is it 4, Gamble Hill Park? Perhaps some of those you do not even know about.

Seriously, I am not trying to be difficult with you; if you have a problem we will try and sort it out and I cannot sort it out without any notice answering in here. In general terms I aspire to the best possible service, putting the customer at the heart of our repair service. Councillor Wakefield was frank enough earlier on to say we are not there; I agree we are not there but I promise you, we are going to get there. *(Applause)*

(5) Back Bench Community Concern

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Finnigan.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Recently I was at a MARC meeting, Morley Against Reckless Construction, which is a meeting where other residents come and join us and talk about particular planning applications and their concerns. It was at the forefront of leading the opposition to Daisy Hill (despite local opposition that was overturned) at the forefront on Bruntcliffe Road when it was overturned, at the forefront of Cottingley Springs.

I was asked by one of the residents there two quite interesting questions. They were saying we are concerned about the fact that the views of local representatives are not taken into account, the views of local communities are not taken into account, can we disengage from Leeds, can we pull out of it and can we have a referendum, in/out referendum? *(interruption)*

Of course, this is an interesting analogy with the discussion and debate about Europe that we are presently having. Of course, these are very interesting

questions. I did not really know what the answer was and the issue at that particular point is that yes, you can and yes, you can, on both of those particular questions.

There is no doubt that Morley has always been a reluctant partner within Leeds City Council. Indeed, if we go back to 1974, Mick – you will have been there – you will realise that this was a forced marriage and, as such, the people of Morley had a ballot in 1974 to see whether they wanted to go into Leeds. Over 90% voted not to. Of course, their views were ignored and there they are ending up in Leeds with what is, Mick, an unhappy marriage. I think the people of Morley would accept that it is an unhappy marriage.

It is quite clear that when we look at issues and the decision making processes where we have an Executive Board, Morley's voice is not heard on that Executive Board. Indeed, we do not even get briefed on the Executive Board Minutes. When we look at the new Housing Committee, we are not on the Housing Committee, so Morley's voice is not articulated on that particular Housing Committee.

As ever, when there is an unhappy marriage, at the point where the partner who has all the influence and all of the cash is not listening to the other partner, that leads to all sorts of problems and all sorts of difficulties.

Inevitably, the people of Morley are looking at a more positive relationship and are looking to see how they can be involved in a better way with the decision making process, and that is about localism, that is about genuine delegation of the decision making down to a local level.

At this particular point we have street cleansing. To Peter's credit, that has worked pretty well, we have some influence at that particular point, but on the bigger issues, the bigger issues are still controlled by the Centre, the decisions are not taken down at that local level.

When we are talking about Community Concerns, the community that I represent, significant concerns that their views are not counted down at Leeds City Council and that their influence over what goes on in their own lives is somewhat diminishing.

Nobody is talking about an acrimonious divorce at this particular point. *(interruption)* What we would like to explore is an opportunity for communities to genuinely get involved in those decision making processes, whether that is the LDF, where certainly Morley feels disenfranchised and I suspect it is not the only community that does, whether it on housing issues, education issues, whatever they may be. We have to strive better to bring that decision making down to a local level and at this point our community are saying their concerns are that it is centralised and they are not involved in the ultimate outcome of things that impact upon their everyday lives.

This is a call for a delegation of power. It is a call for genuine people power and we need to explore ways of making sure that those unhappy communities that see themselves in a forced marriage do believe that their concerns are being listened to and that they have some influence on what goes on in their own back yard. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Gruen to respond.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: This is clearly an important subject and I am grateful for the way you put it. I was thinking as you started talking whether, as President of the Greater Morley Area, you had called in Peter Box and his troops to

annex Morley into Wakefield. I am just waiting for them to come across the border – just waiting.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: Tempting, Peter, tempting.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: The fact is in any relationship, as you described it, there are ups and there are downs and I did not hear between 2004 and 2010 any downs. I did not hear that Morley was really so against Leeds when the Morley Boroughs were part of the administration. They seemed pretty content with life in Leeds.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: We did, Peter, we got a fair deal.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: It was a lot better in those days.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: Can I say this, and I do not mean this in a personal way but in a factual way, you seemed pretty content to be the Lord Mayor of this City. You did not say, “No, we are the Morley Boroughs, please do not give us...” – in fact you fought like cats and dogs to get it, so actually there are ups and downs, that is what I am saying.

Also, if I may say, a lot depends on the quality of the local Councillors (*interruption*) because really, Robert, you have been steadfastly refusing to engage with the whole Planning process for the past 18 months or so. From the very beginning when every other Group considered their position and said, “Do we need to take our share...”

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: That is not fair.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: ...“do we need to look at site allocations? Do we need to do so-and-so?” you have come out against that process. Tom, who represents you at every opportunity has forensically opposed every single thing that we have tried to do. Then you have gone out into your newspaper, the Morley Observer, which you seem to own, and you said, “It is all these people in Leeds who are wanting all this development, it is nothing to do with me, Robert Finnigan, it is nothing to do with me, the Morley Boroughs, it is all that lot in Leeds who are going to ruin your green space.”

Frankly, every ward in the whole of the city could say that because every ward has real sensitivities about where developers are wanting to build and we are going to get into that no doubt in a few moments.

That is what I mean about quality of leadership and quality of Councillors. You have to accept that if you want to talk sensibly and say, “OK, we have to take a share of the overall initiative that is going on, we have to be responsible and be part of the Council” and you would have to do it if you were part of another Council as well and those other Councils have not even got to the point that we have got, so they have got an even tougher life than we have coming up.

Really, I am always willing to listen, I am always willing to talk to you, as you know, on a one-to-one you can come and talk to me about any issue at any time and if you can find a way forward then that is what democracy and leadership is about, but while ever you simply stand on the sidelines, throw all the brickbats at Leeds and the administration, tell us how terrible we are and how you are the single saviour for Morley, it ain't going to happen. That dialogue and that relationship is not going to happen.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: (*inaudible*)

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: Well there you are, you do not want a relationship. You just want to huff and bloody puff and be done with it. (*Applause*)

(6) Back Bench Community Concern

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Latty.

COUNCILLOR P LATTY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I wish to address a long-standing problem in Guiseley, the junction between the A65 Oxford Road and Victoria Road.

The A65 is, as I have said here many times, one of the busiest roads in the Leeds district and the number of pedestrian crossings that have been introduced on it is a testament to the dangers of trying to cross it. This junction is right on the route to and from Guiseley Fieldhead Senior School and Guiseley Infants, which means that twice a day and sometimes at lunchtime a great number of schoolchildren have to cross at this point. Then there are a number of retired peoples' residences nearby – Oxford Court, Hornbeam Court, Marlowe Court and several sheltered bungalows. People who want to get to Morrison's or many of the smaller shops in this busy quarter of Guiseley have to cross it.

Then perhaps potentially the most dangerous situation, the Station Hotel, a very successful pub, stands right on the junction and customers leaving the pub are immediately faced with a dangerous road crossing. For several years Transport Planning have been trying to introduce a method of introducing pedestrian crossings that would make this safe but with no real success. One reason is that they are trying not to slow the A65 traffic, which is precisely what I would think is the whole idea. My colleague Paul will talk about the technical aspects of this problem – man stuff, you know - (*interruption*) but for me it is the people problem that matters and I want to know when we can expect some urgency to be brought to solving this dangerous situation. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Wadsworth.

COUNCILLOR WADSWORTH: Well, after that introduction I am not sure that I can bring the technical stuff that you are all expecting! I think we all agree that the junction needs pedestrianising and that includes officers, and I know that, Richard, you have been sent an email from officers that was copied into ourselves and was very helpful I am sure to you and to us, which clearly highlights in that email that they accept that there is a need to pedestrianise that junction, because currently it is not pedestrianised in a safe way. It leads people on to an island with no way off. They are currently carrying out a feasibility and a costing exercise and there is £45,000 from 106 moneys (we all knew that) and that the scheme is going to cost significantly more than that because the £45,000 is only just there to refresh the bulbs and put brighter bulbs in, not actually to do anything about pedestrianisation.

The big news out of that email is that they say they will not be in a position to commence on site until the autumn, or does it mean they will be in a position to commence on site in autumn? I do not know whether you can clear that up when you respond, maybe you can.

The £45,000 comes from 106 from developments and one of those developments was the Redrow development on Netherfield Road. We were really led to believe that that development should not go ahead – and this was the point that we made to the Inspector – that this was a dangerous junction and that the

Redrow development was going to put more traffic on to that junction, but we were led to believe that that completed the pot of money. It appeared to complete the pot of money to refresh the bulbs, not actually complete the pot of money to do anything physical with the junction, so I think we were misled where that went and that meant that we really did not give a correct view to the Inspector. The Inspector went away with the view that that junction would be upgraded and actually all that was going to happen to that junction was there were new bulbs put in, which really does not cut a lot of ice with local residents because local residents just want a safe crossing and they would like that safe crossing before we start with further developments maybe, or whatever we are going to start with. We have just heard about how we have all got to take our share and we are all taking our share but what our residents want is infrastructure and safe crossing before more traffic is put on the A65.

I hope that you will ensure that we get a safe crossing and we get it in a timely manner, Richard. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lewis to respond.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Thank you, Councillors Latty and Wadsworth, for a genuine community concern. *(laughter)*

I think sometimes we do have complex junctions and certainly ward colleagues and I had horrendous problems with one junction that we tried to get lights on and eventually, after about five years of promising it to people, we failed because technically we could not make it work and where another complicated junction still causes us major problems because we have a big delay on a pedestrian crossing to enable people to get in and out of the bus station.

In some sense it is just technically very difficult to make everything stack up in a way that satisfies all parties and I mention that because the first communication I got about this junction was somebody saying that people have been told that they will only get 30 seconds to come out of Oxford Road and this will stop traffic, and I thought I do not know anything about this scheme and people are already telling me what it is going to do and what it is not going to do.

I think the top and bottom of this is, it is a complex scheme, officers are working on it. We have got the funding, as you mention it is two developers' contributions plus money from the LTP in 2014/15. The timescale for starting is, I understand, in the autumn. It can start in the autumn but it will not finish until next year.

I know conversations have taken place between yourselves and officers. There may be compromises that we all have to make to get it where we can move forward because I think there will be bits where you are not entirely satisfied and the officers will not be entirely satisfied, but we really need to make progress with this and come up with something that as far as possible makes everybody happy. The money is there, it is going to take place, it is a difficult junction – not one with the highest accident statistics but equally there have been significant accidents there and we do not want any more, but we do have to work to get these things right and please have all those conversations with the Highways Officers and go that extra mile to make sure it does work. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Council, we are now moving to the White Papers. We have three this evening, they are to last no more than 30 minutes and will be completed with votes but, on the first White Paper, I think Councillor Carter will probably ask for two votes. Can you introduce your White Paper?

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Before moving this formal resolution in my name as regards Council Procedure Rule 14.0(a), can I just for a moment add my comments about the Members who are not going to be here next year, the retiring Members.

I cannot quite imagine the word “retiring” along with Bernard, really. He has never been very retiring as far as I could tell. Bernard and I both became Members of this Authority at the same time in 1974. I cannot pretend I was here in 1957, I was only eight! *(laughter)* Bernard’s contribution to the city over 50 years has been immense and we all owe him thanks for that. Although he and I have had some pretty robust exchanges, we have always got on personally extremely well. He is a man of whom the city can be very proud.

Neil and I again, we have had robust exchanges over the years but again, on a personal level, have always been extremely friendly and indeed when we were in control of the Council on a number of occasions Neil would come and see me over particular interests of his that he wanted to make sure were being progressed and I was always happy to try and oblige.

Neil muttered very darkly earlier that he intended to be back. I will not say too much but wish him good luck in that venture!

Martin I do want to thank particularly because he was Chief Whip of the Liberal Democrat Group when we were in joint administration. Extremely hard working, very fair, very thorough and did his best to work alongside my Chief Whip which is a very easy task, I have to tell you *(laughter)* but relationships remained extremely cordial. It is very unkind that being the Chief Whip of the Liberal Democrat Party must be like trying to herd cats *(laughter)* but if that is the case he did a very good job. Personally, thank you very much, Martin, and good luck in the future.

Finally, Lord Mayor, no-one has mentioned you. I know formally we will do that at another time but I think as this is your last full Council meeting as Lord Mayor I would like to record my thanks certainly, first of all to you and the Lady Mayoress for your personal kindness but also for the very balanced and sensible way you have always conducted your part of Council business, whether in Opposition or in control, so thank you very much indeed for that. *(Applause)*

ITEM 14 – WHITE PAPER MOTION - PLANNING

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Having said that, I will formally move – and don’t you dare now refuse! – that leave of Council is given for me to add Councillor Cleasby’s amendment in to the resolution being proposed by myself. I move, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: We need to move to the vote then, leave of Council. Those in favour of Councillor Carter’s motion please show. *(A vote was taken)* I think that is CARRIED and I think we will move on, and if that is the case I think Councillor Cleasby has to comment as well.

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: In that case, Lord Mayor, I move in terms of the Notice.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Hamilton.

COUNCILLOR M HAMILTON: I formally second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Again, I have got to take a vote on this. Those in favour of Councillor Cleasby's motion please show. *(A vote was taken)* CARRIED.

Now we have got that consent, Councillors Carter and Cleasby, we consider the motion as set out below on page 13, I think it is Item 14.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Thank you very much, Lord Mayor. I ask to move the resolution in my name relating to the situation in Planning at the moment. I am sorry that we could not reach an agreed amendment with the administration because this resolution in my name is in no way party political. It is and has to be slightly critical and highlight some concerns about how we are progressing matters since the Core Strategy went to examination.

I have put down here a series of bullet points. I do not think anyone, quite frankly, in this Chamber can disagree, with the possible exception of Councillor Hanley who we know is made to vote on these issues and actually out of his personal preference would like to build on every piece of grass he could find! Apart from him, I am sure everybody else agreed with much of what I have put here.

It is essential that this Council now bends its back to the issues outlined. We cannot ignore the guidance from the Government, particularly the revised guidance, which seems to me to give some opportunities. The recent guidance is interesting in as much as it widens the definition of prematurity, for example; it gives much more clarity on the issue of protection of the Green Belt; it gives much more clarity as regards infrastructure and the need for infrastructure in its widest sense – not just the road network, not just drainage but education, hospital facilities – and this has to be a part of the total of our Local Plan.

I am really concerned that at appeal far too often we send our Planning Officers with only half the appropriate ammunition. It is not just about Planning Officers arguing in inquiries about the NPPF and Planning guidance. It is about the other departments of the Local Authority – Education and Highways – making sure that they have robustly commented in the reports that come to this Council's Planning Committee to give us the opportunity to really, with our feet firmly on the ground, turn some of these applications down and give ourselves a fighting chance of winning at appeal.

I have to tell you with some very recent personal experience, that is not the case. I mention very briefly one which we still await a Ministerial decision on in my own ward where the Council solely argued on the issues of the five year land supply and prematurity. There are major highways issues but we did not object on highways grounds. There were major educational issues; we did not argue on those. There are flooding issues; we did not argue on those. We have to have the full range of ammunition at our disposal.

I would urge you to support this resolution because all I am doing is to underline that we have to use everything that we have in our favour if we hope to resist unwanted and unnecessary development whilst at the same time, of course, ensuring that we do get development in the areas that we want it.

My Lord Mayor, with that I will move the White Paper and then when I sum up at the end I will make a couple of other comments. Thank you very much.
(Applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Your resolution includes Councillor Cleasby's amendment and I think Councillor Campbell is going to formally second it.

COUNCILLOR CAMPBELL: Yes, formally second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. We now move to Councillor Gruen.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: I am moving the amendment and I recognise, as Andrew has said, that it is perhaps 90% of his resolution that no-one can disagree with. The bit that we are sceptical about is the weight he may want to attach to the national guidance and how much that might or might not actually help us.

I agree that any guidance which broadens definitions and for the first time talks about what developers have to do in terms of existing planning permissions, and talks about developers' profits, cannot be anything other than helpful, but what weight can be attached to that is the real issue.

The way we judge that is not by the guidance, frankly, but what the Secretary of State has done recently in terms of appeal decisions which have come to him. I think the record on that is that at least 39 out of 58 major housing developments have been granted at appeal by the Secretary of State or his Inspectors in the last year alone, which is double the number identified in CPRE's research covering the previous year.

There is no doubt that we, I think, should have a local consensus of the local democratic process of making planning decisions about the shared vision of brown field first and protecting green belt, about the local vision that we want the right housing in the right places, about the local vision on infrastructure – all of those are issues of common ground.

We do just take a step back, as I said, a bout ministerial advice. When you look at what the HCA's advice recently is about the quality of housing, and we are trying to insist all round through Planning Panels to actually up the threshold of quality and we are telling house builders we will not just want off plan their house types that they use throughout the whole of the country.

Many of the points that Andrew makes I have absolutely no reason to disagree with, frankly, and had Councillor Cleasby's amendment stood by itself I would have asked our Group to support it, so that is another area of common ground.

I also accept to a degree the rigour with which we need to pursue our own objectives. This is not easy because, as we saw at the examination in public, we are on a very uneven playing field. The developers – and this is what Andrew means by developer-led approach – the developers think (in fact they know) that in Mr Pickles, as long as he is there, they have their biggest friend, in many ways, that they will ever have. Whoever follows Mr Pickles, whether he was from your or a different administration could not be as house trained for the volume house builders as he is, so therefore that is the real consequence and that is why, I think, we say in the amendment we need to stick together, at least those of us in political groups who are willing to do the right thing but do it in the right way. You have our commitment and we have shown that commitment certainly politically, Andrew, that we are 100% behind defending some of those appeals. I accept there may be room for improvement, I accept that, but I think in general I hope we are together on most of these things. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor McKenna.

COUNCILLOR J McKENNA: I formally second, my Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. We move on to comments, which are on page 18, and it is Councillor Leadley to comment first.

COUNCILLOR LEADLEY: My Lord Mayor, on the face of it, everyone should support Councillor Carter's White Paper, but a closer look prompts such questions as what does it mean and what conclusions are to be drawn? What is meant by a robust five year land supply? Obviously office and industrial supply is not much disputed, it is housing land which is really meant.

What supply of housing land to supply what need? We have an LDF target of 74,000 new dwellings gross or 70,000 net of demolitions to be built between 1st April 2012 and 31st March 2028, an average of 4,625 dwellings a year for 16 years.

From the Core Strategy Inspector's comments it seems that any early shortfall will be carried forward into the latter years of the plan, causing the annual target to snowball as years of shortfall went by. With the best will in the world it is hard to see how a 16 year land allocation and a five year land supply for such targets could be achieved without taking a lot of land out of green belt. Existing brown field land and planning permissions would not be sufficient and windfall brown field land would not come forward quickly enough.

I say "targets" advisedly. They are targets, not reflections of need or achievability. During the 2001-2011 census decade, all but the last two years of which were building boom, the number of dwellings in Leeds grew by 20,264, and that is equivalent to 32,422 in 16 years, not 70,000 net. Of the dwellings which existed in Leeds in 2011, 12,078, or 3.6%, were empty. There is an LDF target to have no more than 3% of dwellings empty, so by that yardstick there was not an overall under supply in 2011, though there were shortages of social housing which the LDF would do little to tackle.

Potential first time buyers are being stopped from buying houses partly by job instability and partly by the pernicious growth of buy to let, which is becoming increasingly harmful to new ownership since about the year 2000. People paying £400 or £500 a month to rent modest houses will find it hard to set enough aside to get a deposition together. National taxation and fiscal policy should be developed to skew the market in favour of genuine first time buyers and against the accumulation of self-sustaining buy to let empires. One simple step would be to make sure that all landlords properly declare their rental income on their tax returns.

National Planning Policy and consequently, whether we like it or not, local Planning policy have been developer led for years and I agree that we need to do something to break free from that. If we did, there would have to be a fundamental rethink about how many new dwellings we need in Leeds, of what type they should be and where they should be built.

Even before its final adoption the LDF Core Strategy looks likely to be something of a false prospectus which will cause great difficulty with the supply of infrastructure as it falls short of its own targets. Land supply may well be so loose that those houses that are built are likely to appear in unsustainable places because developers find it cheap or convenient to put them there. Thank you, Lord Mayor.
(Applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Taggart.

COUNCILLOR TAGGART: Well, you would think a Government policy on planning would be about planning but in a way it is about anti-planning – that is what we now have because a planned city would have an objective look at all the needs

and requirements of the city in terms of housing, new schools, highways and all the other infrastructure. With this Government that is not how it works – that is not how it works.

The policies this Government has introduced are basically an open door policy to the developers to basically do what they want. Within this Chamber I accept the Conservative and Liberal Democrat Members agree with us about developing brown field land, previously developed land, first. I accept they mean that honestly. The Government is not interested in that in general and neither are the house builders. The house builders do not want to build on old contaminated sites which cost a lot of money to remedy; they want attractive, preferably green field sites in the suburbs because their building costs will be lower than if they were building on previously developed land but the property values will be higher because they are desirable parts of the city where some people want to live.

What we end up with is a housing stock where ordinary people can never, ever aspire to go and live, never get a mortgage and you cannot rent because, as has been said, the buy to let market now charges outrageous rents. How marvellous it must have been to have been around in the 1940s and 1950s when even Keith Joseph, when he was Housing Minister, boasted that they would build more Council houses than the previous Labour Government because what people wanted was quality housing that was decent, that was a reasonable price to rent and if you wanted to buy later in your career you would be able to do that, hopefully.

All of that has gone and so we have a whole generation of people in Leeds who will never be able to buy anything or, if they do, it is a box – it is a box, it is not a proper home for people to live in.

The irony of all this policy is because they do not want to build in my ward – when we had the ward meeting, the three Councillors of Roundhay and Stanningley were actually suggesting to Planning Officers, “Have you thought about this piece of land? We could live with development here.” Where do the developers want to build? They want to build in Harewood Ward, that is where they want to go. They want to build in Wetherby, they want to build in Alwoodley, they want to build in Guiseley, they want to build in the more so-called desirable parts of the city because they will make more money.

However, the housing target we have is completely unreasonable. We are never going to meet it and because we do not meet this five year supply rule, which is a very silly rule, they end up winning their appeals and so you end up building on green field and on green belt. The irony of Tory Liberal/Democrat policies nationally is actually to destroy some of their heartlands.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: And Labour.

COUNCILLOR TAGGART: I accept that the work we do at Panel level and in the SHLAA which I chair, all the Councillors are unanimous, but the fact is the problem is not how we work and how we respond; the problem is it is Government and its appalling housing and planning policies and I do hope they will be swept out of power in 2015 and we will have a Labour Government committed to proper social and housing policies. Thank you very much, Members of Council. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Cleasby.

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I found that rather interesting from our representative on the SHLAA partnership that it is essential

house builder and development dominated, therefore must be led, Neil. I find that very strange, your comments.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: You are four years out of date.

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: Council, before I talk about my amendment that is subsumed, some of the things I have picked up today from Keith – 35,000 new jobs he mentioned. Guiseley, go and look at Guiseley, Netherfield Road. It is a Who's Who of the house building industry. Every one of those companies has an estate there, not just a couple of houses. What has happened? Nothing to infrastructure, and that has been the failure within this Council. A lot of those things were planned and done under the old Government's legislation and if you read the old Government's legislation, you will see that it is largely talking about residents' involvement, neighbourhoods and communities developing the way they want it to be developed.

As for the criticism of the latest legislation, in the introduction a 1 it reads:

"It provides a framework within which local people and their accountable Councils can produce their own distinctive local and neighbourhood plans which reflect the needs and priorities of their communities."

That sounds nothing like what you were telling Council, Neil. That is the very first part of the statement in the present Government's document. I do admit in your Government's document that was a whole page and it has been précised now, but it means exactly the same.

Council, in the last twelve months there has been the winning of two appeals in my ward, St Joseph's and then the Outwood Lane. This document was instrumental in achieving that. It was because of failures in the planning process that residents, who I gave enormous tribute to, listening to the ward Councillors and working with us, they put their wellies on, their maps out, they went out, they found the information, worked with Matthew.

This is the document. It starts on the front:

"Horsforth Craghill and Woodside is a place of special character, of architectural and historic interest. This appraisal and management plan sets out the features that contribute to its distinctiveness and identifies opportunities for its protection and enhancement."

That is what the Inspector referred to and what you, Councillor Gruen, referred to in this Chamber. What I am asking of you, why put the amendment down? I fear that Andrew's White Paper and, again, your amendment, Peter, is essentially centric, it is taking away from communities and the residents who can do that groundwork for us. Why is there such a thing as brown field land? Isn't their brown field housing land and shouldn't there be brown field employment land? There should be on my plateau of the A65, Kirkstall, Horsforth, Rawdon and so on.
(Applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Brian. Good question and I think it is being heard and will be responded to. Thank you. Councillor David Blackburn.

COUNCILLOR D BLACKBURN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I enjoyed Councillor Taggart's "Re-elect me in 2015" speech there.

COUNCILLOR J McKENNA: In Wortley, that is his target.

COUNCILLOR D BLACKBURN: I do not care, but it was clear he was trying to get votes. I would like to remind Councillor Taggart, the first time I ever remember the 70,000 houses being mentioned there was a certain other Government in charge at the time and it was a Labour one, so I do not think that the problem is a political party one, I think it is a Central Government one, and Central Government have a Planning policy, whichever party is in control. This is one size fits all. Basically they have got a problem in the south-east of England and they try to force us all down that path and it is wrong.

The 70,000 figure we all know it is a stupid figure we are never going to be able to deliver on, even if we wanted to do.

I think what we have to do, it is clear if we have this land there we do not have a position where we have brown field first. What is going to happen is developers will take all the green belt, all the green belt that is going to be housing allocations they will do first and all the inner city areas where we have got brown field land will be left, so we have got to be firm on this.

I have just got to say, it is a pity that the Conservatives and Labour could not have come together and found a compromise because it would have been better if we could have spoken with one voice.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: I agree.

COUNCILLOR D BLACKBURN: I have got to say, I do not see much difference between both Front Benches in that but it is something we have got to seriously do. We are going to vote for the Conservative/Liberal motion and hopefully Labour may well change their mind on it – I doubt it – but the fact of the matter is it is something we have got to fight for, otherwise this city and all that it stands for and all that is good about it will be lost because it will just be one urban sprawl with all the brown field left undeveloped. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Procter.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Thank you, Lord Mayor. If you cast your mind back to what, three, four years ago we were told by some of the most senior officers in this Council, all of us, that we had to have a new approach, a new relationship with developers and house builders. In fact, a phrase was coined we need to be “open for business.” I wonder who said that.

I just wonder where we are – nice saying it, actually – now because the simple fact is that that much promised new relationship never materialised and, indeed, on Friday of this week those of us who now thankfully sit on the SHLAA partnership are to be presented with page after page of information from developers about why they say sites are not developable, why they say sites will not come forward within a five year time frame.

I do keep reminding the volume house builders that Leeds City Council is not a volume house builder itself. This is wholly in their hands. They can bring these sites forward and indeed they should. You only need to look at the East of Leeds extension, something like 7,000 housing units dropped into the market place in one go and what have the developing community done about it? They have only brought forward 2,000 units – 2,000 units and that is in four years – four years, frankly, of inaction. That is the scandal of this.

Neil, it is nothing to do with party political point scoring at all. The great sadness to me – it should be to all of us – is that the Housebuilding Federation's voice, their lobby is greater than yours and is greater than ours. That is the fact of it because they have got to your Shadow Ministers and persuaded them of the position and they have got to our Ministers and persuaded them. That is the real sadness to me and, frankly, we should never have let it happen and we should do all we can to correct it.

Councillor Gruen talks about Mr Pickles, as he likes to do. What I will say is that Nick Boles has been helpful, he has been helpful in his letter most recently to us. What we as a Council need to do is to revisit that letter, however, take him at his word and deliver it because what he clearly says, and I quote from him: "I can confirm that there is no central prescription about how a housing requirement should be phased over the planned period." That is a Minister that says that. I take him at his word, actually, and if that is the case, that is what he is saying, a civil servant must have passed it to go out in the first place, we should take him at his word and we should fight these developers and make sure that our inner cities, our brown field sites are developed. We are at one in that. We want to see brown field first and save the green belt. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Caroline Gruen.

COUNCILLOR C GRUEN: I would like to comment on the infrastructure aspects of the paper from three perspectives: firstly, as a Ward Member in an area where new homes are urgently needed; secondly, as Plans Panel Member, knowing the importance of getting Section 106 agreements right not only for the developer but, more crucially, for the community; and, thirdly, as an Area Lead for children in the context of our pressing need to establish new school places very quickly.

It is imperative that we establish first and foremost as a priority in any scheme the essential requirements for affordable housing, green space, public transport, community and health facilities, highway improvements and the all-important need for additional school places. To say that all of this can be done before a single brick is laid in my view is impractical and therefore unfeasible. However, it is crucial that agreement on infrastructure requirements and their timing is reached early, that permissions and progress on schemes are not granted until all partners, including developers, planners, Ward Members, service providers and local communities have agreed together what is required to make the development work and that that is a guaranteed output from the development.

Developers have a crucial role to play in this by working in partnership with Councils rather than against them and by not trying to limit their Section 106 contributions based on the nationally separated Community Infrastructure Levy, the CIL. Currently the CIL does not provide sufficient funding to secure the necessary improvements, even when set alongside the Section 106 payments, the parameters of which are far from clear.

I believe that communities do recognise the need for new houses and certainly we do in Bramley, but that means the right houses in the right places - in general, located on previously used brown field land including sufficient affordable homes for those wanting to take first steps towards ownership or tenancy and with the right sustainable infrastructure to allow people to live management, productive lifestyles in the future. That is why I fully support the £40m Council investment programme for Council and social housing development.

I have already mentioned the urgent priority we face of establishing sufficient school places in the context of a fast growing birth-rate. We face huge pressures in this area and nationally and the obligatory system of Academy and Free School programmes contribute massively to this problem, as Councils are not free to develop or extend in areas of need, demobilising their ability to act as the strategic provider of places.

The expectation from Government is that developers should contribute to school places arising out of schemes but there is no guidance on by how much and contributions frequently do not cover what is needed.

Lord Mayor, I support the amendment. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: At this stage we need Councillor Carter to sum up; we have had half an hour.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Thank you very much, Lord Mayor – and briefly. First of all, let us put this party political thing to bed once and for all. Neil, you must have a very short memory. All this started with the Kate Barker report and the Regional Spatial Strategy when Gordon Brown's Government told this Local Authority "You build 4,000-whatever-hundred houses a year." That is where it started and we are still exactly where we were because this Government has done nothing to stop them and that is when the developer-led planning process started. That is when they started to get their own way, that is when we started losing appeals, along with every other Local Authority in the country.

Let us not play the party political stuff because you know as well as I do that is when it started and, by the way, it would appear your party still has not learned from that. It is our job to make sure that the Coalition Government does, hence the meeting we have arranged with Nick Boles in ten days' time.

I also think it is pretty unfair on the Morley Boroughs, Peter, and not helpful because they have been fully engaged in this process. Because they do not agree with you does not mean they are not engaged. Some of the things they have said I do not agree with but, my goodness me, they have certainly been engaged. Indeed, Councillor Leadley was at the examination on the Core Strategy longer than any other Councillor and I guess I was probably the next one in the line. Members on *this* side, there were loads of them there but Councillor Leadley was actually supporting our planners on some occasions against the massed ranks of the developers. It would have been helpful if some of your lads had been there, to be frank with you.

Let me just repeat something that John Procter has said because it is crucial. It is in the Minister's letter and we have not taken it on board. "I can confirm that there is no central prescription about how the housing requirement should be phased over the plan period." That is in direct contradiction to the Inspector examining our Core Strategy. If that is right then the Inspector is wrong and we already know that the Secretary of State has written to the Planning Inspectorate on another Core examination pointing out where he thinks he is wrong there. We just are not being thorough or firm enough and we have to get our act together. I move, my Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: As leave of Council was given towards the original motion we can vote on the amendment in the name of Councillor Gruen first.

All those in favour of the amendment in the name of Councillor Gruen please show. (*A vote was taken*) CARRIED.

I think Councillor Gruen's motion then becomes the substantive motion and I move to the vote on that. *(A vote was taken)* Councillor Gruen's motion is CARRIED.

ITEM 15 – WHITE PAPER MOTION – LEEDS BRADFORD INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 15 is the White Paper, Councillor Downes is going to introduce that debate.

COUNCILLOR DOWNES: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Residents in Yeadon were very concerned back at the end of January when the Leader of Council, Councillor Keith Wakefield, was on television saying that if we are looking 20, 30, 40 years ahead there might be a better location for Leeds Bradford Airport so it can link with HS2 and create a transport hub. I think these ideas were originally formed from Wakefield City Council and Councillor Wakefield appeared to support those ideas.

Leeds Bradford Airport is a hugely successful airport. Last year it carried more than three million passengers and it is one of the fastest growing airports in the UK. Its intention is that between three and three-and-a-half thousand jobs will be based at or around the airport by 2016. It is the major employer in my ward and most people either work there, know somebody who works there or a relative or friend, and to lose the airport from that area would be devastating. Also, many of the support businesses and other businesses in the area that pick up trade from the airport being there.

If you were to move the airport you have got a lot of problems. First of all, it is a private business and as such you probably need in excess of half a million pounds to actually buy that business out because I have met with the Chief Executive and he has no intentions of moving.

If you were to build a new airport you would be talking at least a billion pounds plus. If you are talking about that sort of money, then I think the better option is to support what the City Region is looking at doing and that is improving the accessibility to the airport, and that is an additional access road from north of the Horsforth roundabout.

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: Horsforth Bypass, it is called.

COUNCILLOR DOWNES: That is the one, and also to put a fixed rail link up to the airport. You could do that for a fraction of the cost of moving the airport and you will get the connectivity that we need.

At a recent Transport Sub-Committee of the Inner and Outer Leeds North West Area Committee, a Labour Councillor there was questioning me saying, "Surely your residents want to get rid of the airport, there is noise pollution." Not really, because those in the flight path are all triple glazed and people have moved to Yeadon knowing that there is a commercial airport there, so that does not wash.

When we challenged officers at that same meeting about the infrastructure they said, "Well, it does not matter because if we build the road and the airport goes, we can put 5,000 houses there" and that, if you put 5,000 houses into Aireborough, which is already congested – and I actually spoke at the examination in public that Councillor Carter mentioned, I attended several days and one of the things I said is, to Planning officers, "Have you considered the infrastructure implications for the transport network?" and Leeds Planning Officers said, "No." They said to me, "Do

not worry, you are getting a new station at Kirkstall and you are getting a new station at Apley Bridge.” The congestion is prior to that. If the airport were to go and housing were there, it is just complete and utter gridlock.

There are two issues: there is the one about the jobs and then there is the one about the fact that we would end up having housing there and that is not what people want.

What I have tried to do with this White Paper is to try and get consensus of opinion with Leeds City Councillors. It is interesting because Metro’s Exec Board speaking to all Councillors, they were not in favour of the airport moving from its current location, so what I am trying to do here is get support from the Council to put out a statement to the airport to say that we support their long-term future.

COUNCILLOR LYONS: Who owns it now? I cannot remember. Who owns it?

COUNCILLOR DOWNES: Anyway, the point is they need that surety because they are looking for investment now and that investment can be a challenge because if the airport might not be there in 20, 30 years’ time, why would a long-term investor pay? *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thanks. Councillor Cleasby.

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: I formally second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Brian. Councillor Wakefield to comment.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. You know, that was probably one of the worst contributions I have heard. I do it because in all honesty I thought you were going to raise the level of debate to be much more visionary. You keep banging on about we are not visionary enough, that was what is here today.

Let me just be absolutely clear. Firstly, you are right, the airport has done extremely well. It has bucked the decline and is now at 3.1 million, 10% increase against the national trend. It is worth, I think, about 2,700 jobs. In terms of Yorkshire it is by far the biggest. You have got Humberside at 233,000 and Doncaster at 700,000.

I always think things have to be put into context, that is our job as politicians looking long distance. If you look at Heathrow at 69 million, Gatwick at 34 million, Manchester at 19 million and Birmingham at 14 million passengers, you realise Yorkshire has got to think about growing its aviation route because we all know that aviation is key to connecting with global markets, particularly now in China, India and South America.

I have absolutely no problem with having a discussion at the LEP, at a City Region and here to say how do we do that, how do we actually try and challenge certain regions which have great aviation hubs? In fact, you used to talk – Councillor Lyons has just reminded us – when Bev Chesney and Jamie Matthews were here we used to talk about constraining airports, but let me just be absolutely clear. Firstly, it is the airport’s decision, they will stand, they want to stay, we will back that, we were looking at access routes, we will be looking at public transport because that is their decision and they want to grow to seven million.

Can I just say that not only did the airport welcome this debate, that is the Chief Executive Officer, because he realises he has got a huge challenge. He has

also been able to persuade Government that this Council is a very positive supporter of it and only yesterday we received a letter from the Government saying this Council is very positive towards this airport and what is more we will pay for a feasibility study for you in order to improve service there. Let us not play petty politics in this...

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Are you going to put a taxi rank in?

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: ... for somebody's leaflet; let us try and talk positively about aviation links with the global economy in the world. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Carter.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: That was a really good attempt at taking it completely out of the context in which it was said to start with and put it into the context that it ought to have been in when the comments were made.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Always was. It always was.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Keith, I am sorry...

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: You were not there.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: ...but the comments you made at the time you made them were most unfortunate and did not give the message you have just given at all, so let us put it into context.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: You were not there.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Let us put it into context, which I am doing. What you just said is what you should have said to start with. I am afraid what happened was there was a reaction to a comment made by our good friend and gadfly politician Councillor Box, the Leader of Wakefield, who was the first one to say this. He has rattled on about an airport over there for ever and whenever he is given the opportunity to promote this Greater Wakefield airport, then he will say something. You do not respond to that by giving it credence it ain't got.

I am sorry, that is what you did. That is what you did and the result of that is that a lot of people were quite concerned, and you know they were. I am delighted that you have now got yourself back on track, got the debate back at the level it should be about how we improve surface connections to Leeds Bradford Airport, how we support them to get to seven million passengers, how we deal with the traffic congestion that would cause, but it would be nothing like the congestion that would be caused if we finished up with 7,000 houses up there – some mini new town that might be in the mind of some Labour politician somewhere. That is the last thing we want.

Do not forget, we are working in partnership with our nearest big city, which is Bradford. I can tell you, the comments that you made went down like a stone in Bradford and you know full well it is not helpful. Do not shrug your shoulders.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: You were not at the LEP debate.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: It ain't helpful – I was at the Combined Authority and it ain't helpful when we just about to launch a partnership of which Bradford is a member.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: You were not at the debate.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: You made a mess. Admit it. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Sobel.

COUNCILLOR SOBEL: I actually welcome this motion and I actually think we should welcome Councillor Wakefield's comments and the fact that he went to the DFT and that we now have a feasibility study on surface access. That is constructive engagement.

This motion is, I think, something we all support and Harold said a week is a long time in politics – well, five weeks is clearly a bit of a lifetime. Five weeks ago Councillor Downes and his colleagues put out a leaflet in Yeadon which said, and I will quote from the first sentence:

“Yeadon residents have raised concern over proposals to close Leeds Bradford Airport.”

The first most Yeadon residents had heard about the proposed closure of Leeds Bradford Airport was from Councillor Downes's own leaflet.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Yes.

COUNCILLOR SOBEL: That is where the message has come from. Coming on to his comments around housing which he talked about today, in the same leaflet Councillor Campbell is quoted: “Building nearly 5,000 houses on the edge of the green belt will cause major hardship issues for Yeadon.” The first person to suggest these 5,000 extra houses was Councillor Campbell in this leaflet. Nobody in this group has suggested these houses.

I would suggest that if they want to be constructive, before they write a leaflet and distribute it to every home in Yeadon, they should maybe send the Leader of the Council an email to see what the real plans are around the airport, what the real investment is and to see what his role, sitting on the Board of Leeds City Region, Councillor Wakefield sits on the Board of Leeds City Region with the Chief Exec of Leeds Bradford Airport and they are clearly in discussions about improving the access to the airport, improving the passenger numbers.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: I heard him on the telly.

COUNCILLOR DOWNES: We have got TVs in Yeadon.

COUNCILLOR SOBEL: The Labour Party in Yeadon put out the Leeds Bradford International Airport factsheet, a factsheet rather than a fiction sheet which was put out by the Councillors for the area where we said that for every million extra passengers for the airport we expect to create a thousand additional jobs and that is right. Last year with the support of Leeds City Region and Leeds City Council two new Monarch planes were based at Leeds Bradford Airport which created 200 new jobs for the area. That is the sort of investment we are seeing. We need to try to stick to the facts and work together to improve access to the airport, grow jobs and grow business at the airport and support the people of Leeds and Bradford and the surrounding City Region in employment prospects at the airport. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Golton.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: I do not know where to start on this one. I feel like pouring oil on troubled waters. Councillor Bruce is looking at me with that wry smile to say it had better not turn up on a focus leaflet in Rothwell! *(laughter)* It has not yet.

Lord Mayor, this comes down, I think Councillor Wakefield actually went on about how this was the most unhelpful debate we have had.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: It is from your leaflets.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: I think his defensiveness is a reflection of the fact that he regrets having said what he did, probably in support of a colleague.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Are you against politicians talking about the future?

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: All right then, you were just daft then! *(laughter)*

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: You have not got a future, Stewart.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: You have just mentioned how Manchester Airport has 19 million passengers and you were talking about being visionary and emphasising and saying we should have the same thing in Leeds as well. Well, do you know what? Manchester Airport actually is an airport for the north of England and what we really need is that talk that Tom Riordan was on about, which was about joining up Manchester and Leeds and Liverpool as a proper unified economy into which we can effectively get our traffic to Manchester to take advantage of all the routes that they have got.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Stop talking down Yorkshire.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Leeds Bradford Airport also needs to expand as well but it needs to expand in an organic fashion. It already has relationships with the communities around it, it is already a significant employer. It already has built up relationships with communities in that area which means that they are inclusive and positive towards growth at that airport. What you do not want to do is to move that airport on to the M62 corridor which has just had millions of pounds spent on it expanding its capacity because it is the most congested motorway in England because of all that cross-Pennine transport. You do not want to stick another 16 million passengers trying to use that motorway to access a great big Manchester-sized Leeds Bradford Airport near Wakefield.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: You lack ambition.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: I will tell you what, I certainly do not, as a south Leeds resident, want to have that runway at the end of my house. Call me a NIMBY if you like but I will be joined by around half a million others in that area, I can assure you.

COUNCILLOR J McKENNA: I do not think that many live there, the whole population of Leeds.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: We are quite happy for it to be where it is appreciated, in the north of the city. *(laughter)* *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Wadsworth next.

COUNCILLOR WADSWORTH: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I do not know where Councillor Sobel gets his information from but my residents in Yeadon have got televisions (*laughter*) so they switch it on and they see a picture of Councillor Wakefield out near his back yard...

COUNCILLOR: Have they all got licences as well?

COUNCILLOR WADSWORTH: Yes, they have all got licences as well, yes (*laughter*) telling them that he is thinking about moving the airport down in to the Lower Aire Valley.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: How can I move the airport? Ridiculous.

COUNCILLOR WADSWORTH: He was obviously being visionary in his thinking because he said that he thought it would be done in the next 20, 30 or 40 years so he is obviously not doing it on any of our time on Council. I think we will all have left by that time.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Speak for yourself! (*laughter*)

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: I will be here.

COUNCILLOR WADSWORTH: However, the airport in its present place is very successful. I think everybody bandies figures about and I have got some just slightly different figures. I understand there were 3.3 million passengers passed through the airport in 2013 and that was up 11%. Also, it has routes to 70 destinations and it was awarded the best airport under six million last year.

I understand that there are 2,000 direct jobs related to the airport and 2,000 indirect jobs and that is very important to the wards of Otley and Yeadon and Guiseley and Rawdon. When people see senior Councillors suggesting that the airport is going to move, it is not helpful. They come to us and they say, "When is it going to happen? Am I going to lose my job? Is my business going to go down because I produce sandwiches and 80% of my trade comes from people who are going to the airport?" They think it is going to happen tomorrow. We all know that it is probably not.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: That is because you tell them.

COUNCILLOR WADSWORTH: I also think you just have to look not just what goes on by moving an airport physically, the runway and the terminal buildings...

COUNCILLOR J McKENNA: You cannot move an airport physically.

COUNCILLOR WADSWORTH: ...aeroplanes have to go in the sky (*interruption*)

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: I thought they went on the river!

COUNCILLOR WADSWORTH: I hope I am getting some more time, Lord Mayor. You may mock but if you just look, I sit on the Airport Consultative Committee as Councillor Campbell does...

COUNCILLOR J McKENNA: You are being televised.

COUNCILLOR WADSWORTH: ...and we have it brought to us that the airport was trialling a system, because most aircraft take off and fly to the west to actually go back east in some cases, and they have been trying to trial a system where aircraft can turn out to the east, but that is problematic because a lot of the air space in the east is controlled for military aircraft and they have had an amount of difficulty with that. Moving the airport further east may not actually be possible.

However, we do need to look at infrastructure and we do need to ensure that we get infrastructure in place and the airport knows full well, I am always telling them, they have to be a good neighbour but it does not help them wanting to get infrastructure, it does not help Councillor James Lewis in wanting to get infrastructure into the airport such as tram/train. All the talk about movement does not help any of that along at all and I suggest that all Members of Council get behind keeping the airport where it is and keeping... *(interruption) (Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Richard Lewis.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. If we can have a bit of reality, apart from planes flying in the sky which is absolute reality. Whenever I have discussions with people locally, from other Local Authorities around about the airport, we tend to have that conversation, "It is in the wrong place, it is not good for us in Kirklees, it is not good for us in Calderdale." It is good that we get to this point of actually let us have the proper debate. Is it in the right place? Is it moveable?

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: No.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: I think the reality is – how have we lived without you, Les, it is good to see you back. There is a problem we have. We know that it is constrained by its site but the reality is that you could not move it. In practical terms it is probably undoable and we all have to accept that, but it was worth actually having that debate in the open.

I am not a great fan of Boris Johnson but he is a guy who says, "Here is the big issue, talk about it" and I think in this city we have to talk about the big issues. We are talking about the south bank. We do not say, let us wait till 20 years have passed and then we will decide what happens then. We are looking at what happens there now so we can do the proper planning. I think we should have ambitions as a City Council that we actually look at those big things and say right, let us have the debate and if we come to a conclusion, which I think we pretty quickly have done that it is in the only place that it can be probably for such a foreseeable future that none of us – and perhaps even our sons, daughters, grandkids do not need to worry about – it is there. What do we do to make it work better? How do we get it from its three million-plus passengers up to seven million-plus? What can we do? How do we strategically work for the benefit of the airport?

I have to say, the debates that I have been involved in in this Chamber about the airport have all been very petty, very parochial and not tackled the big issues. They have not been about people's jobs, they have been about little issues that should never really have been talked about here because we are a serious Council and we have to talk about the future of the city and its prosperity.

Let us talk about the rail link, and there are private sector people who are resurrecting that idea and saying it can be done a lot more cheaply. Let us talk seriously and quickly to them, let us do what we can through the Transport Fund, let us see what other measures we can take quickly to ensure that airport is even more successful and gives more jobs to more people in the city. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Anderson.

COUNCILLOR ANDERSON: Lord Mayor, before going on to support the motion here I want to ask Councillor Sobel a point. Were you present when Ed Miliband was in Pudsey shouting that he was going to build thousands and thousands of Council houses in the north of the city? If he was then maybe today we have found out and had it confirmed where they are going to be. Make your mind up. Your Leader says he is going to build thousands of houses in the north of the city.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: We know he was there. We know he was.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: We know he was there.

COUNCILLOR ANDERSON: Which is it? Is he telling the truth or are you telling the truth?

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Barry. Let us get back to the airport.

COUNCILLOR ANDERSON: Why do I totally support this motion here today? Because I think it will provide the catalyst to get the public transport improvements that we need in the north of the city. We need to do what we can about the Horsforth rail link. It is over capacity and there is nothing Northern Rail are doing at the moment to increase the capacity on there. We need to do something about that.

We need to try and get something done about the access strategy to the A660, particularly if we are going to get the number of houses that are planned to come into the area, that plus the increase in patronage at the airport, we have got to get the A660 sorted out and the A65 and routes through to Bradford and into North Yorkshire as well. We have got to have vision, we have got to do something about it so that is why this is important as to what we are doing.

It will also enable us to look at the light rail options but we have got to start getting the investment in now and the uncertainty that was caused by a comment; whatever context it was said it has led to the airport questioning the commitment of some of the Councillors towards their economic future.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: No it has not.

COUNCILLOR ANDERSON: It has, some of them. I am not saying them all, I am saying some of them in terms of what they are doing.

The one thing I would say and I would make an appeal to the airport today is, please work with all the Councillors in the area. I accept that Councillor Downes has an excellent working relationship with them but other Councillors do not have the benefit, so if they could start working with us and working together we might be able to solve their problems, solve the city's problems and everybody wins and I presume that is the reason we are all in here today so that everybody can win, not just little factions all over the place. Working with the airport means we will improve the economy of the city, it will mean access to better air services and if we can get more and better businesses into the city, they can then start going around the world selling their goods, getting the jobs in that the apprenticeships that you are starting to get in the city can all benefit from.

The airport is a success story. It will be a success story if we can get the investment into it now and help it to be successful. I support the motion. Thank you.
(Applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Downes to sum up.

COUNCILLOR DOWNES: Thank you, Lord Mayor. It is always interesting to hear Keith Wakefield stand up and say that the White Paper is the worst White Paper...

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: No, your comments.

COUNCILLOR DOWNES: ...when it is something we have had a good debate about and it was designed to make sure that this Council and all Councillors are behind the future of the airport where it is. That is what this debate is about. There was concern raised by residents and the first I heard about it, Councillor Sobel, was from a resident who rang me up and who watched the TV programme, watched the news that Councillor Wakefield said the line that I said, and they said to me, "Who is this Councillor Wakefield?" *(laughter)*

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: I often say that myself.

COUNCILLOR DOWNES: "What does he know about the airport?" They said, "This is a plan from Wakefield. Councillor Wakefield belongs in Wakefield" and they said "Why don't we get a Councillor Yeadon to run the Council?" I said, "We are ready!" *(interruption)* They said, "Perhaps then Councillor Yeadon would stand up for Yeadon and we would keep the airport as it is." There is your leadership challenge, Lucinda!

That is what my residents were telling me and I always believe in sharing news, good or bad, so that is why we told the residents what the Leader of Council had said so they were left in no uncertainty. We have TV in Yeadon, as Councillor Wadsworth says.

As to the 5,000 jobs, that came out at the Area Committee. I said quite innocently to officers, "Does this jeopardise the relief road, the Horsforth relief road bypass, does this jeopardise that and the business case for it?" The officer turned round and said, "No, because, Councillor, if the airport were to move 5,000 houses would fit on that piece of land and that road is still viable." Brown field first, they said and that, as I said, at that meeting there was a Labour Councillor there who was supporting that type of policy and that is why I felt it necessary to tell the residents of Yeadon what the potential was. *(interruption)*

We are where we are and the whole point about this White Paper – and by the way, just while I have got the chance, Councillor Richard Lewis, actually for the first time in my ten years in the Chamber Councillor Richard Lewis actually spoke a lot of sense.

COUNCILLOR J McKENNA: You have not been listening.

COUNCILLOR DOWNES: This an important debate...

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: That is a bit unfair.

COUNCILLOR DOWNES: ...that we must get behind and show the airport, the people of Leeds, that we have a commitment to a long term future for the airport, so I urge everyone to vote for this and show that the airport is in the right place. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Time for the vote.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Recorded vote, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Recorded vote.

(A recorded vote was held on the White Paper motion)

THE LORD MAYOR: We have the result. We have 85 Councillors present, “Yes” 82, three who abstained and there are no “No” votes. CARRIED.

ITEM 16 – WHITE PAPER MOTION – CHILDREN’S CENTRES

THE LORD MAYOR: Let us move on. White Paper motion on Children’s Centres, let us have a bit of quiet for Councillor Blake.

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. To bring it back, we have heard a great deal today about the appalling circumstances facing families and young children as a direct result of the austerity measures introduced by the Coalition Government. In the aftermath of one of the most cynical budgets ever, it is clear the Government is set to continue its policy of making families with children bear a massive, disproportionate share of these austerity measures.

In Leeds, 32% of working age families have children and they are bearing 51% of the benefits and tax credit cuts. Unlike the myth peddled by Government, 60% of families with children and on benefits have at least one adult in work in the household. A shocking nearly 32,000 children in Leeds live in poverty and in Leeds a recent survey, 73% of their families said they were having difficulty meeting the cost of food and fuel.

Absolute and relative poverty among children and working age adults looks set to increase. The average loss per Leeds household as a result of Welfare Reform is over £1,500.

Through this White Paper we are expressing in our strongest terms possible the profound impact child poverty has on educational attainment, employment prospects, health outcomes and the safeguarding of young people.

Given the overwhelming medical evidence of the importance of the first months and years of a child’s life to their ability to thrive in later life, Leeds City Council is undertaking a major programme of change with key partners in the city to ensure that all children get the best start in life.

Research has demonstrated the toxic mix of poverty and of parental factors is putting more of our youngest children at risk, these being the addictive use of alcohol in drugs, mental health problems, domestic violence, learning difficulties together with poor housing and especially for those with children who have been forced to move schools because of the bedroom tax.

These are all key factors in the high numbers of 0-1 year olds at risk of harm in the city. 87% of babies coming into care are exposed to one or more of these contributory parental factors. All of these are areas that need intensive multi-agency work to help resolve the serious problems.

In Leeds we are demonstrating through our Families First programme and our increased use of family group conferencing that early intervention works, wrapping the right intensive support around the whole family works, changing behaviour,

enabling more children to stay with their natural families and improving their key outcomes for them in the process. How tragic, then, that it is this area of work that the Government has cut £18m worth of money to Leeds, including the Early Intervention Grant. How short-sighted can you be?

At the last Council we anticipated a new approach from Government to tackle child poverty, only for it to collapse at the last minute as they could not agree on a definition of poverty. I ask you.

Lord Mayor, I am asking Council to support our approach so that we can build on all the intensive improvement work we are doing in early years and primary schools to deal with the appalling inadequate standards we inherited back in 2010. Too many children are arriving at school unready and unable to learn.

I move the White Paper, Lord Mayor, thank you. *(Applause)*

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

COUNCILLOR HARINGTON: I formally second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Bentley to move an amendment.

COUNCILLOR S BENTLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. We know that young children need the best start in life and Children's Centres provide them with that opportunity, to learn through play, develop their emotional, social and talking skills as well as learning how to share and be together which lead to improved educational achievements, so it makes financial sense to invest in good quality Children's Centre and child care.

I acknowledge the Labour administration retention of the 57 Children's Centres across Leeds but I am very disappointed to note that it has proposed an increase of 9% in nursery fees at Council Children's Centres. This is especially disappointing when one in four unemployed parents in Leeds want to work but cannot because of the high childcare costs.

Also you have increased the Council Tax by 1.99% increase. This is at a time when the Labour Party across the country are saying that they want to help people with the cost of living. What hypocrisy.

In contrast, the Lib Dems and Coalition Government understand this and the costs of providing good quality childcare by introducing free nursery education to three and four year olds and extending that to disadvantaged two year olds. From autumn 2015 the tax free childcare scheme will allow eligible parents with children under twelve to save up to £2,000 per year which will also help to reduce their childcare costs.

Following the success of the Pupil Premium helping disadvantaged school children to achieve better results, the Lib Dems have introduced an Early Years Premium for disadvantaged three and four year olds. This has been endorsed by the CBI and the Child Poverty Action Group.

The Government's plans to increase the number of Health Visitors will be vital to improving good health in the development of children in early life and if Labour is really serious about reducing health inequalities, please seriously consider the Lib Dems, what Councillor Wakefield referred to as the wackiest amendment, to supply vitamin supplements for children up to four years. This was based on very good evidence, Councillor Wakefield, from the UK Chief Medical Officer, Dame Sally

Davies. It was her recommendation as 40% of children in this country have a Vitamin D deficiency, which causes rickets, and one child died from rickets quite recently. Ask your Director of Public Health if he thinks it is a wacky idea.

The Government also recognises the value of early intervention through its successful Troubled Families Scheme, which helps our most vulnerable families to change their lives in a positive way and it would, on occasion, be gracious of the Opposition to acknowledge that it is this Government funding outlined in these initiatives that enables it to do this crucial and, I must say, successful work in Leeds yet, despite the fact the Children's Centres have been in operation since 2004 and all these Government initiatives aimed at reducing educational inequalities, Leeds has the widest achievement gap in the country – bottom of the table – resulting in many of our young children not being school ready by the age of five. This is an area that must be improved to reduce inequalities and give our children the best start at school and for their future opportunities.

If we are really serious about wanting to be a child friendly city, ensure that every child will have the best start in life and reduce health inequalities, then we need to support families wherever we can and not increase their financial burdens and you can act now by giving them vitamin supplements. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Campbell.

COUNCILLOR CAMPBELL: I formally second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lamb to move a second amendment.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: Thank you, Lord Mayor. As it is your final meeting, before I turn to the amendment and as a lifelong Everton fan, and noticing that the Deputy Chief Executive is still here and I can see hiding at the back and Councillor Walshaw is still here, I have to say your boys took one hell of a beating! *(laughter)*

Anyway, turning to the amendment, I move this amendment. I have to say, Councillor Blake, this is one of the more disappointing White Papers you have put down. It is a bit like a continuation of the longest running Leadership hustings in history this afternoon, and I have to say Councillor Gruen has won hands down today. At least while we try to find some common ground on the first White Paper - because Councillor Gruen did approach our Group to see if consensus could be found and you have to respect when it cannot be found – Councillor Blake did not approach anybody to see if they would like to support her White Paper and I do not believe for a second there is a Councillor in this Chamber who does not believe that the children of this city deserve the best possible start in life. We could have found some common ground. There are things that we all agree on.

I applaud this administration's commitment to the city's Children's Centres. If anyone tried to take the ones that we have fought so hard for in our ward we would have fought tooth and nail to keep all of them and, indeed, right now we are working hard with them to try and make sure they have got a secure and sustainable future.

Lord Mayor, it is really disappointing that she could not come and talk to us. When the Government took the £12m Early Intervention Grant away, Councillor Carter signed a letter of support for the way it was done and it is another example of Government of all colours taking money away that they have promised and not giving Councils the proper opportunity to plan and prepare for the future. It was an appalling way to take that money away. We supported you at that time and, again, we could have found a way to work together and had a motion that would have had this Council united trying to do the best for the children in this city.

All we have heard from Councillor Blake is going back to the future. It is not as if under the last Government children and young people were living in some wild Utopia where everything was fine, everything was rosy in the garden and they were achieving great outcomes – they were not. The approach that the last Government took did not work, the gap between richest and poorest got wider under the last Labour Government.

COUNCILLOR: What about yours?

COUNCILLOR LAMB: She referred to the Budget. Actually, I thought it was a really good Budget. One thing that has happened under this Government is the richest are paying a much bigger share of the burden of tax than the poorest and the reason I understand that the Exchequer decided to introduce a twelve-sided coin was, in the unlikely event that Labour get elected, it is one side for every time they have tried to spend each pound that they have got!

Lord Mayor, there are lots of things in this paper. We have listed a number of things that this Government has done. There are a whole series of measures which, taken together, show that this Government has put far, far more money and resource into actually trying to get to the root causes of these problems than the last Government ever did and it is starting to work. (*interruption*)

By Councillor Blake's own admission, the approach this Government is taking is working. She refers to what they call the Families First Agenda. That is, by any other name, the Troubled Families Agenda of this Government. They did not like the name but they liked taking and spending the money and by our admission and our own White Paper, it is a success.

Lord Mayor, one thing you will never hear from Councillor Blake is to blame everybody else for the things that she does not think she can tackle. On this occasion she has waited till literally things cannot get any worse, till we are 152nd out of 152 Local Authorities. Things literally cannot get any worse and all she has is to blame the Government. There is plenty of resource, there is more money and resource going into the agenda than under the last Government. Things are starting to work and if she does not think she has got the ability to turn things round and actually improve things for children and young people in this city, she should step aside because there are plenty of people in this Chamber who could even on our own side, and we would all be ready to stand and work together in the best interests of the children and young people in our city. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Latty to second.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: I formally second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Mulherin to comment.

COUNCILLOR MULHERIN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. The best start in life is not only an ambition for the Children's Trust Board and Children's Services in Leeds but also for the city's cross-sector Health and Wellbeing Board.

Detailed understanding of the development that occurs during pregnancy and the first years of life has increased enormously over the last ten years and the evidence is now clear the development in the womb and the first three years are of critical importance to the future life chances of a child.

A report release by the Sutton Trust last week concluded that there was overwhelming evidence of the importance of this early period and it becomes even more important when added to other social determinants of health, such as poverty, education and housing. Getting it right at the start of life is a crucial element in tackling health inequalities overall.

As a result of modern brain and body scanning technologies we now have physical evidence that shows that if an expectant mum is not well nourished or is stressed throughout her pregnancy, it will have an adverse effect on the physical and mental development of her baby and increase the likelihood of many diseases later in life. Research also indicates the first three years of life are also the most cost-effective time to support families. Studies carried out on social return on investment show that in even the most conservative estimates, for every pound spent on preventative care in the early years, it results in a wider £1.37 benefit cost benefit with estimates in some cases being as high as £9.20 return for every pound invested, and that is savings down the line in terms of education, in terms of the criminal justice system, in terms of employment and all of the other factors that we are all concerned about tackling across the city.

As we are all aware, the Council is committed to reducing the number of children taken into Local Authority care. Currently there are a high proportion of under fives and babies under one being taken into our care and it is our priority to address this as a Council. Early intervention and identification of issues during and after pregnancy is crucial to this ambition.

One of the many strands of Public Health work that is currently taking place across the city on the Best Start agenda is around encouraging breast feeding. Last week I opened a fantastic Food for Life event which highlighted some startling statistics on the benefits this brings. Not only does it create a vital bond between mother and baby, there is also evidence that it contributes to healthy brain development and a reduced risk of infections, allergies, sudden infant death and diabetes, as well as that vital attachment between parent and child.

Public Health interventions have seen a massive rise in the initiation and maintenance of breast feeding rates in the city and the benefits that brings to babies across the city. Early Start teams working from our Children's Centres have played an important role in this and I am proud that the Council has kept all 57 Children's Centres open whilst other Local Authorities up and down the country have taken the decision to close theirs in the face of unprecedented Government funding cuts.

Another area where we need to maintain investment and build on it is the Family Nurse Partnership which provides intensive support to first time teenage mums throughout the first two years of their child's life. This has been shown to have massive benefits but can currently reach just 20% of eligible teenage mums. We need to do more. To be able to do more, we need to invest more resources in staff. Lord Mayor, I will wind up. Having adequate resources to build on these interventions will make the difference we need. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Mulherin. Councillor Golton.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I think that was a really good speech by Councillor Mulherin because the introduction to it was a selling point for the Liberal Democrat policy for bringing in childhood vitamins, talking about how the first three years of life are the most important. *(interruption)*

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: You lost it in Budget debate.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: We might have lost the Budget debate but, do you know what is funny, Keith, is that time after time whenever you vote against what we propose here it actually ends up being implemented by you, so please excuse me if we are trying time and again.

In fact, I would put a challenge down to either the Health and Wellbeing Board or to Councillor Judith Blake to actually come back with a paper to have people look at it from our health partners and say would vitamins make a difference.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: What a load of rubbish. *(laughter)*

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Then we will get rid of this debate once and for all.

The second thing I will point to is, I wholeheartedly agree with Councillor Lamb. I am getting tired of hearing about massive Government cuts. We know this Council has got a very tight budget and it is unprecedented but, do you know what, in the area of Children's Services the budget has gone up year on year on year on year, so compared to a lot of the departments that sit round this debating Chamber you are awash with money and what you need to do, you need to spend it a little bit better sometimes. Maybe, if you had not have spent £12m on private sector foster carers for three years when we were telling you to actually pay your own foster carers a decent wage so they would not all go away to a private operator, then you might have actually saved millions of pounds of money that you could have invested in children's structures.

One thing that really gets me about this as well is, this White Paper, are we challenging ourselves in this White Paper? No, we are not. The only thing that the Labour Party is putting down here is all about going to Government. Do you know what they are going to do? Do you know what actually they are going to do? They are going to write a letter. Do you know what they were going to do in their other White Paper motion? They were going to write a letter. Do you know what, that is real leadership. There is not one point in here that says what we are going to do, what we are going to do with our money, what we are going to do different. All it actually says is, "Dear Government, please give us some more money because our children out there deserve investment." Well, they do but they need you to invest it wisely and they need you to do it with a bit more brains and a little less passion. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Robinson.

COUNCILLOR ROBINSON: Hard to follow you, Stewart, when you say something like that! There can be no doubt of the crucial development in early years and there are children and there are children in this city who are going to primary school without the basic knowledge of language, of being able to speak properly, knowing social and play skills and even some children not understanding basic toilet training who are going to school. I do not doubt that this issue is incredibly important.

I have to question slightly why the White Paper is being brought forward, though. You must know as an administration that we are going to throw this 152 out of 152 statistic at you. It is a bit like if you have got a mother-in-law who has got one eye in the middle of her head – you do not let her live in the living room, not where anyone can see it. You do not bring a White Paper forward on this. I am a bit surprised as to why you have done it.

However, the statistics are pretty damning when you look at them. Ranked 129 out of 152 for an average point score at Key Stage 1 for reading and writing and maths; 144 out of 152 for an average point score in Key Stage 1 for maths. They are

pretty terrible statistics. I question slightly why it is being brought forward in this way because, as Stewart said, it is about writing a letter to Government, it is not about leadership, it is not about saying a little bit more about what this administration can do.

If I am honest, I get frustrated at all sides in this Council about “Let us write to Government and do something” as opposed to saying what we should do about doing things quite often. We say that in every White Paper it seems every week.

I do wonder if we have been dragged to the bottom and you lot remember “Things can only get better” and that must be where we are, being 152 out of 152. Keith is looking a little bit quizzical.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: I am too young.

COUNCILLOR ROBINSON: 1997 it was an election campaign, you might have done rather well.

We also hear from Councillor Blake about Free Schools as well and I think it comes to a situation where it is not allowing other ideas to enter the debate for fear that they might be a good idea that you cannot steal. Free Schools make the headlines every time they get into trouble; however, there are 350 Local Authority schools that are judged inadequate across the country and they make no headlines. That actually is a crime, that is something that is going wrong in this country.

If we look a little bit further ahead, our students and our kids in the city are in a race not just internationally but nationally and it seems that we are making them start that 100 metre race about ten metres behind the starting line. We are giving them the worst start in life. What we need to do is focus far more on the Pupil Premium, which is something that has been introduced, about using it well. There are kids that are not claiming free school meals in this city – I would like to see a little bit more about the administration on that because if they are not claiming free school meals, and they will be doing it in every single ward in this city, you cannot access the Pupil Premium, the schools cannot get their funding from the National Government and they cannot get the results in schools. That is what we need to see a little bit more about rather than just writing off letters.

I hope that the administration can bring this forward, do a little bit more about tackling free school meals, more on actually seeing what we can get out of the best nursery care in the city, learning from the best providers nationally and actually trying to do a little bit more for our children. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dowson.

COUNCILLOR DOWSON: Right, now I have got to follow a one-eyed mother-in-law joke – very good!

I would like to support Councillor Blake in her White Paper on child poverty - not vitamins, and we will come back to that – by drawing attention to this Government’s disastrous record with child poverty.

Last Wednesday the Chancellor delivered a budget which he proudly stated was for the makers, the doers and the savers. I find it remarkable that he can stand in front of our country and so publicly ignore the most vulnerable citizens. When it comes to Government’s progress tackling child poverty, George Osborne has very little to be proud of. It appears the Government is far more concerned with appealing

to their core vote and dealing with UKIP than working to better the lives of the next generation. They should be ashamed of their actions.

Their Welfare Reforms are making both absolute and relative poverty, as we have heard before, worse.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: Not true.

COUNCILLOR DOWSON: Their £20b of cuts in benefits are set to increase the number of children in poverty by 900,000 by 2020.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: Not true.

COUNCILLOR DOWSON: 900,000 more children worrying where their next meal is coming from; 900,000 more children living in cold, sub-standard housing; 900,000 more children with a 10% higher risk of infant mortality; 900,000 at greater risk of under-performing at every stage in education. Only 25% of young people in the most deprived areas achieve five or more GCSEs at A* to C compared with 68% in the least deprived.

Just to clear up any misconceptions about Leeds, 80% of Leeds' schools are rated good or outstanding compared with only 77% nationally. Child poverty is a ticking time bomb with victims more likely to suffer from ill health, unemployment, homelessness, drug and alcohol abuse, offending and abusive relationships. The largest groups of children living in poverty are living in working households, which is a shame. These are children with hardworking parents struggling to make ends meet in an economy which favours low paid, low skilled and unstable jobs.

20% of households living in poverty have at least one parent with a degree level qualification and if the Government is claiming to support the doers, why are they not supporting those families?

The working people of this country want to put food on the table, give their children and happy and a healthy future. The Government simply does not seem to understand this and clearly thinks that the working class can be pacified with cheap ploys about beer and bingo. The Government should be able and be accountable for things which are their responsibility – low wages, cuts to child benefits and tax credits and huge cuts in services. More needs to be done to ensure that the future of Britain is not scarred by the actions of this Government. The last time that the Tories were in power child poverty rose from 9% to 34%. It has been clear that we cannot trust the Conservatives with the most innocent and vulnerable members of our society.

Unfortunately for the Eton Mess in Downing Street, this Council will not be pacified and this White Paper demonstrates our commitment to protecting our children is unwavering. *(interruption)* *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: You are on Fergie time!

THE LORD MAYOR: Can I move on to Councillor Blake to do the summing up then, please. Thank you

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: I think you have all heard today exactly why as a Labour Group, as a Labour administration, we have to keep coming back again and again and again to this agenda. They do not understand...

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: You cannot get it right, that is why.

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: ...it is so clear they do not understand the real problems and pressures that families in this city are facing on a daily basis.
(Applause)

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Rubbish. Rubbish.

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: I think it is very interesting, I am sure Councillor Golton will be going out and putting "Vote for me, vote for vitamins" on his leaflet, but again I am sure we are reassured from today that it will be the last leaflet that he puts out in Rothwell as a result.

For a start, all of you have completely missed the point of what we are talking about. We are talking about mothers in pregnancy, about babies in the womb, about the earliest years and hours and minutes of a child's life. You have given us a list of initiatives of working with older children. Is it not ironic you go on and on and on about the Pupil Premium, so today from Ofsted we have the news that E-ACT has been forced to come out of sponsoring two of our schools, has been top slicing their Pupil Premium and it is very clear that none of that top slice has been going to those children to whom it was intended to improve their live qualities.

Going on about position in here, do you all suppose that Councillor Lamb might be putting his hand up for going to Deputy when Councillor Procter gets elected as an MEP in the May elections? (*interruption*) What do you think?

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: She is obviously going to vote for me! That is one vote in the bag!

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: We all are.

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: I tell you what we are laying out before you is what we want from Government and it is National Government, it is a recognition that the investment to make a difference to the young people and the lives of children in our city is to shift the resource from where it is going into the earliest years of life. You have not acknowledged that at all. That is what we are working for.

What we are doing in this city is providing the evidence that this works. Through the intensive work that we are doing with families we are changing around the lives. At the annual Apprenticeships Award we had a young person who had had intensive work with the family and is now in work. It is those sorts of initiatives that we are evidencing and taking to Government on a regular basis to show them what they should be doing.

We are sick and tired of your tired response to this important area of work and I ask all of you to get behind the work that we are doing in Leeds, shout about it, demonstrate on a national platform...

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Red light, Lord Mayor, red light.

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: ...and let us go forward into the election. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you for that.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Keith, you are not retiring, are you? (*laughter*) I could not put up with that for long.

THE LORD MAYOR: Let us try and get these done in an orderly fashion.

The first amendment in the name of Councillor Bentley. *(A vote was taken)* I think that amendment falls. LOST.

The second amendment in the name of Councillor Lamb. *(A vote was taken)* That one fails. LOST.

All those in favour of the motion by Councillor Blake? *(A vote was taken)* CARRIED. That becomes the substantive motion.

That, ladies and gentlemen, at precisely half-seven, is the end of today's Council. Thank you for attending.

(The meeting closed at 7.30pm)