

LEEDS CITY COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

Held on

Wednesday, 12th November 2014

At

THE COUNCIL CHAMBER,
CIVIC HALL,
LEEDS

In the Chair:

THE LORD MAYOR
(COUNCILLOR D CONGREVE)

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, 12th NOVEMBER 2014

THE LORD MAYOR: We now move on to the Council meeting. The Honorary Aldermen can have the option of staying or they may have other business but I am afraid Members of Council do not have this option.

Can I ask that all mobile phones are switched to silent and should a mobile phone ring whilst the Council is in session, then I would expect a donation of £25 to my charity. It goes up each meeting! I do recall hearing one going off at the last meeting and I do not believe I got a contribution to my charity.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: It was mine. You will have, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: At least I have found out who it was!

Can I remind Members that the meeting is to be Webcast and also that I do understand that some of my supporters are selling lanyards to raise funds for my charity and I do hope to see a few of you wearing them this afternoon.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

THE LORD MAYOR: Just to move on to announcements, I am given to understand that Councillor Neil Walshaw has been blessed with a baby son, named Quinn.
(*Applause*)

I am sure Members of Council will join in congratulating Richard Mills on his retirement. In 1968 Richard commenced work in the Health Department as a junior clerk. He then moved to Aireborough Council working as an admin clerk to Mr Rawnsley. After reorganisation in 1974, Richard was promoted to Committee Clerk and in 1986 became Members Services Officer, in a role he had for 30 years, and I am sure many of us recall him in that role. Richard was promoted to Committee Services Manager, which included Members Services and, in 2001, he was appointed as a Principal Scrutiny Adviser until his retirement this year.

I would also like to congratulate our sportsperson on the Council, Councillor Ryk Downes, who carried out his further fundraising efforts with a gruelling week long trek in Africa and climbed to the summit of Mount Kilimanjaro on his 50th birthday, which was 26th September. This was in an effort to raise awareness and funding for the Lily Foundation. (*Applause*) Well done.

I have also received a letter of thanks from Sir Rodney Walker, Chairman of TdF Hub 2014 Ltd, and I will read that letter to Members;

“Dear Lord Mayor,

I was pleased to have the opportunity last Friday to briefly discuss how those of us who at the request of Government and who had served on the Committee responsible for organising the Tour de France Grand Départ in July, would like to place on record our thanks and appreciation for the support we received from Leeds City Council.

Accordingly, I would be grateful if you would convey to Members of the Council my own appreciation and that of the Chief Executive for the support we received from the Council Leader, Chief Executive, Finance Director, together with a considerable number of other employees of the Council who were outstanding in their contribution.

Thanks to the leadership shown by the Council from the time of its support to Welcome to Yorkshire in underwriting their bid to staging the event, the support has been outstanding. The 2.8 million people who came out to support and enjoy the event and the countless millions who watched on television will remember those remarkable two days in July.

You can be proud of the part Leeds City Council played in the success. Thank you”

and that is signed by Sir Rodney Walker. On behalf of Members of Council, I will send a letter of response.

ITEM 1 – MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS HELD 10th SEPTEMBER 2014

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we now move to the Minutes? Before I ask for the Minutes to be moved, is Councillor Nash present? I will just let Members know that Councillor Nash broke her shoulder and I advised her if she was not well she may have leave of Council not to attend. Councillor Selby, you will be standing in.

COUNCILLOR SELBY: Yes. Lord Mayor, I move the Minutes of the 10th September to be accepted.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: I second that, Lord Mayor.

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

ITEM 2 – DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 2, Declarations of Interest. Have any Members any disclosable pecuniary interests to declare? That is none.

ITEM 3 - COMMUNICATIONS

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we move on to Item 3, Communications. Chief Executive.

THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Just two to report in response to the White Paper motions. One, from the Right Honourable Greg Clark, Minister for Universities, Science and Cities on the Growth Deal, which has been circulated to Members; secondly, on Police and Crime Commissioners, from the Right Honourable Mike Penning, Minister of State for Policing, Criminal Justice and Victims.

ITEM 4 - DEPUTATIONS

THE LORD MAYOR: We now move to Item 4, Deputations. Chief Executive.

THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE: There are four Deputations, Lord Mayor: one, Grove Lane Residents regarding traffic issues on Grove Lane; West Riding Ramblers' Association regarding the Walk Leeds Festival; South Leeds Delegation regarding the Trolley Bus Scheme and the route in South Leeds; and finally North West Leeds Transport Forum regarding NGT.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Selby.

COUNCILLOR SELBY: I move that all deputations be received.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: I second that, Lord Mayor.

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

DEPUTATION ONE – GROVE LANE RESIDENTS REGARDING TRAFFIC ISSUES ON GROVE LANE

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

MS A DUNMOLE: Hello, my Lord Mayor and fellow Councillors. My name is Amy Dunmole and this is Harriet Bowe and we are both residents of Grove Lane in Headingley. We represent Grove Lane residents.

Grove Lane is a busy residential road that passes between Meanwood and Headingley. We are here to request action is taken to reduce the incidents of speeding, dangerous driving and accidents. We have become increasingly concerned about the number of accidents we see on our road. Over eight weeks in the summer there were five accidents. In four of these accidents, cars crossed the pavement damaging walls, fencing and street furniture. Had pedestrians been present at the time, fatality or injury would have been highly likely. We believe that speed was a major factor in these accidents. There have also been several near misses where cars have mounted the pavement close to pedestrians and have gone over the zebra crossing when pedestrians have been trying to cross.

The accidents concern us all and we believe indicate a need for road safety measures.

In addition to the accidents police have been carrying out speed operations in response to residents complaints. The police share our concerns and find a large number of motorists are traveling over 30 miles an hour.

In January this year, 42 cars in just one hour were clocked going over 35 miles an hour. Police have also observed overtaking and other dangerous driving. Grove Lane is a long, wide and unrestricted road and it appears very easy for motorists to reach 40

miles an hour; it is only a 30 mph road. Many motorists stopped by the police believed the road was actually a 40 mph road.

The road crosses through Meanwood Valley Trail. At this point there is no safe or supported crossing, leaving pedestrians, wheelchair users and cyclists waiting long periods of time to cross safely. Parking restrictions around Shire Oak School mean that parents park on Grove Lane and Grove Road and the surrounding roads. The parents and children often have to cross Grove Lane and drivers fail to stop at the only pedestrian crossing. We feel that families should be able to walk their children safely to school.

As I am sure you are aware, the risk of death is four times higher when a pedestrian is hit at 40 mph rather than 30 mph. The vast proportion of fatal and serious injuries occur on 30 mph roads. This has led to a recent Public Health England document suggesting that these roads are targeted to reduce unintentional injury in young people. The higher the speed, the higher the injury rate and risk of mortality. The difference of just a few miles an hour can mean the difference between life and death.

We urge you to consider our request for action and the suggested solutions detailed here. We would like to see road markings and signs encouraging motorists to slow down when they come into the area so that they are aware it is residential. We would like to see improved and increased numbers of pedestrian crossings along Grove Lane and Shaw Lane, in particular at the Meanwood Valley Trail. We would like to see cycle paths and road markings to enable safe cycling, in particular encouraging cyclists down to the Meanwood Valley Trail.

We would like to see a 20 mph speed limit implemented and enforced on the part of Grove Lane closest to Shire Oak School, plus on Grove Road, and this would be to protect families and children walking to school. We would also like to see safety measures or a review of the Grove Lane/Grove Road junction where the majority of accidents have occurred.

We would like to see a speed camera or speed indication device to raise drivers' awareness of their speed and permanently deter speeding.

We would also like to draw your attention to Lidgett Lane Leeds 8, Victoria Road Leeds 6, Weetwood Lane Leeds 6, where road safety measures appear to have been successfully implemented.

The road is split across two Council wards and we ask that this boundary does not interfere with the management of the situation. We also request solutions to be area wide so not pushing the problem from one place to another. We want to walk, cycle and drive safely in our local community and we ask that you address this issue as a matter of priority. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Selby

COUNCILLOR SELBY: Lord Mayor, I move that the matter be referred to the Director of City Development for consideration in consultation with the relevant Executive Member and the Community Committee Chair.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: I will second that, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: I now call for the vote. (*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. (*Applause*)

DEPUTATION TWO – WEST RIDING RAMBLERS’ ASSOCIATION
REGARDING THE WALK LEEDS FESTIVAL

THE LORD MAYOR: This is the Deputation from the West Riding Ramblers’ Association.

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

MR M BENNETT: My Lord Mayor and fellow Councillors, I am Martin Bennett, I am Leeds Chair of the Leeds Group; this is Mike Church, who is the Chair of the West Riding area; this is Keith Wadd, who is the Vice-Chair of the West Riding area; this is Margaret Reeve, who is on the Social and Rambles Committee; and this is Rita Jessop, who is on the Leeds Group as a member.

We have found a cure that will improve the health of Leeds. It will lower blood pressure, reduce coronary heart disease and strokes, it will help manage weight, reduce the risk of Type 2 diabetes and cancers, as well as improve flexibility and strength of joints, muscles and bones. The cure is not just good for physical health, it will improve mood, reduce anxiety, aid sleep and improve self-image. What can this cure be? The simple act of walking.

Inactivity is a key factor in the growth of obesity in our country. 61% of English adults and 30% of children are overweight or obese. Inactivity shortens lives and could be costing the economy up to £10bn a year in healthcare, premature deaths and sickness absence. Going for a walk is good for you.

Walking is free and available to almost everyone. There is no need for special equipment or to join a gym. It provides opportunity and accessibility to get out and exercise in the fresh air. It is something you can do from your door.

Leeds has an incredible 899 kilometres of Rights of Way, more than a 1,000 footpaths and wonderful assets in its parks and green spaces. Whether it is the glorious countryside around Leeds or the more urban environment, there are city areas, open air treasures waiting to be shared and used by all. Walking helps get to know and discover both the local area and make connections further afield.

Tourism can be boosted by showing visitors that Leeds is more than just a great urban city. Getting people out into the countryside helps sustain cafes, shops, pubs and communities.

The West Riding Ramblers’ Association is holding an eight day walking festival from May 31st 2015. We have called it WalkLeeds. The event will start with an opening ceremony in Roundhay Park. There is a walk for everyone, including families,

around Waterloo Lake and a longer walk later in the day. There are walks all week within the Leeds city boundary stretching from Menston to Fairburn Ings and from Wetherby to Woodkirk. There are walks from my own town of Pudsey along hidden paths to the wonderful open countryside. A walk has been planned for each morning, afternoon and evening along with a section every day of the 62 mile Leeds Country Way. The walks will be free of charge and led by experienced walk leaders. We are hoping that Walking for Health and other walking groups will join us, along with organisations interested in thematic aspects such as history or architecture. For us the festival is a celebration of walking.

There is an opportunity to promote the WalkLeeds festival to visitors as well as residents of Leeds to showcase our great parks and countryside and improve everyone's health, wellbeing and appreciation of our green spaces.

We would like to invite Leeds City Council to join us for the festival, and we ask that Councillors support the WalkLeeds week and consider ways and ideas to best promote and achieve the Council's aims and policies for health, for wellbeing and the natural environment. With a small amount of support from Leeds City Council, together we can achieve a huge benefit for the people of Leeds. Walking works. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Selby

COUNCILLOR SELBY: Lord Mayor, I move that the matter be referred to the Director of Public Health for consideration in consultation with the relevant Executive Member.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: I second that, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: I now call for the vote. *(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. *(Applause)*

DEPUTATION THREE – SOUTH LEEDS DELEGATION REGARDING THE TROLLEY BUS SCHEME AND THE ROUTE IN SOUTH LEEDS

THE LORD MAYOR: This is the Deputation is the South Leeds Delegation regarding the Trolley Bus Scheme and the route in South Leeds.

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

MR M FITZSIMMONS: Good afternoon, Lord Mayor and fellow Councillors. My name is Martin Fitzsimmons, I live in the Belle Isle area but did live in Hunslet for over 30 years. My colleague is Deborah Fyne. Deborah lives in the Whitfields opposite a place that I am sure some people might have spent many a happy hour, opposite the Garden Gate pub.

Am I all right, Lord Mayor, to do the speech now?

Lord Mayor, fellow Councillors, it is a fact that the consultations on the trolleybus in Leeds keeps repeatedly coming up as being extremely bad. This has come up time and time again. I have been to the Inquiry, the Inquiry has gone on 72 days, I have been there 68 days. The business case presented by NGT is an extremely weak case in all parts you take it on the business and it does not make. Let me give you an example.

The trolley bus was decided on the expense was 2009. The trolley bus was proposed a starting date was 2013. The price then for starting in 2013 was £250m. It is accepted that the earliest trolley bus starting date is going to be 2018. Whenever you are presenting a business case in those days, they would have presented a business case best for them. What NGT has actually us to believe is that the price has not changed from 2015 to 2018. The price is still the same.

Whenever you actually look at the business case, from 2012 to 2014 it has actually gone up in them two years by 12%. That is from the case that they actually submitted to the Department has actually risen the last two years by 12% and we still have another minimum of four years to go before the trolley bus starts. Certainly a lot of people I have talked to that are in this room today will tell you unofficially, and it is accepted as a fairly known fact, that at the moment the bill for trolley bus is estimated to be the very minimum of £500m.

Can I just draw to the attention of people in this room that the Government has actually said the maximum grant that they are going to give, afterwards the rest has to be made up by the people here, but after eight years NGT – a maximum of eight years, it could be as little as six – NGT walks away with no financial responsibility. The financial responsibility lies with the Councils here that are going to be and the ratepayers and that are going to be picking up the bill after eight years.

There is a lot of ails in Leeds, whenever I talk to people about the trolleybus, about the implications of the trolley bus and what it means. There is a lot of people are kept in the dark and I am convinced that there is people in this room, including senior people, that have not been told the facts.

Let me take the Whitfields. In the Whitfields which, the Whitfields, I know the name that comes out that was mentioned here loads and loads of times was the Whitfields actually arisen from the old Leek Street flats. The Whitfields is a housing estate that has been there...

THE LORD MAYOR: Could I ask you to wind up, please? Finish your...

MR M FITZSIMMONS: ...35 years. Can I just say...

MS D FYNE: sorry, because he cannot read it he is having to try and remember it.

MR M FITZSIMMONS: Can I just turn round and say, there has been no consultation with the people in the Whitfields and one of the most important things that unfortunately I did not get in was park and ride in Stourton. Ladies and gentlemen, there is a serious health problem and it is actually accepted by Mott

MacDonald that there is and that it will cost a hell of a lot of money and they might never be able to have park and ride there.

There has been a precinct there for 35 years, you have got the school, you have got the children - you have got school, you have got the children – and sooner or later we are going to finish up with some child and it will be seriously injured or killed. We have the people there, residents are not going to have parking facilities, their parking facilities are going to be, all going to be lost.

You have a pub that is an historical building, Grade II. Buses are going to go completely outside it. Every three minutes you are going to have a trolley bus going outside it. They already have structural problems at the moment; what it is going to be like whenever there is a trolley bus every three minutes.

THE LORD MAYOR: Could you please wind up?

MR M FITZSIMMONS: All right. Can I just turn round and say, please, before you press your buttons will you please consider it and consider you people. Do not leave them with a debt of God only knows how many hundreds of millions.

Lord Mayor, can I thank you; can I thank you, fellow Councillors, for listening to me. Thank you all very much. Thank you. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Selby

COUNCILLOR SELBY: Lord Mayor, I move that the matter be referred to the Director of City Development for consideration in consultation with the relevant Executive Member.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: I second that, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: I now call for the vote. (*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. (*Applause*)

DEPUTATION FOUR – NORTH WEST LEEDS TRANSPORT FORUM REGARDING NGT

THE LORD MAYOR: This is the North West Leeds Transport Forum regarding NGT.

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

MR M THOMAS: My Lord Mayor and fellow Councillors, my name is Martyn Thomas and I am co-Chair of the North West Leeds Transport Forum. To my right is Helen Pickering, from the Churchwood and Drummonds Residents' Association; to my left the Emeritus Professor of Transport Studies at Leeds University, Peter

Bonsall; and Chris Longley, who is a regional member of the Committee of the Federation of Small Businesses.

I am presenting to you on behalf of the North West Leeds Transport Forum - a non-political group of seven Residents' Associations from North Hyde Park northwards along the A660 Otley Road. The views we express today are also strongly endorsed by the Federation of Small Businesses.

We do embrace the principles of the draft Core Strategy, except the references to NGT, the trolleybus scheme, which we believe to be inappropriate and unnecessary.

The facts which we put in front of you today are drawn from evidence and testimony presented by the Promoters at the recent Public Inquiry. It is all in the public domain but we fear that you may not be fully aware of it.

The Core Strategy objectives are admirable and we support them, but we contend that the Council ought to preserve flexibility in terms of implementation, especially so in the context of the likelihood of new devolved powers and the possibility of bus contractual changes which perhaps will be discussed later. NGT is inconsistent with the objectives of the Core Strategy in at least the following respects:

Metro's own forecasts show that introduction of NGT would result in increased car miles, increased emissions and increased road casualties – all contrary to Core Strategy objectives.

Metro's own forecast shows that introduction of NGT would result in increased car miles, increased emissions and increased road casualties, all contrary to the Core Strategy.

Metro's own documents indicate that NGT would lead to reduced public transport frequencies at any given stop along the northern route, thus frequencies in parts of Cookridge and Tinsall would actually fall below the Council's own accessibility standard.

Metro's own documents indicate that NGT would lead to increased door-to-door journey times for many journeys - Victoria Gate, Merrion Centre, the market, the Bus Station, St James Hospital and so on.

Leeds needs a public transport system that will persuade people to switch from using their cars but Metro's own documents show that NGT would result in fewer public transport seats per hour two thirds of NGT passengers would have to stand when the trolleybus is at capacity. Two thirds. This, together with the reduced frequency from any given stop, and the increased door-to-door journey times, will barely persuade people to switch from using their car.

Metro's own documents indicate that NGT would lead to reduced use of active modes (cycling and walking) – which is contrary to Core Strategy objectives – and they show that NGT would result in a greater reduction in cycling and walking trips than in car trips.

Forecasts of NGT revenue are clearly flawed and based upon very dubious assumptions by Metro's consultants. Their studies had shown that people would be

prepared to pay less to travel on a trolley bus than on a bus, but their revenue forecasts assumed the exact opposite.

Their prediction of demand for Park and Ride is made on the assumption that people would use Park and Ride, P & R even if the journey took an hour longer than it would have done if they had parked in the city centre.

The consultants have not even tested the consequences that serious and sustained competition from bus operators would have on NGT revenues.

There is a very serious risk that revenues would not cover the interest on the debt that our City would need to take on.

The much-quoted prediction that NGT will result in up to 4000 new jobs...

THE LORD MAYOR: Could you wind up, please? Could you proceed to winding up, please?

MR M THOMAS: Yes, I will. The scheme is not popular and we have submitted a number of amendments to you which we believe should be made to the Core Strategy prior to its approval. We believe that it is important to remove reference to the NGT project because any newly devolved powers might be tied to the precise wording of the Core Strategy. We commend these amendments to you and urge you to accept them. Thank you very much. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Selby

COUNCILLOR SELBY: Lord Mayor, I move that the matter be referred to the Director of City Development for consideration in consultation with the relevant Executive Member.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: I second that, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: I move to the vote. *(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. *(Applause)*

ITEM 5 - QUESTIONS

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Selby.

COUNCILLOR SELBY: Thank you, Lord Mayor.

- (a) I move under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 2.3 that the order of business be varied so that the items relating to the Leeds Core Strategy and the Leeds Community Infrastructure Levy be considered after the tea break, that questions be considered immediately after deputations and that the tea break be taken at the conclusion of the summing up on the minutes by the Leader of Council;

- (b) Secondly, to move that Council Procedure Rule 14.1(f) and (g) be suspended in respect of the Leeds Core Strategy/Leeds Community Infrastructure Levy to allow the Member summing up on the motion to do so for up to four minutes and to allow one spokesperson from each opposition group to speak for up to four minutes;
- (c) To move that under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 13.2(d) that the Back Bench Community Concern in the name of Councillor Campbell be withdrawn;
- (d) To move that under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 22.11, that Council Procedure Rule 12 be suspended to allow the introduction of an Emergency Motion detailed in the Order Paper below.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Campbell.

COUNCILLOR CAMPBELL: I will second that, Lord Mayor.

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

We move on to Questions where for a period of 30 minutes Members of Council can ask questions of the Executive. Councillor Anderson.

COUNCILLOR ANDERSON: Will the Executive Board Member for Neighbourhoods, Planning and Personnel confirm whether the Council has submitted an expression of interest for Government Housing Zone funding?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Gruen.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: Councillor Anderson, I promised your colleague Councillor Lamb at Whips yesterday that my answer would be brief, so my answer is no, we have not.

THE LORD MAYOR: Supplementary, Councillor Anderson?

COUNCILLOR ANDERSON: Bearing in mind the conversation we are going to have later on this afternoon, do you not think this is actually, in a way, showing the true feelings of the Labour Group? They have utter contempt for actually building on brown field sites, they are making no attempt to get Government money to release some of the sites and make them viable, and is this not making this whole pretence that you actually are trying to do the best for the city an absolute sham? *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Gruen.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: Well spoken but, as ever, badly researched. Actually, the answer is this. We will take advantage of any offers made if they are advantageous to the Council. This particular offer is not. It is financially unattractive because the interest rates are higher than we could obtain competitively elsewhere.

Therefore, it is a bad bargain for Leeds, a bad bargain for Leeds people and yet again, Barry, you are wrong. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Golton.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Will the Executive Board Member for Transport and the Economy inform Council of the total cost of officer time spent up to the end of October 2014 on planning and implementing the residential selective part night switching of street lights in Rothwell Ward?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Richard Lewis.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. As a Member of the Executive Board, Councillor Golton will be aware that on 19th June 2013 approval was given to a programme of street light savings forecast to deliver £1,384,507 gross over ten years with costs of £376,643. Included in these costs is staff time of £67,624 and we are on target to deliver to that estimate, with £19,137 costs incurred so far.

The staff time for the part-night street lighting project is not recorded in such detail as to be able to say how much cost is attributed to each individual ward.

THE LORD MAYOR: Supplementary, Councillor Golton?

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Does the Executive Member not feel that if he had actually spent some of that money properly consulting with those people directly affected, he might have realised the level of opposition that is there at this moment in time and he would have realised that it is not worthwhile either in terms of affecting people's lives and their feeling of safety on their own streets, but also monetarily, actually, in terms of taking this project forward, and he should really have cancelled it.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lewis.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: I will try and be polite. I think that the officers feel that they have spent far more time talking to Members and members of the public in Rothwell, largely because of the misinformation provided by one Stewart Golton, who has told them that there are 8,000 street lights to be switched off in Rothwell. There are not 8,000 street lights in Rothwell – it was on your blooming Twitter! There are only about 4,000. We are switching off a small minority of lights, a small number of lights. We have done a huge amount of work with the Labour Member for Rothwell and residents...

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: It is their fault.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: ... to allay concerns and to counter the nonsense that has been talked by the Liberal Democrat Member for that ward.

I think that the people of Rothwell will find, as the people of the rest of the city have found, that this makes sod all difference to anybody. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Coulson.

COUNCILLOR COULSON: Does the Executive Member for Cleaner, Stronger and Safer Communities believe the Government's taxi licensing reforms are in the best interests of community safety?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dobson.

COUNCILLOR DOBSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. To answer Councillor Coulson's question quite simply, the answer is no. I do not think that they are progressive and I do not think that they will help the situation at all.

The Deregulation Bill is currently in the House of Lords, it is there for its second reading and what I will say to start with, actually, it is not all bad news. Part 10 of the proposed Act, if it finds its way into the Statute Books, would have allowed anybody to use a private hire vehicle at any time for any purpose. Clearly, everybody universally thought that could not be a good idea. There was a campaign by Local Authorities, PCCs, the LGA charities and also, really importantly, trade who all said "This is not a good idea" and that has actually been removed from the Bill in its progression through both Houses of Parliament.

However, if it does go on to the Statute Book there are some areas of genuine concern. The less frequent renewing and checking of licences, taxi and minicab firms being allowed to subcontract and then, of course, people who have been refused a licence in, say, Leeds, can then go to another area, get a licence to ply their trade. There should have been uniformity across the piece on this, not a fragmentation, which seems to be what is taking shape.

I do not want to dwell on some of the very high profile issues around taxis at the moment but really I suppose the question for Council is, is this a good time to look at deregulating? I think the answer is no, we should have been looking to firm up and make regulations around the industry a lot tighter, because actually the public have got to have confidence when they get into a taxi or a private hire vehicle.

In Leeds, I think the picture is very good, I think we could demonstrate that. We have got very robust mechanisms for weeding out people who do not want to have licences, the checks have been done regularly but, whilst I can report on a very healthy picture here in Leeds, I really do not think the backdrop of what is being proposed in the Bill is at all productive. As a city we will continue to work with other Local Authorities in partnership and with the police and through Safer Leeds here in Leeds, but again I must say it is against a very unfortunate backdrop if this Bill does go to the Statute Books, as it is expected to do next year. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Supplementary, Councillor Coulson?

COUNCILLOR COULSON: I do not think the answer needs one, Chair.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Finnigan.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: Can the Executive Board Member for Housing please confirm the costs in officer time and in legal costs and legal representation for the Cottingley Springs Travellers Site Public Inquiry?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Gruen.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: Yes, I can. Round £10,000 for legal fees.

THE LORD MAYOR: Supplementary, Councillor Finnigan.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: By way of a supplementary, could the Executive Board Member send me the full breakdown?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Gruen.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: Yes, I can. Fees for counsel, just a touch over £7,300 inclusive of VAT; internal legal costs around £2,600; we do not keep time records of officer time.

This cost, Council, is offset greatly by the savings that we have made from what we inherited in 2010 from the previous administration, of which Councillor Finnigan was a Member. At that stage for six years they had spent more than £2 on moving travellers and gypsies around the city. Cleaning up, legal costs, cleaning up, legal costs, more legal costs.

This year the costs are down dramatically and we anticipate a further massive fall in costs in 2014/15 thanks to the policies that this administration has pursued. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Harper.

COUNCILLOR G HARPER: Following the publication of the Verita reports last month, how confident is the Executive Member for Health and Wellbeing about the future provision of Congenital Heart Services in Leeds?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Mulherin.

COUNCILLOR MULHERIN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am sure that all of us in this Chamber welcomed the publication of the Verita Reports, which tell us what most of us in this Chamber have always believed, that the Leeds Children's Congenital Heart Unit was safe, is safe and continues to deliver high quality care and outcomes for patients and their families.

The last three-and-a-half years and the last 18 months in particular have been extremely challenging for everyone connected to the Leeds unit, as we know. Primarily the reports that have been published will be a great relief to patients and their families who have been through a prolonged period of unnecessary additional stress and uncertainty. However, the reports also vindicate the hard work and commitments of surgeons, nurses and staff at the Leeds unit who have been under immense pressure and whose reputations were brought into question.

Interestingly, the reports also resoundingly reject the tactics used by other units which led to the temporary suspension of services at Leeds and acknowledge that they cast the Leeds unit in an unfairly poor light, even if all the concerns raised had been substantiated. Indeed, the report clearly states that reporting the unchecked allegations of others is not whistle blowing and Newcastle should have made the status of their concerns clearer when they reported them. Verita's findings inform us

that professionals representing other units had reported concerns raised by parents of patients without performing basic tests to determine their validity.

Looking ahead, we believe that Leeds can meet the new standards set out in the new review which is currently being consulted on until 8th December, which is the subject of the Emergency White Paper we are bringing to Council today. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Have you a supplementary, Councillor Harper?

COUNCILLOR G HARPER: Yes, Lord Mayor. Can I ask, based on what Councillor Mulherin said, what lessons have been learned about the consultation with the public?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Mulherin.

COUNCILLOR MULHERIN: Thank you, Councillor Harper and thank you, Lord Mayor. It is clear that lessons have been learned from the mistakes made by the teams responsible for the flawed Safe and Sustainable Review. Primarily we welcome the fact that NHS England are now consulting on standards for children and adults' congenital heart services together. However, there are still some gaps that need to be addressed. Chief amongst these are the methods being used to consult. There is an over-reliance on conducting the consultation online, which will make it more difficult for some to take part. Even more astounding is the failure of NHS England to translate the consultation documents with a new review into community languages for parts of the population who are more susceptible to congenital heart conditions, such as the South Asian population. I am pleased to say that NHS England has belatedly produced these translations and as a result the document is now available in Urdu and Punjabi and four other community languages. However, this has only come about more than half way through the consultation as a result of pressure exerted on them from the Leeds Health and Wellbeing Board and the Regional Scrutiny Board chaired by Councillor Coupar, amongst others.

Can I thank you for raising this issue and drawing it to the attention of Members, as I know it is of considerable importance to the communities across Leeds. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor John Procter.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Will the Leader of Council outline any implications for Leeds City Council of the recent tribunal ruling that will see overtime calculated within holiday pay?

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. As you would expect, staff in Legal Services are currently considering the detail of the Judgment and we are awaiting an advisory bulletin from the Local Government Employers Organisation, so at this stage it is very difficult to determine what the impact will be.

As you probably know, the organisation involved in this ruling has been given permission to appeal to the Court of Appeal which, if they do so, means that a final ruling could potentially be a number of years away. The Government has announced the launch of a Government Business Taskforce to assess the possible impact.

THE LORD MAYOR: Do you have a supplementary, Councillor Procter? No. Councillor Campbell.

COUNCILLOR CAMPBELL: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Can the Executive Board Member for Neighbourhoods, Planning and Personnel inform Council what the formula used by Council officers is 1) to calculate the reduced green space contributions; and 2) the reduced garden size for housing developments within the vicinity of a public park?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Gruen.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: I confess that you have put a question where I do not have the information or formulae regarding smaller gardens in my head, so I could either read you the page of technical details and exact figures, or I prefer to not take up valuable time of Council but to send you the briefing I have been sent.

Let us cut to your supplementary which you will ask in any event.

THE LORD MAYOR: Do you have a supplementary, Councillor Campbell.

COUNCILLOR CAMPBELL: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am surprised that the Executive Member does not carry that information in his head. I thought it would have been something that he would have at his fingertips at any moment. I appreciate the spirit of his comment.

I would just like to say, though, will the Executive Board Member join with me and say that as a city, given our commitment to quality, that we would not expect developments to have substandard gardens or make reduced green space contributions just because they happen to be near a park.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Gruen.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: I think, as Councillor Campbell knows, as we are going through the Site Allocation Process, we are spending considerable time and detail on green space across the whole of the city. I agree with him, green space, whether it is the inner city or the outer areas, is vitally important for the benefit of citizens who want to work, live and play in Leeds. We will continue to pay great attention to that particular issue.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Maqsood.

COUNCILLOR MAQSOOD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Given that today, 12th November is Housing Day, could the Executive Member with responsibility for Housing and Planning confirm whether he supports the measures laid out in the Lyons Review of Housing? Thank you.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Gruen.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: I am very grateful for the question and I hope colleagues have seen the display about housing, particularly some of the schemes in Little London and Beeston Hill in the ante Chamber.

It is great, I think, to celebrate today as the Day of Housing and the Lyons Review, commissioned by Ed Miliband, is, of course, a major contribution towards the debate.

There are 39 important recommendations and we in this city have said courageously and absolutely from the top that we want to build more affordable and social housing. We are committing a great deal of public money to that very purpose and at the same time – and we will debate the numbers no doubt later on – we are setting a lead very clearly that we want the houses, not just the quantity but the quality and the emerging Leeds Housing Standard is fundamentally important to that debate.

Some of the recommendations from Lyons we are already implementing. I talk about the Council homes, I talk about the housing standard, I talk about space standards. Our minimum space standard in this city equates to the maximum Government standard. They go cheap and cheerful; we go for quality.

Our Core Strategy process is well advanced and might even be more advanced in two hours' time, so we recommend and welcome the recommendations. The report also suggests further work around the right to buy and the actual dismal effect that is having on our housing stock; around New Homes Bonus, which is top-sliced by Government to such an extent that we have to build a huge number of houses just to get our own money back; and around the headroom available for the borrowing cap.

Thank you for the question. I think that we have done, there is a lot that we know we still have to do.

THE LORD MAYOR: Do you have a supplementary Councillor Maqsood? No, thank you. Councillor Finnigan.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: Can the Executive Board Member for housing confirm the number of housing new build completions for the last three years?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Gruen.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: That follows on pretty seamlessly from the last question, I think. Each year there has been an increase so April 2011-March 2012, just below 2,000; 2012-2013, 2,100; 2013-2014, 2,900; and this year so far in excess of 3,000.

THE LORD MAYOR: Supplementary, Councillor Finnigan.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: By way of supplementary, does the Executive Board Member for Housing believe that it is achievable or realistic to build 74,000 houses between now and 2028?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Gruen.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: It is an ambitious target and we will do our best.
(Applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Macniven.

COUNCILLOR MACNIVEN: Would the Executive Member please outline his views on the new ratings announced recently by the Care Quality Commission regarding the standard of care in homes?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ogilvie.

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Thank you, Councillor Macniven for that question. With a brand new team at the helm of the Care Quality Commission, many of whom have many years of experience, the Care Quality Commission has introduced a new rating system for providers of care. At the heart of this new system is what Andrea Sutcliffe, the new Chief Inspector of Adult Social Care at the Commission, calls the Mum Test. She is asking her inspection teams to consider on their visits to providers of care whether that be residential or nursing homes, homecare providers or Local Authorities, would the inspection teams be happy for one of their relatives or friends to use those services.

Andrea came to visit Leeds as she was taking up her position at the beginning of last year and she was particularly impressed by the work we had been doing with residential care providers in the city to develop a Quality Framework with them where they are benchmarked and remunerated against quality to try and drive up the quality of provision in Leeds and to reassure Leeds residents that they will get good care in the homes in our city.

She was also impressed by the work in addition of our Contracts Team who visit all our contracted providers of care and we have put more resources into that Contracts Team, I think it is worth noting. We have also got a team of trained up volunteers, Dignity Champions, as we call them, members of the public, who go in and visit residential homes to look at services, as well as our Good Lives leaders and these are people with learning disabilities and their carers who go in to look at Learning Disability Services.

She has adopted this practice nationally and the Care Quality Commission now use, in addition to their inspection teams, members of the public, experts by experience, as they call them, to go and inspect services.

I think most people want to know that services are safe, caring, effective, responsive to their needs and well led and we are working closely with our local Care Quality Commission teams to make sure that the Mum Test - is it good enough for your mum or my mum – is put into practice.

If I can just finish and take a moment to pay tribute to Sandie Keane who many of you know retired at the end of last week after seven-and-a-half years' of public service here in the city. I am sure we will all wish her a long and happy retirement. We appointed Dennis Holmes as Interim Director this week (*Applause*) and we have started the process of the recruitment process for Sandie's replacement and we will keep you informed on how that progresses. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Do you have a supplementary, Councillor Macniven? No. Councillor Anderson.

COUNCILLOR ANDERSON: Will the Executive Board Member for Cleaner, Stronger and Safer Communities comment on rumours that police officers are being redeployed from Leeds to Bradford?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dobson.

COUNCILLOR DOBSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Timely, Barry, in as much as we were hearing swirling round the self-same things in the last couple of weeks so, of course, it is only right and proper we took it upon ourselves to get to the bottom of what was actually going on.

What I can report to Council today is the following. In terms of redeployment, what I am being told is that the way that West Yorkshire Police are looking at the deployment of numbers on an operational level is going to be something like the following. Clearly, they have got a strategic view to take and that is that there needs to be some resources in Bradford. How it will work is based on our current crime statistics as opposed to theirs. There will be a situation where over the coming weeks and months there will be a reduction of policing in Leeds of up to 16 based on 1.5% of the Force. That is based on crime reduction here as opposed to a crime increase in Bradford.

Clearly that is an operational decision but it does, of course, leave us with concerns. As a city we work extremely closely with Safer Leeds – I would say it is one of the strongest partnerships in the city. I know the last few years, the last four years have been phenomenal. You know as well as I do the driving down of burglary year on year, robberies, other crimes year on year coming down and it has been a credit to the joint partnership working, but I do wonder if Leeds in effect could end up being a victim of our own success. There is a talk of movement of police officers and how it would work in effect is, if somebody leaves the service in Leeds, the post would be re-recruited but it would go to Bradford in terms of those 16 officers.

As I say, not to set too many hares running, this represents 1.5% of policing in Leeds but it is a trend that obviously concerns.

What I am not going to do is really use this as a stick with which to beat West Yorkshire Police for one simple reason. We all know through working in Local Government that currently we are constantly trying to re-move people around, get the best value for money and really plug areas of resource where we see need, and I suspect they are doing the same thing. I will say this, for a modern police service this cannot be the way forward in terms of how we fund them and the funding gaps that are really now becoming so transparent from Central Government are simply unsustainable in what I would like to see not only for Leeds but for the whole of West Yorkshire in terms of how the police service operates and is funded.

As always, working with the PCC and our partners in Safer Leeds we will continue to get better outcomes for less, we will continue to get better outcomes for Leeds but I do think it really does give us a moment to reflect on how not only our services which we focus on constantly but other services are being impacted by the cuts, and I would say that if it does impact on us as a city and we see those stats that we are all so proud of rising, we will make every attempt to re-address this in the coming weeks and months. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Supplementary, Councillor Anderson?

COUNCILLOR ANDERSON: Just briefly. Can I thank Councillor Dobson for those comments and I think, or hopefully we will share the concern, is that what would be a good idea if possible if that has to happen is that the ward Members in the area are advised when it has occurred, not necessarily before it is occurring because I think

operationally we should not get involved in trying to manage, micromanage the police service, but it would be a good idea to let the ward Members know just in case there is a spike in crime. We heard at a meeting you and I attended yesterday about a blip that has occurred in some total crime statistics and it would help us reassure our public so that we can say, "Well, it was not in this area" and we can then all work together with the police so that we can drive down crime in this city.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dobson.

COUNCILLOR DOBSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Yes, from my perspective, what we have managed to establish in the last week or so is merely the tip of the iceberg. I have made a commitment and I will reiterated it - we will keep a very, very close eye on all the wards across the city where there are spikes and if there is a correlation between increases in crime and a reduction in police numbers, not only is it something that we will engage actively with any ward Member upon, because it is so significant for this city; we will also be making representations at the highest level to the police service. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Downes.

COUNCILLOR DOWNES: Thank you, Lord Mayor, and thank you for your kind comments at the opening of the meeting.

Will the Executive Board Member for Transport and the Economy prioritise the review of bus lanes for 2015?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Richard Lewis.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Development of the Bus Priority Network is being looked at in conjunction with the West Yorkshire Combined Authority and Bus Operators as part of the ongoing development of the West Yorkshire Bus Transport Fund work, Local Transport Plan and Bus Strategy.

There are no plans to fundamentally review the present network of bus lanes which is considered to fulfil the vital and valued role as part of the city's integrated transport system. However, if Councillor Downes wants to promote the case that we should, then I am open to hearing his proposals. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Supplementary, Councillor Downes?

COUNCILLOR DOWNES: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Can the Executive Board Member then advise why we have been advised that £50,000 is likely to be spent on a review next year?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lewis.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: I presume that is in part of the work that I have just described, Lord Mayor. Thank you.

THE LORD MAYOR: I think we are just about at the end of Question time. Any questions that have not been answered will receive a written response.

Can we now move to page 11 and items (5) and (6) at the top of page 11, as Members will realise, are to be discussed after the tea break.

ITEM 7 - APPOINTMENTS

THE LORD MAYOR: We move on to 7, which is Report on Appointments. Councillor Selby.

COUNCILLOR SELBY: I move, Lord Mayor, that the Report of the City Solicitor on appointments be approved.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: I second that, Lord Mayor.

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

ITEM 8 – REPORT ON THE OUTER WEST COMMUNITY COMMITTEE

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 8, Report on the Outer West Community Committee. Councillor Jarosz.

COUNCILLOR JAROSZ: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Fellow Councillors, I welcome the opportunity to address you today regarding the Outer West Community Committee in my capacity as Chair.

My contribution today will not look back on the historical work of the previous Outer West Area Committee, although I do pay tribute to the good work the Area Committee, its members and previous Chairs have done over the past decade or so to improve the wellbeing of local residents and local communities. Instead, I will focus on the recent transition from Area Committees to Community Committees.

In this new guise we have held the first of a series of themed meetings. I would like to talk to you about what we did, how we did it, how it felt and why it was very different.

The strategic positioning of Outer West in the Leeds-Bradford corridor is important and significant – a significance which is not lost on Members in Outer West who have had a great interest in business engagement for many years. Given recent international and national economic pressures and the austerity measures, the Community Committee decided it was the right time to consider what actions could be delivered to support business enterprise and further develop the local economy in the Outer West, potentially creating more training and employment opportunities for local people.

It was a great opportunity for elected Members to engage with business, listen to what they had to say and about what works for them and, indeed, for business to listen to Councillors about what we can do for business and what we find harder to do but could do better. It was also a way of exploring what elected Members are doing in some parts of Outer West already that could be shared and translated to others.

We met at Pudsey Civic Hall in October. It was really pleasing to see a range and mix of partners attending the meeting from private, public and Third Sector, including community groups. Councillors Andrew Carter and Richard Lewis made keynote contributions to set the scene from the Council's perspective on local and city-wide developments relating to business. Guest contributions included the owner of Sunny Bank Mills in Farsley, a really good example of a local Outer West business that had converted a former mill into a modern, welcoming space for business use. He gave a really insightful analysis of the success and how it could be enabled from a business perspective.

The discussions were held in small groups in a café style set up, with Councillors distributed across different groups. The economic trend analysis, the local data on employment and the socio-economic breakdown of the Outer West area from the Council's Economic Development Unit was very well received by businesses. Many were unaware of the context in which they were operating and many wanted to know more about how they could work more with the Council on exploiting the data and intelligence to create wealth and economic opportunity in the locality.

Discussions which were held in October helped to shape the problem of work we will do. The paper outlined the key challenges and they are identified, including local transport links, attracting new employers to the area and linking local employment to local opportunities for local people. I welcome any of the Members of Outer West to make comment prior to summing up. Thank you. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Selby.

COUNCILLOR SELBY: I second.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Coulson.

COUNCILLOR COULSON: Yes, Lord Mayor, I am going to stick mainly to the business side of what we have been doing in the Pudsey since mid-October, before October. In fact, in Pudsey we have been working with the local businesses for the last five years – businesses, schools and the community. We pay money to Leeds Ahead to provide business information for the local businesses, but this year we decided on a new approach.

In early October we sent some of the Pudsey businesses, small businesses, down to Farsley where fortunately enough we have the mill there with 30 businesses in it which is a natural forum for local businesses. That gave us a step up and we sent a few of the business people down there to start, brought them back to Pudsey. We had a small meeting, I think there were about four of us there. Amrit Choda was there, the business adviser from Leeds Ahead and from that day onwards we started the Pudsey Business Forum.

From that meeting of four people we had our first meeting for the business community where we had twelve people. I chaired that meeting. We formulated the way forward for the rest of the businesses. We did impress upon the businesses that they had to take this on board, that we were not going to do it because in other years we have been saddled with chairing the forums and that sort of stuff. We needed the businesses to take hold and do it themselves.

We were fortunate enough to get a Chair – nobody else wanted it. He has proved a success. He works very hard. From there on we spread out a bit more, we did a bit more in the community, we brought in the churches, the schools, the local community. It is not just about businesses, it is about the community and the businesses, the schools and that sort of thing.

Our second meeting from twelve, lo and behold we now have 80 registered members of the Pudsey Business Forum. From that we have organised several things: we have five markets, we have all sorts of events going – time is running out, I cannot tell you everything, I am trying to tell you the important bits.

We have a logo.

THE LORD MAYOR: Could you please wind up, Councillor Coulson?

COUNCILLOR COULSON: Yes. We have that, *[holding up a poster]* there are 20 events on it, five different nights, all up to Christmas, in Pudsey. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you very much. Councillor Jarosz to sum up.

COUNCILLOR JAROSZ: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Councillors, Community Committees feel different to me. Our approach is emboldened and strengthened by the way we have engaged, as you have just heard, with a range of stakeholders to look afresh at a theme that is important and meaningful to local elected Members rather than just receive generic reports from officers that are not tailored to our locality. Whilst it is early in our transition to Community Committees, we are taking a much more bottom up approach to understanding the issues and challenges of our locality and developing local solutions with stakeholders, like the business sector, to continue what we know best. We are now talking and listening to each other. This must continue.

Undoubtedly there are challenges in transition, some of them quite practical, such as communication with a sufficiently wide audience, developing the networks around themed topics, providing a venue that is local, light, roomy, accessible with plenty of parking and good acoustics. However, these challenges can be overcome. In fact, I acknowledge the hard work and dedication of the officers who prepared well for the meeting and helped to make it the success it undoubtedly was, including my officers at the West North West Area team. I have definitely seen a step change in their support Committee and their responsiveness to Members. I hope all other Members have seen that same change.

Whilst the discussions focused on the range of pertinent successes, challenges and opportunities, it pleased me greatly that the local business sector acknowledged and welcomed the need to work together to develop sustainable business and sustainable communities that co-exist alongside each other in a mutually supportive and beneficial way. I highlight the recent development, as Councillor Coulson has highlighted, of the Pudsey Business Support Group. Following Community Committee funding to the Business Support Local project, the group has been very active in a short space of time and working alongside local Councillors to support local community events and Councillor Coulson has just said one so I will not talk about it again.

We are also strengthening our links with other Community Committees. For example we have been working with Councillor Caroline Gruen as Chair of the Inner West Community Committee about the proposed developments to extend the Britvic Warehouse facilities on Swinnow Lane which could result in a real boost to employment opportunities in both Inner and Outer.

In closing, we are not stopping at business and local economy. In the near future we will be focusing on children and young people and older people with social isolation as a key to both topics. I thank my colleagues and thank you all for listening.
(Applause)

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

ITEM 9 – REPORT ON THE INNER EAST COMMUNITY COMMITTEE

THE LORD MAYOR: We go to Item 9, Report on the Inner East Community Committee. Councillor Khan.

COUNCILLOR KHAN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I move in terms of the Notice.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Selby.

COUNCILLOR SELBY: Formally second.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ingham.

COUNCILLOR INGHAM: My Lord Mayor and fellow Councillors, I am speaking on the Inner East Community Committee paper which looks at how we can involve young adults and children in the community in an effective way.

I would like to celebrate the work done by the Committee on this agenda. We have positively looked to engage young adults and children in activities that they themselves want, things that they have said they are interested in. We are also putting on some great free events for young people in this city, such as the Breeze DJ School UK event later this month. This will show off the skills of young people who have learned to DJ on a Breeze project. The challenge now is making sure we communicate them in the most appropriate way.

I started my role as Community Champion for Children and Young People in July and over the summer I spent a lot of time talking to young people and children as well as local organisations to understand the issues that are affecting them, how we can more effectively engage with young people to make our services more responsive to their needs.

When we visited School Councils the children told us they wanted to be involved in establishing new ideas for events and at a time that suited them. Their ideas came across loud and clear. Our young people clearly want and need to be at the heart of decision making when it comes to activities and services that are all about them and that is exactly where they should be.

Make no mistake about it, some of these young people may be sitting in this Chamber in a few years' time. Tom, Keith – I am sorry to have to tell you this but your jobs are not safe! It is our responsibility to make sure they are engaged in involving in their local communities now.

As I have already touched upon, engaging with children and young people must be on their terms. We must use the methods of communication they use such as the internet, Facebook, Twitter, Instagram and apps for smartphones if we are to communicate at their level.

These young adults and children are the future for this city and communities and we must include them in local issues now. There is a lot of great work being done across the local area but these are challenging times for children and young people. They deserve to be provided with services that are relevant to them and they deserve to be involved in whatever decisions are made about what is offered for them. One thing is certain though, our Committee is certainly working hard to make sure their views are heard. I thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Hussain.

COUNCILLOR A HUSSAIN: My Lord Mayor and fellow Councillors, I am speaking today on the Money Buddies project which seems to be tackling poverty in the city. Firstly I would like to welcome the Money Buddies programme as a great way of teaching local people about the importance of understanding moneys and working to make the most of their incomes. This can be seen to be giving something back to the residents and open up a volunteer opportunity for the public in these communities.

Money Buddies are volunteers, there to give support and further guidance to the public in difficult financial circumstances. They also have the chance to gain skills and a nationally recognised qualification. Money Buddies takes on a number of the roles including working on budgets, applying for the grants for the companies such as the Yorkshire Water Community Trust, British Gas.

I am sure they will see many issues created by the Central Government's bedroom tax. These simple steps allow many people into the community to get involved with the final aims to improve their circumstances and give them independency and skills. Throughout the programme there is an opportunity to offer out help and advice concerning money issues.

It is possible for those members of the public to advise the progress to give support, they can gain qualifications which are intended to enhance their skills, their confidence and their ability to manage into the work-based setting. They can give accurate support whilst having a sense of professionalism.

The Money Buddies programme rewards both members of the public who want to get back into the work and those who want to offer informed advice. Indeed the programme is a great service, helping to promote the importance of using money well and saving money. Community Committee funding over £1,000 has been given to the project which will add to development programmes and continue these fulfilling schemes. There is evidence of the programmes having a positive outcome for those in

financial difficulty and believe that all of the city will appreciate the award of this service. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Cleasby.

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I wish to speak to the same agenda item and ask, if I dare, some advice of Councillor Khan. A major item in this agenda is consultation and engagement and we have heard from Members just how that engagement might take place. I have concerns about the major issue in the area and that is the awful incinerator which unfortunately, Councillor Khan, you were very keen to oppose.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Cleasby...

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: I am speaking on the agenda, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Sorry, Councillor Cleasby, is that in the report that went to the Committee? We are discussing minutes of the Committee.

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: On page 76, Lord Mayor, at 7.1, Consultation and Engagement.

THE LORD MAYOR: Sit down.

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: I am speaking on the consultation and engagement.

THE LORD MAYOR: No, no, no. You are mentioning a specific issue. If that is not in the report...

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: Yes and I am asking advice upon it, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Sorry, will you not interrupt when I am speaking. Please will you sit down.

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: Yes.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Now, you are mentioning a specific issue. If that is not in the report that when to the Committee then it is not for discussion here. If you want to talk about something generally that is in that report, then you can do so but you cannot talk about a specific item that is not in that report. Is that clear?

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: May I stand, Lord Mayor?

THE LORD MAYOR: You can. Yes or no, is that clear?

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: It is clear, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you.

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: If I could then ask for advice from Councillor Khan on Consultation and Engagement, on how he just goes about that when one moment he

seems to be saying one thing to the community and then another another thing, how does he square the circle, Lord Mayor?

THE LORD MAYOR: I am sorry, Councillor Cleasby, sit down again. I think that is a personal attack on Councillor Khan. That is nothing to do with the report, that is a personal attack. I think you have finished speaking. If you are continuing in this vein I am not hearing any more.

We will now move on. Councillor Khan to sum up.

COUNCILLOR KHAN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I also want to thank Councillor Ingham and Councillor Hussain for their comments today. I spoke at the last Council about the good work the Committee is doing and will try to be brief in my summing up.

Councillor Ingham has spoken on the need to engage young people. This is one of the key priorities in our area. From what we have learned so far, many young people are interested and want to be active in their community. We have to find the right tools and the right language and the right way of talking to people. Like everyone, they want to talk to us, talk to them with the respect. One example, since July we have posted more than 75 items on our Facebook page, meaning that we have engaged more than 3,500 people. This is just the tip of the iceberg and I want to thank Councillor Ingham for her work as Children and Young People's Community Champion for Inner East Leeds. I believe that the Community Committee can be a key to working with local people. We have the local knowledge and the skill to talk to people in their own language and on their own terms. This applies as much to children and young people as to the older people.

Councillor Hussain has spoken on the Money Buddy project which is run by Ebor Gardens Advice Centre. When people face financial challenges at various times in their lives the Money Buddy project is an initiative that will see not only people receiving the help they need with financial difficulties but will give the volunteers valuable skills for their future as well.

This scheme is enabling and is a really good idea for both the city and the area. I am glad that the Community Committee, we are able to help fund this valuable and important project. Partnership work is also key to the committee in order to reduce crime. That is why I am very happy to confirm that we have seen a 43% reduction in burglary in Burmantofts and Richmond Hill in the last twelve months. I am proud that Inner East is being seen as a beacon for working with local communities. I want to thank the Members of the Board and the Area Support Team for the work they do but there is much work still to be done.

I hope that we will continue to meet the challenges in the coming months and years. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

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

ITEM 10 – REPORT ON THE LEEDS AWARD

THE LORD MAYOR: We now move on to Item 10, which is the Report on the Leeds Award. Councillor Hyde.

COUNCILLOR HYDE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I do not intend to speak too long because I know colleagues in the room would like to speak about Arthur. I have the pleasure, Lord Mayor, to move Arthur France to receive and be the recipient of the Leeds Award.

Arthur has been a central figure in the city's life for over 50 years and there are many achievements that Arthur has achieved in his life working in the community, particularly in Chapeltown but in the city. I just thought I would give a few but I think I will leave that for the rest of my colleagues to comment on.

Arthur first created and galvanised his community to stage the first ever authentic Caribbean Carnival in Europe. That was in 1967 and it is still going strong today. He took what was a Chapeltown event, which I remember very well, and he has now made it into one of the largest single one-day events in the country.

Arthur is also well-known now for being involved in other communities across England, helping them to organise carnivals and events including the Notting Hill Carnival in London.

Arthur has been central in staging the First Steel Band Competition here in Leeds. He is the Chair of the Leeds West Indian Centre and has been since 1975. Arthur was awarded the MBE for his services to the community in Leeds. He has also been awarded the Black Achievers Award and Ambassador for the Community in 1992. In 2000 he assisted in setting up the Stephen Lawrence Award under the banner of Leeds City Council's Educational Standard. In 2012 Arthur received a Lifetime Achievement Award presented by Hamara Community Award for his outstanding contributions to community life.

As I said earlier, Lord Mayor, these are just a few of Arthur's achievements and Arthur is still going strong today, working in Chapeltown and in Leeds, helping the communities deliver things that they want to see.

Lord Mayor, I have great pleasure in moving Arthur France to receive the Leeds Award. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Selby.

COUNCILLOR SELBY: I formally second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Elliott.

COUNCILLOR ELLIOTT: Thank you, Lord Mayor. The Morley Borough Independents are delighted to support the nomination of Arthur France for the Leeds Award.

I can speak from personal experience of the work which Arthur does and the esteem with which he is held within the community, for in my term of office as Lord Mayor I had first hand experience of this, in particular to see him in action for and on behalf of the West Indian Community on the occasion of the annual Leeds Carnival. It said

everything to me. It is with the greatest of pleasure both from a personal and a Group point of view to support this nomination for the award to Arthur France. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Cleasby.

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I too have great pleasure in supporting this proposal. Lord Mayor, as you may well have experience Arthur in your present position, at our Group meeting the other evening when I offered as a former Lord Mayor to speak, Chris Townsley immediately said, "Hang on, every Lord Mayor gets to know Arthur France. That is Arthur's position in the city of making sure he makes every aspect of the city work for the city and the community.

I was very lucky in my year, Lord Mayor, being part of the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the abolition of slavery. Arthur played a very prominent role in those celebrations and I am grateful to him that of all the things he made me do, limbo dancing was not one of the. With my knees you will understand that was a great privilege. However, at the last Council meeting, Lord Mayor, we paid tribute collectively to those involved with the Tour de France and the Grand Départ. When this came forward it made me realise it is one aspect of our city that I think we had forgotten, and that is when the Grand Départ had gone there suddenly was a lot of noise in our city, a lot of blowing of whistles, a lot of colour and a lot of movement when the West Indian dance group came. Arthur France was in costume, he was one of those dancers. Thankfully, I too was in a Tourmaker's costume in bright green and people did not recognise me because the moment I saw Arthur's face I thought, "Oh my God, he is going to grab me, I will be dancing all the way to Harrogate!" Thankfully I did not have to but it is just an example, Lord Mayor, of Arthur's involvement in our city.

It is with great pride on behalf of the Liberal Democrats that I put our name to this award on behalf of Arthur. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Cleasby. I am sure we would all be delighted to see you at the next Council meeting wearing your green costume! *(laughter)* That has been seconded!

Councillor Rafique.

COUNCILLOR RAFIQUE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Lord Mayor, I too would like to congratulate Arthur France on his well deserved Leeds award for his service to the community, equal opportunities in particular to carnival. The carnival is one of the biggest and longest running carnivals not just in Leeds but in Europe. Arthur started carnival and as other colleagues have said, he actually goes round the world, particularly Europe, to promote carnival around the continent.

Arthur is one of those people who actually never stops working for the benefit of others and apart from community work I think over the years his contribution towards equality and those people who live in poverty and for good causes has been immense.

He is a person, I have known him for a number of years as a ward Councillor, he is a person of a very humble sort of personality, easy going and always encourages young people to get going and to get involved in volunteering and community work. I think nobody deserves more than Arthur, a very well deserved Leeds Award. Lord Mayor,

I would like to thank the Council and colleagues for nominating Arthur for this award. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Anderson.

COUNCILLOR ANDERSON: I will be quite brief, but on behalf of the Conservative Group we totally and fully support this. I was part of the group that looked into this and there is no doubt we have someone who does believe in leading, putting Leeds where we all want it to be, at the forefront of everything that we are doing. Again, someone whose innovative thinking brings positive messages to Leeds in terms of what we are doing. These are the things that Arthur is able to do.

Also, as a Scot living down here who could have been seen as a foreigner if things had not been done differently, it is also important that you look after your heritage as well and that you have pride in where you came from, and that the multiculturalism and the way that we can allow anybody to come into this city and to be welcomed and to be living in what we are doing.

Finally, one of the reasons we did think he was worthy is that this is another example of someone going above and beyond what any normal or average person does and that is the reason why we support this and put this award in. It is for those that show extra. We have got a lot of people in this city that do a lot but Arthur is someone who goes that extra stage. Thank you very much, Lord Mayor. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Hyde to sum up.

COUNCILLOR HYDE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I think everybody's sentiments say it all. Arthur is well respected by the Leeds community. He is hard working and it is a well deserved award, Lord Mayor. I just move the motion, Lord Mayor.

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

ITEM 12 - MINUTES

THE LORD MAYOR: We move to Item 12, which is the Minutes. We are here to receive and comment upon the Minutes of the Executive Board Committee established by Full Council and Joint Authorities to which the Council makes appointments. Councillor Wakefield.

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

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

- (a) Executive Board**
- (i) Children and Families**

THE LORD MAYOR: We move on to the Executive Board Minutes, Children and Families. Councillor Caroline Gruen.

COUNCILLOR C GRUEN: Lord Mayor, I would like to comment on Minute 61, page 90. This Minute deals with the Local Children's Safeguarding Board's Annual

Report, which reassuringly sets down the excellent work carried out by the Council and its partners to ensure our children are kept safe from harm, are well looked after, cared for and given the best possible educational opportunities.

Today I would like to reflect on some of their broader learning experiences. The ultimate aim, of course, is to ensure the children in our care successfully enter the world of work and become fulfilled and independent citizens, and to that end Leeds has run an apprenticeship scheme which has resulted in almost half those participating to be now in full-time apprenticeships with the Council, and the remainder working towards this goal.

There is a striking and creative collaboration with further and higher education in Leeds. Each of the 16 High Schools with the highest number of looked-after children will have a university undergraduate mentor to support those children in their journey to post-school destinations. Leeds Beckett University is facilitating a scheme for younger looked-after children to acquire those skills and the confidence and the ambition to achieve improved grades and move on to higher study and to employment. The Council is now looking to engage with colleges nationally to provide learning opportunities, particularly for care leavers who may, through various challenges and hurdles placed in their way, have missed out earlier in their education.

There is powerful collaboration too with business and commercial partners, resulting in better life experiences through, for example, Waitrose employees volunteering to decorate the homes of kinship carers, Marks & Spencer getting involved with the foster caring service and the Independent Visitor Scheme, and the Northern School of Contemporary Dance engaging our children through the performing arts.

During the children's takeover period looked-after children have been given the opportunity to take over a range of relevant meetings and activities in the Council, which they have done with great confidence and skill. It was with great pleasure and pride that I was directed by the Children's Have a Voice Council through a meeting of the Corporate Carers Committee. Their increased confidence, respectable but frank contributions were a credit to the life skills they are clearly acquiring. Not all of us, Lord Mayor, have the skill to call Members to order with quite such authority and conviction.

All of this is good and we know that more of it needs to happen, because we all care and we are all responsible. Our looked-after children brought a heartfelt deputation to this Council very recently calling for more direct interface with us and I would leave you with a question – so what difference have you made since then? *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Harington.

COUNCILLOR HARINGTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. This is again page 90, Minute 61.

Some years ago I was cycling in the United States across Kansas. It is very flat and so in amongst the endless cornfields you can see these huge corn silos looming up in the distance. They look pretty close, you cycle for two hours against a 30 mile an hour headwind but you still are not there. On the prairie, of course, there are no red lights to jump for a cyclist – I mean, to law abidingly wait at!

If it had not been that we were cycling that day to Dodge City I might have given up, but if you have watched as many westerns as I have, a cyclist sure as hell has got to do what a cyclist has got to do. *(laughter)*

Silos – isolated, on their own, separated. No wonder we use the word to describe agencies that do not work together and when it comes to safeguarding of children we know what happens if agencies do not work together – the circumstances, the consequences can be horrific.

Not surprisingly, the Government produced a paper in 2013, Working Together, and the key function of the Leeds Safeguarding Children Board (and the Minute refers to their Annual Report), the key function of the Board is to make sure that agencies do work together and so in the city we have, for example, Think Family, which means agencies working together to make sure that the needs of the whole family are met; Front Door, which means agencies working together to make sure that the right decisions are made at the point of referral; Multi-Systemic Therapy, which means agencies working together to make sure that families are helped with children which have challenging behaviours and because that has been so successful, Leeds has been one of the two authorities chosen to test another programme entitled Families Integrated Transition – agencies working together to make sure that young people are assisted, young offenders, especially when there are issues to do with mental health and substance misused.

Progress is being made but a key challenge for the year is to make sure that these various initiatives are properly, as they say, embedded.

Another key challenge is to do with hearing the voice of the child. Big efforts are being made to involve children in all the decisions that affect them, especially through, for example, the Family Group Conferencing and, as Councillor Gruen has mentioned, two very good initiatives when the Have a Voice Council came here and also they have been to Corporate Carers.

The word “silo” can also mean a place where nuclear weapons are stored. If we do not get safeguarding right we do not cause a nuclear explosion, but we can see that if we do not get it right the fallout can have a devastating effect on children and on their families, on the young people of today and therefore on the families for tomorrow. Big progress being made but so much still to get right. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Elliott.

COUNCILLOR ELLIOTT: Thank you, Lord Mayor. In view of the appalling facts of the shortcomings that have emerged from Rotherham and, one suspects, a number of other cities, that the seriousness with which Leeds City Council appears to be viewing the issue of safeguarding around children, one hopes that the actions which are necessary will be taken to match the words that are being articulated about this matter.

In other words, we can see that we can talk the talk; one hopes that it will be followed by a clear indication that we can walk the walk. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Illingworth.

COUNCILLOR ILLINGWORTH: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I rise to speak on Minute 62 on page 91.

Lord Mayor, the Children and Families Act became law in March this year. The policy changes for people with special educational needs and disabilities are the most significant for 30 years.

Children with SEN and disabilities are almost one-fifth of the school population. These children do less well than their peers, are more likely to be absent or excluded from school and are more than twice as likely to be NEET. 93% of people with learning disabilities end up by being unemployed.

This situation must change. It is unacceptable that people with disabilities are struggling in our society. Changing these statistics would bring enormous benefits to self esteem, to confidence and to independence. The saving to the public purse is readily measured. Bringing a learning disabled person into employment reduces their lifetime care costs by £170,000. Moving one person from full support to semi-independent living can save £1m.

The changes introduced by the Act are long overdue. They focus on a group of people who were previously overlooked. They include personal budgets and a requirement for a local offer to be published which details all our available services. These are designed to encourage independence and prepare these young people for adult life.

I welcome these changes and the improvement to lives that should follow. I do, however, have serious concerns regarding the level of funding that is available to initiate these changes. The funding allocated so far is for 2014/15, with no figures available for the following year. This leads to great uncertainty about how these changes can be delivered.

Education, Health and Care Plans will replace Statements of Special Educational Needs and Learning Difficulties Assessment. Previously, these covered young people from aged two to 19. They will now be from birth until age 25 and it has been estimated this will lead in Leeds to an additional 100 requests each year. This obviously comes with a resource implication. We are yet to see if the funding will be in place to support this or we will be forced to stretch our already depleted resources even further.

This is apparently being handed over to Local Authorities in the expectation that we will sort it out. It must not become another grand plan from Central Government without the necessary financial underpinning. This vulnerable group of young people must not become the victims of a Government that talks big, Lord Mayor, but fails to deliver on its promises. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Sue Bentley.

COUNCILLOR S BENTLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am speaking on Minute 63, page 92, and Minute 98, page 113.

I am a member of the cross-party Basic Need Group, which is a great example of cross-departmental working to resolve the shortage of school places. I want to

highlight the concerns about the number of developments not only in Weetwood but the adjacent wards of Adel and Wharfedale and Horsforth.

Many pupils live in our ward but attend schools in the other two wards so it is essential that Councillors are aware of what is happening in neighbouring wards. Horsforth's Broadgate Primary School is being expanded to cater for the 500-odd house Clarion development site. In the next few years there is likely to be more than 608 new dwellings in Weetwood with 280 being built now. There is not pressure on our schools at the moment but, with the Centurion Fields and proposed development of the Government buildings in Adel, there very well could be.

In July I went to a very well attended Outcome Based Accountability Meeting in Adel to discuss ideas to overcome the shortage of school places but I have heard nothing since. If you are struggling to find a suitable place which would cater for this need, there is, of course, the demolished West Park Centre, which was a former school.

I would like to congratulate the Chair and Members of the Safer and Stronger Scrutiny Board on their recent enquiry report on domestic violence. I think the 29 recommendations reflect the complexity of how to deal with this problem sensitively. Domestic violence affects so many men and women from all walks of life and culture but the effects are very long lasting on everyone, and in particular children who witness any abusive behaviour.

It is a sad reflection that children living in abusive families more often continue to perpetuate the same behaviour. Schools can help our children understand this behaviour through their work on personal relationships education. It is very hard for victims and perpetrators to talk about this problem and so the web-based virtual One Stop Facility will hopefully make this easier so that they can gain the relevant advice.

It is refreshing that so many statutory, voluntary and private organisations are all keen to work together to offer support and guidance to victims, their perpetrators and families. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Lamb.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would like to speak on Minute 63, page 92, in reference to Basic Needs and in particular the Basic Need pressure around Alwoodley.

Some Members may not be aware that on 10th October the Under Secretary of State issued a scheme to transform the former Fir Trees site to the Khalsa Science Academy and that they implemented that scheme on 13th October and forcibly took control of the building and changed the locks. That building is now in the possession of the Khalsa Science Academy.

Members will be aware that we have consistently been of the view that this transfer should happen and should have happened sooner. That said, I think every one of us will feel somewhat uncomfortable with the way that this has taken place.

In effect, we have lost an asset with a notional value of £1m when we could have protected our long-term position by taking a different approach. It would be easy to express outrage that any Government can or should do this, but that really misses the

point in this case. It has been clear for two years that using legislation first introduced by the previous Government, the Government did have the power to do this and have expressed repeatedly that they would if no progress was made.

It is also very clear the Children's Services Officers have repeatedly recommended to Executive Board that this course of action should have been taken. Other officers have taken a different view.

Given the potential outstanding legal issues, there are many issues I am aware of around this that I am going to steer clear of today because there is a long way to run, I suspect, but it is very clear, Lord Mayor, there are many questions to answer about this whole affair and I am certain that all Members will agree there needs to be an urgent Scrutiny enquiry to understand how such a significant Council asset is no longer in our control.

The key questions I think that we need to hear about today are why, when this happened on 13th October and there was an Executive Board on 15th October, this was not reported to this Executive Board; why was there no intention to raise this in this Chamber today and alert Lord Mayor Members to the fact this has happened until I raised it now; why has there been no attempt to brief or work with Opposition Parties to try and come to an agreed solution (in the past that sort of thing has always happened); and two further points that I wonder if we could hear from today, is there something this administration knows about Khalsa that they have concerns about them that they have not shared with us to date and, if so, will they get on and share it with us; and finally, is it the case that their opposition to academies and free schools (and let us bear in mind free schools are by legal definition academies), is their opposition to them so deep they will pay any price to fight against them? Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ghulam Hussain

COUNCILLOR G HUSSAIN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am speaking on Minute 64, page 93, and I would like to comment on proposals to expand two primary schools in my ward, Gledhow and Immaculate Heart of Mary Catholic School.

As a local ward Member I am acutely aware of the pressure on school places and how families can struggle to get into the school they want. Therefore, I am delighted that we are able to put forward proposals to expand Gledhow, an outstanding school in Roundhay.

The senior leadership team at the school and the governing body are all in favour of the expansion and I am sure they see the opportunities this will bring. This will give local families the opportunity to send their children to an outstanding and well respected school. As we continue to face basic need pressures across the city and have our hands tied by Government legislation, it is more important than ever that we listen to the views of local people and respond appropriately.

I think it is important that we remember that any decisions we make impact the local community and sometimes our proposals are not greeted with enthusiasm. It is for this reason that, although it means we still have a pressure for Catholic school places in North Leeds, I am reassured that the proposal to expand Immaculate Heart of Mary Primary School will not be progressed. It is vitally important that wherever we

undertake a consultation, we act accordingly and take all the things into account before forming a decision. I am comfortable in the knowledge that when proposals are so obviously against the wishes of the community and the school involved we will take the necessary steps and have a rethink.

Tackling the pressure for school places across the city is an ongoing issue and I am pleased that we are continuing to put the wishes of the local people first. Thank you.
(*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Pat Latty.

COUNCILLOR P LATTY: Lord Mayor, I wish to speak on Minute 64, page 93. Guiseley has suffered from a huge and disproportionate amount of development over the last 15 to 20 years and school places have failed to keep up with that development. Many times over those years Councillor Graham Latty and Stuart Andrew, then Councillor, tried to get Education Leeds to understand that you cannot build houses without producing children but no, their pleading fell on deaf ears. Now at last realisation has dawned and we are to get the school places needed – not, I might add, because Education has seen the light, but because the new Trust Status of our schools allowed the schools themselves to decide to expand.

Lord Mayor, I am delighted that we are now to see the expansion that we have so long needed and that for a while parents will not have to face getting their children to a distant school. It has come not a moment too soon, but again there is a caveat. Under the Core Strategy Aireborough has to provide sites to build a further 2,300 houses. Guiseley will be the major provider of those sites and, as we all know, houses mean children.

The calculation we use in Leeds is that every 100 houses generates the need for 25 primary school places. Will the limited expansion we now so gladly applaud cope with this sort of development? Using Leeds's own calculation, 2,300 homes will produce a need for 575 infant and primary school places, or two new primary schools. That should illustrate that the modest expansion we are so thrilled to have got will only scratch the surface of that need and we see no signs that it is even considered in our Core Strategy.

Lord Mayor, once again I say that in Guiseley we are absolutely delighted that our children will not have to travel miles to find a primary school place but we are very far from thrilled with the prospect of the school place nightmare that the ill-considered Core Strategy will visit on our young families. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Charlwood.

COUNCILLOR CHARLWOOD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am speaking on page 113, Minute 97, on the Domestic Violence and Abuse Programme.

As we all know, domestic violence and abuse is something that happens in every community and behind closed doors. It can often be difficult to notice and prevent, but something we all need to take very seriously.

The numbers are always quite simply shocking. Since April 2011 there have been 15 domestic violence homicides in Leeds. The year to June 2014, there were over

14,000 incidents of domestic violence and abuse reported to police – very sadly, an increase of 858 on the previous year. This is almost 40 cases a day reported to police in Leeds alone and nationwide two women a week are killed by their partner.

We know some things to be true. One, that domestic violence is under-reported, so these figures are only capturing those for whom the abuse has become too much. Two, that an increase in reporting figures could mean more reporting is going on just as much as increased violent behaviour; we simply do not know which. Three, we never hear the names of those women who died from domestic violence. It is not reported in the media and these crimes go unnoticed by society.

Children are a major concern in these numbers. Children were present at over a third of recorded domestic violence incidents. This is a major reason for children being taken into care. Children who witness domestic violence are two-and-a-half times more likely to develop serious social and behavioural problems.

Leeds Domestic Violence and Abuse Strategy Group, which is a multi-agency partnership, works to support and challenge the work done by the city in response to this issue. Leeds has various services already available for victims of domestic violence and abuse. These include a refuge service and an outreach service, along with a resettlement service that delivers wrap-around care to victims and their families. We also offer housing advice and assistance including alternative safe temporary accommodation, security installations to make existing accommodation safe if that is what the victim wants, assistance to find alternative accommodation in the private rented sector, or assistance to move out of Leeds altogether.

The Leeds Families First Team is an early adopter in the second phase of the Troubled Families Programme, which sees families experiencing domestic violence qualifying for the programme, and Leeds Safeguarding Partnership building on current front door arrangements which the Children's Social Work Duty and Advice Team co-located with the Police and Leeds Community Healthcare, likely to include Third Sector domestic violence and offender management services.

This Council takes this issue and those affected by domestic violence very seriously and I am very proud of the work being done by this administration. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Jarosz.

COUNCILLOR JAROSZ: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I wish to speak on my experience as a Member of the Safer Stronger Scrutiny Board, which undertook a wide ranging and extensive enquiry into domestic violence and abuse.

One of the items we had to consider was gaining an insight into the experience of victims. As a previous Probation Officer, I felt I knew a great deal about this subject. How wrong I was.

Just to put it in context, three years ago my much loved mum died and for about three or four weeks I could not leave home. Then, when I could leave home I could not wait to get back. Why was I wanting to get home? Because it was safe, secure, protected, surrounded by a loving family.

When we went to this location with Councillor Coupar, Councillor Harland, we met women who were not safe, who were not secure, who were not protected, who did not have that familiarity of the surroundings and I really hope that this Council and partners can challenge the cultural attitude which has for a long time tolerated domestic violence and abuse and I really hope that the work we have undertaken will manage to achieve that objective. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Collins.

COUNCILLOR COLLINS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would like to speak on Minute 98, page 113.

Horsforth is very fortunate in having some wonderful schools. We have brilliant Governors, teachers and administration staff. They all work tirelessly to give the support and nurture our children need to grow and succeed in the world. I would like to offer them my thanks for their hard work and to apologise to them for the way the City Council treats them.

The City Council appears to believe that all schools within the city are flush with money and have pots of surplus cash at the end of the year. Please let me correct you on that assumption. This is not the case in Horsforth. Every penny of the meagre funds Horsforth schools are given are carefully and cautiously spent every year. We do not receive the level of funds some inner city schools are granted and it is only with a great deal of skill that our schools continue to run without impacting on any of our children's needs or education.

The Council's decision to now try and deprive our successful schools of even more money by charging them for appeals is disgraceful. It is not the schools' failings that have meant that there are shortages of primary school places in Horsforth; it is the Council's. For the Council to see the city's schools as another way of raising an additional £98,000 each year is appalling. Putting this target income into the figures for this year's budget does nothing to encourage this administration to correct their own problems.

It is the failing department within this Council that needs to be charged for each appeal, not the schools. The failing department needs to provide more places for the city's children at excellent schools, either by building more schools through the Free Schools Option or by improving the less successful ones. Surely this is fundamental to what it is there for.

This administration needs to realise that if more excellent schools choose to become academies in the future in order to take the purse strings away from the Council, they cannot point their fingers of blame at the Governors of the school or anyone else, only at themselves for their failure to realise what their ambitions to prop up their own financial imbalances mean to a lot of schools in real life. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Andrea McKenna.

COUNCILLOR A McKENNA: Lord Mayor, I am speaking on page 92, Minute 63, and I hope that Council will allow me to diverge slightly from the contents of the paper, which is Basic Needs. However, I am speaking on a school issue.

As you know, I represent Garforth and Swillington and I am delighted to be able to say that the winner of this year's Leeds Children's Mayor Competition, as announced last night, is Amy Eckworth-Jones from Strawberry Fields School in Garforth. *(Applause)* I am sure that colleagues across the Chamber will join me in congratulating Amy on her achievement, after her manifesto Safe Area Social Clubs received the highest number of votes after over 6,000 votes were cast.

The Leeds Children's Mayor Competition is celebrating its tenth anniversary this year and it continues to grow from strength to strength, engaging young people from across the city and giving them an early taste of democracy in action.

To be elected Children's Mayor gives the winner a unique opportunity to represent the children of Leeds at events across the city, the type of event that they would not ordinarily be at or perhaps even be able to attend. Past winners have been involved with the Tour de France when it came to the city, the Young Film Makers' Golden Owl Award and one winner even met the Queen. Another one gave a live interview for CBeebies on Millennium Square.

In addition to this, though, the winners represent their manifesto to Council and it sees how the changes they are making are progressed through the Council system and hopefully with a positive outcome.

This year's entries range from business open days, healthier hearts to disability inclusion and a children's entertainment play zone. From this it was whittled down to ten finalists, open to a public vote with a focus on young people voting and culminated last night's celebration which saw Amy becoming the Leeds new Children's Mayor.

Amy's winning manifesto asked for safe areas for children to play games out with their friends. She has suggested parks or local areas to school and wants secret supervisors to ensure safety for the children while they are in these areas.

This competition is something Leeds should be proud of and this saw a record number of entries, and I know that pupils really appreciate when Councillors show their support by going into schools and talking to them about their manifestos.

I am looking forward to seeing Amy take on her first public engagement tomorrow night when she helps the Lord Mayor with the Christmas lights switch on. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

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

COUNCILLOR DOWSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would like to speak on Minute 63 page 92 again, Basic Need, but I would like to start by just addressing Councillor Collins. 83% of primary schools in Leeds are good or better and that is despite your Government. It is due to the hard work of the officers in School Improvement. *(Applause)*

Since 2009 we have created additional 8,666 primary places with plans in place for a further 4,249. However, we do recognise that we have pressures across the city but it is also true that those pressures are different in each location. While it is true to say

that the pressure is felt across Leeds, it does differ across the city. Based on the Audit Commission Review of Free School Policy, the Government has spent £743m on 24,000 children being educated in 174 free schools. That is a lot of figures but what it actually equates to is that the average cost per filled place in a free school is almost £31,000 per child.

Now, the DfE fund Local Authorities per place per pupil is about £11,000 and for secondary it is £15,000, so free schools places are funded at almost double the rate of children in Local Authority maintained schools. That is a disgrace.

How is it fair? It is not fair at all to the LA, to the children of Leeds. It just is not. These figures do not include the £100m programme cost which add around another £1,000 per place created. We know that these free schools are not always based in the areas of need, which is why they are not full which, quite frankly, is a waste of money. We are currently predicting a shortfall in funding for primary and secondary places here in Leeds of £41½m, and that is up to 2018/19. It does not even include the additional cost for SEN and Sixth Forms. Councillor Latty, Councillor Bentley, you should really know that the Government has taken away our ability to open new schools. That ability has been taken away, unfortunately, so we cannot build them just by clicking our fingers. We have to go through a process to do that and that includes looking at and we are well aware of new housing developments.

Let us make it clear, free schools do not address our Basic Need Pressures. We all know they are one of Michael Gove's vanity projects and it is still Tory policy to dogmatically pursue this flawed scheme. Tory efforts to fragment education in this country is quite frankly shameful. Taking millions of pounds away from mainstream education where it is needed here in Leeds, you have been elected as Tories, you know, but your responsibility is to the people of Leeds. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Could you wind up, please, Councillor Dowson. Thank you very much.

Councillor Blake to sum up.

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. We have had some fantastic contributions today and I thank everyone who contributed. I will not have time to make reference to all of them. I do want to echo Councillor McKenna's comments about the Children's Mayor last night. It was a wonderful ceremony and Charlotte last year did a wonderful job for us and I know Amy will do the same. It links exactly to the points that have been raised in the Annual Report of the Safeguarding Board in terms of giving young people a voice in our city. It is absolutely crucial that we know what is happening with young people and that we take note of it and we inform our policy as a result.

We have also got to make sure that we get the early help in there to mean that we can fulfil our ambitions to safely reduce the number of children coming into our care.

The other really important issue is giving a voice to children with special needs, as Councillor Illingworth highlighted, and we do welcome many of the things in the Act but we are concerned about the cost, as he has said.

Domestic violence, fantastic contributions. We must not forget the impact that domestic violence has on children. Over 66% of all cases of young children under the age of one presenting for social care have experienced domestic violence in their families. It is a truly, truly shocking behaviour.

Coming on to schools, thank you for the comments about how we are tackling Basic Need. We have made huge strides forward working cross-directorate. We know the pressures we have got but Councillor Collins, I have to say to you, I am not sure if you are aware but the Schools Forum, supported by the Headteachers in Leeds, supported us writing to the Secretary of State, Michael Gove, asking for permission to use the DSG to spread the load of the admissions costs across the whole of the city and what did he say? N-O, no. That is the thing. He came back and said we had to make efficiencies and make the savings ourselves. This is an issue from the Governance part of the Council, as you are aware.

Can I move on to the Basic Need Programme as raised by Councillor Lamb. Can I just put this in the context? At the moment, what have we been discussing as a country more than anything? It is the need to devolve powers to local areas, Local Authorities and their communities. How ludicrous that the Secretary of State and her civil servants, therefore, can take a decision to move on to one of our sites and change the locks without telling us that that is what they are going to do. I ask you, is this the way that we should be sorting out school policies in our area?

We know that that site is worth nearly a million pounds in a capital receipt if it goes to housing. This is the argument that we have had. The Department for Education has said that we need to give over that site to a free school that they gave permission to two years ago without having a site. We do not feel that that site is appropriate for a school linked to the Basic Need that we have in the area.

They will not listen to what we are saying on that. We have nothing against Khalsa. We are working with Khalsa. We have worked with them from the start to sort this out and we have offered them other sites. Our whole philosophy is, we do not like, as Councillor Dowson says, the fact that free schools are being imposed on us, and academies, and being made to open in areas where we do not have the need for places but once the schools are open then we have to work with those schools and help prepare them to make sure, first of all, they are in the right areas, but they are our children within those schools. The idea that we would walk away from them as you are suggesting on a philosophical basis on a point of principle, quite frankly is absolutely ludicrous.

Let us just respond to this. We believe that the way the DfE have operated is high handed, it is inappropriate and it is not serving the needs of children in our city. For that reason we are continuing to negotiate with the DfE and that is the reason why we have not been talking about it because we hope beyond hope that the DfE will see sense and come and work with us so that we can provide the places that young people need in the city in the areas that they are required so that we can continue to build on the quality of education that our children need and deserve so much. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

(ii) Digital and Creative Technologies, Culture and Skills

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Blake. We now move on to Digital and Creative Technologies, Culture and Skills. Councillor Groves.

COUNCILLOR GROVES: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am speaking to Minute 87, page 108, changes to the library opening hours and community hubs.

The Library Service has undergone a massive change over the last few years but it is still held dear by the people of Leeds and I know that we all really value the Libraries in our wards. No-one is jumping for joy at reducing opening hours. However, I understand that the discussions around this paper have been broadly positive.

Since the onset of the Big Society David Cameron has made it difficult for libraries to survive. The idea that people would come home from work, make their tea, then run out and run the Library Service simply is not good enough.

Therefore, I would like to focus on the Community Hub model mentioned in this paper which we are moving towards.

St George's Middleton is a pilot and we are already seeing the benefits for both the Council and citizens. For the community, a single destination building works. Teams from Libraries, Customer Services, Employment and Skills have adapted to a one team approach. Prior to the hub the library was often shuttered down and open only 31 hours. By changing how the teams work, the library now opens 53 hours per week.

By pooling resources and working together, we offer a more effective and efficient service. In the Hub Partners is included the Credit Union and the local PCSOs. Our Customer Services teams are now taking enquiries for the PCSOs and feeding them through through hand-held devices. One resident reported recently by the time he had got home from the St George's Centre, the police were already waiting. Housing are due to move into the building alongside Health, that are already located there, and community groups like the New Forest Village and Friends of Middleton Park and also using the centre.

The Government Transformation Panel, working to Eric Pickles MP, visited St George's Community Hub recently. They are visiting Councils to look for good practice that can increase the pace of change across the public sector. They reported a good example of partners working under one roof. They were impressed how staff and partners had embraced change and opportunity to share expanded provision. I think this is a real good example of leadership on the ground. I hope this model will soon be available across the city and I am glad that Leeds is leading the way. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Khan.

COUNCILLOR KHAN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would also like to speak on Minute 87 on page 108 about the changes to library opening hours.

These changes are clearly a result of the massive funding cuts the Government continue to inflict on the people of Leeds. We worked really hard to ensure the changes have the smallest impact on our communities, especially those who need to use our library services for their job searches, for learning or for pleasure.

These proposed changes focus on the times when libraries are less busy so we can continue to offer the full service at the time when most people want it. This approach is supported and enhanced by our excellent mobile library service, which continues to grow from strength to strength. The mobile library service is incredibly popular in our ward of Burmantofts and Richmond Hill. Many people are not able to get to the library so we take the service to them. Some of these people are those who need or want to use the service the most. The figures speak for themselves. The children's mobile at Richmond Hill Primary School issues an average 26 books each hour and the Community Mobile at Clark Mount issues about 17 books per hour. Buying books is expensive that is a difficult for families on a tight budget to meet so it is fantastic that the Council is still able to lend books to people, even when they do not live near or cannot access the library building. This is why we are delighted that we are not reducing the number of mobile libraries in our communities, as many other towns and cities have had to do. Despite the impact of Government cuts we still have a great Library Service here in Leeds and I hope we can keep offering this to people long into the future. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Golton.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am a little mixed up there and I will explain why in a moment. The review of our Library Service did not begin with this administration. I have to say, when we were in joint administration a library closed in our ward because the numbers of people that were visiting it did not actually tally up with the amount of money that it would have cost to actually make it safe and secure, and we closed one.

Of course, with the environment that we are in at the moment which financially is far tighter, there will have to be a more comprehensive review of library services, and I think the majority of Councillors in this Chamber will approach that responsibly. When we got to discuss this at Executive Board, it was agreed all round that everybody had engaged with the process, that the Library Service themselves had been honest and open and, more to the point, they listened, so when they had initial closing times that were different to what they were used to, they actually listened to the Councillors, they took them on board and they amended it so that everybody at some point during the working week could have access to their local library.

Unfortunately, I was still getting telephone calls from local residents concerned about their library being closed and I could not understand where this was coming from because, as you know, Liberals are very good at putting stuff in their focus leaflets which say what a terrible job the Labour administration is doing on certain issues. We did not do that on this issue because we knew that what was being done was responsible and we were being engaged.

Unfortunately, the problem came from the literature which was being put out by their own Party, who were so busy getting involved in the rhetoric around massive Government cuts and "Your Library Under Threat" that people actually thought it was going to close. Obviously, it was done so that the following leaflet could actually come out with the title, "Rothwell Library Saved."

I do not think that kind of debate is helpful, Lord Mayor, and I am sure that it does not make the Executive Member's job any easier when she is trying to do the responsible

thing because at the end of the day you have been voted in, you are responsible for the choices that you make and when you demonstrate that you take things responsibly, it does not help when your own Members actually undermine your argument.
(Applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Yeadon to sum up.

COUNCILLOR YEADON: Thank you. Library Services, the challenge that we have to find a way to sustain a modern, relevant and vibrant library service is not just an issue that we have got in Leeds. I think you will see in the press that it is an issue that is across the country at the moment. I think Liverpool is one that is particularly in the spotlight at the moment, where they had been consulting on the closure of eleven libraries, which I think they have not gone ahead to do, but I know that the majority of Core Cities and major Authorities across the country have in some way been reviewing or consulting on library opening hours or closures.

As Councillor Golton said, it has been an ongoing issue for a number of years not only because of the Government cuts that we cannot underestimate have hugely impacted on the service, but also because of the way that people use libraries is changing and what people want from a library is changing. The way that people access information, the written work whether it is on your Kindle or your phone, you may not necessarily go in to get a real live book any more.

With wi-fi as well, I went into Clark's shoe shop the other day and I could get free wi-fi on my phone and I thought it was ironic that we are still pushing to make sure that can be rolled out throughout all libraries, which I am very pleased to say it will be over the next six months.

The libraries are changing, I was really incredibly grateful for the way that Members responded to the consultation which was positive and it was constructive in the way that everybody engaged with officers and I think a lot of credit has to go to the officers for them haranguing Members to say "We need to talk to you" and so I do thank them for that.

I think Councillor Groves is right, if we are going to have a modern and relevant Library Service for the future, how do we build those relationships? It is those relationships within the Local Authority, across departments, whether it is Jobs and Skills, as Councillor Khan mentioned, or whether it is outside relationships with local community groups. The model of a Community hub is going to be really important for the future and how do we extend that out in other ways.

Community Asset Transfer is not going to work for everyone. It may work for some and we have got some examples in the city where it has worked, but it is not going to work for every community. Through the consultation we saw different community groups saying "We do not want to run the library but we could probably do it on Thursday afternoon. Why don't you give it to us for Thursday afternoon?" It was extremely positive that the consultation looked at those different examples, and it is how do we use, like Councillor Khan says, the mobile libraries?

In Kirkstall the library closed a few years ago but the mobile library that we have in Kirkstall actually reached more people than the static library used to, so it is about

making sure that there is a library service there. It may not look the same as it has done in the past.

Councillor Golton, I appreciate your comments about the openness and honesty and the transparency of the library service, and the consultation. It is very difficult when you are consulting on services in people's wards because people are passionate and I am very grateful for all Members who have passionately articulated why libraries are important because they are advocates for our service, they are advocates for the staff that work in those services and it is getting that message out to local people.

I have not seen the literature myself so it would be very difficult for me to comment on anything that has been sent out; perhaps that is something for you to communicate with your ward colleagues. It is great that ward Members are passionate about their services and they want to defend their services, but they also want to work with us as a department to constructively look at how the service should evolve for the future, how it can be sustainable for the future and how it should be relevant for the future.

It is a hugely important resource and it does get people passionate and that is because it is important. We know it is not going to look like it looks now in the future but if we do not engage with people, if we do not communicate with people and if we do not walk with ward Members to know what is important for their wards, then it will not be relevant.

The Library Service is committed to continuing that and is committed to look at new ways of working so that it will still be there in ten years in the future. Thank you.
(Applause)

(iii) Adult Social Care

THE LORD MAYOR: We now move on to Adult Social Care. Councillor Coupar.

COUNCILLOR COUPAR: Yes, thank you, Lord Mayor. I am speaking to Minute 60 on page 90 and I am making comment on the Safeguarding Adults Annual Report.

I cannot stress enough the importance of partnership working in relation to Safeguarding Adults. When organisations come together to work alongside each other, sharing knowledge and practice, then those they aim to serve should only benefit. We discuss many issues in this Council Chamber but I cannot think of any more important than an individual's right to be protected from harm or neglect. When the Care Act is implemented in April 2015, the safeguarding of adults will be put on a new Statutory footing and many of the current partnership activities will be required by law.

We are very lucky in Leeds to have strong local partnerships already in place but it is important that we do not rest on our laurels. We should continue to work to maintain strong partnerships and improve upon them.

I am pleased so support the approach of Safeguarding that Councillor Ogilvie has prioritised and the importance he has placed on partnership working. For this to be successful he has expressed the need for a clear vision and priorities, together with a consistency of approach, clear lines of communication and clear understanding of the roles of others.

In Leeds the Safeguarding Adults Board has a vision, a strategic plan and a Safeguarding Charter alongside agreed priorities for each year. This ensures a commitment to a common approach and common aims. Working to support people at risk of abuse and neglect requires close partnership working.

Leeds Safeguarding Adults Board has already sought to do this by developing new partnership approaches. For instance, in April 2013 they introduced a shared multi-agency Safeguarding Policy and procedures that will help partners learn from and develop best practice with neighbouring Safeguarding Boards.

Locally, closer relationships between the Adults and Children's Board and Safer Leeds Executive have been formed and to add to this, more integrated working practices between Adult Services and the Police are being explored.

In Leeds, a Joint Board Development Day was held with the Safeguarding Boards and Safer Leeds Executive to identify potential opportunities for closer joint working, such as we have heard earlier with the domestic violence agenda and the Think Family agenda. It is imperative that the Council and agencies work together in partnership. The more we do, the better the outcome for the very people we are trying to help and I look forward to further updates and improvements from Councillor Ogilvie and his department. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Urry.

COUNCILLOR URRY: I speak to Minute 60 on page 90. As winter sets in I want to talk about care services for some of the most vulnerable people in our city.

When temperatures fall below freezing for two consecutive nights, national protocols require us to open emergency shelters for all rough sleepers. Leeds opens them on the first night. They include 16 places at St George's Crypt and many more at other centres. It is not luxury, typically it is curtains and Z-beds in a hall, but it is shelter and it saves lives. It is only a small part of our offer to the homeless. The Council has a duty to secure suitable accommodation for people meeting set criteria, including the right of UK residents being unintentionally homeless and in priority needs.

In the small hours of Friday I will again be joining officers and our Commission Service, CRI, on the twice yearly head count, looking for rough sleepers and persuading them into accommodation. The November head count is critical to get homeless people under cover before winter really sets in. We also commission CRI to go out at least three times a week and every night in freezing weather to find rough sleepers. In the small hours experienced staff approach people with coffee and friendly words and seek to get them to shelter. We commission twelve hub places at St George's Crypt and more at other providers, including St Anne's, Leeds Housing Concern and others to provide short term accommodation, food and support. Our Housing Option Staff visit the hub every day from 7.30am to find longer term support and housing solutions for people who have come in overnight.

Work continues longer term to support people into permanent accommodation, stable lifestyles and, yes, even employment. I have met people who were once isolated, homeless, often drug dependent and suicidal who have transformed themselves with help to provide outreach to others.

In talking of vulnerable adults I must also mention voluntary services such as Leeds Asylum Support Network. At St Aidan's Church Hall in Harehills on a Thursday people in limbo are provided with food, accommodation advice and legal and medical support. Whatever the issues around migration, asylum seekers are people thousands of miles from loved ones who deserve respect and human dignity. I would love those in Whitehall who have been quietly planning to end EU rescue of refugees from sinking vessels in the Med personally to go and meet some of these refugees and volunteers at St Aidan's.

This is just part of Leeds's often unacknowledged Adult Social Work quietly going on in the background, so please let us acknowledge it as the cold weather really sets in.
(Applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: That concludes discussion on the Minutes of the Executive. We now move on to other Minutes and on page 15 we start with North and East Plans Panel. Councillor Paulene Grahame.

(b) Regulatory Committees
(i) North and East Plans Panel

COUNCILLOR P GRAHAME: Lord Mayor and fellow Councillors, I am speaking today on Minute 77, the extra pack, The Drive. I congratulate any Member of this Chamber who has not so far heard about this particular property. Members of the North and East Plans Panel and its predecessors will have had great opportunities to understand the impact of this extension on the local community. For nearly a decade this case has been showing what a determined individual can do if they are ready to push against local and democratic decisions. Yes, it is a peculiar case but it is one which shows the need for a locally led Planning Policy as we agreed in Leeds earlier in the year.

The original extension was not built to the specification laid out in the Planning application. The resulting building, in residents' and ward Members' opinions, was way out of line with other houses in the area. It was too tall, too different to the homes and simply too large. In my view the extension built would not have been passed by the Planning Committee. This would have been troublesome but not unsurpassable if enforcement action had been allowed to take place. The building work could have been undone and a new extension meeting the planning permission could have been built but instead we had repeated applications, appeals and claims to the High Court from an owner who at times did not seem to understand the impact of their development on the local community.

At each point local people and their elected representatives hoped that this would be the last roll of the dice but each time a new barrier was placed down by the owner, each time seeking to amend the original planning permission in ways that would allow the existing building to remain. Nearly a decade after the original application we now have a scheme agreed by local residents and ward Members that represents a significant improvement both on the original application and the unattractive existing building. Local residents from Cross Gates have given time, energy and commitment over nearly a decade in order to get to this point. I want to thank them for their resolve and their determination, which has been a wonder to behold. I also want to thank Councillor Charlwood and Members of the North and East Plans Panel not just

for their work so far but also for their demands that the work required takes place promptly. This is demonstrated by their ability to extract an undertaking from the owner of the property, something we will all be watching to make sure is followed.

The eyes of the Planning Department, Plans Panel, Ward Members and most importantly the local community will be on the development. Now is the time for the works to be completed and I hope the developer has understood this at last. Anybody passing cannot understand what all the fuss is about; it is hidden behind some beautiful trees that have a protection order on, so he even uses Mother Nature to get what he thinks he can do. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Macniven.

COUNCILLOR MACNIVEN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I wish to speak on North and East Plans Panel Minute 79. As a Member of this Plans Panel and Councillor for Roundhay, I was delighted that application 14/03196/FU presented on October 23rd 2014 for the demolition of the former public toilet on the edge of Oakwood Square and its replacement with an interesting new building housing a café was unanimously approved.

This favourable decision to the third proposal for this site is the final stage of a huge effort in which the community of Roundhay has been engaged to aesthetically enhance the Oakwood village, to improve its attractiveness to residents and visitors and thus positively impacting on the fortunes of the many businesses in the area.

In late 2012 as a new Councillor I was requested by residents of Oakwood to investigate the Council's plans to address the sad disrepair into which the much loved Oakwood Clock had fallen. I was horrified to learn that although on the Council's radar to be preserved, there were many other equally deserving edifices and the clock was number 101 on the city list. As I reported this back to the community I added, more in hope than expectation, that we might take up the challenge ourselves. The response was immediate, positive and dynamic. Since 2012 the Oakwood Traders and Residents Association (OTRA) has worked tirelessly and inventively to support the project.

Fundraising began immediately and continues to date from a dinner, to rock festivals, an arts fortnight, generous donations from local artists, businesses and schools, donations received from individual residents past and present. A bid to the Heritage Lottery Fund for a six figure sum was successful and has resulted in OTRA members becoming engaged with the community in the collection of reminiscences and in the provision of an historical online Oakwood Trail.

Not content with merely saving the clock, the community then decided to simultaneously redesign and restore the surrounding square. Efforts to raise funding for this are in full spate at the moment, major income is being raised through the sale of 500 paving stones inscribed for all time with the names and messages of individual families with a connection to Roundhay. The residents are grateful to the Heritage Lottery Fund for their help with the clock and to Caird Peckfield who, I understand, are contributing to the rejuvenation of the square through the landfill levy.

Throughout the assistance and encouragement provided by Executive Members and LCC departments, particularly Civic Enterprise, has been invaluable and is hugely appreciated by the community.

The fly in the ointment which marred all this was the semi-derelict public toilet looming over the square. That has been addressed by this recent planning approval. Its early demolition and the erection of an interesting new café incorporating in its construction stones from the original building has been extremely well received by the community. Thank you. (*Applause*)

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

COUNCILLOR CHARLWOOD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would just like to thank Members who have contributed to this interesting debate. Good points are made in relation to Members' own wards. Generally the Panel is always aware of the strong feelings that are aroused by planning applications in local areas. We live and govern in a time of increasing population, a scarcity of housing, but we also live in a big city, green space is at a premium and whilst people want affordable houses for their children, they also want adequate play, recreational space and countryside to enjoy for years to come.

Members on Plans Panel sit and determine some complex and weighty subjects, many of which are covered today. I would like to thank all the Panel Members, they have managed somehow to remain fresh and engaged all day long through site visits and long afternoon debates, and clearly genuinely care about the matters for discussion.

Thanks are also due to officers for their support and diligence in preparing reports, applying their professional acuity to each case. We are very well served by officers and an awful lot of work goes into the preparations.

Councillor Macniven raises about the toilet block in Oakwood, which was a pretty dilapidated toilet block behind the Oakwood Clock. They have now got permission to build a timber framed, timber roofed two storey café and restaurant retaining some of the original bricks to the Gledhow side. This redevelopment should enhance the restoration of the Oakwood Clock and together with a thriving farmers market means the whole section of land should be utilised much better in the future, in keeping with its heritage and the character of the area. Members were actually very impressed by the design of the proposed structure. Being in woodland the timber should complement the character of the area and bring welcome use back to the section of land.

It must be said that ward Members, local traders and residents worked together in an exemplary way which makes the area attractive to investors, so I congratulate you on that. Councillor Macniven is rightly proud of the improvements to her area and I really welcome her contribution.

Councillor Paulene Grahame made some excellent points and I am glad she welcomes the decision that was made. This is a long-running planning dispute going back almost a decade where the property owner has not complied with a number of enforcement attempts, instead seeking permission from the High Court to be allowed his original plan. This case shows the more general importance of making clear decisions with a view to being able to defend them in another place.

Members make decisions which can be appealed and significant litigation can ensue. Conversely, it is also true that Members must be conscious of the detail of the decision to ensure it is implemented correctly and is as intended. The attention to detail requires Members to be very methodical and I think probably is why Plans Panels can go on for so long.

The final agreement is better than the original Planning Permission, which is very welcome. The Panel want to be kept informed and updated on the progress of the implementation. This is still on our work schedule and we will keep a close eye on it.

We have made some excellent decisions for the city and I would like to note my thanks to all involved and also I would like to note the Lord Mayor's contribution to this particular Plans Panel before he was Lord Mayor – thank you for that. Thank you. (*Applause*)

(ii) South and West Plans Panel

THE LORD MAYOR: We now move to the South and West Plans Panel, Councillor Iqbal.

COUNCILLOR IQBAL: My Lord Mayor and fellow Councillors, you will have to forgive me with my hoarse voice today. You will have to put up with it. I am speaking today on Minute 22, page 190, about the land on rear of Sandon Mount, which is in my ward, City and Hunslet.

This application for a small private site for travellers was rightly refused by the Panel. I and my ward colleagues objected to the objection [*sic*], as we felt it was in the wrong place, being sited right next to the M621 motorway. Anyone who has stayed in a caravan, even a top of the range caravan, will know that the sound insulation is nothing close to a house. The motorway is open 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. It would not be reasonable for a Planning Authority to permit people, especially children, to live permanently in such a noisy place with little or no chance of reducing the noise.

There is no doubt that we have a challenge to meet the needs of traveller and gypsy communities in Leeds. The Core Strategy, which we will be talking about later, says that 62 pitches are needed in Leeds up to 2028. This is a challenge every Member must think about and every ward must act on when it comes to site allocations.

We are doing our bit in the City and Hunslet ward by hosting a temporary site with ten pitches. I absolutely welcome this temporary site and hope that it will continue to be a success. I was heartened to see that this view was shared by Members of the City Plans Panel. I appreciate that this is still a live application so I will leave my comments here.

We have had so many illegal encampments in City and Hunslet in the last few years. This is not something we want in the future. Everyone wants a safe and secure place to live in, whether this is a house or a pitch to put a caravan on. We need to work together, alongside gypsy and traveller organisations, to find suitable sites that meet everybody's needs.

Just like every other Planning decision, individual circumstances have to be looked at. In this case it was the wrong location for a permanent site. I want to thank the Plans Panel for doing their bit in such a professional manner. I hope that we will continue looking together for the new sites in order to meet our long term needs. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Leadley.

COUNCILLOR LEADLEY: My Lord Mayor, I wish to speak about the background to the refusal by Plans Panel South and West of a small, private traveller site at Sandon Mount in Hunslet. This decision may be the last of Leeds's traditional traveller policy whereby the City Council has gone to extraordinary lengths to avoid granting planning permission for traveller pitches anywhere other than Cottingley Springs, with disastrous consequences for all.

In Morley, a private traveller site was granted permission following support from the Town Council in 2010. That was the first to have been granted in Leeds without going to appeal for at least 20 years. Unfortunately, it did not form a precedent immediately followed by others. The administration clung to the tradition of offering or allowing nothing legitimate other than Cottingley Springs.

We can see cracks appearing in that policy. Many of those close to it would have to admit privately that the application to expand Cottingley Springs, which was the subject of the recent Public Inquiry, has little or no chance of success. As if to underline that, the temporary site at Kidacre Street at the back of Meadow Lane Gasworks in Hunslet, originally promoted as a one year stop-gap to be used pending expansion of Cottingley Springs, recently was granted a three year permission by City Plans Panel rather than the one year originally recommended.

Gypsies and travellers make up a tiny fraction of Leeds's population. If they are allowed to live on small, easily managed or self-managed sites, it will be to the benefit of all. It is not surprising that city which has offered two choices, Cottingley Springs or unauthorised encampment, has made a lot of trouble for itself. Thank you, my Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dawson.

COUNCILLOR DAWSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I wish to speak on Minute 37 on page 200 on the development at Owlery Farm in Morley South.

The site at Owlery Farm is one that should not have been developed. It was a PAS site in the Leeds Unitary Development Plan and is currently in agricultural use. Areas such as Owlery Farm were included in the UDP adopted in 2006 as a Protected Area of Search (PAS). The intention was that PAS sites were reserved for longer term development needs.

At the July meeting of this Council we agreed unanimously about the concerns of the activities of landowners and house builders who appeared to be making a concerted and deliberate attack on localism by inundating the Council with planning applications on PAS land. Owlery Farm is one of those sites.

The effective release of this land for building is that other wards in the city, where they are desperate for regeneration, where there are outstanding planning consents, do not get developed. It is not economic to develop them. That is what we are told. These same builders do have money and investment to take options out on green field and PAS land, such as Owers Farm.

The site of Owers Farm is now being developed and the Council has successfully applied the policy of providing 15% of any development with affordable homes, which is very welcome in Morley where we have nearly 2,000 people on the Council waiting list. This contrasts with another nearby site where the developer refused to agree to the 15% requirement for affordable homes and the application was quite rightly turned down.

In addition the Owers Farm development, through Section 106 money, will bring in an additional £800,000 to be invested locally. This will include nearly half a million to be used in investment in education and new school facilities which is needed in Morley. It will also lead to local training and employment initiatives during construction, which again is very welcome in Morley.

The development of this site reflects the changes made outside of Leeds and made by Central Government. The changing of the goalposts in 2011 to stop a brown field first development policy has meant that more PAS and green field sites are now under threat. I see this as just another example of localism being overridden by this Coalition Government where decisions are not made locally, they are made at Whitehall overriding our local rights. Thank you, my Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Townsley.

COUNCILLOR TOWNSLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would like to speak to Minute 40 on page 204, and Minute 42 on page 205.

As President and former Chairman of the Horsforth Historical Society I firmly believe in protecting our county's heritage. I am sure that every Member of Council will feel the same way. However, I am not sure that is necessarily true as far as some of our Planning Officers are concerned.

The Woodside Corn Mill and its predecessors were so important that they were listed in the Domesday Book which was an account, of course, of the buildings and land held by the Crown in 1086. Horsforth was charged 30 shillings because of two corn mills, one at Troy and one at Woodside. Here endeth the history lesson.

For the past few years, and after several attempts by developers to demolish this building and opposition from myself, local historians and residents in resisting the bulldozing of it, it looks like the developers have eventually won; leave a building long enough and it will collapse. Previously at least one developer saw an opportunity to save the building and there was even a suggestion that this could have been used as a local facility for recreational use. That soon passed and the building was left again to rot and fall into a great state of decay.

This latest application is for its demolition and a rebuild into offices. Even after discussions with the owners asking for much of the original building to be included within the design, we are still in the position where there is resistance. However, all

is not lost. English Heritage are at least attempting to come to the rescue by putting in a late objection. They too would like to see more of the original stonework included within the design.

I am delighted that Plans Panel have agreed to defer this application until further discussions have taken place with both English Heritage and Leeds Civic Trust. The Leeds Civic Trust actually included this building in one of their monthly reports, saying that it too objected to the demolition of one of the city's last remaining corn mills. In contrast, however, an adjacent mill, Horsforth Mill, is a wonderful example of good practice. Consultation at an early stage with ward Members on an application to redevelop this mill, which is to accommodate 89 flats, has resulted in this building being retained. This multi-storey mill is an important feature on the skyline. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. This brings us to the end of comments on Minutes. Can I now call on Councillor Wakefield to exercise right of final reply.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Firstly, I do think there has been an incredible amount of brilliant contributions today because actually on the first one by Councillor Gruen, I remember ten years ago sitting at Exec Boards and sitting here and listening to a very depressing story about looked-after children. Guess what, 40% behind the rest of state school kids in GCSEs; 8% with A-levels and the usual sad social story of exclusions, poor performance, unemployment, drug problems, alcohol problems and so on.

Some people thought that was inevitable and I think the story that Councillor Gruen narrated today was a real sign that you can turn things round. The work with the 16 schools, the work with Beckett's Park have proven that actually these children can achieve and I think when we come back with those results, I know they are going to be incredibly much better than they were ten years ago, so I think we ought to congratulate the officers and all those agencies involved in turning around the lives of vulnerable people like looked-after children.

It is similar to the story that Councillor Illingworth told about special needs and, as you say, 18%. The fact that 93% of people are unemployed with special needs I think is a real indictment on our society, on our Government. We are trying to do something here in terms of making sure we employ disabled people into jobs, but you have still got huge swathes of people who cannot get a job, cannot find that dignity, that self-respect, that confidence because the jobs are not being put before them. I think there is a lot of work to do.

I know some of the retail – Marks & Spencers, Waitrose and others – are doing bits around it but it just shows you how bad a decision closing Remploy was which gave people that dignity and respect and self pride that people get from work. I think it also adds to I think the decision that the Government made, how bad that was, in terms of cutting their benefits, which I think Councillor Yeadon talked about, which allowed them to get the mobility to look for jobs, go and get the interview and come on. A lot of them now say they are trapped in their homes. I think those are very powerful stories and huge challenges for this Council.

On Councillor Harington and Councillor McKenna - Councillor Harington, it is a long way to go to understand silos but I hope you enjoyed that trip to Kansas. The point

you make is like the point that Councillor McKenna makes. It is no longer good enough to do things to children. You have to work with children and the increase in the interest, Lord Mayor, is, I think, a classic example. From ten years ago there was a few hundred and now there is ten thousand who are taking part in voting for that.

Lord Mayor, one of the things I thought, for those people who were at the Cenotaph Sunday, nothing was more inspiring than watching that young person deliver a wreath alongside the Lord Mayor with such great seriousness and respect and dignity, and I think that is the way we need to treat our young people in the future, with that seriousness, that respect and listen and have a voice, as I think Councillor Coupar and Harington have been doing is a real powerful vehicle for those young people.

I have to stop just a minute on the Fir Tree because I think Councillor Blake summarised the dilemma for us very well, because you could not write a script as bad as this. Somebody you offer to meet and negotiate two weeks before, they send their letter on 10th October to tell you what they are going to do and then change the locks of a building that belongs to the people of Leeds, invested in us, Leeds City Council, so that we cannot get in. Never mind consulting about the use or the alternatives, as Councillor Blake said. Never mind saying, “Hang on, don’t you have a statutory duty as a Local Authority to look after special needs?” because guess what, that school was identified as a serious option for a special school like Elmete while it needed refurbishing to put those pupils in. Did they listen? No, they did not and never mind so-called local democracy.

Frankly, Councillor Lamb, your account of the Exec Board story is completely wrong. You may have been badly briefed but I do not think we, in the 21st Century when everybody is talking about localism, we should allow that dogmatic ideology to come in, change the locks, take a million pound asset and then just walk away. That is not acceptable in today’s political democracy – not acceptable anyway. If they did it somewhere else, in Eastern Europe, you would be all up in arms and say what a dictatorship. It is not good enough for Leeds City Council, it is not good enough for those pupils.

You have asked us a question about free schools and academies. Let me put it straight. Free schools should not be at the expense of the vast majority of pupils in this city. (*hear, hear*) (*Applause*) You can have anything you like. As I say, I hope we can get down to some sensible negotiation and consultation because that is the way to do business, not come up with your big heavy boots, change the lock and keys and walk away, never even talking about remuneration. I think both Councillor Blake and Councillor Dawson are right.

In terms of domestic violence, I think Councillor Charlwood put it over very well. When you hear 14,000 people reporting you can be absolutely horrified, but you can also be reassured that actually years ago, I hate to say this because it makes me feel a bit ancient, but years ago when people walked round with bruises, particularly women, it is because they walked into a door. Now people are feeling confident to report to those agencies which is really growing and recognised as one of the best in the country because they have got the confidence in the reporting system, and so if we are seeing increases we should actually be reassured that victims are now not hiding behind the door or frightened, they know they will be seriously listened to and they know they will be actually looked into and protected.

One thing we should have as a city, and I know we have, a zero tolerance to domestic violence. It is not acceptable just to close our eyes or ignore it, not today, and so I am pleased with the work, I am pleased with the progress that has been made.

Councillor Groves, of course, in terms of the Hub, it is a fantastic model. Your older colleague, Councillor Truswell and I, go back some years in terms of the One Stop Shop, and when we started the One Stop Shop it was about integration on benefits. This is a much better model, this is about getting the police, getting Credit Union, getting Health in and tackling unemployment, tackling social exclusion, tackling financial exclusion and actually it is a model that we all want to see rolled out and I think it is having a huge impact, I have seen the Credit Union there, as you know we opened it together, and there are huge crowds there. That is when public service is at its very best.

On Councillor Golton's library issue, we can only congratulate Karen Bruce and Councillor Nagel for keeping that library open, can't we? *(Applause)* Fantastic campaign - even if there was never a threat it is a fantastic campaign! *(laughter)* Guess who is guilty of doing that the most? The Liberals. They do it all the time. We used to call them the Pothole Party, do you remember that? Now it is the Streetlamp Party. The times they have written leaflets claiming victories, what they have done. The times they have done that.

Again, I just want to finish off, Councillor Ogilvie has mentioned it, Sandie Keane has left and what a brilliant and fantastic officer she was. She led with great authority, made changes that were transformational and we will miss her. The Safeguarding is another great example of strong partnership joined up with Children. We do not want to see and watch these programmes where our elderly people are being abused in homes or in hospitals or anywhere. I think that model that you are developing and that increase in reporting is a sign that we really are getting on top of that Safeguarding issue, which all of us want to see.

Finally, what we did not get to but I can sneak it in now, I want to congratulate the Adult Social Care Officers on winning £6m to deal with isolation by elderly people with their very imaginative, creative bid which made this the only city that managed to get £6m. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. I now call for the vote to receive the Minutes. *(A vote was taken)* That is CARRIED.

I will just remind Members that Councillors agreed to withdraw the Community Concern which is Item 13 from the Agenda.

I think it is time we had a tea break. Just before I call for the tea break, I would just like to mention once again that the lanyards for the Lord Mayor's Charity are on sale in the ante-Chamber and they are being modelled by three of our Councillors, Councillor Gabriel, Councillor Jarosz and Councillor Chapman. If you would show your parties a lanyard, because you should all be wearing your ID and this is a suitable lanyard on which to put it, but it also shows your support for the Leeds Children's Hospital. I am sure you would all want to support that.

Can we all be back for, say, just after five o'clock. *(interruption)* We have a lot of business. Five-past five then, we will split the difference. I like to get you back early

because there are always stragglers and we have got some important business to discuss with the Core Strategy and the CIL, three White Papers and a motion.

(Short break)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Members of Council. We are now moving to the items relating to the Leeds Core Strategy and the Leeds Community Infrastructure Levy.

We will now debate these items for a period of one hour, following which I will call for votes on the recommendations relating to each item as set out in the reports. Councillor Gruen.

(5) and (6) Recommendations of the Executive Board – the Leeds Community Infrastructure Levy; Adoption of the Charging Schedule and Leeds Core Strategy; Inspector Report and Adoption.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. We are about to take a very significant step in adopting the Core Strategy and the Community Infrastructure Levy. It is a significant step from 2001 when we had the UDP, which is now outdated and no longer fit for purpose. We spent seven years getting to this point. The first work done on this document was in 2007.

The experience of other Authorities has led us to understand very clearly that there are two key issues. The first is that we need to have a sound Core Strategy, as it is called, and the second is we have to be able to demonstrate a five year land supply. Indeed, Nick Boles MP, the Minister, said as much in Parliament earlier this year. He said:

“In the absence of a local plan and a five year supply, the preferences of local people and local communities as to where development should happen will unfortunately not carry the weight it would have carried if that Local Authority had a five year supply and a local plan.”

Nothing can be clearer than that from a Government Minister, so the first question for us today is, are we going to adopt the Core Strategy having received the report from the Inspector and he has found our Strategy to be sound.

To go back to our inheritance as an administration in 2010, we had an out-of-date UDP, we had a SHLAA process which only involved one Member of Council to represent all of us and it was never reported back in any formal structures, and we had just gone through a painful and costly set of appeal where we lost eleven appeals and it cost is £1m. That is where we were at in 2010 and I say that not politically but factually, that is where we were at. That is where we found our position to be.

Today, we now have the opportunity of adopting the Core Strategy where the Inspector has agreed with very many of our suggestions that we put forward ourselves. He has agreed a planned period up to 2028. He has agreed a housing target which I know is controversial but it is not the 90,000 that the volume house builders wanted and it is not the 50,000 or so that some communities want. It is slap bang in the middle in that range.

He has agreed the step up that we wanted. He has agreed 65% of brown field in the first five years and 55% thereafter. He has agreed a windfall allowance and the managed release of sites, a plan-led system. This is a real achievement. There are issues around population which I will come back to in my summing up, because I suspect other people will talk about that.

My final comment is this. The elephant in the room today is the fact that we have an election within six months. I tell you now, colleagues, we would be having a very different debate today if it were not for the fact that there are Members of Parliament in some of these seats who are fighting for their skins and that is what the elephant in the room is. I know, they are sitting up there. I know, I have seen them.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Piece of cake, Peter, piece of cake.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: That should not hinder us accepting the Core Strategy, which I think is an excellent document for us to adopt. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Selby.

COUNCILLOR SELBY: Formally second.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Procter.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Colleagues can see from the Order Paper that there is an amendment to the core Strategy, or an addition, should I really say, that is in my name. Some people who do not follow these matters closely may be slightly baffled by this amendment but safe to say it is what most elected Members, certainly from what they have said to me across this entire Chamber, actually want. That is to say, they do not believe that 70,000 houses will be built over this planned period.

Indeed, there is a big question mark about how we ever ended up with the 70,000 figure. Do any of you know? I thought not. Some of the Members of my Scrutiny Board started to get to the bottom of the approach yesterday but the absolute truth of the matter is that the advice that was given to us at the time by Professor Peter Boden was “within a range” and for some reason the Council chose to accept the figure right at the very top of the range. Professor Boden’s advice was that the range should be between 2,500 dwellings per year and 5,375 dwellings per year. The Council chose the 4,375 top of the range number rather than any other number.

It is for that reason that all of your communities, all of our communities, have been getting so exercised because they have followed these matters, they have seen the numbers that were in the SHLAA, they have seen much of what GVA and Professor Boden actually put forward.

It is right to say that we in this Group have always been supportive of the need for a Core Strategy. We agree with the element that Councillor Gruen has put forward in relation to that need. What we disagree with is the need for the numbers identified. We spoke at the Public Inquiry at some length on that point.

What you should also know, colleagues, is that there is a further report being prepared now, officers of the Council have it, I was denied it until a little earlier today. I now

have got a section only of that report that again shows the updated figures and the range. That is since, or taking into account, the 2012 base figures where we saw a drop of 20,000 in the projected population growth.

That is critical – it is critical. We want to build houses for the people who need them in this city, obviously we do, and for those people who are educated in this city at universities and want to stay in this city, but we do not want to concrete over the Green Belt when there is no need to do so. I know Members of all Parties share similar concerns, Lord Mayor. Thank you.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Collins.

COUNCILLOR COLLINS: I would like to second the amendment.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Campbell.

COUNCILLOR CAMPBELL: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Could I start on, I suppose, the Cinderella part of this discussion, which is the CIL, but actually is a very important part of the way forward within Planning and within providing infrastructure in particular for the city.

I think it has been clear from the start that CIL will never do what many people thought it would and that is pay for all the infrastructure needs associated with any development. Indeed, I think we have done a calculation to say it would not even cover the education costs. It seems to me that we could and we should have been more ambitious when we set the CIL rates because once again the people of Leeds are going to be asked to pay what is in effect an infrastructure subsidy to developers.

Notwithstanding that they will be getting an infrastructure subsidy, I am sure that developers will come forward, as they do now, and say “Oh, it is really hard to develop this site, we cannot afford to do it, we are down to our last million, I do not know how we are going to make ends meet” etc, etc, “please can we have a reduction?”

There is a bit of an issue here because the CIL, even though it is at a low rate, is probably not negotiable and so I have a grave concern that developers will come along and say, “Well, where else can we shave money off?” Let us talk about 106 money. 106 will remain, you will not have any control over it as we do at the moment but it will remain, but mostly it will be associated with affordable housing, so affordable housing will be provided via 106 agreements.

You can see it, I can see it; where are they going to shave the costs? They are going to shave the costs off affordable housing.

Now, this Council does not have a very good record on forcing developers to include affordables. In fact, if you recall, it took a resolution of this Council, a unanimous resolution of this Council, to say that we expected in the Core Strategy that all developments would have an element of affordable contributions – not necessarily a house but an amount of money that would go into a pot that would provide affordables. I think we were remiss in not insisting on that to the Inspector, who has come back to us and said yes, you can do that in part of the city but not in all of the

city. Again, we are being asked to subsidise; again we being asked to accept second best for affordables.

I will not spend time talking about the number. I think John actually, in that short, brief point made the point for us. The numbers are wrong, we all know they are too high, we said this at the publication of the draft – we were, sadly, overruled.

One thing we do agree with, though, is that any housing that should take place has to take place in response to affordability and what areas need. I am not sure that the Core Strategy does that. I notice I am running out of time, Lord Mayor, so I will come to the end. The Core Strategy will be the basis of development in Leeds. It over-provides housing land, mostly for the benefit of developers. It removes Green Belt from unwanted and not needed PAS sites and it will let down residents by failing to supply a secure of affordable housing for local people.

Yes, we need it, we need a Core Strategy, yes, we need a CIL; I am not sure we need this one. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor James McKenna

COUNCILLOR J McKENNA: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Members in Armley and other parts of West Leeds want to see sensible growth in housing. Residents need to know that their children will have somewhere to live. Members also want to see green spaces, parks, recreation facilities protected. Again, these are ambitions that everyone can understand and surely support. Having an adopted Core Strategy seeks to find a way to balance these equally understandable needs. Not adopting the Core Strategy now could risk the very ambition Members, local people, are trying to secure.

It is the role of the City Plans Panel to decide on large and strategic applications. Members want to see well designed mixed housing schemes in the right locations. Having an adopted Core Strategy will help achieve this.

There is no doubt that there is a need for housing across the city. The current Council Housing Waiting List is around 25,000 households. This does not include people who are living with relatives or family or trying to save up to buy their own home. Of course the Core Strategy looks at all housing but the need for affordable housing in key areas like Armley, West Leeds and for many parts of the city is paramount. While the Core Strategy is unadopted, it will not be possible to move on with the work to formally identify sites.

This puts at risk other sites - ones that could meet developers' desire for profit but may not meet communities' ambitions for sustainable and affordable homes. There are some wonderful green spaces in Armley, like Gott's Park and Armley Moor, but care also has to be taken in the decisions made about other areas of land in Armley and West Leeds, especially those that are now used for informal recreation. Currently there is a shortfall in Armley of green spaces as a whole.

It is therefore appropriate to take these decisions together in the round through the Site Allocation process, than it is to see them disappear one by one through planning applications and appeals. Adopting the Core Strategy therefore gives Plans Panel a very clear set of guidance to make decisions.

This will allow Panels to make defensible decisions that will help to protect our Green Belt and site our housing numbers in places that are more acceptable to local communities and elected Members. I am afraid, John, your amendment does not help in this process. It is rather late in the day to come up with this. We certainly can expect this amendment, if passed, to be vigorously contested by the house builders. Thank you, Lord Mayor, I can see the red light. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor McKenna. Councillor David Blackburn.

COUNCILLOR D BLACKBURN: Lord Mayor, I think previous speakers have said that what we need is a Core Strategy because if we do not have a Core Strategy in place, whatever it is, basically it is disaster, it is anarchy and we are falling into the trap of the volume builders, but the 70,000 figure for housing, as John said – my recollection is different to John on this but I think the first time I saw the figure was in relation to the Yorkshire Regional Spatial Strategy that was done under the previous Government. It seems to have got a life from there and gone on and on and on, and it has no reality with what is out there.

The fact is, we are not going to need 70,000 houses. The fact is, the industry, even at the peak when they were building all the apartment blocks in the centre of Leeds, were not building that many houses a year, so it is impossible (it is to me) an excuse to the volume builders so what they can do is, they can make big profits building on Green Belt first, and that is what it is all about.

I think John's suggestion of the amendment is a good suggestion. There is nothing to stop us going on at that and at least we have got the Core Strategy in place. It might not be what we all want but that would be a sensible thing to do, I feel, and there is no reason why we should not do that, and I think the Inspector has actually mentioned the possibility about reviewing the housing numbers. That is the sensible way forward and I hope Council will do that.

The fact is, we cannot leave it to the volume builders because we have got people out there that need housing – not the kind of housing that volume builders want to build, not ones that are thousands and thousands of pounds more than people can afford. We want houses for working people and we are not going to get that by leaving it to the volume builders, so what I would say is, support John's amendment and go forward with the Core Strategy together.

On the CIL I have got to say I share Colin Campbell's fears on this because I just do not feel that there is enough in that to supply what we need. I know there are reasons why we have ended up where we are but the thing is, I think we need to be more challenging. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Leadley.

COUNCILLOR LEADLEY: My Lord Mayor, the Community Infrastructure Levy, or CIL, should be introduced in Leeds on 6th April next year. It follows legislation enacted by the outgoing Labour Government in April 2010 which has been adopted with adjustments by the Coalition. Some local Planning Authorities have CIL in place already. The Leeds scale of charges is, to an extent, experimental and likely to

be subject to early review. Any flaws shown up by practical application should be ironed out without causing widespread or long-lasting dismay or difficulty.

Most of the Core Strategy is uncontentious and a credit to those who worked on it through the years. The one thing that has eluded them is a sensible housing target. From a recent report in the Yorkshire Evening Post it seems that Councillor Andrew Carter now supports the LDF New Dwellings Target of 50,000 units which I have been promoting for some time. The total reasonably likely to be built is actually between about 35,000 and 40,000. 50,000 is ambitious though not ridiculously so and it would allow leeway to deal with shifts in popularity between districts and between dwelling times.

The LDF target of 74,000 units gross in 16 years is beyond reason and sooner or later it will fall into disrepute. Eventually no-one will try to get anywhere near it, so we will finish up drifting without a credible target at all. That target, well over 4,000 a year, derives ultimately from the Yorkshire and Humber Regional Spatial Strategy adopted in May 2008, just two months before the credit crunch and recession began. It was based on an assumption of perpetual upward growth from the peak of a boom. In the last round of RSS public consultation in December 2007, I said that those assumptions were wholly unrealistic but we have been stuck with them or their derivatives ever since.

Our best chance of escaping from that trap came in the Spring of 2013 when the detailed returns for the 2011 census were published just before the draft Core Strategy was put forward for public examination. A delay of only one Council cycle would have enabled us to build in those best and most reliable population figures into the LDF.

What we have now is a statistical assortment. We have got housing targets drawn from the inflated 2008 RSS housing and 2008 ONS population growth assumptions, a reasonably accurate local academic assessment of what Leeds's population was in 2012 and the ONS 2012 population growth projections which actually were a partial climb down from the 2008 figures which must have been prompted by a partial analysis of the 2011 census returns which they were carrying out at the time. Really, it was the 2011 census returns published in 2013, not the 2012 predictions, which were the best and most up to date figures and which should have become the base for the Core Strategy. They were an absolute count, not a sample or estimate. We had the chance to adopt them and build them into the draft Core Strategy but we did not take it.

Leeds will not have a million people in time for the 2031 census, or anywhere near it. Fewer than 830,000 are likely. That is why we will need far fewer dwellings than the LDF target of 74,000 by 2028.

Allocating land to satisfy the inflated Core Strategy target will place great and unnecessary pressure on the Green Belt and urban green spaces. If it is allocated for housing, alternative protected areas, land will be lost from Green Belt for ever, the practical legal and financial difficulties of reversal are more or less unsurmountable. That is why we will be supporting Councillor John Procter's amendment. The overall target, which his Party now seems to support, matches ours and the suggested method of achieving that target before Site Allocation took place, or a fully calculated and

examined target which is likely to be close to it, seems to be the only option now open which will avoid unnecessary and irreversible losses of green spaces and Green Belt.

Unlike an adoption of CIL which might to a degree be harmlessly experimental, adoption of inflated housing targets now followed by early review after the Site Allocations have taken place would not allow all the consequent errors to be corrected. Some of the most harmful effects would be irreversible. Thank you, my Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Latty.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Lord Mayor, we have got a lot of looking at the big picture here but I am a ward Councillor and I would like to look at the picture from a ward point of view or, in actual fact, from a housing area point of view because my ward, basically, is a housing area all of its own.

We are talking about 70,000 houses. That is not what I am looking at. I am looking at 2,300, my percentage of those houses for my ward. What we are talking about is how it is going to affect people.

This housing area over the last 15 or 20 years has seen all its brown field sites, or what became brown field sites through knocking down factories, schools, public utilities, they have been built on, all the brown field sites have disappeared.

With the extant permissions that we still have, we shall have had built something in the order of 2,000 houses in Aireborough and most of those houses are being built and have been built in Guiseley. The same thing is going to happen with the 2,300 houses that we are supposed to take, the bulk of those in Guiseley.

To build those houses we are going to have to build them on Green Belt. We are all talking about brown field first – we ain't got any brown field first, ours is Green Belt. What happened to the Green Belt Review? As far as I can see the Green Belt Review was the Site Allocation process which really is a review by default and there was not any real room for argument.

What about infrastructure? We have just had infrastructure mentioned. I believe officers told Development Plans Panel that it would take something in the order of £400m to provide the infrastructure to cope with 70,000 houses. Have we got £400m? Not in Aireborough we haven't. No mile of public road has been built in our ward since that headlong expansion began. Even if we had the money there we could not build the roads because we have already built houses where the roads would have gone, so there is nowhere to put infrastructure in.

The Strategy has not even planned for schooling. I appreciate Councillor Dowson did say that we cannot build schools, but we can provide the land to build schools on. We have not done that. We have not done anything about job creation except take away jobs by knocking down factories, so there is nowhere for people to work.

In a nutshell, Lord Mayor, any young couple buying a house that gets built out of these 2,300 houses in Aireborough will be buying a house where they have not got any new roads to get them to the schools that have not been built or to get to the jobs that are not there because we have closed them all.

Lord Mayor, whatever we do we must reduce these numbers because we just cannot cope with them, or we must get a new method of sharing them out and I do support Councillor Procter's amendment. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Golton.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. You may have noticed that the first spokesman from the Liberal Democrats to speak on this, of course, is Colin Campbell. I appreciate I am not a Planning expert and whenever anything like this comes up in Executive Board, I always make sure that I consult with my colleagues who have spent a lot of time on Planning committees because they know far more about it than I do.

Similarly, I am coming at it from a viewpoint the same as Councillor Latty in terms of being a ward Councillor. I can appreciate, actually, that Councillor Gruen and his colleagues are entering into this Core Strategy in good faith and are wanting to do the best thing for the city and I appreciate that a lot of the housing growth which is associated with this plan will actually be built in areas represented by Councillors such as Councillor Gruen. However, one of the things that you do when you are in administration is sometimes you challenge your officers, and I feel that the numbers that have been put forward for the Core Strategy – and I will reiterate again, we support the fact that we should have a Core Strategy because it is your best defence but we join other colleagues in questioning the numbers of housing which are associated with it.

We appreciate that our officers' class were traumatised by those appeals which were referred to earlier which led to a £1m loss when developers challenged our position. Unfortunately it meant that the response was that we were overly risk averse and we over compensated, not only in terms of the numbers that we put forward therefore for our Core Strategy, but also in terms of sacrificing land that we had safeguarded and opened it up to developers, and I refer specifically to PAS sites in my own ward in Rothwell where the interim PAS land policy meant that we sacrificed some areas in order to save others and then discovered later on that actually they were an unneeded sacrifice because we already had enough land that we could demonstrate a five year supply.

This is where it comes into the community aspect, because PAS land is an important aspect of this plan, because as well as your 70,000 houses that you have to identify land to build on, you also on top of that need to demonstrate 10% more in PAS land and where is that PAS land going to be? I can assure you that it is not going to be in the inner city part of this city, so we are asking a lot of communities to take on the prospect of some very intense development, and those communities, a lot of them are stepping up to the plate and they are forming Neighbourhood Fora and they are taking on responsibility in a voluntary capacity to shape their communities and they are being given a far tougher job when they are being set targets for houses which are unrealistic and would make their jobs untenable.

If we are supposed to support those Neighbourhood Fora we should be having another look at our Core Strategy in terms of the numbers that we put forward to it, so I support the approach, accept the Core Strategy but we do review immediately the numbers that are associated with it. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dawson.

COUNCILLOR DAWSON: My Lord Mayor, I want to look at what adopting the Core Strategy will bring to Morley. One of the greatest areas of concern is the building of new houses in the Green Belt around Morley. Firstly, in Morley Town Council area adopting the Core Strategy is likely to mean the building of around 1,600 new homes over a 15 year period, just over 100 per year. In my ward, in Morley South, it will mean not a single Green Belt site will be lost through housing development; one site may be lost as a PAS site.

Having the Core Strategy in place will stop nearly 10,000 houses from being developed in the Green Belt in Morley North and Morley South wards. Key sites will be protected such as St Mary's at Woodkirk, Owers Farm extension, Tingley Station as well as sites along the Morley and Middleton corridor. Not to have a plan, not to have a Core Strategy or delaying the adoption of the Core Strategy will mean that every Green Belt site is vulnerable and significant development can take place.

Already there is a developer looking to build 600 new homes in a Green Belt site in my ward. If the Council adopts this Core Strategy today, then they do not have a chance of building on that site. It will be interesting to see if my ward colleagues vote today to stop this erosion of the Green Belt in Morley or whether they will vote against the Core Strategy and take a gamble – and it will be a gamble – that we could end up with vast tracts of the Green Belt being lost for ever. No-one knows how a Planning Inspector will decide at appeal if we do not have a Core Strategy in place.

I keep reading about the 7,200 new homes being built in Morley. It is simply not true. Indeed, nearly a third of this number already have planning permission – we cannot stop these from being built. Another third, around 2,500, are not in the two Morley wards. My MBI colleagues seem to want to fight battles over the Green Belt in Middleton, in Wortley, in Lofthouse, in Ardsley – areas they do not represent.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Somebody has to. They don't.

COUNCILLOR DAWSON: The Planning Inspector has agreed a figure of 70,000 for new homes in Morley and this may or may not be achieved, but what the Opposition do not explain is why at this stage the Planning Inspector would change his mind from the current numbers. The answer is he will not. The suggestion of using 50,000 is a figure plucked out of thin air.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: No it is not. Your own advisers advised you, if you bothered to look.

COUNCILLOR DAWSON: It is simply not tenable. It is simply not tenable. Adopting this Core Strategy is the best possible deal to protect Morley's Green Belt and green spaces. I believe the adoption of this LDF Core Strategy is necessary to do that. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Finnigan.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am deviating very slightly just to see that rather desperate attempt by Councillor Dawson to hang on to his seat,

which he will fail miserably to do in May by arguing that the Labour Party have saved, somehow, Morley green field sites, like Daisy Hill – not really; Owlers Farm – not really; Bruntcliffe Road – not really. They voted for those to be developed, green field sites to be developed time and time and time again.

Of course, one of the major culprits, when you look back, is Ed Balls and his Regional Spatial Strategy which set these sort of ridiculous unachievable figures back there backed by his missus, who was the Housing Minister at that point and spoke up time and time and time again for this ridiculous unachievable target. If you think voting Labour is going to save any green field sites in Morley, then you need your head examining.

Back to the prepared text. My colleague, Councillor Leadley, has persuasively and eloquently spoken about the folly of the 70,000 housing target contained within the LDF. My comments will cover the consequences of adopting this unrealistic and unachievable target by analysing what a 70,000 housing target will mean to the communities we represent and how these communities will suffer under this target.

70,000 new houses between now and 2028 means a completion target of 5,692 units a year every year for the next 14 years. This is a target never reached, nor anything anywhere close to it in a previous year, even during the boom years when mortgages were handed out based upon calculations on the back of fag packets. Based upon the average price of a home in Leeds of around £160,000, the 70,000 housing target requires a total investment to deliver it of somewhere in the region of £11 billion in just under 14 years. That is almost a billion pounds each and every year with no real indication of where this massive amount of money is to come from.

70,000 new housing units equates, according to the planners, to an additional 18,500 primary school pupils. If we accept 600 place primary schools, and that means an additional 31 primary schools over the next 14 years, more than two new primaries a year every year for 14 years. If we accept a price tag of around £8m per primary school, then the bill comes to 248 – quarter of a billion pounds. My maths is not good! Quarter of a billion pounds of public sector cash and where is this cash coming from? Certainly not from CIL.

70,000 new housing units equates to 7,000 secondary school students, an additional seven high schools, one new high school each and every year adding a further £140m to the public sector bill, where there is no money. We can throw in the additional 111,000 traffic units during peak time. The target is unrealistic and unachievable and is based on figures many population experts are sceptical about.

We support Councillor Procter's amendment. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Walshaw.

COUNCILLOR WALSHAW: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Is it me or is there an election due soon? It is really hard to tell from the contributions this afternoon.

I have got a few points on some of the observations to go through, colleagues, and thank you all for your congratulations about our happy news. That is the last of the small Walshaw projects, I promise!

Right, I cannot really underestimate how important the Core Strategy is to the people of this city. I think this is an important day for the people of this city; this is a good day for the people of this city. As Development Plan Panel Chair I have got a few thanks to make.

First of all, for Neil Taggart, former Chair, for getting us in large part to this point. He did an excellent job and he is also a star in the YEP today, if you all want to have a read. I have not read it yet but I will do.

I would like to thank the Development Plan Panel Members both past and present and all you lovely colleagues on the Council for all your help so far in the Site Allocation Process. It is very much appreciated and your contributions have almost all been really rather good. I would like to thank particularly the people of Leeds, every group that has corresponded, every group that has got in touch, every group that has got involved, every person that has got involved in this really important process for us as a city.

I would also like to thank the Council officers for the amount of work they do, often under a lot of pressure from people like me and I think you will all agree and join me in saying that they do an excellent job.

Turning to this lengthy and this really challenging process that we have all been through that started in 2007 and is now reaching its summation today, and I hope you will all vote to accept the Core Strategy and the CIL charging schedule because, guess what, after much consultation, much inspection, the Government Inspector in his draft report agrees with this administration that we have got the right strategy and policies to take this city forward. The plan is declared sound and that is incredibly important for us as a city.

Why is the Core Strategy important? This is about putting the powerful forces of land and development and capital, making them servants of the people of this city rather than the masters of the people of this city, and I think that is enormously important for people, particularly us on this side of the aisle to represent. I think that is incredibly important. We often speak for those poorer communities who do not have the big voices and they do not have the consultants and they do not have that kind of fire power. The orange light is on already – good grief.

I think turning to a couple of issues, I think there has been some disquiet about brown field sites and perhaps our ambitious housing targets will mean the brown field sites will not come forward. I actually think they will. You are already seeing brown field sites come forward already, in City Plans with Councillor McKenna we see that. Also I would say that the phasing of sites in this process, and that is key, we need to think, colleagues, about the phasing of when sites identified will come forward. Brown field is our priority and, guess what, the Inspector agrees with us.

Turning to population figures, there is going to be a lot of debate with perhaps more heat than light this afternoon, and I think I attended the Housing Scrutiny Board, and after two hours, three hours of examination it was clear that Professor Boden, who is our independent expert, was right and that his figures are good, they are ambitious, they are that is for sure, but the Planning Inspector agrees with those figures. After all this examination, he has got a fancy amendment with a 50,000 level that frankly does not really hold water and it may be done in the best of interests to serve the people of

this city but it will raise the real possibility that the plan is unsound; if our plan is unsound the developers in this city will cherrypick all those sites that you guys do not want to see developed - you are shaking your heads now.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can you wind up, Councillor Walshaw?

COUNCILLOR WALSHAW: I think we should all vote for this Core Strategy, colleagues. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Anderson.

COUNCILLOR ANDERSON: Lord Mayor, there is no doubt we do need a Core Strategy and that is a fact. However, I do wish some Members across there would actually read what our amendment says. We are changing the recommendations, not anything else. If you do not believe me, read your Order Papers in front of you.

There is much to be welcomed in here but because time is short I want to concentrate on the need for flexibility. Where is the flexibility that is meant to be part of what we are doing?

The Inspector himself says in modification MM6a that the information is based primarily on the 2008 based population projections and has not reflected the 2012 based population projections which were published at a very late stage, so there is a hint to you, I think, that he is trying to say to you, "Have another look. I agree with the fundamentals within your Core Strategy but I do think you need to look again at that."

The housing numbers are unachievable. To back this up I have here a letter which comes from a Government Minister where it says clearly:

"Our guidance is clear, that wherever possible local needs assessments should be informed by the latest available information."

The latest available – not some historic look back in history the way some people would like things to be interpreted.

We have already heard today about the transport issues that were raised by the NGT group that in a way what we are doing here with some of the recommendations we have got in there is we are actually boxing ourselves in. There is nothing wrong with the principles in what you are talking about in transport. It may be at the end of the day a trolley bus is the best thing for this city, but I do think that the references that they made should be something that is reflected back.

Can I just briefly say something and ask a question of you in the 30 or so seconds I have got left? There is a great comparison between John Prescott and Peter Gruen. They both think that the Green Belt should be built on, amongst many others. The other thing I would say is, and I think this is a fundamental today, this is a terrible day for democracy in this city. The Labour administration are ignoring the views not just of us but of your own residents in your own wards. I have been privy to discussions where a lot of the Members opposite have been arguing as to why development should not take place and arguing the case clearly, concisely and correctly in what they are doing.

There are going to be elections coming up in May and I think some of you will not be returning because the parties that are arguing that we are all a bunch of you-know-whats, are going to win the day because we are ignoring, and you in particular are ignoring the wishes of your local residents.

THE LORD MAYOR: Please wind up, Councillor Anderson.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Charlwood.

COUNCILLOR CHARLWOOD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. The Core Strategy was submitted to the Secretary of State in April 2013. Here we are in November 2014, 18 months later, seeking to get approval from full Council on it. Therein lies the biggest problem we have in shelving or changing this proposal. These things take significant time to get through all of the stages they need to be implemented.

There are many reasons why this is a sound strategy. It is bold, it deals head on with the housing crisis that we all know we have and we refuse to bury our heads in the sand about it. We are planning for 20 years ahead. Being plan led protects us from development on a scale in places we do not want. Because of the Core Strategy we have maximum control over where the development will be and the quality, the size and the types of infrastructure and other facilities that we need and yet provide in a responsible way for the future needs of the city. A no brainer. So you would think, until you come into this Chamber and hear the arguments from the Opposition – arguments that centre on population numbers, essentially, and for that difference you would have us throw out the year's work, the significant investment the taxpayer has committed to this project...

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: It does not say that. It says approve it.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Read the amendment.

COUNCILLOR CHARLWOOD: ... and effectively start again. We have got a projected number of 70,000; you say 50,000.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: No, it does not say that.

COUNCILLOR CHARLWOOD: In five years' time our projections will all be wrong, guaranteed. What do we do in two years' time when your projections that we come up with again are wrong? How easy is it for the Opposition Members to have the best of both worlds. It is frankly madness to operate policy on those terms. No forecast can be relied upon as concrete evidence but used carefully, along with other evidence, it is a guide.

We can build in a review of the population forecast if it is necessary and phase the releasing of sites through the Site Allocations to get around all the problems Members have predicted today. However, that reassessment should not be now. The Inspector states:

“I do not consider that reopening the debate to discuss the population projections would lead to any clear and reliable conclusions regarding objectively assessed need.”

Imagine the scenario. We accept the amendment, have a significantly weaker strategy even though we are in a sound position with the Inspector, we have put significant resources into the lengthy project and we can see the difficulties other Authorities are facing as a result of having a protracted and ill-defined process. We end up in a tumultuous two to three year gap where court cases allow appeals in the Green Belt and in all sorts of places we do not want development. We do not get our brown field sites developed, there is poor quality or no inner city development and all the while it will be the Labour Group taking the blame as the ruling administration for allowing chaos to rule. Then the Inspector will not approve our revised plans.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Rebecca, you have not read the amendment.

COUNCILLOR CHARLWOOD: This is irresponsible. Months ahead of a General Election the Opposition are seeking to extract maximum political capital out of the process. In contrast, we as the party of sound governance, willing to do the hard graft (*laughter*), willing to provide security for our citizens into the future. (*interruption*) They should grow up, support the Core Strategy and work with us to implement it. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: I am sorry, those Members that were calling for the red light but I could not hear the debate. I was hoping you would just quieten down so I could hear the finish. Councillor Cleasby.

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: Lord Mayor, I am assuming that we are discussing (5) and (6) together collectively, even though I noticed on the Order Paper they are separate votes. I have concerns, Lord Mayor, Council.

In 1995 (that is in a previous century) when I was first elected I inherited the task with my Group of working up the UDP. Like now, it was quite an onerous task. There was a hell of a lot to get through and now this side of it, we realise mistakes were made. One of those big mistakes was when we got traditional employment sites we just assumed that they are traditional employment sites. We did not annotate them as employment sites. We are now suffering as a result of that because the challenge, they can be turned into housing because they are not employment sites.

A classic example in my ward happened, Lord Mayor, when on Low Lane two garages which I contend is an employment site. People are employed to sell cars, people are employed to clean cars, people are employed to service cars – to me that is an employment site. Oh no, officers said, when a developer came along to put 49 houses on it. Thank God we beat them off because very soon you will see a grand mill opening which will now take a company of 125 to a staff of 500 employed in high tech medical software, Phoenix. To be congratulated, but even better, and I have mentioned this in Council before, their travel plan – not our travel plan, their travel plan – if you sign to work for them you sign to live within half an hour’s travel and if you think about it in our city, that is pretty damned close, so that is 500 local jobs for Kirkstall, for Weetwood, for Horsforth and so on around. That is just one point, so the important thing I am asking of officers – some of whom are sitting up in the gallery – we make absolutely sure every scrap of land has the correct and proper annotation on it so we are not getting warped things happening. That is one thing.

The other thing, something happened in my ward just recently, Lord Mayor, and I refer to page 49 of the charging there under CIL. We have got a problem with Trinity University because their agents totally cackhandedly handled the situation where the college, university, wishes to grow, and I assume our three universities wish to grow. There is not a CIL charge on a block of 250 students living there. If that was McCarthy and Stone putting an elderly purpose living accommodation there, there would be a CIL charge.

What is worse, the top figure of the university – and just talking Trinity University – would like to go to a total intake of 4,000, so that means another not just one in four living on site but three in four travelling there and we do not have a contribution through the CIL, I believe.

I would ask of those officers sitting up there, would you please check that out. Thank you for giving me the time, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Cleasby. Councillor Rafique.

COUNCILLOR RAFIQUE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Lord Mayor, I am speaking on the Community Infrastructure Levy. Contrary to some earlier comments and perceptions, CIL is not created by this Council but is something that we need to pass in order to recoup some of the costs of development.

Many people outside these walls are not particularly interested in what CIL is or, indeed, how much we will be charging for different areas. However, they do care about where there are school places for their children, health facilities for their parents and places to exercise and play outside.

The rates have been set in these with an eye to commercial viability. We understand that developers must make a contribution to everyday life, especially in those communities that will be impacted. Getting the balance right is one of the hardest parts of setting the CIL rates.

The amount we receive will not be enough to meet all of our infrastructure needs, nor could any amount realistically achieve this while developers do hold on to their assets, thinking about their viability, including their astronomical profit rates.

Developers do need to understand their plans come with a price. At the very least CIL is a transparent way of achieving this. A two-tier scheme as demanded by Central Government would be complicated and hard to understand. Both as a Board Member and as a Plans Panel Chair I see cases where developers try to over-complicate matters or try to get away with only a minimum, paying a minimum contribution. CIL will not stop this from happening but it should provide some clarity and knowledge for both developers and local communities for infrastructure projects.

I would prefer a single system but we have no option but to follow the law set by the Government. I was pleased to see that the examiner had so little to say about our plans for CIL. This shows what a good job the Council did in preparing for these changes. Lord Mayor, I welcome that Authorities from across the country are coming to us to learn about how to create a successful CIL.

It would be wrong to think that CIL will cover all of our infrastructure costs; it will not. However, to do nothing would mean an even bigger loss and one that would truly devastate the city. I hope, colleagues, that you will be able to join me in supporting a Leeds Community Infrastructure Levy. Thank you, Lord Mayor.
(*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Dobson.

COUNCILLOR DOBSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am taking the most pragmatic view possible I can on this debate this afternoon for one simple reason. I was on the wrong end, like many people in this Chamber, of one of the decisions that went against us some time ago and I will tell you, when you go and you meet a Public Inquiry in this very building and you make the arguments about sustainability, infrastructure, flooding, drains, roads, you name it and the only question is where are you going to put them, I never want to be in that position again. I did not like it one bit.

70,000 houses, is that achievable? Frankly, I will be absolutely honest – I am not sure. I have not got a crystal ball, I cannot see in to the future. If you look at the 1981 census they reckoned there would be a million people living in Leeds by this time and there is not. What I think we must do is accept one principle. We have reached an agreement that the Inspector and the Council have settled upon and to not accept it at this stage in the game gives me real concerns, which are, I really do not want the situation in my ward again where key areas and strategically bad areas for development are laid bare, and through adopting this strategy we can avoid that.

I have concerns that it will stop the Site Allocation Process. I have concerns that in reopening an inquiry in the here and now what we will actually do is give the developers a second bite of the cherry and I do not want to be in a position until 2016/17 where this Council remains vulnerable to avaricious development in areas that are inappropriate.

Actually I think the idea of a review is a perfectly sensible and sound one; when we are able to project going forward, look at the numbers of housing, what is being developed, what do population growth actually look like in the short, middle and longer term, and I think that is perfectly right and something that I understand we can do in the current mechanisms, but I really want to be in a position very quickly where I can say to the developers who are coming forward virtually every month with proposals, their vision for Garforth, their vision for other areas in this city that do not actually involve many of us, and I want to say, “Sorry, we have got a Core Strategy in place, we are working hard with Neighbourhood Planning Forums, we can demonstrate land supply, we have a sensible and pragmatic approach to how to deal with this matter in this city.”

I want us to be there. I would not rule out a review but I think to do it immediately will put us back in the danger zone and from my perspective, as somebody who has already been in the firing line once and really did not enjoy it, I want to be a ward Member, as I am sure we all do, that can actually shape and scope this debate and where houses go and the infrastructure and the key word I have not heard this afternoon, sustainability, that the developments that we do get do have the schools and the roads and the infrastructure and the community facilities that we all want to see achieved.

We cannot do a King Canute and try and hold back the tide. This is coming and I think it is incumbent upon us to demonstrate that we have got the understanding to develop that but, of course, not rule out at some point in the future we will want to revisit it if the numbers do not stack. I think that is perfectly reasonable. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Jonathan Bentley, then I will call on Councillor Peter Gruen to sum up, Councillor Bentley. Sorry, Councillor Carter, my apologies.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: It's a good job you are a nice fellow! My Lord Mayor, I do wish that some of the Members on the Labour benches with even a rudimentary grasp of what we are debating this afternoon would tell the rest of them that the amendment does not stop the adoption of the Core Strategy, it does not stop the moving forward of the Site Selection Process. It merely ensures that we undertake a review simultaneously.

My Lord Mayor, I have been absolutely firm and absolutely straightforward throughout this process. We were informed, all of us, a long time ago, the baseline was this Council had to have a Core Strategy and we have supported the progress of that Core Strategy but we have opposed the housing numbers that you put forward because they are based on outdated 2008 population statistics, they are based on you deciding, Councillor Gruen, you and your officers deciding, I suspect not your Members, deciding that you would take an upper figure from a range of projections of houses that were needed and using that as your housing figure. That cannot be right.

Since then we know the population projections have gone steadily down in certainly two and I think now about three further projections. We have called for a review consistently. I am very proud, I have to say, of my Members and, indeed, Members of all the Opposition Parties, who spent days and days at the Core Strategy hearing. I did not see many of you, to be frank with you. In fact, I only saw two, including you, Councillor Gruen. That was the place to go and fight for your constituents and we all did.

My Lord Mayor, there are some very good things in what the Core Strategy Inspector has said. He had adopted nearly everything the Council has asked for. It leads you to believe that we were far too, far too ambitious with the housing figures because earlier last week, thanks to our Member of Parliament for Pudsey, we met with the Minister, Brandon Lewis, and he pointed out and confirmed to us in writing that:

“I would add that in the light of concerns on changing population and household projections, the Inspector included a modification to the Leeds Core Strategy to commit the Council to monitor evidence regarding housing need and delivery.”

Another blatant hint, this time from the Core Strategy Inspector backed up by the Minister saying we should be reviewing the position, but you refuse. It leads me to believe, Councillor Gruen, that you are in fact, talking about politicians losing their jobs, actually peddling the housing policies of Ed Miliband and you are not pushing for a proper Core Strategy that suits the people of this city. It is your Core Strategy, it will have to be adopted but we will go on fighting to get those numbers reduced and

we are giving you the opportunity to join us in that by voting for Councillor Procter's amendment.

Finally can I say, on inheritance, Councillor Gruen, when you took over this Council you inherited 14,000 planning applications for housing units granted by the Authority under the Coalition in the previous four years and 23,000 consented units in the bank. It is time all of us started saying, and Planning Officers in particular, to the building fraternity, "We do not build houses, you do. We gave you the consent and you chose not to build them. We are not a recalcitrant Authority." (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Bentley.

COUNCILLOR J BENTLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am pleased that Councillor Carter wound up on the housing issue because I am not going to talk about housing numbers or housing development, but I would like to spend a few minutes looking at the principal enabler of development, that is the transport policies which are in the Core Strategy.

If we look at some of the wider objectives of the overall strategy we see expressions like, "A well connected district", "the delivery of accessible and integrated transport", "protecting and enhancing the strategic green corridors." From the specifics in the transport policy sections of the strategy, our policies include improved connectivity, to tackle transport's contribution to climate change, lower levels of car usage, secure the delivery of a fully integrated transport system and making better use of bus network.

We have absolutely no problem with these principles and policies and we will do everything to support their implementation.

What is disappointing, though, is that the first chance for many years the Council and Metro, the Combined Authority, have to promote a new public transport scheme, it promotes the trolley bus, the NGT, that does not live up to any of the principles and policies in our Core Strategy. It is not integrated or connected, it does not even connect to the bus station or the new retail developments. It is not integrated with bus services, it does not share bus stops so passengers need to change buses or have a long walk to go. It does not protect or enhance our green corridors or conservation areas, it will lead to the destruction of over 400 mature trees as well as listed and heritage assets. It does not reduce congestion or lower harmful emissions. At the Public Inquiry the promoters conceded that as a result of the trolley bus scheme the number of car miles travelled would increase. Congestion on non-NGT traffic would increase leading to higher fuel consumption, increased emissions, contributing adversely to climate change.

The Core Strategy says that we should be making better use of the city's bus network but by the promoter's own admission, the scheme will not result in better use being made of the city's bus network; exactly the opposite. Bus services not on the NGT route could be cut by as much as 50% and this will be in areas of high deprivation where families rely on public transport to work, to study and to socialise.

Lord Mayor, we will be saying more in the White Paper debate later on. You have heard what residents from across the city think of the trolley bus scheme. It has no

place in the Core Strategy and is non-compliant with it. Thank you, Lord Mayor.
(Applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Gruen to sum up.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: I would like to start by thanking everybody for their contributions. Clearly I enjoyed some more than others. I would also like to thank all of the officers involved in the preparation of all these years in the Core Strategy and CIL and I hope that Mr Riordan can write to our colleagues to thank them on behalf of the Council for a monumental effort – well done.

Colleagues, we must never under-estimate the audacity of the Opposition to re-write history. As Councillor Rafique rightly pointed out to Councillor Campbell, who introduced the CIL policy? Not this Council. I have said publicly it is a dog's breakfast. It is yours, your dog's breakfast. We are having to live with a CIL inheritance which will not pay anything near the infrastructure needs that we all know we have.

Councillor Anderson lectures us about all the things that we should be doing. He single-handedly for six years was the only Councillor who was in charge of the SHLAA process. He told nobody about it, he never came back to us. He single-handedly had that responsibility and discharged it badly. Do not lecture us.

Then we come to everybody's opinion about what the housing targets should be. Colleagues, I trust all of your judgments. You all have the right, like a football manager, to think you have got the best team, but the only judgment that matters is that of the Inspector. It is not historic. In September, two months ago when his report arrived and he said:

"Assessing housing need is not an exact science and small changes in headship rates and other assumptions can have a significant impact on the calculations. However, on the basis of the evidence before me..."

- the evidence before me –

COUNCILLOR PROCTER: 2008 evidence.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Five year old evidence.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN:

"...I am satisfied that the Core Strategy figure of 70,000 (net) is based on a reasonable objective analysis of the need for new housing in Leeds up to 2028."

Wind your necks in. Your opinion is not the opinion that matters. The opinion that gives us a Core Strategy which is sound is that of the Inspector.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Peter, you do not understand.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: He has made that judgment, and why is it that Bradford and Harrogate and York and Kirklees and Calderdale have not got a Core Strategy? I

say this not with any degree of *schadenfreude* because they are trying very hard to get a Core Strategy, but their house numbers have not been accepted by five different Inspectors. They are too low. They will not accept their figures.

We have got a sound plan and your amendment seeks to wreck that sound plan.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: It does not and you know it.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Rubbish.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: You are lying to your own Members.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: You cannot have a sound plan based on what the Inspector has said and on the day before...

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: We have got a plan, we will review it. That is all it says. Review it.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: Before the ink is dry you are going to underscore and undermine that soundness.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Rubbish.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: I have given you an undertaking we will have an early review.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: In three years. You said three years.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: When, Peter? When?

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Go on, when? Tell us when.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we be quiet on this side, please? Please let Councillor Gruen speak, otherwise I will have to allow him more time.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: He will need it to explain this mess away, Lord Mayor. Give him another hour.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: We have also said quite rightly we will continue to monitor week in, week out the policies of the plan.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Someone take the shovel off him.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: When is the review date?

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: We will do that when our judgment dictates it is the right time. This is the time for you to stand up and show some leadership.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: When all your fields are built on, when they are all allocated, then it will be too late.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: Not like some other people.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Your 70,000.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: Sorry, Lord Mayor, I am going to finish very quickly. What this is about is Mr Shelbrooke. That is what it is about. Mr Shelbrooke telling lies in this magazine saying (*interruption*) I am going to finish but I was interrupted. I was interrupted.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we be quiet and let him finish and get on with the meeting.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I will take ten more seconds, if I am allowed to. This says Labour has plans in all of the villages in your area.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Apart from where you live.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: We do not.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: You live in Shadwell. (*interruption*)

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Apart from here you live, Councillor Gruen.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: There is the lies.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can you please be quiet? Councillor Gruen, will you stop upsetting the Opposition. (*Applause and cheering*) Thank you.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: You will not be cheering in twelve months.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can I just remind Members that although the debate was on the Leeds Core Strategy and on the Community Infrastructure Levy, the votes will be taken separately.

Item (5), which is the vote on the Community Infrastructure Levy. I will take now. (*A vote was taken*) That is CARRIED.

We come now to the vote on the Leeds Core Strategy, item (6). A recorded vote has been called for.

*(A recorded vote was held on the amendment
in the name of Councillor J Procter)*

THE LORD MAYOR: There are 97 Members present, 36 in support of the amendment, no abstentions and 61 votes against the amendment. The amendment is LOST.

We now move to the ...

COUNCILLOR SELBY: Recorded vote on the substantive motion.

THE LORD MAYOR: This too will be a recorded vote.

(A recorded vote was held on the substantive motion)

THE LORD MAYOR: I understand that some Members have not voted. Was that the intention or do they want to have a quick vote now? I will read the results. 79 Members present, 61 in support of the motion, 18 abstentions and no-one voted against. That is clearly CARRIED.

ITEM 14 – WHITE PAPER MOTION – HEALTH AND WELLBEING

THE LORD MAYOR: We now move on to the final segment, the White Papers. We have three White Papers this evening for debate and each debate will last for no longer than 30 minutes and will conclude with votes on the motion and any amendments.

The first White paper is in the name of Councillor Buckley.

COUNCILLOR BUCKLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. In proposing this motion may I begin by congratulating Members of the Health and Wellbeing Board on all their hard work over the last two years or so and also thank Healthwatch for its also valuable contribution.

In this excellent publication of the Health and Wellbeing Board there are four core commitments of the Board: supporting more people to choose healthy lifestyles; ensuring every child has the best start in life; increasing the number of people supported to live safely in their own homes; and improving people's mental health and wellbeing. These are all sound commitments and there should be no argument in this Chamber about any of them.

As we all know, Leeds has been selected as the Health and Social Care Integration Pioneer and the transformation of all these services will continue and gather pace. Preventing unnecessary hospital stays and treatment in the home have cross-Party support, as has the greater involvement of the Third Sector and of Neighbourhood Networks.

The man in the street tends to think of the NHS only in national terms. He tends to read about it in the press and see it on the television only. He has had no conception that a committee of this Council is now central to the way he or she may be treated and cared for. The public needs to feel that they are part of the process, that they are engaged in the changes and that they have some understanding of them. There should also perhaps be a no surprises commitment in the booklet as well, if at all possible.

The recently published CQC Report only serves to highlight not only the need for change and improvement in Leeds's hospitals but in my view they need to bring the public along with them to inform and to consult.

The Health and Wellbeing Board should act clearly to explain to these people the changes which are coming along. The Board has made clear progress but some have questioned its effectiveness in engaging with the public. It is the key body in Leeds, uniting the Council, the Third Sector and the NHS on behalf of the citizens of Leeds to promote healthy living.

Some of its reports can be somewhat impenetrable to the layman, like me. It is perhaps no surprise that its meetings are not well attended by the public. Now, responsibility for public health issues such as obesity, smoking and alcohol abuse has been handed to Local Authorities. These reforms are essential to allow the Health Service to become more efficient and responsive. Without change, its services would be subject increasingly to rationing. This might have been acceptable in 1948 but it certainly is not an option in the modern world, so there is some way to go before the Board truly becomes effective in communicating these issues to the public.

In conclusion, what further improvements could be made to the Board? There are perhaps three or four: more public engagement; a more rigorous communication strategy; reports to be made more understandable to the layman; and, perhaps more specific resolutions and recommendations rather than noting or simply commenting on reports.

We believe that this motion should have all-Party support, there should be no doubt about this whatsoever. Everybody in this Chamber should be on the same side. We do believe that these matters should be considered seriously and the report produced in order to carry this out and I have pleasure in moving this motion, Lord Mayor.
(Applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Latty.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: I second that, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Mulherin.

COUNCILLOR MULHERIN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Members of Council, in moving the amendment to the White Paper I want to emphasise not only the severe pressures on the local health and care system but also the positive steps that we have taken to address this situation which has been led and co-ordinated by the Leeds Health and Wellbeing Board.

As Chair of the Board I am always open to exploring new ideas about how the work of the Board can be improved. This is particularly appropriate in an environment where the infrastructure is new, complex and rapidly changing. The Board has sought to engage the public in a number of ways. Formal Board meetings are open to the public and there is an open forum at the start of each meeting where members of the public can raise issues to be considered by the Board. We also have a good existing communications network with a newsletter produced and widely distributed after each meeting and the Health and Wellbeing Board Twitter feed, which is active throughout Board meetings and connected meetings and events. I also use my own Twitter feed to promote the work of the Board, as do most of the organisations around the table.

The Board has a strong public connection by virtue of its membership. In addition to the five democratically elected members, cross-Party, every organisation with a seat at the Board represents patients and service users in some way. For example, the GP-led Clinical Commissioning Groups have patient involvement groups whose views are often fed into reports and discussions. Also represented on the Board, as Councillor Buckley has noted is Healthwatch Leeds, who are the appointed patient watchdog and who exclusively represent the needs of patients and service users at the meeting. The

Board has also undertaken workshops and visits where it is engaged directly with frontline staff and patients and service users.

As well as noting the ways that the Board has engaged with the public in the last 18 months, this amendment refers to the severe pressure that the health and care system is under. The Health and Wellbeing Board is leading constructive work in a difficult context to make the system more sustainable, to ensure the rapid transformation of the system considers the whole system impact, and that real progress has been made by the Board to integrate Health and Social Care services around the people, not organisations.

The Board has led discussions to find ways to address the unprecedented financial pressures which my colleagues will be commenting on further later. These pressures leave the city facing a £650m funding shortfall to deliver services in the next five years alone. The Board has used its influential position of having all the key players around the table to develop and progress the concept of the Leeds pound, pooling together the collective resources of the Council and Clinical Commissioning Groups to provide better value for money for the services we commission and provide. With the Board leading discussions and action planning, it has led an inclusive approach to the work to address the considerable funding gap in the city.

It is important to remember that the Board has only been in existence for 18 months. While significant achievements have been made during this period, it is still very early days for Health and Wellbeing Boards here in Leeds and across the country, and I am sure that our Board will continue to strengthen its role and influence in the months and years ahead.

In this respect it is important that the Board continues to develop and adapt to the changing environment it operates within. The recent inclusion of NHS Trust providers to sit on the Board is an example of this happening in practice.

Our amendment states that it should be the Health and Wellbeing Board and not the Executive Board that should be tasked with exploring new ways of engaging the public in the Board's work. Referring this task to the Executive Board would exclude the health partners whose involvement is essential in this process and will undermine the positive joint working in real partnership that the Board has done since its creation. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Blake.

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: I second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Golton.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I have to say, when the motion came forward from Councillor Buckley I was not quite sure what his point was, because it was all plainly evident and truthful in terms of what was in the motion. It did not actually call for much other than a report coming forward.

COUNCILLOR BUCKLEY: Common sense.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Common sense, fair enough. Basically we merit a debate about the Health and Wellbeing Board in the Council, don't we? I think that is one of the reasons why you put it in because there was not a particular strategic reason for it. It was just a matter of you have sat on the Health and Wellbeing Board, you know what an important body it is and yet you probably have not found any opportunity yet to discuss it within this Chamber, and that is one of the reasons why we put the amendment in that we have, is that our Health and Wellbeing Board is, other than the Executive Board, the only other statutorily engaged body that this Council produces that is supposed to report back to the people of Leeds, and yet when it comes to the full Council where the ordinary Members of this Council can participate in debating things that other people have decided in other places, it gets put in as an also-ran, tucked in with I do not like to call it the odds and sods section but not put in the primary place that it should be alongside Executive Board, let us put it that way.

Because we do not do that we are missing out debates on some very serious areas that Councillor Mulherin has pointed out. There are no doubt pressures on the services that are provided publicly within this city. There are pressures there because of those budgetary pressures to ensure that integration happens as quickly as possible. There is some fantastic work which is happening in this city in terms of making that integration work, led by our own officers from Social Care working alongside in alignment with Health Service colleagues and we do not get to hear about it enough and we do not get to debate it enough. I think that is one of the reasons why it is good that we actually have this inoffensive motion before us, which is why I am a little bit disappointed that the Labour Party has to think about making it more partisan and Oppositional based, because actually on the Health and Wellbeing Board I think one of its major strengths is that we do not play party political politics on that Board and we work in partnership and we spend most of our time listening because as elected Members we are not experts in the medical field and the more that we listen the more that we absorb and the more that we are then able to challenge, because the whole reason why the Health and Wellbeing Board has been placed where it has been and the Public Health has been put within the public sphere of Leeds City Council and other Local Authorities, is because it might be a public service and it might do some really good work but just like the police, just because somebody does a good job on behalf of the public does not necessarily mean all the decisions that they take are the right ones and are right for the community that they are meant to be serving.

That is why that Health and Wellbeing Board is there, because just because you work for the NHS does not mean to say that everything that you do is right and it is right that we, as elected Members representing the community in Leeds, should be able to challenge those decisions and you, as ordinary Members of this Council, should be able to challenge those of us on that Health and Wellbeing Board as well. That is why our amendment is in here to make sure that we do get proper referencing here at full Council. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Campbell.

COUNCILLOR TOWNSLEY: I second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Ogilvie.

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would like to speak to the amendment in the name of Councillor Mulherin. The Health and Wellbeing Board is

trying to chart what the high quality compassionate health and care system we wish for ourselves and our relatives and friends should look like in Leeds. As has been said, good progress has been made in the first year, particularly around getting shared priorities and shared actions agreed between the Council and our health partners and I think getting our health providers on the Board will really help with that as we go forward.

The Board has supported a number of initiatives in line with our Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy, such as when the Board approved a Dementia Strategy for Leeds which we have discussed many times in here, or when the Board received its Certificate of Recognition after adopting the Dublin Declaration of Age Friendly Cities.

I think we all accept we have got to do a lot more, particularly around how we engage the public. I have certainly said to officers that the language we use in the reports has got to be much more accessible, far less health and social care jargon.

(interruption due to lighting failure)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Members, for being patient. I think there is one Member amongst us who would like to address Council.

COUNCILLOR SELBY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. May I apologise to Members for a minor interruption in the proceedings. I went out there to have a word with Councillor Wakefield – he is totally innocent – I thought I was turning the lights off. I did not realise that the buttons that I pressed turned everything off! *(laughter)* I shall try not to do that again *(laughter)* depending on who is speaking but I apologise to all Members for any inconvenience caused.

COUNCILLOR J McKENNA: £50 to the Lord Mayor's charity! Well done, Councillor Selby.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor McKenna. Right, now we will continue with the meeting and I think I will ask Councillor Ogilvie to start his speech again.

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: Even I don't want to start again! As I was saying, (I will not go right back to the beginning) we do need to find ways of engaging the public more. We also, in response to Councillor Golton's point about there not being opportunities for us to talk about what goes on in the Health and Wellbeing Board, I remind him that Scrutiny is looking at the work of the Health and Wellbeing Board. We as Members of the administration appear in front of Scrutiny and are happy to answer questions on the Health and Wellbeing Board, so I think that is an important point to make.

As Councillor Mulherin alluded to, if we are really going to sort out issues to do with our health and social care system, we cannot ignore the issues to do with funding and the Opposition do not ever want to talk about that. Firstly, there is an issue with the way the different bits of the health system are actually paid. It has perverse incentives – the tariff system actually means that people end up going into acute settings rather than being treated locally and we have got to find a way of addressing that, and the Government needs to help us to sort that issue out.

The second issue in relation to funding is pretending that new money is going into the system. It is not new money. Jeremy Hunt and Eric Pickles the other week at the Children's and Adults Conference in Manchester were pretending again that the Better Care Fund was new money. It is not new money. Even Norman Lamb, Mr Hunt's Minister of Health, has broken ranks by saying that the Health Service, the NHS, needs an extra £1bn of funding each and every year if it is not going to crash and burn. God forbid the reports in the press the other day that George Osborne has asked his Treasury officials to find a further £30b-worth of cuts on top of what is already planned a year after the General Election. If that was to happen the Health and Social Care system would be completely decimated. We cannot allow that to happen.

Lord Mayor, the Health and Wellbeing Board has done a lot of good work this first year. We recognise we have got a lot more to do and we are all up for that challenge but the Government has got to do its part if we are going to really be successful. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Truswell.

COUNCILLOR TRUSWELL: Thank you, Lord Mayor. When it comes to talking about healthcare and the NHS and Social Care, I know it is not unusual for me to get animated, passionate and even angry but before I got to the end of reading Councillor Buckley's motion I almost fell asleep.

I realise that that was probably the intention. It is a political Mickey Finn designed to take us off to some sort of La La Land far removed from the real issues that the people of Leeds want to talk about. Fortunately, Councillor Mulherin's very helpful amendment jolts us back to reality and it is a pretty bleak reality, Lord Mayor.

The Five Year Forward View recently published by NHS England Chief Executive Simon Stevens shows just how bleak. Does it say that the salvation of the NHS rests in the Health and Wellbeing Board rearranging the deckchairs as the NHS sinks? No, it does not. It says the NHS needs money - £30bn by 2020 and that is based on some pretty ambitious efficiency savings.

Lord Mayor, only Labour comes anywhere near to meeting that challenge. Labour's Time to Care Fund would provide 20,000 more nurses, 8,000 more GPs, 5,000 more homecare workers, 3,000 more midwives and Labour would guarantee a GP appointment within 48 hours and a maximum one week for cancer tests. They are the sort of issues that the people of Leeds want us to be talking about.

How did this Government start to meet the NHS funding challenge that it faced? Well, first of all it wasted £3bn on the dogmatic vandalism of the Laundsey Reforms. Cameron's promise of no top-down reorganisation must be one of the most expensive and destructive whoppers in political history. Despite their other whopper, the protection of NHS spending, they have cut the number of nurses by nearly 5,000.

COUNCILLOR LAY: Not true.

COUNCILLOR TRUSWELL: Yet they are spending twice as much on expensive agency staff to cover the shortfalls, a massive £2.5bn in the last financial year and that

just about sums up this rotten Government. It cuts nurses' jobs, it cut nurse training places...

COUNCILLOR: Wrong.

COUNCILLOR TRUSWELL: ...they refused to pay nurses a measly 1% pay rise...

COUNCILLOR: True.

COUNCILLOR TRUSWELL: ... yet they then increase agency payments by 100%. It is typical Tory madness – and Lib Dem madness. One of the Government's latest wheezes is to pay GPs £55 per patient for diagnosing dementia. My Lord Mayor, if these sorts of policies are anything to go by, GPs are in for rich pickings from the Party opposite. I support Councillor Mulherin's amendment, Lord Mayor.
(Applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Varley.

COUNCILLOR VARLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Reading the amendments and listening to the amendments and the proposal, there is nothing much to choose between them, really, and they all are singing the same song – maybe not from the same hymn sheet but they are all singing the same tune.

The only difference I see in the papers is the fact that like myself, Councillor Golton says he thinks that it ought to come to full Council. I think it should come to full Council at some point of the year because if we are not careful, our Health and Wellbeing Board will actually develop into what we decry about the NHS, the NHS England, sitting up there in their ivory towers and if we cannot make the connection, then I am afraid that we shall lose faith.

They are doing a brilliant job, I am not decrying what they are doing but the people – and we are the people who can give it to the people – we each have ward Members that we can tell what is happening, they can come to us and even though they can actually come to the Council Chamber if they wish to do so and listen to something that maybe needs debating. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Flynn.

COUNCILLOR FLYNN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Elected Members, contrary to what one or two speakers have said recently, this White Paper is not intended to be a criticism of the Health and Wellbeing Board or the administration. It is presented in the spirit of genuine collaboration, which I am delighted to say has been a key issue in my dealings anyway during my time on the Scrutiny Board, and an attempt to improve the engagement of the people of Leeds, which I thought was the major point of Councillor Buckley's speech.

The Health and Wellbeing Board provides oversight and strategic leadership across many complex organisations on behalf of the people of Leeds. It is absolutely essential that our residents have full confidence in local NHS services and a central plank of this is the need to develop genuine partnerships with commissioners, providers and other agencies as well as establishing mutual trust to ensure the provision of high quality healthcare.

The primary role of the Health and Wellbeing Scrutiny Board is to hold the Council to account. To do that it is critical that the Health and Wellbeing Board is in possession of all the relevant facts, but I suggest and suspect that that may not be the case – I hasten to add, through no fault of their own.

Perhaps a few examples might help. The temporary suspension of paediatric cardiac surgery and the following review at the Leeds Teaching Hospital came as a very unpleasant shock to all of us, I would suggest, not least the families of the children being treated there – happily resolved in the meantime.

More recently, a CQC Report on the Leeds Teaching Hospital found significant shortcomings in some of the services that they offer, some of them requiring immediate remedial action.

At a recent Scrutiny hearing a very senior manager of the hospital admitted to us that the Trust Board had been well aware of the shortcomings of the hospital before the inspection carried out by the CQC. You will understand that some Members of the Scrutiny Board were somewhat taken aback, as we had no knowledge of this and presumably the people of Leeds had no knowledge of it either.

Similarly, the CQC has just released the report on the Mid Yorks Hospital and the relevance of this is that Leeds commission some services from that hospital and one of the issues that was raised was safety at that hospital.

I do not know whether our commissioning bodies were aware of the issues but we certainly were not and I am sure the citizens of Leeds were not either. Our NHS is a national asset but it is not always right and we should not expect it to be always right, either, but it is vital for public confidence that any significant shortcomings are acknowledged and addressed immediately and, just as important, the Health and Wellbeing Board and the public are kept fully informed and engaged as appropriate.

Transparency, involvement and accountability between all agencies is essential for the Health and Wellbeing Board to carry out its statutory functions on behalf of the City of Leeds. We owe that to our residents. I commend Councillor Buckley's White Paper to Members. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Lay.

COUNCILLOR LAY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would like to comment on the Lib Dem amendment but first, every time the Labour administration bring forward criticisms of the budgetary pressures and privatisation facing the NHS, you all know that I am going to stand up and remind you that it was the last Labour Government through its then Health Secretary and now Shadow Secretary Andy Burnham that introduced the rules meaning there must be competition over who provides services, and it was he who authorised the £20bn efficiency savings currently working through the system.

Of course, you also know that the budget of the NHS has gone up in real terms under this Government. However, we, the Lib Dems, do not think that is enough and that is why our Lib Dem Health Minister is calling for an immediate injection of a million

and a half and wants a further £5m over the course of the next Parliament – twice the amount Labour is offering - twice the amount.

Moving on though, as Members know the Health and Wellbeing Board commissions and oversees and helps scrutinise a billion and a half to two billion of Leeds Public Healthcare funding. It is an important local Board with the ability to help the poorest in our society improve their health fastest. Indeed, this Council recognised this and asked the Board to ask the City's providers to join them so that this could happen. Everyone and each Party supports the premise of the Board. I think Government probably recognises this and that is why Local Authorities have the Chair. This Labour administration recognised this in July whilst calling for the abandonment and reversal of the Health and Social Care Act, specifically asking, and I quote:

“Council supports the work taking place locally in Leeds to integrate Health and Social Care and ensure that decision making at all levels in the NHS is open and transparent and that patients and the public are involved in designing services for the future.”

These quotes highlight the importance this Council gives the Board and we as full Council should be able to ask, discuss and scrutinise in much the same way we do Executive Board Minutes. Members in our community deserve a chance to challenge and question the Board at full Council and not just at Scrutiny Board, and this can be easily accommodated by removing Community Committees from the Standing Agenda on Council. Although Community Committees is a new Agenda item, it is clear it is just an opportunity for the Chair of that particular committee to stand up and tell us how wonderful their committee is. It really is a waste of full Council's time and that time should be allocated to the Health and Wellbeing Board.

Finally, it seems to be a perfectly reasonable...

THE LORD MAYOR: Red light, Councillor Lay.

COUNCILLOR LAY: Okey doke.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can you wind up, please?

COUNCILLOR LAY: Like many Lib Dem motions, initiatives and policies, I expect the Labour Party to nick it and pass it off as their own in due course, so why not just get on with it now? Accept the motion.

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

COUNCILLOR LEADLEY: I am surprised to have enough time, Lord Mayor. My Lord Mayor, the White Paper is fair as far as it goes. It does not more than state the obvious. We all rely on the National Health Service, even those who have private health insurance or pay to go private. There is no private accident and emergency service and insurers are loath to cover chronic ailments.

By far the greatest problem facing the NHS is its deep seated virtual insolvency, which has undermined its vitality for many years through a succession of national Governments. In 2003 when Health Scrutiny was very much in its infancy, I served on a sort of Health Scrutiny Board chaired by Councillor Alison Lowe, which had no

real powers and could only ask people politely to appear and give reports and answer questions. At that time there had just been a reshuffle of local NHS organisations so I asked one of the new spokesmen what would be done about the accumulated debts inherited from their predecessors and there was a bit of a silence followed by an attempt at an answer which was not really an answer at all. There is not much has changed since then except that the debts have grown.

Two things keep the NHS afloat. One is ad hoc Treasury bail outs and the other is that because of the long-standing British tradition that public sector organisations do not default on their debts, NHS creditors are less jittery than they would be if a private sector corporation had similar liabilities.

This will have to end. One day, regardless of the political colour of the Government of the day, the Treasury will have to write off the debts of the NHS at the expense of the taxpayer so that NHS bodies can concentrate on treating patients rather than managing debt. Once that has been done, financial management will have to be more sensible and more astute, avoiding white elephant projects, avoiding the payment of inflated fees to agencies and to administrators of the kind highlighted in the YEP this week and avoiding poorly negotiated agreements such as hospital PFI contracts. Thank you, my Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Buckley to sum up.

COUNCILLOR BUCKLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. If I could take the contributions in order, Councillor Mulherin made some reasonably reasonable remarks. However, I notice that she missed off the phrase which was Government irresponsibility, or Government mismanagement, which was in their amendment.

Councillor Golton made some entirely reasonable remarks which are to be commended.

Things started to go downhill when Councillor Truswell made his contribution. As soon as I saw his name on the Order Paper I thought this is going to be typical. In all his years down at Westminster he presumably learned lots of things but one of them, unfortunately, was not common sense. *(laughter)*

He talked about Government mismanagement and how the Government are such awful people, etc, and how wonderful it would be if we had a Labour administration, but what about not looking in the crystal ball, look at Wales. You have got an administration in Wales and the place is in a mess. *(Applause)* It is run so badly that people are fleeing Wales into England every month to get proper treatment, so do not talk to us about efficient use of money.

This White Paper motion is entirely constructive and entirely non-political. The Labour amendment completely ignores people and talks about politics, which unfortunately is what they tend to do all the time.

COUNCILLOR J McKENNA: And you lot don't.

COUNCILLOR BUCKLEY: This is entirely about people who need a National Health Service. The wealthy do not care because they just pay twice, as they ever do. It is all about the poor so it just proves that time and again when it comes to the

Conservative side of this Chamber, we try to look after the poor, after the needy people and the people who need guidance in these matters (*interruption*) unlike the opposite side who turn all these arguments in to politics.

I am afraid that all this talk about Government inefficiency and lack of money is just a smokescreen and going back to Wales just for a second, the BMA predicted that over in Wales there will be imminent meltdown. That is what Labour administration does for you and this is entirely non-political, entirely reasonable and I commend it to the Chamber. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: I now call for the vote, firstly on the amendment in the name of Councillor Mulherin. (*A vote was taken*) That is CARRIED.

I now call for the vote on the amendment in the name of Councillor Golton. (*A vote was taken*) That is LOST.

We are now to move on the substantive motion in the name of Councillor Mulherin. (*A vote was taken*) That is CARRIED.

ITEM 15 – WHITE PAPER MOTION – FIXED ODDS BETTING TERMINALS

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

COUNCILLOR CHAPMAN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Gambling is a very important issue facing this Chamber. We find ourselves in a position where we are unable to control our high streets. Gambling addiction is encouraged by these fixed odds betting terminals which have been able to operate unchecked. These are preying on our most vulnerable and deprived communities, turning our traditional high street bookies where you could go for a flutter into soulless gaming shops.

I have got a few facts and figures that actually made my eyebrows rise. £132m, that is the amount gambled in Leeds Central alone in 2012. £100 maximum wager can be placed every 20 seconds on FOBTs – that is four times faster than in casinos. There are four times as many betting shops in areas of higher unemployment than low, as they target those who can afford it least. More profit is made from the FOBTs than from the National Lottery, even though over half of our population play the Lottery but only 4% play on these machines. Some sad figures.

Links have also been made to money laundering. Criminals gamble their dirty money on low risk odds, exchanging their won tokens for clean cash. They are even a danger to our youth, with over half of all shops targeted in the campaign this summer by Northampton Borough Council allowing under age teenagers to play on the machines. Limiting the number of machines to four per shop has done nothing as Councils like ours are expected to aim to permit betting shop applications, leading to the clusters that have sprung up on all our high streets.

Councils up and down the country are fighting back. Southwark is calling for a levy on all betting shop machine profits. Barking and Dagenham has introduced an Article 4 direction to try and exclude betting shops from saturating high risk areas. Newham Council has put forward a Sustainable Communities Act, proposing to limit the

maximum bet from a staggering £100 per spin down to just £2, which would bring these machines back in line with other gaming machines in the UK.

Lib Dem Culture Spokesman John Leech MP went on record in October backing calls to support a £2 maximum stake. Councils of all political persuasions have passed motions supporting Newham, from Labour run Liverpool and Preston to Tory led Fareham in Hampshire, to Green-based Brighton and Hove. Political colour has paled as local politicians fight together for the right to help their communities.

I am hoping that we can reflect a similar cross-Party consensus in this Chamber here today. Therefore, I ask all of you in the Chamber to join us in supporting this White Paper. Let us join Newham in calling for Whitehall to let local Councillors help their residents and, in doing so, we can help eradicate a growing cause of poverty and deprivation in our city. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Harland.

COUNCILLOR HARLAND: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Lord Mayor and fellow Councillors, I am very happy to support this White Paper motion. Fixed odds betting terminals are a blight on our city. As Chair of the Council's Licensing Committee I strongly feel that we should be doing all we can to lobby for more powers to enable us to reduce the dangers these gambling machines present to our residents and our communities.

As mentioned, these machines, often referred to as the crack cocaine of gambling, allow gamblers to wager up to £100 every 20 seconds. This means that an individual could lose up to £18,000 per hour. These figures are shocking but they are also a reality. Almost £205m was placed on fixed odds betting terminals in just two of Leeds Parliamentary constituencies during 2012/13. It is therefore paramount that we are given more control over these monstrosities. We simply cannot allow them to continue ruining lives any longer. However, we cannot do what is needed without being given the ability to do so.

It is positive to see that locally Opposition Members agree we need more powers to protect the wellbeing of our communities. It is just a shame that their national counterparts could not do the same earlier this year when the matter was debated in Parliament.

Indeed, Greg Mulholland voted against the motion. As Clive Efford highlighted in the Commons debate, we need more powers not only to deal not only with fixed odds machines themselves but with the wide range of issues that go beyond gambling. It is about economic regeneration and vitality and diversity in our town and city centres and it is about the effect that betting shops have on the character of our city.

Because of this and its usually detrimental impact that these machines have on the lives of individual people, it is right that we unite in asking for more authority and influence over the reduction of maximum betting stakes and the spread of betting shops in our city.

I am reassured that nationally the Labour Party continues to work hard on this agenda. The Fixed Odds Betting Terminals Bill will have its second reading in Parliament in

February next year. It would be good to see the all-party support on a local level reflected nationally. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Lowe.

COUNCILLOR LOWE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Fixed odds betting terminals are an abomination. The ability to lose £100 every 20 seconds is an evil that devastates our families and communities here in Leeds and it is a reality that we have to reverse.

In April 2014 a report by Landman Economics found that people who gamble regularly lost £1,208 a month on fixed odds betting terminals compared to £427 a month for other forms of gambling. In West Leeds in 2011/12 gamblers lost nearly £2m on fixed odds betting terminals, a disgrace when one looks at the deprivation levels in West Leeds. In Armley there are many betting shops clustered together, each housing fixed odds betting terminals. This clustering is even more problematic because people can hide their losses and the depth of their addiction by moving from betting shop to betting shop.

Armley people identified this as a major problem when they were spoken to in 2010 and came up with a consultation document, “Bringing Armley Together”. The number of betting shops in Armley Town Street was their single most important issue that they wanted us as Councillors representing them to deal with, so we have to listen to them and we have to act.

Not only do we have to act, as has already been mentioned. Central Government has to act. I do find it galling, the hypocrisy from the Liberal Democrats. I do like you personally, Judith, but I don’t like lies and I do not like liars and when on the one hand we are being told that Nick Clegg and his entourage are against fixed odds betting terminals and yet when they are given an opportunity to vote against them, as they were earlier this year, and choose not to do so - in fact the only thing they voted for was an increase in the maximum stakes on fruit machines so that again people could lose £100 a pop. It seems to me it beggars belief that you can sit here asking for them to be removed when you had the power to get them removed in the first place. Lib Dems, as ever, two faces – the face they want everyone to see when it is election time and the face we know is in existence here today, the face of a liar. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dobson.

COUNCILLOR DOBSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would like to approach this from a slightly different angle. I think the case has been very well made around the detrimental impact on Health and Wellbeing and clearly in some of the most deprived communities where people are being sucked into betting on these fixed odds betting terminals it can bring nothing but misery to families.

Actually, the irony is, I think as Councillor Chapman said, the idea of having a flutter on the horses actually, for a lot of people, it was a hobby, it was an interest and there was a skill involved, picking out the form. I always say that as a kid in the 60s going to stay at my gran’s, I thought my grandmother’s television, the little black and white image fluttering, I thought it only showed horseracing. I did not realise that she could change the channel over, because she never did. *(laughter)* I suspect that positively helped her wellbeing, it was something she was interested in, she would put a few shillings on the nags and that would be her bit of pleasure. This is different and the

reason it is different is because she never once kicked off and felt the need to lash out at anybody or engage in criminality as a result of losses.

The figures in Leeds around this are staggering. There were 80 offences last year in Leeds in betting shops around this agenda. A third of them were people who were stolen from while on these machines, so engrossed they did not realise somebody was lifting their wallet. Unbelievable. The other two thirds break down into some really quite chilling categories. There were eight damage, presumed to be machines or the shop when people lost; there were three assaults; there were a lot of public order offences; there were threats to kill; and there was a robbery. This is Leeds in 2014 and we have got people in this distressed, hyped up state spilling out on to the high street. That cannot be a good thing.

We spoke about police budgets earlier and the way they are having to move their resources around. Frankly, I think the police have got far better things to be engaged in than handling something that is a social blight.

Why is it so acceptable? Because, frankly, it makes £1.6bn and I believe that is why it is not being given the proper credence and it is not being addressed properly, because it boils down to money. When it is re-heard in February in the House, I think that there really has to be a pay-off. Yes, it raises income – big deal when it is causing social harm, social disorder, social disruption, a detrimental impact on health and wellbeing, breaching into criminality and other matters and it is something that has to be stamped on hard, and I would certainly think this Council and others should get behind a campaign to really reduce these odds right down to a couple of pounds. £100 every 20 seconds, absolutely scandalous and it has to stop, Lord Mayor. Thank you. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor John Procter.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Thank you, Lord Mayor. If Councillor Chapman had genuinely wanted all-Party agreement she should have, either herself or her Party Whip should have consulted with others first. That did not happen. I am advised, as far as our Group is concerned, that did not happen

There are certain lines within this motion that we just simply could not accept because it does not just call for limitation on fixed odds betting machines. It also talks about controlling the proliferation of betting shops as well.

I am not quite sure how the many hundreds of people who are employed by William Hill, which is based in this city, would react to that in actual fact, because they owe their livelihoods at their base above the St John's Centre to that very industry. I have to say, I have got absolutely no axe to grind whatsoever. I have never been in a betting shop in my life, for no reason at all, I have to say, other than I just have not. I am not a specialist in odds or whatever else.

Interesting, isn't it, I just heard from opposite "Oh, boring." I am sorry, but you cannot have it both ways. You cannot say on the one hand, well, it is OK to bet to a certain level and then bet no further and I am boring because I have not been in a betting shop, but that effectively is what is being supported here today.

Lord Mayor, we have a range of views within our group on betting in general, as did the Liberal Democrat Group when they were in joint administration with us, and Richard Brett, when he was then Leader of the Liberal Democrats, you may recall, was flatly opposed to the idea of having a Super Casino here in the city, but he still played a part in the administration. He put his personal view to one side and left the room when the rest of the Cabinet were discussing such matters because he had a deeply religious held belief, actually, in relation to those matters.

I think it is a mish-mash of a motion in truth, Lord Mayor. As I have said already, if there was to be a genuine attempt at all-Party agreement this certainly is not the way to go about it. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ann Blackburn.

COUNCILLOR A BLACKBURN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I also wish to talk about the White Paper on fixed odds betting terminals. I am concerned about these machines. I feel that some of the people using them will end up using the services of legal or illegal money lenders to make up the amount of the money that they have lost through gambling on these machines.

Clearly, it is wrong that betting shops are allowed to house these machines which can take bets up to £100 every 20 seconds from players. We know that people can become addicted to these machines. We know that an addict always believes one more go, one more go and I may win. Then it becomes one more go and I may win back the money I have lost. Of course, we all know, we here all know that this is unlikely to happen. As my late father, who was not a gambling man used to say, the only people who really gain from gambling in the betting shops are the bookmakers themselves.

Should the temptation be there in the first place? I say no, definitely not. We must try to alter the situation and therefore my Group are more than happy to support this motion. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Chapman to sum up.

COUNCILLOR CHAPMAN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I had not intended saying anything because I had hoped that we were going to get cross-Party support, but obviously not so. I am assured that an email went to Andrew Carter on 30th October from Stewart Golton and Andrew Carter responded, said he would take the issue to his Group for discussion. Nothing further has been heard from him as far as I am aware. I am only saying that because I would never come out with a statement like that unless I was sure that everybody had been spoken to.

All I am going to say is, we have got a problem with gambling in this city, we have people who are spending money they can ill afford to spend, so I hope that as many of you who feel it is correct, let us vote together and let us try to do something to help the people of Leeds. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: We now move to the vote on the motion in the name of Councillor Chapman. *(A vote was taken)* That is CARRIED.

ITEM 16 – WHITE PAPER MOTION – LOCAL PUBLIC TRANSPORT NETWORKS

THE LORD MAYOR: We now move to the White Paper in the name of Councillor James Lewis.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I think it is slightly fitting that a debate about public transport has arrived later than we expected it to (*laughter*) but I hope it is a smooth ride for this White Paper because since we within the Labour Group started talking about doing a White Paper about devolution and transport, actually the world around us has changed considerably in terms of the commitment from the Coalition Government and the Labour Front Bench to devolution of resource and powers to local areas in transport has moved on apace, so you have seen a significant announcement from the Labour party about Local Authorities having London-style powers to regulate and franchise buses.

Also, and I think you know we can congratulate the bus operators for convincing the Conservative Party, who people might remember at the last General Election went into the election with a commitment to scrap any powers for Councils to run bus services, we have now got a position where George Osborne has signed up to Greater Manchester as a starting point and hopefully and other City Regions, to actually have those powers to regulate buses and I think that is a reflection of the services that bus operators provide, that we have seen a shift and I think it is a move that we would all welcome.

Why do we need a devolution of powers and why do we need, more importantly, the devolution of resources? We do not play on a level playing field. Not only does London have the power to run its own bus network but the amount of funding that London gets on transport overall is significantly higher. Using the Treasury figures it is £545 per person compared to £246 per person in Yorkshire.

The Institute of Public Policy Research had a look at the National Infrastructure Plan and came up with an even more stark figure, that when you look at spending that is committed on capital projects, it is £770 per person in London and £2.62 per person in Yorkshire. I think reflecting on these figures it is also worth considering that over the last five years the amount spent per person in London has gone from less than £600 to nearly £800. We are all in this together, as somebody once said.

I think it is a recognition that we need to change that because we are not after infrastructure spending for the sake of it. We do not want to repeat Boris Johnson's episode of building cable cars and things like that. It is important, this is how people get to work, this is how people get their first job, this is how people look for another job, this is how employers can look further and farther, as Councillor Cleasby referred to earlier, for the right workforce because there is a transport infrastructure to get people to jobs. This is how we put in, this is how we support things like housing growth and employment growth that we debated earlier, because of the funding and the resources to put infrastructure in, to get people in houses, get people in jobs and it is not just about saying "We want what London's got." We want also better jobs and more income for people and we can get that by giving people more opportunities.

Turning away from the infrastructure on to the services we operate, because I think that is an important part of this White Paper as well. It is about saying, actually, for

far too long deregulated and unregulated privatised operators have not given the services we deserve, they have not given us integrated ticketing, they call the shots when it comes to services, they take the profit when things are going well, they do not invest when things are going badly, they do not run services that are necessary but unprofitable and you look at the way the railway is run, we have seen a rise in growth of passengers on the railways; we have not seen any new trains and we have seen train operators taking money out. Lord Mayor, I move the White Paper. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Harper to second.

COUNCILLOR G HARPER: Lord Mayor, I formally second.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Golton to move an amendment.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Devolution of transport. It has come a long way in a very short time and I have to say, it is down to the Coalition Government that devolution has actually taken centre stage and has actually become something of a reality.

The speed at which it has progressed, I cannot say it has all been down to Central planning from Whitehall; it has actually got more to do with some people taking chances, some people making challenges and then ultimately, of course, we have had the Scottish Referendum debate, which has meant that actually having to make the case and do the sell to the people in the regions of this great nation is something which is far more important to the politicians in Westminster to do and they appreciate that they will be held to account.

What we should bear in mind, though, is that we are also to be held to account and although we can be congratulated in developing the culture that we have in our City Region where we have gone from a position not too long ago where a politician from Bradford would not be seen on the same platform as someone from Leeds and a politician from Wakefield would not actually use the word “Leeds” in terms of talking about a region which was an economic reality. We have come a long, long way and that is due to a great deal of personal investment from some of those Leaders mostly, of course, of late they have been from the Labour Party and they should be commended on that.

We have come a long way in a very short time but there are some things that are taking far too long and it now means that they are not fit for purpose. One of those things is NGT. We spent years and years and years fighting for our fair share of public transport infrastructure. What we actually wanted was a tram system. Because Government after Government of both shades in their singular forms in terms of Labour and the Conservatives, because of that we did not get what we want and the parting shot from Mr Alistair Darling, of course, was to tell us, “You cannot have trams, you can only have buses.” That, of course, is not what we wanted and ever since we have been developing a system which tries to fit in with what the Central Government wants.

Now, we have a position where we can actually challenge Government and say, “If you are really serious about devolving to us, the you can devolve that money that you have set aside for a trolley bus and you can actually allow us to shape our own future

and create a transport solution which is actually up to date and not 20 years old. That is the first challenge.

The second one, Councillor James Lewis talked about not just making it a reality for us in terms of decision makers but also in terms of us as deliverers of public services. Our bus users are not well served. They have overpriced, not frequent enough and over shortened services, so that a lot of our areas over the past three or four years have actually had their services cut and they have been moved to different routes, which makes it more convenient for the bus operator but not for the people who are actually meant to be using them.

We were supposed to be bringing in Quality Bus Contracts years and years ago and we have been singularly inept in actually making them a reality. I am afraid that that demonstration of our lack of will to make something happen is not a good track record to take down to Westminster to say, "Do you know what, we are actually effective at making decisions and seeing them through to implementation." There is a challenge there to Councillor Lewis to actually do something about that. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Townsley. Councillor Richard Lewis.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Lord Mayor, I have had the dubious pleasure of sitting in many meetings down at Metro, now the Combined Authority, arguing about tendered bus services, about our impotence to deliver any real improvements to public transport, arguing about the virtues of one clapped out, second hand diesel multiple unit which we might get instead of another one; arguing about the iniquities of bus deregulation which took place back in 1986.

After a number of those meetings you just feel so frustrated that all we do is talk about coppers, effectively. We do not talk about the real issues, we just talk about history and we talk about the minor things that we can do. I think what James's White Paper is actually about is that we need to lift our sights. The possibilities are there now for us to start looking at really having a proper transport system. For the first time in 30-odd years to really talk about integration because 1986 was one time when clocks did not just stand still, they went back. What integration there was was destroyed by one piece of legislation.

Very much about how can we really take advantage of all the opportunities that there are? That is why I am disappointed with what Stewart says because it is all talking about NGT, which is an issue that is very important but to drag it into this debate, particularly in the way he does it, is very unhelpful.

To talk about the unpopularity of NGT, that is interesting, there are various views on that. One Radio Aire piece of work on that recently, they asked people what they thought and they said the immediate response was a lot of people saying, "Oh, we hate it" and then they realised that these were all the usual suspects and then there was this kind of flow through of people who said, "Well, actually we think it is quite a good idea". It is not quite as straightforward as you would have it.

One thing, people need to read what your White Paper says. I will just read this bit:

"Council therefore calls on the Executive Board and the West Yorkshire Combined Authority to return to Central Government in the light of recent

announcements and request that the funding promised for NGT is transferred to the West Yorkshire Transport Fund.”

I know it is not very grammatical but I think what you are saying is give us the money back and give it to the Transport Fund for West Yorkshire Plus. Do you think that those Authorities in the rest of West Yorkshire are going to say, “Oh that is great, £173m, well, Leeds can have all of that, can’t they?” Of course not, they are all going to want their chunk and to think otherwise is incredibly naïve.

It is absolutely typical of you, Stewart, that that is the way you think about that. This is absolutely about what we can do. We can talk about Oyster cards, we can talk about integrated systems, about people using buses, about using trains, about using everything that is out there and actually thinking that transport belongs to them.

THE LORD MAYOR: Red light, Councillor Lewis.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: That is what is great about this White Paper and everybody should support it. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Taylor.

COUNCILLOR TAYLOR: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Lord Mayor, it is plain to see the effect of current arrangement for the transport system where decisions are made either by the Government department, agencies or private operators and local transport service in Leeds and the surrounding region.

In the result is under investigation. Inadequate service and rising costs for passengers, an overall lack of planning and interrogation has created a public transport system that fails to meet the needs of the people of Leeds.

A prime example of this is the fact that Leeds is almost amongst the country’s worst for overcrowded trains. Over the last 20 years the number of passengers who use local services has more than doubled but this has not been met with the capacity needed to cope with the rise in demand. Figures from the Department of Transport last year shows passengers are some morning and evening over peak hours service include one through Leeds are travelling on a train which are 60% over capacity on certain routes. For most commuters in Leeds it is standing room only and at this rate rush hour should be renamed crush hour.

Added to this, our passengers in the north are being hit by even higher increased train fare, making it unaffordable for many commuters as fares rise while wages remain standard. Many will be aware of Northern Rail extension of peak rail fares which will mean some commuters in the North are facing fare hike of up to 162%. This is not acceptable and people should not be put into this position for paying more or having to travel home late and these price rises are on top of the annual increase in fares which will come only into play January.

To make things worse, while people are paying a fare for their tickets they are not even rewarded with investment in the train this are travelling in. Much of the rolling stock of old trains that have been in service for over 25 years. This often results in more poor service such as delay due to train failure. This lack of reliability is

compounded by the fact people are often left struggling to fit on the train, resulting in added delays.

To sum up, the rail service today, particularly for commuters, people are facing high fares for poor service and the situation on the buses is not any better. While bus use has increased in the capital, it has decreased in the rest of the country, particularly because fares have increased 15% and 1,300 routes have been axed.

THE LORD MAYOR: Red light, Councillor Taylor.

COUNCILLOR TAYLOR: Sorry, Lord Mayor, can I just sum up by saying, this is why I am supporting this White Paper motion that calls for devolution for powers from Whitehall for transport. If the Government will not serve the needs of the public, then it needs to be transferred. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Leadley.

COUNCILLOR LEADLEY: My Lord Mayor, Councillor James Lewis's White Paper may remind connoisseurs of those small editorial articles buried deep in the pages of Pravda in the 1970s and 80s which seemed innocuous to the point of banality, perfectly in line with five year plan objectives and easily skated over in a search for more significant matter. In every case, the significance was in what was not said, something had not been mentioned, it had been airbrushed out, perhaps a dodgy nuclear reactor that no-one wanted to own up to or a doddering Politburo veteran who had been forcibly retired to a dacha in Southern Siberia with a lifetime guarantee of Stolichnaya vodka.

The unmentioned thing here is NGT. Some months ago as I crossed the city centre I was waylaid by a senior officer from Metro who told me that the NGT Inquiry was not going well and that the consensus within Metro was that it was likely that the project would go down. It was like being collared by a man in a raincoat and trilby stepping out a stinking late night smog in Bratislava or Debrecen to pass on a friendly and helpful message from the other side before disappearing into the gloom – the sort of reaching out that led to Glasnost and Perestroika. Thank you, Councillor Lewis, for what your White Paper did not say. We have made a careful note of it. Thank you, my Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor John Procter.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I actually welcome the conversion of Councillor Lewis and his Labour colleagues on the ITA. I seem to have spent the last few years going and doing things to get things done, being sent to various places by my Leader. I was sent to Leeds Bradford Airport on to the Board with the sole aim of getting it sold and that subsequently happened; I was sent down to Metro with the sole aim of getting Quality Bus Contracts – sadly the Leader of Council and co. disbanded that organisation before I and others managed to achieve that, but I have always been clear there is only one way forward and there has been only one way forward and that is Quality Bus Contracts. If we are to make a step change in terms of our transport infrastructure we have literally no other choice.

You always know when you are on the right track when the conglomerates of First Bus *et al* draft in the highest paid lawyers in the country to defend their monopolies

and their cartels. It is nothing to do with the travelling public who we all serve; it is to do with their base line profits. I do not blame them for that, that is what they are in business to do but actually we should not be persuaded any other way.

My criticism would be that we should have done this years ago because actually we all knew that was the only way years ago.

Moving to NGT, and I will link the two together, I think it is an unfortunate amendment, frankly, because it takes things in a completely different way which were not intended.

NGT is not the solve-all. It is not what I would have wanted, it is not what many people here would have wanted. It is something – it is not the best thing. However, we have got a choice. We can have something, even though it is not the best, or we can have nothing. That is our simple choice. Something or nothing at all.

Our difficulty as a city is our forefathers, advised dare I say it by officers, were far too cautious. If Keith Loudon was here he would say to you, as he has done many a time in this Council Chamber, “We need a rapid transit system, we always have done and we should have actually had an underground when we had the chance” but we chose not to do that. We chose not to do it, advised by our officers and decisions taken by our forefathers. That is why we are where we are, frankly. We did the same again in terms of a tram system and we should not have done, frankly.

When I first went to Metro I asked the most senior officer there, “OK, let us forget the Government money, if we borrow the money ourselves, what will it cost? Let us build what we want. How much will it cost to build a tram?” At that time he said it would cost £1bn. I said, fine, whatever the number is, it is just a number, we should get on with it, find out how we finance the billion and build what we really want. We are not in that position now, unfortunately. We are where we are, Lord Mayor. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Jonathan Bentley.

COUNCILLOR J BENTLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am speaking in support of Councillor Golton’s amendment to the White Paper, and it is in the spirit of support and helpfulness to Councillor James Lewis that we have put forward this amendment. Member will see that we have not deleted any wording from Councillor Lewis’s original wording but our addition is just taking it, I think, to its logical conclusion.

How could we not agree with Councillor Lewis’s spirit of the White Paper, the devolution of powers and resources from Whitehall to the cities and City Regions has long been a long-held Liberal Democrat policy and thanks to Liberal Democrats in Government, it is being delivered. We have the City Deal, we have the West Yorkshire Transport Fund, the Deputy Prime Minister is calling for devolved funding for transport improvements for West Yorkshire to be included in the Autumn statement. There is now a groundswell of political will to devolve powers and resources that we have all called for for so long.

It is disappointing that this Council and the Combined Authority is still slavishly pushing for the NGT trolley bus scheme, a scheme that encapsulates all that is wrong the old top-down, use it or lose it, have what we tell you approach – an approach

really that is encapsulated by Councillor Procter's last piece, effectively saying we have got to do something, this is something, let us do that. That is not the way it should be working. We should be doing something that is really needed and we really want.

Councillor Lewis starts his White Paper saying this Council believes the people of Leeds and their elected representatives are best placed to develop local public transport networks. We have heard deputations from the people of Leeds today; from Holt Park to Belle Isle there is no support for the trolley bus. At the Public Inquiry not one independent person came forward to support it, and as for elected representatives, apart from Councillor Anderson and myself, who voiced our concerns and misgivings to the Public Inquiry, no other elected representative gave evidence to the Public Inquiry – not James Lewis, not Richard Lewis, not the Leader of the Council were prepared to go to the Public Inquiry and face questions and cross-examination on the scheme.

The trolley bus scheme does not have support from the people of Leeds and I suspect as a result of the poor performance of the promoters at the Public Inquiry, it no longer has genuine support from the administration either.

What are we going to end up with? In another year or so we might end up with nothing. We might find we are committed to a non-integrated, technologically obsolete system that does not meet our objectives, so why wait? Let us take the initiative as a Council, cross-Party, let us take advantage of the new climate of devolution, go to Government, ask for the funding promised for NGT to come back to the city, come back to the Region and fund what we need genuinely to develop and shape the local transport network that we all want. I support the amendment. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor David Blackburn.

COUNCILLOR D BLACKBURN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. The motion that is in front of us I think sums up what a lot of us have been arguing for years. What we do not want is we do not want First Bus, we want better bus services and this I believe will deliver that. It takes us back to a position where control is local and not with some multinational down in London or up in Aberdeen.

I don't know about the rest of you but my constituents constantly complain about First Bus, about fares, about services and we cannot do anything about it significantly. This will enable us to do so.

As for the amendment, as is quite well known I opposed NGT. I do not think that an amendment to this mentioning NGT is helpful. If you had brought in a motion I would support you but I cannot support you here. It is more important. There are other places in this city that are suffering from bad public transport that need dealing with and this is about them. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Groves.

COUNCILLOR GROVES: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I support Councillor Lewis's White Paper for the following reasons. Transport is a vital ingredient to successful cities around the world, never more so than in terms of their economies and creating

supporting employment. Better transport in Leeds and Yorkshire would help the City Region in its ambition to become an economic powerhouse that plays a more prominent role in driving national prosperity. It would also, of course, help narrow the north-south divide to create a more balanced economy. As the recent One North Report recognised, improving connectivity and transport links in our region is critically important to our hopes of stimulating economic growth.

The recent City Growth Commission also found that without efficient transport between and within Metropolitan areas, we would hold back long term sustainable economic growth. First and foremost we need economic growth to create jobs and opportunities for unemployed and young people in Leeds. Better transport and connectivity can help do this because improved journey reliability, better travel quality and shorter journey times mean the following: more businesses would be attracted to the region; wider employment opportunities for workers; access to larger labour supply for employers; businesses are brought closer together meaning reduced trading costs.

At the moment our transport network is not doing enough to help increase growth and create jobs for people in Leeds. Journey times take too long. Just last month the Department of Transport Supported Study by the Centre for Cities concluded there could be a £6.7bn effect on growth across the North of England with a 20 minute reduction in journey times. Public transport is also too crowded. The same study found that train capacity in Leeds is at 84% in the morning rush hour. This is the highest anywhere in the country outside of London.

We have to do something about this if we want to create the conditions for businesses to create jobs and opportunities for unemployed and young people in Leeds. Lord Mayor, that is why I am supporting the White Paper Motion that calls for the devolution of powers from Whitehall to enable the creation of a fit for purpose integrated public transport network and for the future of generations of this city. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lewis to sum up.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I found Councillor Leadley's contribution an interesting history lesson – I was still at primary school in the year that he was talking about so I will take it as that.

If I can help in the spirit of support and advice that I think this debate has had, if I can help Councillors Procter and Golton out on why we did not move quicker on Quality Contracts, remember for most of the last four and a half years your Coalition Government has been saying anywhere that went for a Quality Contract would be penalised with even less money, even less money than the current cuts that are being given to public transport from the Coalition Government. Now they have decided nobody gets any money whatever they do, so I suppose we can call that progress.

What I was hoping for and I have not yet seen in this debate, disappointingly, is I was hoping for a moment of revelation in the Liberal Democrat contributions on their amendment to find out exactly what it is they have got planned, which routes they want to go down, what technology they want to use, how they want to do it, which scheme they have got that has no impact, which scheme they have got will have no opposition, which scheme they have got that will carry universal acclaim and, as that

did not come out in their contributions, I think it is very difficult to accept their amendment because fundamentally my White Paper moved on behalf of the Labour Group is about accepting responsibility and, given that they submitted BGT to the Government in the first place, it was Nick Clegg their Leader that announced NGT and lots of funding for it and it is their Minister that is saying that funding will be ringfenced however many times he is asked, most recently on the Local Growth Fund. Their amendment is not about accepting responsibility for making things happen, it is about deflecting responsibility, about deflecting responsibility from the Lib Dems I do not think we can accept that.

Turning on to the fundamental points that people made, we have discussed why this is important, why it matters about having a good transport infrastructure and I think actually when it comes to that and devolution the time is now and we are starting to see real progress. Nobody asked us to take forward the plans that have now been accepted on a cross-Party basis for devolution like One North. We went forward and said they should have happened. Nobody asked us to put forward the plans for London style buses and it took all the parties could get a general acceptance and we have got that now. It is now time for Government to respond.

I will finish on this point. Over the last 30 or 40 years Central Government has given away power over transport and it has given it to private sector transport operators. Now is the time to give it back to people, give it back to Transport Authorities, give it back to those of us that are accountable. I move the White Paper, Lord Mayor.
(Applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: We now move to the vote. The first one is the amendment in the name of Councillor Golton.

*(A recorded vote was held on the amendment in the name of
Councillor Golton)*

THE LORD MAYOR: There is 83 Members present, 11 were in favour, 16 abstentions and 56 against. That is LOST.

We now move to the original motion in the name of Councillor James Lewis. *(A vote was taken)* That looks to be CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

EMERGENCY MOTION

THE LORD MAYOR: We now move to the Emergency Motion in the name of Councillor Mulherin. There is no debate on this motion so it is formally moved and seconded. Councillor Mulherin.

COUNCILLOR MULHERIN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would like to formally move the White Paper on the new Congenital Heart Service review.

COUNCILLOR BUCKLEY: I formally second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: I move to the vote. *(A vote was taken)* That is CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Thank you all for attending and I hope you enjoyed the excitement.

(The meeting closed at 8.05pm)