

**COUNCIL VERBATIM  
29 MARCH 2017**

This page is intentionally left blank

LEEDS CITY COUNCIL

ORDINARY  
MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

Held on

Wednesday, 29<sup>th</sup> March, 2017

At

THE COUNCIL CHAMBER,  
CIVIC HALL,  
LEEDS

In the Chair:

THE LORD MAYOR  
(COUNCILLOR G HARPER)

---

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  
ORDINARY MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 29<sup>th</sup> MARCH 2017

THE LORD MAYOR: Welcome everyone to today's Council meeting. Can I advise Members that the meeting is being webcast and can you please switch off your mobile phones or put them on silent.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

THE LORD MAYOR: I have one announcement to make regarding the terrorist attack in London.

I was horrified to hear of the terrorist attack in London last week and I would like to offer my sympathy to all those affected, as well as my heartfelt support and solidarity for the people of London in the wake of this despicable attack.

Leeds is a welcoming city where understanding and compassion go hand in hand and we will continue to work with our friends and partners in communities across the city to ensure it remains that way.

I would like to call on all Members to join me in expressing their sympathy and support. Could I ask you all to stand for a minute's silence.

*(Silent tribute)*

ITEM 1 – MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD 22<sup>nd</sup> FEBRUARY 2017

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Item 1, Minutes of the meeting held 22<sup>nd</sup> February. Councillor Ogilvie.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Buckley.

COUNCILLOR BUCKLEY: I second that, Lord Mayor.

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

ITEM 2 – DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

THE LORD MAYOR: Declarations of Interest. To invite Members to declare any disclosable pecuniary interests. Has anyone got anything to declare? No.

### ITEM 3 – COMMUNICATIONS

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 3, Chief Executive.

THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. There have been two communications since the last meeting, from David Mowat MP, Parliamentary Undersecretary of State for Community Health and Care in respect of the White Paper on Health considered by Council in January; and from Marcus Jones MP, Minister for Local Government, in respect of the White Paper on Adult Social Care Funding, also considered by Council in January.

These responses have previously been circulated to all Members of Council.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you.

### ITEM 4 - DEPUTATIONS

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 4, Deputations.

THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE: There are three Deputations: first, Fare Share Yorkshire in respect of food poverty and provision; second, the Leeds based charity Karma Nirvana, supporting victims of forced marriages; and third, Team Beckhills, residents from the Beckhill Estate regarding pavement repairs.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ogilvie.

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: I move that all the deputations are received.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Buckley.

COUNCILLOR BUCKLEY: I second that, Lord Mayor.

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

### DEPUTATION ONE – FARESHARE YORKSHIRE

THE LORD MAYOR: Deputation One, Fare Share Yorkshire in respect of food poverty and provision.

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

MR G BATTY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. My Lord Mayor and Councillors, thank you for this opportunity to address the Council today. My name is Gareth Batty and I am the CEO of the charity FareShare Yorkshire. I am joined by my two colleagues, Andy Studdart, Chair of Trustees of FareShare Yorkshire, and Dave

Paterson - Chair of the Leeds Food Aid Network. Together we are work in the city to help people suffering from Food Poverty.

What is Poverty? Poverty means not being able to heat your home, eat healthily, pay your rent, or buy essentials for your children. It means waking up every day facing insecurity and making impossible decisions about money.

Three years ago the Leeds Food Aid Network was set up with the support of former Councillor John Hardy and the Welfare and Benefits team of Leeds City Council to help address the growing need. We want to bring to you our concern for the significant increase in people struggling with food poverty in the city. Data shows that in 2014 people accessed a food bank over 20,000 times. Last year that number had risen to over 25,000 times.

We believe that all people, faith groups, organisations and institutions have a part to play in tackling food poverty, including Leeds City Council. This deputation recognises the great work the Council has already done in helping people and supporting initiatives, but we should not be complacent about the need there is in the city. The rest of what I would like to say aims to raise awareness the fantastic work that is taking place in the city and encourage the Council to continue to play its part.

‘Food Aid’ is a term that is to describe forms of provision that assists people in a state of food insecurity. This includes food banks, soup kitchens, food drop-ins, parish pantries, hot meal providers and street outreach. The Food Aid Network is underpinned by a document which details Homeless and Food Aid Provision in Leeds. This document details the different initiatives that provide support and is distributed to over 650 front-line workers. A short summary of Activities include:

- Organising training and networking events for support workers and volunteers;
- Distribution of surplus food across the city to front-line providers;
- Facilitating communication through network meetings, social media and website and engagement with local media;
- And finally engaging outside Leeds with the Independent Food Aid Network, the End Hunger UK campaign and the West Yorkshire Food Poverty Network.

Initiatives in Leeds vary significantly. There are high profile initiatives such as the Leeds Food Bank, part of Trussell Trust, and St George’s Crypt, which has provided thousands of meals since the 1930s There is FareShare Yorkshire who three years ago, with the support of Leeds City Council, established a permanent base at Cross Green as an extension of its Regional Centre in Barnsley. FareShare’s mission is to rescue surplus food and, by working in partnership with the food industry, FareShare taps into the 270,000 tonnes of food that is currently wasted which is still in date and could be used to feed people. This food has been used to support 101 community groups and schools in Leeds, providing over 580,000 meals for vulnerable young people and adults since we launched.

Food aid provision is not only provided by well-known organisations, but is often in smaller, more informal ways with churches and local organisations all playing their part supporting their community . Then there is the Council's Local Welfare Support Scheme, where the provision of a food parcel for someone within 24 hours is co-ordinated by FareShare Yorkshire at a significantly reduced amount of funding than the previous scheme. This is in addition to a Breakfast Club provision that FareShare provides to school clusters where, in its first year, it provided enough food for over 380,000 breakfasts

Looking forward, if we may, we would like make some suggestions:

- Could all front-line services in the Council have access to the Homeless and Food Aid document, which is updated on a regular basis?
- Would all areas of the Council consider collecting food and distributing it to either a food provider directly or to FareShare who will distribute the food appropriately?
- Finally we would like to encourage you to attend a Food Aid Network meeting or a local food aid provider to see the front line work first hand.

In conclusion, we are encouraged by the way Leeds City Council takes food aid provision seriously and on behalf of FareShare Yorkshire and the Leeds Food Aid Network, I would ask you all to continue to do whatever you can to support the many initiatives. Leeds is one of the very few cities in the UK that collaborates to this extent. We hugely encourage you to make sure that Leeds City Council is proactive and continues to be at the forefront in facilitating and supporting what is required to combat food poverty at a time of real need for our residents.

Thank you for this opportunity to come and speak to you all today.  
*(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ogilvie.

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: I move that the matter be referred to the Assistant Chief Executive (Citizens and Communities) for consideration in consultation with the relevant Executive Member.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Buckley.

COUNCILLOR BUCKLEY: I second that, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: To the vote. *(A vote was taken)* CARRIED Thank you for coming to today's meeting. Officers from the relevant Department will be in contact with you due course. Good afternoon. *(Applause)*

#### DEPUTATION TWO – KARMA NIRVANA

THE LORD MAYOR: Deputation Two, the Leeds based charity Karma Nirvana supporting victims of forced marriages.

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 J SANGHERA CBE: Thank you Lord Mayor and Members of Council. I am joined by Members of the Karma Nirvana team – this is Trish Harlett, this is Rachel Ginder from the team.

I am going to start now by introducing myself. My father came from India in the late 1950s in search of work. He came to Britain, invited by UK Parliament, and he settled in Derby. My mother joined him later, I was born in the UK. I am one of seven sisters, I have one brother. My father came from rural Punjab in India, did not have the benefit of education. We were educated in Britain and I watched 37 years ago the majority of my sisters being taken out of British schools at the age of 15 to marry men they had only ever met in photographs. They would disappear one by one and nobody questioned their absences and they would be forced into marriages which were justified in the name of tradition – tradition and religion, which we know is absolute nonsense.

I was 14 years old when my mother sat me down and showed me a photograph of the man I was to learn I was promised to from the age of eight. I said no, I was born in Britain, I should have the right to an education, independence, democracy, everything Britain stands for.

That led to my family taking me out of education, being held a prisoner in my own home until I escaped. I escaped from home at 16, I ran away to Leeds, actually, so Leeds is a home to me. I made the point I was born here. My family were very clear – I either come back and marry a man in a picture or I was dead in their eyes. I chose not to go back home and subsequently I have been disowned for 36 years.

I became a campaigner and established the charity Karma Nirvana, which is a national charity here based in Leeds, because my sister Robina sadly did not make it. She was forced to marry at 15. In her early twenties, after years of abuse, years of family and community members telling her to go back for the sake of the family's honour, she set herself on fire and she committed suicide and she died.

Here I am today asking you to please work with Karma Nirvana, a local and national charity that has a national helpline. We want Leeds City to become a beacon of good working practice. I work nationally with all three political parties. The Home Office recognises our work, we have a national helpline. Last year we dealt with 505 calls to our helpline from West Yorkshire. We have real issues across nationally. We want to embed this across partnerships and I am coming here to ask you for your support in helping us to develop a partnership where others across the UK can look to us for good practice.

One thing I want to be very clear about is, cultural acceptance does not mean accepting the unacceptable. I was born here, I was not afforded the same level of

protection as my white counterparts because there exists an attitude that somehow this is cultural, so it gets watered down and then you have the fears of offending communities, the fear of being called a racist.

I know that if you tackle this issue you will promote equality, you will promote cohesion. You will also be able to help integration and citizenship. These are all national issues of national concern. Every child should have the right to choose who they want marry; every child should have the right to go to school and have an education.

We do have issues across West Yorkshire. I believe we can tackle them only through partnership but I also believe that through our safer executive partnerships here, through leadership, your leadership as Councillors from those communities, you can help us to send out a message to the national corridors of power as well, because our work has influenced a criminal offence in this country. We campaigned for it for ten years and we successfully achieved criminal legislation. However, whether many people know that exists in the UK is another thing.

I believe here in the UK if we develop Leeds as a beacon of good practice we can use that as a model in Nottingham, in Tower Hamlets, in Leicester and people will listen.

We have trained West Yorkshire police now and have good partnerships. Where we are lacking is with children and young people. We need to get it right in Health as well. That is the national picture.

I believe by working with you we can achieve this. I very much thank you for the time. I am proud to be a member of Leeds, I am proud that Karma Nirvana is in Leeds so please use us and work with us and I would like to thank Councillor Coupar and James for their support in giving us this platform. Thank you. *(standing ovation)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ogilvie.

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: I move that the matter be referred to the Assistant Chief Executive (Citizens and Communities) for consideration, in consultation with the relevant Executive Member.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Buckley

COUNCILLOR BUCKLEY: I have the greatest pleasure in seconding that, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: I call for the vote. *(A vote was taken)* CARRIED  
Thank you for coming to today's meeting. Officers from the relevant Department will be in contact with you in due course. Thank you very much for coming.

MS J SANGHERA CBE: Thank you. *(Applause)*

### DEPUTATION THREE – TEAM BECKHILLS

THE LORD MAYOR: Deputation Three, Team Beckhills, residents from the Beckhill Estate regarding pavement repairs.

Some of my old friends here! 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.

FIRST SPEAKER: Lord Mayor and Members of Council, we are representatives of Team Beckhills, a group of residents from the Beckhill Estate, which is on the border of Chapel Allerton and Meanwood wards.

We are asking for a commitment from Leeds City Council to complete vital repairs to steps and pavements on our estate. These pavements are dangerous and have been causing falls and injuries for many years. We need the Executive Board to include repairs to steps and pavements on Beckhills Estate in the Capital Programme for 2017 and 2018.

This Deputation is not just about money. By listening to us you are helping continue our positive story of residents coming together to make life better for each other. For many years residents have felt the estate has been neglected. We have been reporting problems with antisocial behaviour, litter, fly tipping and dangerous pavements for a long time. We all have stories about things that make us angry and disappointed. We have lost track of how many times we were promised repairs and redevelopment over the years. Consultations come and go, but we are still faced with the same problems.

It felt like no-one was listening to us and people have got used to it. There has not been a functioning residents' association in years. Residents have few positive things to say about the Council. Many have lost hope of seeing positive change.

SECOND SPEAKER: But over the last 18 months we have decided to take some responsibility. Instead of complaining, we decided to get organised. We teamed up with Leeds Citizens, Stainbeck Church and Mill Field Primary School to see if we could build up some pride in our estate and get some things done.

We started with some training in Community Organising. Then we joined Year 6 pupils on a walkabout to identify local issues. Then we knocked on doors and spoke to our neighbours about what change they wanted to see on the estate. We helped run a very successful Fun Day last summer. We reached out to Councillors and Area Officers. We would to place on record our thanks to Leanne Manning, Councillor Dowson, Councillor Rafique and Councillor Taylor for their steadfast support locally. Can we have an applause? (*Applause*)

We were delighted to host the Lord Mayor for tea. Thank you for giving our estate some much-needed recognition and thank you to Councillor Blake, who visited us twice and committed to do all she could to get things moving. Gradually, we are starting to see change.

We have developed our negotiation skills and have organised meetings with Mark Grandfield, Tom Smith and other senior officers from the Council about the main issues of litter, waste collection and unsafe steps. None of us had experience of charring meetings or public speaking, but with the support from Leeds Citizens and Stainbeck Church, we are growing in confidence. We are starting to see positive things such as a better bin collection system and Service Level Agreement with the waste team.

FIRST SPEAKER: One of the most important issues we have is the dangerous steps and pavements around the estate. These are a major hazard and are not fit for purpose. They will already cause injuries for people trying to get around the state. We have knocked on doors around the estate and over 150 families have signed our petition to get them fixed. Repairs have been approved for about 10% of the estate, but that leaves another 90% of the estate unsafe.

SPEAKER TWO: We are asking Leeds City Council to act immediately to prioritise repairs for the rest of our estate. We have worked so hard to bring people together and to get them to the point where they believe change is possible. We even got 44 residents come to a meeting last night about antisocial behaviour. It would be a real shame to let them down now.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can you wind up, please? You have had your five minutes. Just carry on but wind up.

FIRST SPEAKER: We need you to include repairs to steps and pavements on Beckhills Estate in the Capital Programme for 2017 and 2018. Thank you for listening. I will look forward to your response. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ogilvie.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Buckley.

COUNCILLOR BUCKLEY: I second that, Lord Mayor.

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

Thank you for coming to today's meeting. Officers from the relevant Department will be in contact with you in due course. Good afternoon and thank you.

FIRST SPEAKER: Thank you very much. (*Applause*)

ITEM 5 – RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD – LEEDS SITE  
ALLOCATIONS PLAN SUBMISSION DRAFT STAGE

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 5, Recommendations of the Executive Board – Leeds Site Allocations Plan Submission Draft Stage. Councillor Richard Lewis.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Given how many people have got their names down on the Order Paper I will keep my comments short at this point.

Firstly I would just like to say thank you to all Members and officers who have been involved in the process of reaching this point. I think there are very few who have been left untouched by it and I think officers must sometimes feel like they are painting the Forth Bridge – no longer have they finished doing one Site Allocations Plan than they are starting off with another one.

It has been a long and difficult process but we have got to the point where we have a document. That document, I remind people in the terms of the Notice, is about the Draft Site Allocations Plan to the Secretary of State for independent examination. It is absolutely appropriate that that stage now goes ahead, whether you are in favour of everything in the plan or against. It is absolutely the right thing that this plan goes forward at this stage.

I do recognise that many people have their concerns. It is about building on green belt, about building in their locality. It is a normal human reaction. The fact that there are huge numbers of people objecting in some cases does not make it easy for that process to be carried out. It makes it very difficult to come to some conclusion that is actually logical and rational.

I think we have come up with the best that we can. I will probably talk a little bit more about that at the very end of the debate because I think there will probably be some comments that I might want to comment on myself.

It is also appropriate that we have got so many people commenting. This is democracy, this is people's chance to have a say about the proposals before they go elsewhere.

As I say, I will listen very carefully to everybody's comments but one thing that does concern me is people who almost wilfully describe the debate as if it were Leeds City Council imposing its will willy-nilly on the people of Leeds. That is not the case and the thing is that the Members who say that know absolutely what the case is. They also know that we cannot just reject planning applications as we see fit. We are bound by rules set further up the food chain.

Most of all I am a bit concerned about the people who seem to have forgotten what they said at an earlier stage in the discussions about site allocations. I will clearly be talking at length about that later on.

At this stage I would just urge everybody to vote for this because we cannot be left in limbo, we cannot be left with a Core Strategy but no Site Allocations Plan. We have to move forward and the way forward is to put this to public examination – let's do it. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Venner.

COUNCILLOR VENNER: My Lord Mayor, I am delighted to second the motion to approve the Site Allocations Plan being submitted for examination in public.

The Development Plans Panel has been working hard to bring forward the Site Allocations Plan but this has only come together as a result of developments from all Members. The information and guidance from all Members, particularly in ward Member and HMC and other briefings which took place in 2015 have helped make the plan. It has been helpful that Members have been willing to work together to try and make the most appropriate plan possible, and I would like to thank all the Members of the Development Plans Panel from across the Chamber who have contributed to this work and also the officers who have provided us with the support and information we need to make recommendations.

As the new Development Plans Panel Chair I have valued their guidance and the previous DPP Chairs', Councillor Congreve and Councillor Walshaw. Nothing in Strategic Planning happens very quickly, but it is worth remembering the Site Allocations Plan has been years in the making. This has to be the case when you consider the consultations and other considerations that have to go into the plan. Consultation took place between 3<sup>rd</sup> June and 29<sup>th</sup> July 2013 for Issues and Options; 22<sup>nd</sup> September to 16<sup>th</sup> November 2015 for the publication draft; and 26<sup>th</sup> September to 7<sup>th</sup> November 2016 for the publication draft on the Outer North East.

Every Member of Development Plans Panel over that time and every Member who has attended meetings, workshops or invited local residents to consultation events has played their part in bringing the plan to fruition. The public has clearly also been engaged by the plan, with 45,000 representations received to the consultation in 2015 and 4,000 individual representations to the Outer North East consultation.

Given the size and scale of the plan, as Councillor Lewis, said it is unlikely that everyone will be happy with every allocation. That said, getting the plan to this stage will hopefully help towards protecting sites that are not included in the plan and that is what we are looking to achieve in Leeds, a plan-led approach.

Of course, this means some hard decisions and there will likely be much more discussion to be had with the Inspector through the examination in public, but to do

anything else at this stage or add further delays into the process could mean the loss of sites not included in the plan. That is why we have to press ahead now and that is why the plan needs to move to the next stage, to be examined in public. Thank you.  
(Applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Andrew Carter.

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I listened with interest to the very low key presentation from Councillor Lewis for this paper.

We in this Group have tried to be as reasonable as possible with this process, accepting that it was flawed from the beginning – flawed in two ways and I do not retract in any way at all my criticism of the Government’s NPPF. Nor do I retract my criticism of the base point, the starting point for this Site Allocations Plan of 70,000 houses that this Council – this Council – decided was the number of houses it wanted – it wanted - and it put before an independent Planning Inspector.

We accepted at that time we had to have a Core Strategy that was what was being told to us from Government, from everybody. We expected in the Site Allocations Plan a lot of representations to be made and, indeed, they were – thousands. If you look through this Site Allocations Plan, virtually every single representation has been dismissed, so to the people of Leeds, they have gone through a pointless exercise in consultation where nobody was prepared to listen and we go back to the issue of the 70,000 houses being actually the be all and end all, because that is where the trouble started and that is where it has now ended us up.

It is a figure that is amazingly similar to the figure imposed under the old Regional Spatial Strategy by the last Labour Government, who wanted us to build 69,000-some-hundred houses.

I am led to the conclusion that actually it is time for the side over here to put their hands up and say they actually want 70,000 houses. That is what they actually want, although the figures do not stack up. I say they want it because let me just tell you something very quickly. I FOI-ed the Council in connection with the QCs’ practice that had done a lot of work for us and now cost us £300,000, incidentally, and asked how many times the Chief Executive, the Leader of Council and Councillor Lewis had met with Nathalie Lieven, the lead QC from that Chambers, to discover that Councillor Blake has never met her, despite the fact she has cost us £300,000; Councillor Lewis has met her once on the same day I met her, although I have had a number of meetings with her, and the Chief Executive has not met her since 2013. Are these people truly taking seriously the representations of thousands of people? I would suggest to you they are not.

We cannot vote for this and because of this information and the fact that their party, Mr Reasonable there, put a leaflet out in Horsforth accusing the Liberal Democrats and the Conservatives of saying he should build on the Strawberry Fields. That is a lie. How can we have any sort of working relationship with a party that

plays games like that? We shall not be voting for this Site Allocations Plan. Indeed, because of this we shall now be voting against it. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Procter has asked to speak later in the debate. Councillor Barry Anderson.

COUNCILLOR B ANDERSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. The Site Allocations Process, there has been a lot of debate and there has been a heck of a lot of disagreement. For example, your side are still determined not to look again at the Tetley site in Weetwood despite from the very beginning all of us, including some of your Members, agreeing that it should not come forward.

The public are totally, utterly confused. Yet again, another consultation by this Labour administration that is just not being listened to, you are just riding roughshod over anybody's views. Even in the Development Plans Panel we were told that there were thousands of objections. Did we get to discuss them? No, not one thing. Yet again, decisions have been made and to the best of my knowledge this goes for the elected Members on your side as well, none of them have actually gone through the objections either to see how many have been properly made and come up with valid reasons as to why they should not be brought forward.

We need to know. We need a debate and you are not facilitating it in any shape or form. The public just think they are being ignored which, I am sorry to say, they are being ignored.

What is happening in this Council? Who is making the decisions? Who is behind it? The Labour Party in my area say they are against development to my area. Well, the Members are not voting that way in here. They say in Horsforth they are against it. They are not voting there. I accept now Garforth is probably now raising a little bit more concern but beforehand they were not raising objections either. I hear problems down in Robin Hood and Ardsley – they are not making any comment about it.

You have your concerns. This, believe it or not, is another NGT on its way. You will not listen to what Members are saying, you push things through and you damn well sow the problems that come through to you at the end of the day.

We have got problems with the Education service, they have not been properly evaluated in the Site Allocations Plan. Neither has Transport, neither have the Highways implications, nor have you made it clear about the use of green belt. You are using green belt to actually take in the amount of development to make up for the housing need which you have been told you have not to do so your officers are telling you that and you are ignoring that.

We need sustainable development, we need the Core Strategy to be reviewed at the same time, in tandem, because there is going to be some sites at the end of the day, because your figure will come down, that are going to be given away to the developers that not even you want to build on but because of the way you have gone

about it, you are destroying it for the city and by God we are going to hate it afterwards. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Stephenson.

COUNCILLOR STEPHENSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would like to begin with a short thank you to officers of the Council, residents in my ward and indeed in Garforth and Swillington as well and the Save Parlington Action Group for supporting elected Members in the Harewood ward – Councillors Procter, Robinson and myself – who hosted an information event on this consultation on Monday the 20<sup>th</sup>. We had a record turnout at that and we were incredibly grateful to officers for supporting us in that respect.

It is important that we recognise that local plans need to have the support of communities and are, indeed, locally led. Over the last six months I believe this Council has received nearly 15,000 individual responses to their various consultations including 10,000 submissions to this last consultation alone, of which 6,000 came from one site, MX2-39, Parlington, in the Harewood ward.

The problem I have, among many, today is despite the scale of the responses received, the consultation closed less than 48 hours ago, we are now being asked to sign off the plan and none of us have seen any of the responses that went into that consultation. We are being asked to make a judgment on this Site Allocations Plan but we have not seen all the information before us.

Councillor Lewis mentions quite rightly that it is right now that this plan be examined by an independent Inspector – I am glad he used that phrase, an independent Inspector – and, of course, that Inspector will judge whether the plan is sound, but there will be a number of other sound plans put forward, I imagine, by other developers within the city, but the point being the plan that is being judged is the plan that is being put forward by this Labour administration.

From Day One, before I was elected to the Council, Councillors on this side of the Chamber have been trying to support the Council in their efforts. We acknowledge that things had to come forward and be considered. Well, Councillor Lewis, they have been considered, by nearly 15,000 electors across the city, and they have decided they do not support the Site Allocations Plan. I will be supporting a majority of those people who want this Council, this ruling administration, to take stock. You have got to revise down your housing target, re-draw the Housing Market Characteristic Areas that you have put forward, that you decided to put forward, and relieve communities in the Harewood ward and across this city from the inappropriate, unnecessary and unwanted development on green field and green belt sites in this city while urban brown field stands undeveloped. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Robinson.

COUNCILLOR ROBINSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am delighted to speak on this matter and share the thanks of my colleague, Councillor Stephenson, for the work that officers have done but also the huge amount of representations that have gone in from across this city. It is fantastic to see that so many people are getting involved in this consultation and actually making their voices heard.

They will not think it is so fantastic, though, if we do not act on those concerns and responses that have come in. 48 hours passed by – not one Member in this Chamber has seen the responses, has been able to gauge them properly, has been able to look at them and we are asked to vote on this. It starts to make a little bit of a mockery of democracy.

As I read through the papers that were supplied to us, I noticed the 70,000 target again mentioned throughout and Councillor Carter has hit on the crux of the matter. This 70,000 market is a choice by the administration in this Chamber. It is a choice by the administration running this Council to go after the 70,000 houses. If you are in favour of that I have no problem with that. We will meet on the hustings and at the ballot boxes and we will see how that goes down. I do not think it will go down very well with the residents that I have spoken to across this city though, because they think that it is a highly disreputable and highly disputed figure. They do not think that it actually reflects their views, they do not think it reflects the way this city is going and the way we wish to move forward.

Green belt should be seen as the absolute last resort for housing. It should not be the first port of call and for the administration to see green belt as the way out is very, very risky. I am very pleased that they are not negotiating on Brexit because they would just take the first deal that came forward as opposed to actually going into a negotiation and thinking about all the consequences. *(interruption)* Is it any wonder that you cannot get a devolution deal?

COUNCILLOR COUPAR: The Prime Minister knew what he was doing, didn't he?

COUNCILLOR ROBINSON: As you start to look through the papers it is very, very clear – it is very clear in the papers, it says “Given the scope of the SAP it is not possible to revisit the strategic matters such as the overall housing requirement”, so Councillor Lewis can stand up today and tell us the progress that he has made on reducing the 70,000 target and he can be very, very public in that and perhaps come back and update us on the review in this Chamber time and again so that the public know.

Unfortunately, these papers actually do not listen to the people of Leeds, they do not listen to the comments coming in from the people of Parlington, they do not listen to the concerns about schooling in Parlington, around transport and around the neighbourhood planning. I have yet to see anywhere that a weight has been given to neighbourhood plans within these documents as well. I think that it risks this Council looking out of touch and out of time and that the public will not believe in the Site

Allocations Scheme and not believe a single word that is in there. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor David Blackburn.

COUNCILLOR D BLACKBURN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. We have been waiting for this for a long, long time but quite honestly, after it has gone through all its consultations it is very much like it was to start off with. It does not deal with the main problem, and that is the total housing numbers.

The fact is, I have got some of my constituents who are getting very frustrated with the planning process, and for that matter I am as well. There is stuff in here that by the time it is lodged with the Inspector they will be built on, so it is out of date now.

The whole process has been a complete disaster and some of us have been warning of that from the start off. The point is, we need something that stands up in law and has the right figure, and it does not do. I can see when we lodged this certain green belt land, because of the problems we have got with the five year land supply, I can see this coming along and it happened with the UDP. I remember it happened with the UDP. There is a housing estate in my ward that is actually green belt. We lodged it, a developer put in a planning application, we turned it down for being premature and then the Inspector passed it, and then the Inspector at UDP said it should remain green belt, and there are houses on it. That is what we are going to end up with this.

It has taken too long, the consultations have not been consultations, they have just gone through it and hardly changed anything at all and it has just been a total, total mess.

I do not know what we will do with this because quite clearly we need a Site Allocations Plan. It is not right. On the individual stuff, we will wait until the examination comes because there are certain things we want to say when we are there. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Walshaw.

COUNCILLOR WALSHAW: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I want to speak again about the Site Allocations Plan and before I speak on a few issues pertaining to that, Lord Mayor, if you picture in your mind's eye sharks swimming around and bear that in mind while I talk about a few of these issues.

Some of these sharks are good sharks and some of them are bad sharks but all sharks want opportunities, right? They are just sharks; that is what they do. Bear that analogy in mind, that visual analogy.

First of all I am really pleased about the depth and the quality of submissions regarding the SAP process. As Members have pointed out on both sides it has gone

on a long time and it is good to see people engaged in that. Why is the SAP important? It is absolutely important, isn't it? This is a vital part of Leeds's planning armour, and I use that term deliberately. Who in this Chamber does not want, in as much as we can in an imperfect system, direct development to exactly where we want it and when we want it and what nature it is? Everyone wants to do that, right? Nobody thinks we should have a free for all, which is interesting given some of the comments we have had from Members already.

The clearest and most direct way we can protect our communities from unwanted development is to pass this SAP and to pass it to independent enquiry. That cannot be any clearer to Members in this room and I am slightly taken aback that Members would want to delay that process, because bear in mind that shark analogy.

Bearing in mind that, it is map prop time! Of course it is map prop time, Lord Mayor! Cast your mind back to the Site Allocations Process when we were developing what sites would come forward. All the seas of red sites, absolute seas of red sites that we rejected out of hand, all of us working together as a responsible Council and administration. We rejected those sites, didn't we?

Now, if we do not pass the SAP, what happens? Those sites come up for grabs, don't they, amongst other sites. Who wants a free for all in this city? That cannot be allowed to happen. We are in an extremely imperfect planning system, the legislation, the Statutory Instruments, Councillor Blackburn, they are extremely clunky, they take a long time. We need to revisit that at a national level, don't we?

Of course, all this process causes a lot of anxiety for our communities, doesn't it? Let's call it site anxiety. Why are we having that site anxiety? Well, like so many things in this grossly over-centralised country, it comes from the top. It comes from the National Planning Policy Framework. That rewards developers for not building their permissions. When they under-deliver the city is seen as not delivering. That opens more sites up. The system incentivises failure. How can we have national planning policy that incentives failure? That cannot be allowed to stand, can it? We need a national dialogue about how we make the planning system work for all our communities. We do, we need that and we need that urgently.

In the meantime, we must act where we can. Part of where we must act and where we can act is passing the SAP, because our communities need this to protect the sites that they do not want to see developed. Thank you, Lord Mayor.  
*(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Sounds a bit fishy! *(laughter)* Councillor Maqsood.

COUNCILLOR MAQSOOD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am also speaking in support of the Site Allocations Plan. The Site Allocations Plan for Leeds is one of utmost importance for the city. Setting out a vision of where our new homes, businesses, green spaces, schools and shops will be built is vital to the growth and continued success of Leeds. However, in order to meet this vision and to ensure a plan-led approach, land must be allocated across the city. Therefore, it is worth

acknowledging which areas are taking on the most new homes. In doing so we can meet the need for new homes in a fair and balanced measure across all areas of the city.

In the Site Allocations Plan the three areas agreeing to take on more than 10,000 new homes in Leeds are Inner and City Centre. The two areas with proposed allocation under 2,400 are Aireborough and Outer North-West. The population density of wards in Inner and City Centre are substantially higher compared to the rest of Leeds. For example my ward, Gipton and Harehills in the Inner area, has a population density of 74.2. That is more than five times the national average in Leeds of 13.6. Elsewhere, Harewood and Outer North-East area has a population density of 1.7. (*interruption*) Hyde Park and Woodhouse has a population density of 67. In Guiseley and Rawdon it is 11.1. In Headingley it is 103.7. To put it simply, the highest amount of new homes are in areas with already higher levels of population density.

These facts serve as a reminder, contrary to what we have heard today, that the areas with the least amount of population density in the Outer areas and Aireborough are not being unfairly treated under the Site Allocations Plan. While some of the spaces in these areas are green spaces or green belt, it must be acknowledged that the areas giving up the least amount of land are areas with the lowest population density. These means making sure we get green spaces and infrastructure right in the areas who are taking on the highest burden and one we want to work together to achieve.

The Site Allocations Plan must succeed and move forward in its plan to build new homes, schools, businesses and shops for our city to grow. We also need to grow through our plan-led vision, not blindly follow the vision of developers or fail to acknowledge that the city will continue to grow.

As a Council we need to provide homes for this growth and the Site Allocations Plan is how we intend to do it.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can you wind up, please.

COUNCILLOR MAQSOOD: Therefore, co-operation between all areas in Leeds City Council is a crucial part of the Site Allocations Plan. Because of this, areas must move forward with the plans fairly accepting...

THE LORD MAYOR: Will you wind up, please.

COUNCILLOR MAQSOOD: ...that growth needs to be shaped and has the most land available for housing. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Leadley.

COUNCILLOR LEADLEY: My Lord Mayor, as the Site Allocations Plan is submitted for inspection, it is clear that the City Council has lost control of its housing land supply. There is no measured progress, not even an orderly retreat. We see a

rabble in full flight. There is nothing surprising about this, it is a mathematically inevitable outcome of unrealistic and purely aspirational aims to build an average of well over 4,000 dwellings a year which Leeds has had since the Yorkshire and Humber Regional Spatial Strategy consultation of 2007, which was confirmed in the adopted RSS of May 2008.

Problems which we have now were foreseeable and foreseen ten years ago and underlined by the flawed and over-simplified National Planning Policy Framework which came into force in March 2012 with all its rules of land supply, just before the Leeds Local Development Framework began on 1<sup>st</sup> April of that year.

Since 2012 we have had an LDF slow start target of 3,600 dwellings a year which is too high in itself. The consequence of this was that even more inflated balancing targets of 4,700 dwellings a year for the rest of the LDF have had to be introduced until its end on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2028. It has been my belief that a crisis would come at the end of March 2017 as we stepped up from 3,600 a year to 4,700 because, as forecast, the shortfall since 2012 has been so vast that it snowballed into a deficit which has to be added to the existing excessive underlying targets.

In fact, the crisis came last December, a bit earlier than expected with the loss of the appeals at Bramhope, Collingham and East Ardsley. Ken Barton, the Inspector at those appeals, did the unavoidable and inevitable maths on behalf of the city Council and calculated a need to provide land for 6,379 dwellings a year for each of the next five years to satisfy the targets, clear the backlog and give a 20% buffer beyond the five year supply which is in line with NPPF rules.

As I have said for some years, a realistic and still ambitious target would be 2,875 dwellings a year net based as it should be on need rather than under-achievement or aspiration. Builders are not doing enough towards achieving 2,875 a year but whether they did or not they would need a far smaller five year land supply, there would be a far smaller backlog and no need for a 20% buffer.

Once land is taken out of green belt it is all but impossible to get back in again. The need to defer the green belt review until after the housing targets have been reduced is set out clearly in many of the representations sent from Morley so we will not be voting for today's proposal though we do recognise that there must be a movement forward to a conclusion by the end of 2017. Thank you, my Lord Mayor.  
*(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Robert Finnigan.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. As my colleague has said, this was all entirely foreseeable. We are the only Group that has consistently backed lower targets and have been talking about this since 2007. Councillor Leadley has been the only clear voice that has suggested that we would create the problems that we now find ourselves facing with a target that is unachievable and entirely unrealistic.

It is certainly interesting to hear the Labour Party bleating on about how unfair the NPPF has been on them. This particular target is based on their Regional Spatial Strategy which they consistently backed at that particular point and is just a reforming of that particular target, and that is what they voted for. We consistently voted against it.

It is interesting to hear Councillor Walshaw talk about free fall, talk about unwanted development. It is absolutely fascinating to hear that certainly in the context of Morley because, quite frankly, we have been in free fall and we have been subjected to unwanted development year after year after year which the comrades have been happy to support time and time again.

Certainly if we look at the most recent betrayal at Lane Side Farm where the Labour Party was wringing its hands about what a difficult decision – all of them backed it, despite the opposition from others and this is a protected area search that was supposed to be part of a plan, a plan that looked at putting the infrastructure in first and did not do. We had the betrayal of Land Side Farm and Low Moor Farm and Owlens Farm and Bruntcliffe Road and Spring Gardens. All of these led to over 2,000 new homes being proposed or developed in the Morley area and we had no infrastructure there to be able to accommodate this new development. It just shows what a total and utter chaotic shambles this whole process has been.

I argued in the Morley Observer that they were synthetic socialists, that they said one thing and did another. Prove me wrong. Put communities first instead of developers. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Government Stewart Golton.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. This is a flawed document; it was flawed from the very beginning and it deserves to be rejected and we will not be voting for it. Unfortunately, the Group opposite take some very bad advice. I will, however, congratulate them on their tenacity. When they chose the 70,000 target for their housing target, it was at the very highest end of a range of advice that was given to them and they chose to take it. To give Councillor Gruen his due, who was in charge at the time...

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: It's all his fault!

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: ...Councillor Gruen accepted quite a large chunk of that new housing to be built in his own area, so he was not just talking the talk, he was walking the walk. However, I would point out to Councillor Maqsood...

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: Not round where he lived. *(laughter)*

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: ...to talk about population density is irrational when you are talking about housing targets.

COUNCILLOR: No it is not.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: The whole point about this city, and one of its strengths, is that we are a very diverse city and we have very different communities, and what makes Harehills such a vibrant place is because there are so many people living in it and they have learned to live together and in harmony.

COUNCILLOR COUPAR: Can we have a blade of grass?

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: It is vibrant. It is a very different community to that which you will find in Barwick or you will find in Carlton, which are sleepy villages and we should not take away the choice of people to choose to live in those different environments within the boundaries of Leeds. We should not seek to try and cancel them both out by turning them all into some kind of faceless suburbia. We do not want that in this city but unfortunately, if you are not careful, your 70k target will take us that way.

I have to say though, Lord Mayor, one of the things that we need to remember in this debate, because the Conservative Party make out that they were, “Oh, we were really helpful at the beginning and we expected you to actually pull it round and reduce the target in the end and now we are so disappointed we are withdrawing our support.” Actually at the very beginning why do they want to have 70,000 houses built in this city in the first place? It is because it is only through building homes that your Government offers any new income to this Council. They are cutting the funds that the Council gets from the general settlement it gets from Government and the only way it offers any kind of new money is to associate it with houses built on the ground.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: It came in when you were in Government with us. You were in Government as well. *(interruption)*

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: You get New Homes Bonus, we get Council Tax income and more importantly as well we get Community Infrastructure Levy.

What I will say actually to the Conservative Group there...

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we let him finish, please.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: It is very dishonest to talk about how they are so bad at putting this plan together. They took your advice in Outer North East, they took your advice and said yes, we will develop housing in that area in one single site...

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: No they didn't.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Yes we did.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: ...and now the only single site that is available is Parlington and all of a sudden you are saying you cannot support that without actually putting forward any suitable sustainable option.

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: Look at the numbers. Look at the numbers.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: I am not sure I agree with you. That is dishonesty. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Campbell.

COUNCILLOR CAMPBELL: Thank you, Lord Mayor. As has already been said, this train went off the rails with the Core Strategy and I recall the discussion we had that day and there were three groups on this Council who strongly opposed the Core Strategy, said from Day One that it was wrong. Having said that, there were two Groups on this Council who voted for it – two Groups who voted for it – and in fact when I spoke against it I got the finger wag from you about it.

The bottom line is, it is all right saying you do not like it now but you voted for it and that is what has caused this problem for us.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: For God's sake, we are not even in administration, are we, so how did we cause the problem?

COUNCILLOR CAMPBELL: Oh, come on. Come on.

COUNCILLOR: Why did you support them then?

COUNCILLOR CAMPBELL: The trouble is that you were in favour of it, you were supportive of it, you were supportive of the single site in the North-East quite frankly, and I was not going to say that but I am now.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Say it!

COUNCILLOR CAMPBELL: Suddenly because you got a load of pressure you changed your damn minds.

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: You want 500 houses in every village in Outer North-East, you must do.

COUNCILLOR CAMPBELL: Right, Lord Mayor, let's get on to the basics of the Labour Party's. The issue for all of us who have been involved in the Development Plans Panel is the fact that the Labour Group have signally refused to accept what we regard as rational comment in relation to sites. A number of people and a number of Councillors, including Labour Councillors, have come up with reasons, valid reasons, for example it floods, it is Area 3 flood plain, let us take it out. OK, it is not wanted for development, it is a historic site, can we take it out? We have

said that on more than one occasion, we have proposed that and under no circumstances has any site been allowed to come out of the LDF but actually, strangely enough, more sites seem to have gone in for reasons that none of us can understand, and I think no wonder people have some confusion about the rationale.

Let us just touch on Councillor Maqsood. It is really clear, whether we disagree on the Core Strategy or not it is really clear after that statement what Labour policy is, and Labour policy is if you do not agree to this, we are going to tweak it and we are going to tweak it so that Harewood gets more, so that Aireborough gets more, so that Adel and Wharfedale gets more, so that Otley and Yeadon gets more – anywhere that has got a low percentage gets more. That is totally contrary to everything we have agreed in this Council, that we should have a fair and rational base for that. I am not being browbeaten by you into agreeing to something that is basically wrong simply because you are threatening me with a large housing estate. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Jonathan Bentley.

COUNCILLOR J BENTLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. We have already heard from lots of previous speakers how effectively the consultation on this plan has not worked, it is just wanting a rubber stamp for it and residents have not had their voice heard, not had their objections listened to and validated. I am just going to put that right just on one site and use it as an example, really, of where there is no joined-up thinking in terms of what this plan is going to do.

Whenever a Weetwood Councillor stand up, colleagues wait in anticipation for who is going to mention West Park Centre first, so I am not going to disappoint on that. Members may remember that the West Park Centre was demolished a couple of years ago, thus depriving residents of one of the few community facilities we had. However, there was a plus side to this, the land was designated in the original Draft Site Allocations Proposals as “Reserved for educational purposes.” This was good because of the shortage of school places in the area and we thought that logically a previous school site would then be ideal for either a new school or for expanding the existing local school, St Chad’s, which is immediately adjacent to the West Park Centre site.

In the course of the SAP being developed the status of the site changed from “education” to “suitable for housing” and was then put up for sale as part of the Council’s Asset Disposal Programme in advance of the SAP being approved.

Meanwhile, we are still short of school places. The only option we now have for the expansion of St Chad’s School is for it to expand on to a green field site which is protected under the Fields in Trust Scheme, thus depriving the local community of a much-needed amenity space. It is likely that the Fields in Trust people will not let that happen.

There is a compromise. The SAP could have been amended so that part of the West Park Centre site could be used to replace the green space being taken up by the

school expansion and the remainder used for housing but, unfortunately, the Council, in its drive to extract every last penny from the site, is putting school places at risk and as with so many sites in the SAP, the legitimate consultation, the legitimate needs and representations of the local residents and the children have been totally ignored. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Sue Bentley.

COUNCILLOR S BENTLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am talking about the site on Weetwood Avenue known as Tetley Field.

It is a green belt site, it is part of the Urban Green Corridor in the Meanwood Valley. It sits within the Meanwood Conservation Area and has playing pitches with Sport England protection. The site has therefore got the strongest protections to retain its green space status. It adjoins the Meanwood Conservation Area and provides an important ecological habitat. Any development on this land would increase urban sprawl, create a precedent by opening up the whole of the Meanwood Valley to development that would destroy this crucial green land which is important for residents' health and wellbeing in an already polluted area of the city.

Since 2013 this site has been classed by the Council Planning Officers as unsuitable for housing development. That was until the owner decided it should be considered for housing on the spurious notion that proceeds could be used to enable development of Headingley Stadium to retain international cricket. The Council hastily reassessed the site, resulting in it being available for housing a development. A planning application for housing, which drew objections from residents as well as the Conservation Area, the Civic Trust and Heritage England, were submitted in an attempt to pre-empt the outcome of the Site Allocations Plan. It was withdrawn after the Council received legal advice. The enabling or very special circumstances could not be sustained as there was no connection between Headingley Stadium and the land at Weetwood Avenue, as there was no benefit for residents.

At this stage the Council could have honourably reinstated the land to its original green belt status but would not.

With news of the £35m funding plan for the stadium, the defunct Enabling Development Proposal, this site should revert to the green belt status but cannot because of where we are in the Site Allocations process.

The Council was taken in by a spurious idea. It did not act to save the site when it could have done and should therefore agree that no developer shall be allowed to build or profit from the unfortunate situation this site is in.

This leaves this precious site in a precarious situation as the Site Allocations Plan proceeds and I would just like to add, Councillor Lewis, when Councillor Gruen convened a meeting of people from the North area of the city, all the Councillors at that meeting agreed that this should remain red status. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Brian Cleasby.

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I find it quite interesting, a lot of what I am listening to today, and if everybody who is here down to speak were to speak we would be 69 minutes on this. We could have had several White Papers changing the number and bring it downwards, but those who criticised you, Andrew, are absolutely right – your party supported *that* party when the MBIs asked for a Reference Back to get the number down, we round this side said yes, that is a good idea. You opposed it then and that is partly why we are stuck here now.

As for Strawberry Fields, Andrew, you have to accept that it was identified to the city by what was then a Conservative Councillor and that is the problem we have got with Strawberry Fields. Strawberry Fields is what I want to major on, Council.

When the SHLAA was started as a consequence of Gordon Brown's Government, started by Andrew with Barry Anderson as the only Councillor sitting on the Panel, the only consideration in relation to flooding was whether it flooded or not. If it flooded, "Oh, you cannot have that for housing" so it all went for housing, housing, housing.

We now know as a result of the Kirkstall tragedy that actually we should be paying an awful lot more attention to flood creators and that is Strawberry Fields. If Strawberry Fields is built upon, and you are proposing quite dishonestly a school there – and remember two Councillors now have spoken about Freedom of Information requests, if you would like to find out more I would like to tell you on the dishonesty that went on at it and now a proposal for Strawberry Fields, 700 houses and that does not include the 500 at Riverside and Clarion at the moment, plus a through school. That is an enormous flood creator on a site that is a hillside feeding the River Aire – a hillside that has the ability to absorb the rainfall that falls on it, slow the rate at which it goes down. What it will do with every house, with toilets, a dishwasher, a washing machine, it will feed Esholt Station upstream with its effluent which then goes in the River Aire. Where does the River Aire go? It floods Kirkstall.

Come on, let us get sensible with this plan. Let us put the houses in the sensible places to put them that do not damage communities, do not damage our city but enhance our city and enhance our communities, and let us get this figure down to a sensible figure that we can manage. Get it down to 50/60,000. Come on.

Can we not in our city somewhere find land for a new village, because that is what we will be talking about – not spoiling every community in our city but looking at how we could create something new, vibrant, modern. Thank you, Council.  
*(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ryk Downes.

COUNCILLOR DOWNES: Thank you, Lord Mayor. As I think many Members over here have said, this plan is fundamentally flawed, which is why we

cannot support it. We have consistently opposed it, and the numbers that it offers. They are far too high, it means that the brown field sites within the plan that are unaffordable to develop and will be overlooked in favour of green field sites which will be built first and we will end up with brown field sites that are not built on.

Over many years brown field sites have provided the housing requirements for the city, windfall sites, and I believe that can still continue. We do not need anywhere near the number of houses that are being proposed.

On to the consultation. What consultation? I have got here a document which was sent to me by the Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum, which includes a number of sites throughout Aireborough. That was sent to me on Monday and it was their submission. Has anybody actually looked at that submission to consider the impact of it within Aireborough? No. You cannot possibly have done so since Monday, so that consultation is out the window.

It will be interesting to see because they make some very, very good, valuable professional comments – positive comments and it is not all NIMBYism, there are some positive comments there accepting some things and spelling out why sites need to be changed around, etc.

Now then, that is all well and good. When the Inspector sees that, if the Inspector can be bothered to read that document, I think he would laugh at the proposals that are being submitted. If he actually looked at the tens of thousands of comments by residents of Leeds and actually read them, which clearly you have not actually taken account of, if you actually were to be bothered to take account of them (and I have my doubts on the way Inspectors have been in the past with various things) I think that you would be in for a shock. I hope that the Inspector reads the documents.

I would also like to move on to the comments made by Councillor Maqsood. It was a few years ago when she appeared on Yeadon High Street complaining at our administration for investing £1m into Yeadon High Street from the Community Regeneration Fund, the Town and District Partnership Regeneration Fund, saying that we should not be spending money in Yeadon, it should be spent in other parts of Leeds. She says that if we build in the Outer areas, which are less dense, then we need to make those areas sustainable. Brilliant, except no assessments have been done, the A65, the A660 are absolutely chock-a-block. There is so much congestion on those roads, nothing is being done to assess them to do anything about those roads, we are going to build more houses, put more congestion. That is the problem with the Outer areas. We have the congestion going into the city and so there is no impact assessment being done and that is one of the other reasons why this plan must be rejected until we can actually get a handle on the impact that it is having. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Mark Dobson.

COUNCILLOR M DOBSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. In terms of do we want to protect this city from avaricious developers (I will not go as far as the shark analogy, Neil, but you do make a good point) yes, of course we do. Do we need a Site Allocations Process? Yes, of course we do. What we cannot afford to do is what happened in Garforth a few years ago when an application on green field was turned down by this Council and accepted on appeal. We simply cannot go on like that and I have been clear throughout my entire time talking on this debate in Council that we have to get a Site Allocation Strategy in place.

However, what I want to talk about today is something very specific, a very specific anomaly that has occurred. We have been really pragmatic, as I say. We have consistently promoted a site, 1232B Peckfield. That would be where the majority of Outer South East would go. We have been always clear in that, that that is our preferred option.

The problem is, late in the process when Headley Hall for whatever reasons fell and Parlington came into the equation, again, I will be absolutely honest, we looked at Parlington as an alternative, would this fly. We did the actual work to see what was what in terms of what would be the best outcome for Outer South and Outer North but we were told at that stage (and this is what Councillor Field is going to expand on) because it is into Housing Market Characteristic Areas, it will not fly.

Effectively what can happen is, because of that we could end up with 3,000 houses to the east of Garforth and 5,000 to the north of Garforth, which would effectively swamp Garforth, it would no longer exist in its current form. I think what we are all agreed on throughout this process is that we want to protect the unique nature of what makes Leeds Leeds. It is a city with satellite towns and villages and I have a great degree of sympathy for the administration because the reality is we are all between the devil and the deep blue sea. We have had a clear directive from Government to find targets, we have got a clear problem in as much as there does not seem to be sustainable sufficient land to do that.

Our big issue is around the Housing Market Characteristic Areas that will effectively swamp our community. We need to unite around that. I do not know how we can do it. Could we quickly reconvene a Special Council to look at this again, the issue is so important to all of us?

Actually, we need to be united on this. I actually think the majority of us are on the same page. The only way the Council is going to get financial growth is through the allocation process and housing development going forward, but it has to be done sustainably and with the anomaly – and I suspect that anomaly is recreated in other parts of the city where because of Housing Market Characteristics you could end up with a community effectively swamped as will happen to Garforth. I am asking just for a pause, a simple deep breath and to look at this again because unfortunately, Lord Mayor, in its current form it is flawed. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Field.

COUNCILLOR FIELD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Despite repeated analysis of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, Garforth and Swillington Independents cannot comprehend how a state of affairs like that with which we are now faced in Garforth was not predicted. No amount of research can compensate for the arbitrary nature of the consequences of these boundaries and Garforth, it seems, is a glaring illustration of a grave flaw waiting to happen.

We find ourselves in a situation where, if MX2-39 in the Outer North-East HMCA and HG2-124 in the Outer South-East HMCA are both developed, it would mean Garforth being the main existing hub for some 8,000 new houses, and we did look constructively at every site.

Not only that but we will have no local input regarding demand or infrastructure and crucially no Community Infrastructure Levy coming back to the community because the Parish Councils of Aberford, Barwick and Scholes have the hierarchy of control. Garforth will be pushed beyond capacity and to breaking point and the impact on our infrastructure, schools, local amenities and already old and over-burdened draining system would be disastrous.

The Housing Market Characteristic Areas are little more than imaginary blue lines which are only serving to distract from any bigger pictures. There is now a real danger that the satellite towns and villages of Leeds will be swamped and swallowed up due to these nonsensical boundaries. We reiterate our conclusion that the Housing Market Characteristic Areas are not fit for purpose and call again for an urgent review of the boundaries.

Finally I would just like to say a really big well done to Save Parlington for their extraordinary dedication and some 6,200 written objections delivered here on Monday. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Caroline Anderson.

COUNCILLOR C ANDERSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Some points I would like to expand on. Contribution fatigue. Residents are fed up having to constantly write in to try and effect a sensible decision over these sites. Firstly, we have individual planning applications, then we have the Site Allocations Plan, then we have applications from speculative developers due to having no plan in place. Residents argue and contribute concerns and objections as well because they are on land that should be in Phase 2 or Phase 3. There is no infrastructure in place to cope with these sites coming forward at this time. Education has no clue what to do about the shortage of school places. Yes, they might set aside land but developers say "Schools are nothing to do with us" so they put a piece of land set aside but will not have any engagement with what might happen after that.

Transport, despite the trumpeting of your big transport conversation, what is going to be done? My Group have had to ask for a Special Council Meeting to discuss this. Transport to and from a number of the desired sites is either at worst non-existent or at best erratic.

We must continue to preserve our green belt. Developers are starting to grab green belt sites with some of their applications. This is not acceptable. You have thousands of square feet of brown field sites in and close to the city centre; you are refusing to make developers use them and they are much more sustainable than some of the other sites.

You have created a developers' charter because you have lost too many appeals and they know you are running scared. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Collins.

COUNCILLOR COLLINS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Just over 35 years ago I came to Leeds as a student. I instantly loved the city. Very few students back then had their own cars so it was wonderful to find that there was plenty within walking distance of Hyde Park, where I was living. A few minutes' walk away, the city centre with fantastic shops, historic architecture, a huge market and one or two night clubs. The other amazing thing about Leeds was if I chose to walk in the opposite direction instead, it was not long before I was able to find open spaces and green fields. Leeds had the very best of both worlds.

After obtaining my degree I only applied for jobs in Leeds because by then I had chosen to make Leeds my future home. These gems are the reasons why a lot of people come to live in our city and stay in our city. To consider attacking our green belt and open green fields now is no different to proposing to demolish the Town Hall.

In a Horsforth Labour leaflet last week local Labour supporters were blaming the Government for setting the numbers for housing. I assume that this relates to the recent Government White Paper which does include a target for the whole of the country and possibly had to be drafted because the south-east of England is resisting the plea to build on their green fields.

However, if you take those proposed future numbers and do the maths as to what our share would be, Leeds has chosen to build 50% more than the Conservative Government is asking for. This might be fine if we were only building on brown field sites and we were also saving some brown field for business use too, but we are not. Essentially, we are giving up our green fields so that the southern counties can keep theirs.

You should be the white knights of our city, protecting our rights to green fields and open spaces, not just offering them up so easily. To many people these are worth more than precious gems.

Are you the white knights of our city, or are you really just a big red dragon?  
*(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Neil Buckley.

COUNCILLOR BUCKLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. We have heard some commonsense from this side today about the mess that the Party opposite have made of this entire matter, basically because they just do not know how to get things done properly and efficiently.

There are three points I want to highlight here but first I have to just refer to Councillor Maqsood's comments, and I am going to come back to that in a moment if I can, Lord Mayor.

The three points; number one, is the 70,000 number itself. As we all know on this side, this was never remotely sensible and it is now completely discredited, it is a complete dead parrot, it should not happen. A figure much more like 50,000 in the first place would have been far more accurate. The review into this entire fiasco of the numbers will take far, far too long.

The second point, which actually has not been brought up today, is this entire scandal of the lack of city centre residential brown field development. Developers who work to a certain business model are working in Manchester and Liverpool and developing sites which are build-to-rent, mainly flats because they have a business model based upon not having on-site affordable units but commutable sums which are then used to revitalise the inner rings - all the areas which that lot ought to be concerned about but this point seems to have completely passed them by.

I have to say that the Liberals, who have said apparently that they are not very keen on this because they are compassionate – this is what they said – they are ever so compassionate. Hand wringing here does not work. There is no compassion involved in leaving people without homes to live in.

COUNCILLOR: That's why we are building them.

COUNCILLOR BUCKLEY: Third, lack of infrastructure. You have heard from some of my colleagues about overloaded trains and roads and the whole thing cannot cope. I have to say that Councillor Maqsood's comments were either designed to be offensive or were completely ill-informed. *(interruption)* The only reason why areas such as she mentioned – and for instance Alwoodley has not been developed – is that the country lanes which serve most of our housing on the edge of the city are 15 feet wide and have not been widened since 1935.

I am surprised at the way they moan about these things they are not seeking the opportunity to blame Stanley Baldwin for not building a dual carriageway.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can you wind up, please.

COUNCILLOR BUCKLEY: Lord Mayor, I will just finish by saying that the party opposite need to get a grip on this and we need a plan but this is the wrong one. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Paul Wadsworth.

COUNCILLOR WADSWORTH: Thank you, Lord Mayor. The problem comes is your 70,000. I think every speaker so far has mentioned the 70,000 and when you did the original consultation, perhaps you will look back and see who actually wrote in and said they were in favour of 70,000. It will not be hard to find because there will only be one response there, if any. It could be Councillor Gruen but I do not think he is in favour of 70,000 really, not now.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Not now. Not now anyway.

COUNCILLOR WADSWORTH: Look where it got Councillor Gruen when he suggested 70,000. That is the problem, the public do not want 70,000 and we represent the public. You do and we do, we represent the public. The public put us here and the public can take us away and you need to remember that. Everybody that comes to me about site allocations says 70,000 is the wrong number but you do not appear to be listening. You seem to have set off with 70,000, gone along with 70,000 and you are sticking with it.

I refer back to an inquiry that we are doing in the City Development Scrutiny Board about NGT and the reason that that was pulled was the high level of objections, and they were not anywhere near as high as these are, so where are you going to go? You are going to have to fight people at every stage until you can take people on board with you. You need to take the city's public on board with you and 70,000 is not going to do that.

COUNCILLOR LYONS: Jeremy Corbyn (*inaudible*)

COUNCILLOR WADSWORTH: Mick, I do not think Jeremy Corbyn is going to help you out on this one!

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Or anything else for that matter!

COUNCILLOR LYONS: Ye of little faith!

COUNCILLOR WADSWORTH: Looking to my own ward, you have made minimal changes regarding flooding but you have been inconsistent. You have made a few changes and reduced the numbers on Ings Lane which does flood, and that is welcomed, but on Wills Gill, which also floods and was highlighted on Boxing Day on flooding, you have done absolutely nothing with that, so obviously that is going to be developed and still flood and you do not appear to care.

With regard to Councillor Maqsood's comments about Guiseley and Rawdon, Guiseley and Rawdon, remember, took twelve developments over twelve years on brown field sites but had no infrastructure, no increase in schools, on increase in doctors, no increase in dentists and no increase in roads. That is true – you are shaking your head, Councillor, but that is true. The sites that you are proposing in Guiseley and Rawdon, everyone but one is on green belt and that is the green belt that

protects us not within our own communities but between Leeds and Bradford. If Bradford do the same thing as you do we will have joined up with another city...

COUNCILLOR GABRIEL: What about the people at the end of the M621, what about Holbeck Moor?

COUNCILLOR WADSWORTH: ...and that clearly can't be right.

At the very last minute, the last Exec Board, you brought forward a plan to try and develop the city centre and try and get a commuted sum across for the Inner City Centre to develop in your own Inner areas and that is good but some people do not like that because some people seem to think it will gentrify the city centre. I do not see how that can be - if we build on more brown field sites surely we will protect our green field sites and our green belt. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor John Procter.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Thank you, Lord Mayor. It is audience participation time! Lord Mayor, feel free to join in, officers likewise, members of the public I hope you will join in as well, everyone has to join in.

Here is the question, hands at the ready. Who thinks Leeds needs 70,000 new houses? Those in favour put your hand up.

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: Mick Lyons!

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: One person. One person, Councillor Michael Lyons. Let us just recap, then, shall we. Only one Councillor present today thinks we need 70,000 new homes in this city. No officers think we need 70,000 new homes building in this city and no members of the public who are here today think we need 70,000 new houses building in this city either. So why have we got 70,000 as our housing target, I ask you? Why?

COUNCILLOR CAMPBELL: You voted for it. *(laughter)*

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: Nobody knows.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: We will come to Councillor Campbell in a minute – we will deal with him in a moment.

That is the problem because things move on. Things move on. The truth is we do not need 70,000 new homes in this city. The developing community cannot build 70,000 new homes in this city and because they have not got the capacity to build it, or the inclination for that matter, they can still come at us for our green belt sites as well and that is the ridiculous situation that we are in.

If you are looking to point a finger, who do you point the finger at? Yes, you point it at Central Government, without any doubt. It is a ridiculous position that we

have ended up in and I am pleased that certainly the Conservatives who represent Leeds have made those representations. The Labour ones have not, unfortunately – I wish they actually would.

COUNCILLOR: They have not listened to us, John.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: I do wonder what benefit we have by building million pound homes in my ward though. I continually go on about the housing mix and how we need to further progress the one and two bedroom homes that are needed, that is what is identified in the Core Strategy in Leeds. 52% of everything we build should be one and two bed and yet there is no tie up between what the Core Strategy said and also planning applications and how they are determined.

Apart from the Government, who else is to blame? Councillor Gruen? Maybe, to a degree. He listened to his officers, unfortunately. He should not have done, he should have listened to a Scrutiny Board that I chaired at the time and others who were advising that we should go into an immediate review. I do not blame Councillor Richard Lewis at all, actually, and I would like to thank him for enacting the SHMAA to reduce the number of houses which is sorely needed.

THE LORD MAYOR: Time.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: What we do need to do though is run the SHMAA in tandem with site allocations so when we get to the end of this SHMAA process we do not need to allocate as much land. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Graham Latty does not wish to speak. Can I just say welcome back, Graham, after your short illness. It is good to see you back. *(Applause)* We will move on to Councillor Graham Hyde.

COUNCILLOR HYDE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I had switched off then, listening to this enlightening debate.

It has been an interesting debate and it is a contentious one in this Chamber, as we all know. I just do not want to speak about live planning applications, Lord Mayor, but it might be useful for people in this room to actually get up to North East Plans tomorrow and listen to the debate about planning applications that are going on in my patch. That is about brown field sites, 33 hectares of sites, all brown field, all being developed in our patch over a number of years and long consultation with the public, ward Members etc. Also on top of that, East Leeds has a large number of other sites which I know colleagues in East Leeds will be pushing for those brown field sites to be developed.

I have listened this afternoon and the debate is really about green field or brown field. It really is because that is what you have been saying, green field or brown field. Actually, it has to be a compromise. No matter what number of figures that you get, it is going to have to be brown field and green field. Now the plan, majority of it, by the way, brown field sites - not green field, brown field sites like

those in my ward and the adjacent wards in East Leeds who are taking a substantial number of new homes on brown field sites at the expense of some of our amenities.

Councillor Maqsood actually is quite right in some of the things she is saying because our Inner City wards – hold on, Neil, you are nodding your head – she is actually quite right in terms of that she has no green field sites in her patch and she has no green space, because I used to work there so I know what it is like.

The key thing is that there has to be a compromise and that is all sides of this Chamber. All you talk about is green field against brown field. The plan is brown field but the interesting thing is that Her Majesty's Government says we cannot do brown field sites first and we all know in this Chamber, both sides that have been in administration, we have lobbied Government on numerous times to actually do that and they are still giving us the same answer which is no, you cannot do it, which is wrong. It is absolutely wrong. John, you are agreeing and I agree with you.

We need to deal with it and we need to get it sorted out quickly because this plan has to go through because developers will come along and they will choose easy development sites which are green field, as they have done in our ward (my colleague will verify it). The only piece of green field sites will have 750 houses on it in the next five years – Parlington Park in East Leeds, Seacroft Hospital, and they have already started.

We really do need to sort it out and we have to stop bickering across this Chamber, green field or brown field, because that does not help the community up there.

THE LORD MAYOR: Time.

COUNCILLOR HYDE: Thanks, Lord Mayor. We really do need to sort it out and we do need to get to the bottom of it and actually we do need to stop this bickering about green field and brown field because brown field is in the majority of this plan so we should accept the plan. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Christine Macniven.

COUNCILLOR MACNIVEN: Lord Mayor, I have indicated that I would like to speak as I am astounded by some of the arguments I have heard from Members about individual sites.

Did we not all go to briefings with officers both for our own wards and for the Housing Market Characteristic Areas to discuss sites? Has it not been made abundantly clear that where a site has come out a replacement will have to be found elsewhere within the same Housing Market Characteristic Area? Are Members seriously suggesting that we should take out individual sites with no indication of where they would like to see housing elsewhere in the area?

The implications seems to be, put it all in the centre in other wards, somewhere away from us. If areas that have exceeded their Core Strategy targets like the North HMCA have a reduction, perhaps the replacement sites should come out of one of the areas significantly below their targets. That seems to be the only way it would make sense to me.

Do you think an Inspector will think it reasonable for sites to be taken out of Outer areas and place them in the Inner areas where we are already significantly exceeding our target? Well, to be frank, that beggars belief.

We hear warm words about green spaces but the impact of their actions can be to threaten safeguarded sites, some of which we are already losing because of Central Government's focus on development in front of all other considerations.

Those of us who sit on Planning Committees know how dispiriting it is to see appeal decisions where our genuine concerns have been overturned by the Secretary of State. I am not sure how some of the Members talking today would feel if the same sites they are trying to defend are lost simply because we cannot move ahead with the process. We have to move the plan on to the next stage now. It is the only thing that will stem the flow of unsuitable sites, so I hope we can all come together to agree this plan and send it to the Secretary of State. Thank you, Lord Mayor.  
*(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Peter Gruen.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: Thank you for the welcome! I am going to do what is not done often. I am going to appeal, first of all, to your honesty as individual Members and, secondly, to your memory. I have a file and in that file I have a record of all the meetings that I attended with officers and others with you – all of you – because this has been the most consulted-on project in the history of this Council.

I personally went round and met ward Members twice on the Core Strategy. I set up working groups, I met with Councillor Campbell and Councillor Procter regularly. Yes, I listened to officers but I also listened to Members of the Opposition. For example, we heard earlier on a contribution about Garforth. I remember meeting the Garforth Members and they set out very clearly to me what their preferences were, where they would expect building first and where they would expect building later. Do you know what? I followed the plan that they asked me to follow. I am not picking on one set of Members, it goes for all of you. All of you set out where your red lines were and what you did not want and all of you set out where well actually, if push comes to shove, OK. All of you said let's have these meetings in private first and get something on the piece of paper and then we will have these meetings in public. What did I do? I followed what you asked me to do.

Please, do not now distort because it happens to suit your own reasoning now. We had lots of meetings. We did not always agree – we did not always agree but one of the things that to the credit of the Conservatives and ourselves we agreed was that there was pain to be shared right across this Chamber. Every Housing Market Area,

every ward, would have to take a certain share of the 100%. We all agreed. You cannot come back and then say “Well, actually, I did not really mean it. What I really meant is that you should take twice because you are the Inner areas and we are the Outer areas and we should take half.”

The city can only thrive together and work together and co-operate together and grow together and we need unity and honesty about that purpose. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you.

COUNCILLOR: Honesty?

THE LORD MAYOR: And finally, Councillor Richard Lewis to sum up.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I think the debate got better as it went on. I do not want a mutual love-in but I think John Procter said some very sensible things – not about me but just generally about the process where we are.

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: Even John makes mistakes occasionally!

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: One of the problems of the debate was that for some people it was just rehearsing the same arguments about the Core Strategy number that we have heard so many times before.

Tom, he is great, he is consistent, he has been saying the same thing since 2007. The unfortunate thing is that the world changes between dates and so when the old debate about Core Strategy took place and all the research was done, it showed one thing and if you do the same research now it will show something else. In three or four years' time it may well show another figure. That is the nature of having a figure to go with the Core Strategy. It is the product of its time.

To do what the Morleyites and others did, which was to say as soon as that figure was produced, “Ah, the world has changed. There has just been some set of statistics that have proved that there are 2% fewer children being born, therefore we need to immediately revise the figures.” It was nonsense and it was not grown up and it was not mature.

I can even remember a product of the Scrutiny Board saying now is the time to move on from this endless rehearsal of the Core Strategy number debate, let us get on with talking about other things, but no, we come back here and it is always the same thing. It is a bit like my chocolate Labrador when he is sick, he goes and eats it again because he thinks well, first time round it tasted all right; second time it will probably taste even better!

COUNCILLOR: Richard!

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: That is what we are like here because we have not moved on and we should move on and this debate was about site allocations, not about the Core Strategy number. That is the title of the paper; let us look at it.

We talked a lot about consultation. I think Graham Hyde's contribution was fantastic as well because that is about where we really should be. Consultation is very difficult because the one thing we ask people is, "If not there, where?" Nobody ever gives an answer to that. *(Interruption from public gallery)*

I will just use, if I may, on the issue of Parlington where the two Members from Harewood were careful not to talk about Parlington but did talk about it at the same time, because those Members signed a letter. The letter came from the office of John Procter and I will just quote it:

"Behind the scenes ward Councillors in Wetherby and Harewood have been working to resurrect the Strategic Site Option that was put in jeopardy by the university's decision to withdraw Headley Hall from the planning process last year. As a consequence, Development Plans Panel will now consider a proposal for a strategic site on the Parlington estate. In total the site can deliver 1,750 units."

Signed by Ryan Stephenson, signed by Matthew Robinson. You signed it, you are the people who are now turning round and saying we do not want it and encouraging people not to have that site, but you are not being honest with people and saying, "If it is not there, where is it?" I have got that letter, it has got your name on it. *(Applause)* It has got your name on it, you hypocrites. You are a disgrace. You are a disgrace to this Chamber if I am honest. You are probably the worst you two. You are probably the worst.

THE LORD MAYOR: Richard.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: The worst hypocrites.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Red light, Lord Mayor.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: I think I have said enough, thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

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

ITEM 6 – RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE – APPOINTMENTS OF CHAIR TO THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL AND OF THE INDEPENDENT PERSON FOR STANDARDS MATTERS

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 6, Recommendations of the General Purposes Committee – Appointments of Chair to the Independent Remuneration Panel and of the Independent Person for Standards Matters. Councillor Judith Blake.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Adam Ogilvie.

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: I second, Lord Mayor.

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

#### ITEM 7 – RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE – APPROVAL OF THE 2017/18 PAY POLICY STATEMENT

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 7, Recommendations of the General Purposes Committee – Approval of the 2017/18 Pay Policy Statement. Councillor Judith Blake.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Adam Ogilvie.

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: I second, Lord Mayor.

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

#### ITEM 8 – REPORT ON APPOINTMENTS

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 8, Report on Appointments. Councillor Ogilvie.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Brian Selby.

COUNCILLOR SELBY: I second, Lord Mayor.

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

#### ITEM 9 – REPORT ON LICENSING ANNUAL REPORT

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 9, Report on Licensing Annual Report.  
Councillor Selby.

COUNCILLOR SELBY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I move that Council receive the Annual Report of the Licensing Committee.

This report highlights the work done this year to see that we enforce the legislation that Parliament enacts to regulate many areas of our lives. Some of that work is proactive; some of it is reactive.

Can I first of all take this opportunity to thank all those in the department for all their hard work, often working unsocial hours to make sure that everyone using our taxis, private hire vehicles, pubs, clubs, betting shops, casinos and other licensed premises are entitled to do so and able to do so safely and without incident.

Members of the Licensing Committee go out on Friday, Saturday nights with officers from time to time to see all the work that is being done, seeing how they manage the city centre in particular where at night time, Fridays and Saturdays, there can be something like 100,000 people in town coming in to enjoy themselves. It is a lot of hard work for the officers to do to see that everybody is safe and I think we need to pay thanks for all that they do.

Can I also thank all Members of the Licensing Committee for their commitment to work together harmoniously, unlike other debates that we have. We have harmonious debates dealing with some of the more problematical properties that we deal with.

Where there are problems we try and look for solutions. Leeds, Lord Mayor, is a thriving city and the night time economy attracts many visitors and provides employment, encourages other investment into the city. I would like to take this opportunity to highlight in particular that in January of this year the city was awarded purple flag status because we met the highest standard of excellence in managing the evening and night time economy. This could not have been done without all that hard work of the officers.

Further, Lord Mayor, so far as taxis and private hire is concerned, Leeds leads the way in seeing that passenger safety and safeguarding is a high priority and other Councils look to us for guidance and support.

Lord Mayor, I am moving that the Council accepts this report. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor James Lewis to second.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I second and reserve the right to speak if Sandy starts carrying on! *(laughter)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Sandy Lay.

COUNCILLOR LAY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Having shared my speech with Councillor Selby he is aware I shall be speaking on the Licensing Annual Report and specifically the Strategic Safety Advisory Group, a group I had not heard of until the cancellation of a music festival last summer in Otley. It is fair to say that I rarely get angry with departments in this Council but this shadowy group last year made me livid.

Otley prides itself on being a town that does things, starting with the Otley Show in May through the Carnival and Cycle Race to walking, food, beer, folk and music festivals, to name a few, culminating in the Victorian Fair in December. The community, through voluntary groups, delivers a huge range of events to support tourism, local business and social cohesion and integration, so you can imagine my anger when I was contacted by organisers of the music festival who told me of the hugely disproportionate requirements made by someone purporting to represent the Strategic Advisory Group.

Despite risk assessments and evacuation plans, a control room and volunteer stewards, demands were made by this person for twelve paid security guards with stop and search powers; for signs and paid stewards on entries into Otley; for drug paraphernalia bins; and for a private ambulance, as this event is more than 30 minutes away from an A&E, which actually it is not. I can get to my A&E in Harrogate for work from Otley in 20 minutes.

Of course, all these demands led to the cancellation of the event – an event run by community volunteers who only wanted to give the town of Otley a good day of free music to support tourism and business and I was not happy, to say the least.

I know the Council and its partners are risk averse but they do seem to have the power to shut down perfect reasonable events despite saying they do not. It is clear that they put so many unreasonable obstacles in the way that the community volunteers gave up.

I understand public safety is paramount but we have to be sensible and show an appreciation for smaller community events, treat them differently to the huge events like Leeds Fest, the Triathlon or Gay Pride which probably do require those things unless, of course, this is what this Council wants, to allow the growth of private security and traffic management companies whose only interest is in maximising profits by making such events so bureaucratic and costly.

I am asking that in the future the Strategic Safety Advisory Group informs all ward Members when they are involved in our wards, that they tell us what they do as many Members have not heard of them, and that they move out of the shadows and into the light so that Members and communities can better understand and, when necessary, challenge what they do. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor James Lewis has indicated he would like to speak.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I did listen very carefully to what Sandy was talking about and I do know a little bit about the Strategic Safety Advisory Group. I think it was something that was set up in response to Members' concerns about another event that was licensed in the city a couple of years ago, about Members' concerns around that, but I listened very carefully to what Sandy said and I think towards the end about how we can work to make sure Members understand more about the group and how it can work it certainly is not – and I can put it on record here - it certainly is not the intention of the Council to stop events happening or to place ridiculous burdens on events.

We know that lots of organisations involved in events – ourselves, the police, others – have less resources than they have had in the past due to the imposition of austerity so maybe it does take a little bit more planning, but I will take on board what Sandy said very carefully and look about how we can bring the work of this group forward to Members. Like I say, it was something that started at the instigation of Members and I think perhaps it is worth bringing it back so we all know what is going on. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Brian Selby to sum up.

COUNCILLOR SELBY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Can I thank Councillor Lewis for his comments. Can I also say to Councillor Lay, it is a pity that you mentioned it now, some seven, eight, nine months after the event. Could I suggest that in future if any Member has a problem with events and they are having problems because of the SSAG, that they mention it to Members of the Licensing Committee, including your ward colleague who sits on that committee sooner rather than later so that we can look at that and try and work a way forward.

COUNCILLOR LAY: I did not know who sat on it until I saw the Annual Report.

COUNCILLOR SELBY: There we are, it is one of those things. Again, I am sorry, I am surprised that you did not take it up with Members directly. Had you done so I am quite sure that the music festival would have taken place and if you are planning this festival later on in the summer, let us all know so that we can all hopefully come along to Otley and take part.

Can I thank you for your interest in this matter and I invite Councillors to accept the report. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Selby. Can we call for the vote? That is CARRIED.

#### ITEM 10 – REPORT OF THE STANDARDS AND CONDUCT COMMITTEE

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 10, Report of the Standards and Conduct Committee. Councillor Elizabeth Nash.

COUNCILLOR NASH: My Lord Mayor, I move consideration of the Annual Report of the Standards and Conduct Committee.

This year the committee has been informed of ten complaints from members of the public against Leeds City Council Members. None were received against Parish Council Members. All ten complaints against City Members were dismissed at Stage One as invalid. Half of the complainants gave insufficient information to substantiate their complaint despite being requested to do so. One referred to a Member's private life, two referred to alleged failure to respond to the complainant and three were about a Councillor's use of social media when it was deemed to be the Member's private life.

Since the committee met in early March two further complaints have been received. No further action is being taken on one of those due to the lack of information to substantiate the complaint, and the other is awaiting assessment for it to process to Stage One of the complaints process.

The committee had some discussion about social media and resolved that guidance notes be forward to every City, Town and Parish Councillor. Members will be aware that there have been two very high profile libel cases in the courts recently. It is vital that Members who are using social media in their work as a Councillor, care must be taken not to invite complaints to the Standards and Conduct Committee.

If the committee decided that a sanction was necessary, then it could pave the way for a very damaging libel case at the Member's own expense.

The committee also recommended that Members be reminded on a regular basis of not only ensuring that their Register of Interests is up to date but also that any gifts and hospitality to the value of over £50 that is received in their role as a Councillor be notified to the Monitoring Officer.

This sum is in line with the Representation of the People Act 1983. £50 can easily be reached if a Member, for example, receives an invitation for two tickets for a theatre performance and especially if refreshments are provided. This may sound tedious but it is required by our Code of Conduct and it has to be done. Failure to do so by Members could again invite a complain under the Code.

On that happy note, I move that the report be considered. *(laughter and applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Brian Selby.

COUNCILLOR SELBY: Second, Lord Mayor.

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

## ITEM 11 – QUESTIONS

THE LORD MAYOR: We now go to Questions. Question number one, Councillor John Procter.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Does the Leader of Council support the strike action taken by the RMT on Monday 13 March in Leeds and across the north of England?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Blake.

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: Thank you, John. Let us be clear about what we do not support and that is the privatisation of the railways that seems to put profit before passengers and investment and a process that allows foreign state-owned railway companies to bid for our trains but not the UK Government-owned company.

I think we can all agree the strike on 13<sup>th</sup> March inconvenienced many people who rely on trains to get about their daily business, whether it is to visit people or to get to work. I think we all agree all strikes are regrettable but this strike was not about money; it was about passenger safety and passengers overwhelmingly support having guards on their trains.

The Council through WYCA is a member of Rail North and this body has successfully argued for the substantial investment that is now coming into place through the Northern and Trans-Pennine franchises, including 500 new carriages, more capacity and the withdrawal of the very unpopular Pacer trains.

Rail North continues to support Northern's plans to transform the rail industry and travel and services, and deliver substantial benefits to passengers and the UK economy. However, Rail North is of the firm view that staffing proposals are a matter for the operator to agree with staff and the unions. This is a dispute between Northern Rail, as the private operator, and the RMT Union. It is not a dispute with Leeds City Council, the WYCA Transport Committee or Rail North.

The Department for Transport awarded the new franchise to Northern Rail at the end of 2015. We need desperately to get both sides round the table, have a constructive dialogue to find a sensible solution and in so doing prevent further strike action planned for the first Saturday of April.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Procter, have you got a supplementary?

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Indeed I have a supplementary, Lord Mayor. It is interesting to reflect though, whilst the Leader of Council comments on privatisation of rail, she neglects to mention that actually that finished in 1997 and I do believe after that point there was something like 13 years of Labour control, was there, where you could have reversed it if you had so chosen.

By way of supplementary, Lord Mayor, and the Leader of Council almost preempted by supplementary question which was, does she support the further action that is due to be taken to disrupt the Grand National on 8<sup>th</sup> April?

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: I can only refer my comments that I have made in my first answer. I do not think that was a supplementary required at all. We urge both sides to get round the table, particularly Northern Rail, to actually make sure the conditions for the talks are appropriate and right and let us urge that.

Do you know what? Do we need to have a lesson from John Procter and the Tories on industrial relations when you look at their amendments to our Budget and the horrendous impact of the bin strike in this city when they were in administration. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Question two, Councillor Brian Cleasby.

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Does the Leader of Council believe that the Council has fully prepared planning officers and Panel members with sufficient training to handle any future possible fracking planning application?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Richard Lewis.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Yes. What actually concerns me is the talk from Central Government about a fast track for fracking applications and the fact that whatever local and democratic decisions are made by Members in Leeds or elsewhere could be overturned by the Secretary of State and Planning Inspector.

David Cameron announced that the Government were going all out for shale, and I have seen nothing from Theresa May to suggest she is not of a similar mind, although she does want to pay off local people who will be affected by fracking, so let us wait and see, Brian.

THE LORD MAYOR: Have you got a supplementary, Councillor Cleasby?

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: Yes, I have. By way of supplementary, whilst understanding the response, Lord Mayor, I am disappointed by it because I am mindful, sitting on a Planning Panel, of the number of times when we make what we consider to be the right decision but for the wrong reasons it then goes to appeal and we lose. We not only lose it, we lose control completely, Lord Mayor, and that is my concern, Leader.

THE LORD MAYOR: Richard, do you want to...

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: I do not think there was anything – that was as comment not a question at all.

THE LORD MAYOR: OK, Councillor Stuart McKenna, question three.

COUNCILLOR S McKENNA: Pleasure to ask this. Please can the Leader of Council confirm if she supports the Orgreave Truth and Justice campaign?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Blake.

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Councillor McKenna. Yes, I can confirm that I support the Orgreave Truth and Justice Campaign. All colleagues will be aware that many people from Leeds supported the Miners' Strike back in the early 1980s, not least those who lived in former mining communities in this city but also those who were on the picket line at Orgreave Coking Plant on 18<sup>th</sup> June in 1984. Many Members of this Council at the time worked tirelessly to support the families involved in the strike at that particular time.

At the end of October last year the Home Secretary ruled out an inquiry into the events of that dreadful day. To say that this is a disappointment to those former mining communities and all those who support the Orgreave Truth and Justice Campaign is an understatement.

Can I remind everyone in Council, the campaign is strictly non-political and welcomes support from all those with genuine concern, particularly around the deception and covering up of events that happened at Orgreave that day. I think all of us only have to look at the footage of the events of that day to know something was very, very seriously wrong.

95 miners who took part in a peaceful picket were arrested and charged with riot offences – later all acquitted among claims that the police had fabricated evidence. There were also claims that police attacked the peaceful protestors. Miners suffered this just for exercising their right to protest against the threat to their jobs, their industry and their communities.

The redacted report of the Independent Police Complaints Commission released in June 2015 found evidence of excessive violence by police officers, a false narrative from police exaggerating violence by miners, perjury by officers giving evidence to prosecute the arrested men and an apparent cover up of that perjury by senior officers.

In the light of these statements it is very surprising indeed that the Home Secretary does not think there are any lessons to be learned from any review of these events and in such close proximity to the inquiry and Inquest into Hillsborough, this is very surprising indeed.

Let us think about those miners, their wives and their families who suffered so much at the time and all that has been left of their reputation as the years have gone by.

I would like very much to ask all the other Groups on this Council to join with me to sign a letter that I will be writing to the Prime Minister in support of the campaign to call for a change of approach from the Government towards the scandalous decision not to order an inquiry. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor McKenna, have you got a supplementary?

COUNCILLOR S McKENNA: I would like to applaud the Leader for her comments there and I would come in and add that it would be nice if we had full party support on this. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Anne Blackburn, question four.

COUNCILLOR A BLACKBURN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Can the Executive Member for Children and Families tell me how many walking bus schemes are operational in different parts of Leeds?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lisa Mulherin.

COUNCILLOR MULHERIN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Thank you, Councillor Blackburn. From the records that we hold in the Council we believe there are currently 25 walking buses operating across the Leeds district. The records, we are not entirely sure how accurate they are because it is the school who takes on the responsibility for setting up the walking buses, so they are usually reliant on parent volunteers and a member of school staff acting as a co-ordinator. We have the Influencing Travel Behaviour Team who provide advice and support to those who are setting up the buses. They also offer risk assessments of routes, training for the co-ordinators and volunteers and also supply hi-vis tabards for staff, parents and children who are involved in those walking buses which are provided for free by the Council.

We are totally reliant on the school and parents to run the schemes so whereas we believe there are 25 currently, we just need to say that the caveat with the fact that it may be that some schools have failed to notify us that a walking bus scheme has stopped and likewise that we may have had other schools starting up a walking bus scheme who have not notified the team who are supporting this in the Council. We would encourage Members to speak to the schools in their wards, to let them know that there is support available for walking bus schemes as I have set out and we would be very happy to support any schools that want to start that up. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Blackburn, have you got a supplementary? No supplementary. Councillor Alice Smart, question five.

COUNCILLOR SMART: Would the Executive Member for Children and Families care to comment on the school funding announcements contained within the recent Budget?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Mulherin.

COUNCILLOR MULHERIN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Thank you, Councillor Smart, yes I would very much like to comment on the school funding announcements or, to be more accurate, the lack thereof.

What we heard from the Chancellor was nothing short of disgraceful. Once again we saw the continued drive towards ideologically driven projects. We heard of the £360m available for new free schools and grammar schools. What we did not see was the desperately needed funding for every other school in the country.

What the Chancellor should have done was put more money into the National Funding Formula. That is the only way to ensure that every single child gets a good education. In fact, Philip Hammond's budget led to the National Union of Teachers accusing him of a dereliction of duty to children and young people. Schools up and down the country are facing a financial crisis. They simply cannot afford to make the savings or cuts, as they are better described, without having an impact on our children and young people.

The underlying financial problems faced by state schools in England were highlighted in the National Audit Office Report in December last year which said that schools would have to find £3bn in savings by 2019/20 amounting to budget cuts for schools of 8%. The Association of School and College Leaders went on to do a survey of its Members which suggests that schools are finding it difficult to make savings without cutting provision and these cuts include 95% of responders saying they had cut back on support services including equipment and material for pupils, but also mental health and special needs support. In contrast to what the DoFE repeatedly tell us, more than eight out of ten schools said that class sizes had increased. More than two-thirds said they had cut back on activities like clubs and trips for pupils and just under three-quarters have cut GCSE courses and just over three-quarters have cut A-Level course, directly impacting education.

A new funding formula will not solve these funding shortages. Figures from the NUT and other education unions including using Government statistics show that even after a new funding formula, 98% of schools and 100% of colleges will be worse off in real terms by 2020.

Protests against inadequate school funding seem to have become a regular occurrence over the recent years but there was increased anger after this last budget announcements. The decision to prioritise funding for selective grammar schools over money for the additional running costs of schools that serve all children has been described in a letter sent to parents of half a million school children as little short of disgraceful and I have to say I agree.

It has become increasingly clear that Theresa May's focus when it comes to education is throwing money at education for the privileged few and leaving everyone else to take their chances. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Smart, have you got a supplementary? No. Question six, Councillor Alan Lamb.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Would the Leader of Council inform me how many people, whose remuneration is paid by Leeds City Council, are paid via personal service companies?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor James Lewis.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. In reply, the Council does not directly employ anybody under a personal service company. The Council undoubtedly paid for various services and work which is performed by individuals who operate as a personal service company. However, there is no requirement for this information to be recorded at the moment but new tax regulations mean that this work will be subject to checks from 1<sup>st</sup> April and the Council is currently putting in place measures to ensure that the new tax regulations can be implemented.

So far this has thrown up around 60 agency workers who are paid through a personal services company and we are working with all the agencies to ensure the PAYE arrangements that need to apply will do on April 6<sup>th</sup>.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lamb, have you got a supplementary?

COUNCILLOR LAMB: Yes thank you, Lord Mayor, I have a supplementary. I did ask a similar question to Councillor Wakefield in 2012. He actually had the courtesy of replying himself and informed Council that in future if we were going to have any interim specialists we would either employ them on a temporary contract or we will go to a recognised agency and there would be no more practices like this.

Perhaps as Councillor Lewis is answering, could he confirm whether or not there are any employees who have left the Council under ELI who have done work for the Council or are doing work for the Council that have been or are being paid by personal service companies?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lewis.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: Thank you. I can help Councillor Lamb out with a couple of things here.

First of all in 2012 Councillor Wakefield was responsible for the HR portfolio which I now have, so obviously you did your research better in 2012 who to direct the question to.

Secondly, nearly 3,000 people have left the Council under ELI. I think it is particularly ridiculous, even for the standards of the Conservative Group, to expect me to know without prior notice exactly the details of all of those but I will be absolutely delighted to look into it and provide you with a written answer. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Question seven, Councillor Colin Campbell.

COUNCILLOR CAMPBELL: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Does the Executive Member believe in light of recent reports brought to the Executive Board, that developers are doing their bit to provide affordable housing in Leeds?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Richard Lewis.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: I am not quite sure where you are coming from there, Colin, but if you asked the supplementary that was a little clearer perhaps I could give you the answer you want.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Campbell.

COUNCILLOR CAMPBELL: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am slightly surprised that the portfolio holder does not know how many affordable houses have been built in Leeds but in the spirit of co-operation I will tell him. There have been 900. Unfortunately, if you strip out those that have been built by the Council or housing associations, it is 100.

I will make it really simple for you. Do you believe that building 100 houses is the developers doing their bit for affordable housing in Leeds and if not, what are you going to do about it?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Richard Lewis.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: We got to the question in the end, didn't we? I think that Colin should be well aware, obviously, of quite how the planning system works and how the affordable element is actually quite a difficult one where you have a Government that has changed its views of what "affordable" means and whether it should be rented accommodation or whether it should be accommodation for purchase.

Planning is not the only route by which we get affordable homes in this city. In fact, I see what we do through working with the better elements of the development industry, we get good affordable units like those that are being developed in East Leeds at the moment which have just been under discussion and we, through our own programme of building homes, are delivering a considerable number of affordable homes.

You know as well as I do that there are a number of loopholes that allow developers to get away with not making a real contribution in terms of affordable housing because they allow them to appeal against previously agreed decisions, they agree them to try and weasel out of their obligations through the use of viability tests and suggesting that no affordable housing should be built on schemes which have not had a previous housing use, so actually I think we are doing pretty well. If you look at our record, I am happy to debate that at length. If you look at the recent report that we took to Exec Board only a week ago, that was all about not just wanting a bigger

percentage but to actually increase the number of units built within the city centre and by doing that not only help hit our housing target but also to increase the number of affordable units within the city centre and its rim that we can use by packaging up through commuted sums to do the things that we want to regenerate areas within the city centre.

Actually, I do not think we are doing too badly, Colin.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Christine Macniven.

COUNCILLOR MACNIVEN: Can the Executive Member for Health, Wellbeing and Adults comment on Leeds winning the bid to become of the first Time to Change Hubs?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Charlwood.

COUNCILLOR CHARLWOOD: Thank you, Lord Mayor, and thank you, Councillor Macniven. I am absolutely delighted and so proud to say that we did win the bid to become one of the first Time to Change Hubs because being a compassionate city is completely central to the vision we have set out as a Council and reducing the stigma and discrimination around mental health fits with this core value. There are so many people in this Chamber who are passionate about mental health. I think it is a brilliant judgment on that that we have done so well already.

In Leeds the scale of the challenge is that we have around 105,000 people in Leeds living with depression and anxiety and it is the most common mental health problem. It is likely that for many people, because of the stigma that they face, they suffer in silence and isolation and take longer to ask for help and certain groups are vulnerable to not asking for help until it is really too far down the line. It is an area of serious concern for the city.

In securing the Time to Change Hub, working with partners, it will allow us to more effectively address stigma and discrimination in Leeds that targets the wider population, which is really exciting.

We know positive local initiatives already exist. These are currently being delivered across the city in different settings and by a number of separate organisations, such as Space2, Mindful Employer Leeds for example in Outer who have great peer-to-peer working to help people in the workplace; Touchstone and LYPFT which is the NHS Trust for mental health and learning disabilities.

There is still a great need for local ownership of the agenda and across England all Local Authorities, Chairs of Health and Wellbeing Boards like myself were contacted and encouraged to apply to become Regional Time to Change Hubs and that is what we did.

As the Council's Mental Health Champion along with Tom, I am passionate about this issue and I used to be a mental health worker in 2002 in the city so I am so

pleased that I can stand here as the portfolio holder being involved in this, and I was even on the interview on Skype with the Panel in London.

I think it is really worth highlighting that by winning the bid to become one of the country's first Time to Change Hubs we have been recognised as being a city that is committed to being mentally healthy and we will also help others in the region in their work to become mentally healthy as well.

The involvement of the Health and Wellbeing Board in hosting the Hub will ensure greater refocusing of what is already being done as well as giving the Stigma and Discrimination Agenda a higher and more visible profile.

Space2, Leeds Mind, Touchstone and West Yorkshire Police will be part of the process moving forward as key partners for the Time to Change Hub. Current activities focusing on raising mental health awareness will be bolstered, unified and maximised as well as an increasingly better strategic and operational approach to be taken and they will report back to the Health and Wellbeing Board on their progress as well.

Messages around mental health will be stronger, more consistent and more coherent and it will provide a secure foundation to develop new and exciting initiatives in our communities that raise mental health awareness and challenge stigma and discrimination.

It really demonstrates the strength and quality of the work already being done in the city and I would just like to mention the work of Tom Riordan and the Yorkshire Evening Post who have campaigned to reduce stigma in the city.

I really look forward to celebrating our mentally healthy and compassionate city where people can access the workplace and are supported to recover without judgment or stigma, and where people who have a period of illness are supported within the community and return to their everyday lives as quickly as possible. Thank you very much. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Macniven, do you have a supplementary?  
No. Councillor David Blackburn, question nine.

COUNCILLOR D BLACKBURN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Could the Executive Member for Communities tell me when Leeds Watch will be extended to cover the CCTV in multi-storey flats in West Leeds?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Debra Coupar.

COUNCILLOR COUPAR: Yes thank you, Lord Mayor. Thank you, Lord Mayor and thank you, Councillor Blackburn, for the question as well. There is a long-term upgrade programme for the CCTV installation to the tower blocks in the west of the city being carried out. There are 33 tower blocks in total in the west area of the city; of these eight blocks – the Clydes, the Wortleys and the Poplars – have

already been upgraded. The Rycrofts are all wired and this upgrade will be complete by the end of April.

I am pleased to report that the pilot for the Clydes and Wortleys has been streamed into Leeds Watch and is showing positive results. As this pilot has proved to be effective we are now in the process of getting the fibres for the other blocks so they can also be streamed into Leeds Watch. Whilst this work is being carried out all the blocks will still be recording incidents locally on site and Leeds Watch can obtain the footage as and when required. The full upgrade programme is due to be completed by the end of the financial year 2017/18.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Blackburn, have you got a supplementary?  
No. Councillor Caroline Gruen, question ten.

COUNCILLOR C GRUEN: Can the Executive Member update Council on the recent Apprenticeship Recruitment Fair and how progress will be maintained going forward?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Rafique.

COUNCILLOR RAFIQUE: Thank you, Lord Mayor, and Councillor Gruen for the question. Lord Mayor, I am delighted to say that the fifth Leeds Apprenticeship Recruitment Fair was a resounding success with just under 6,000 people attending, which is a 20% increase on 2016.

Visitors attending the Arena and taking the opportunity talked to over 130 employers and trading providers including BT, Siemens, Sky, Jaguar, Land Rover, Yorkshire Water, ITV, Yorkshire Building Society and many more. This year the event was supported by Leeds BIT for which we are very grateful for their contribution. We will seek similar sponsorship for future events. A full evaluation of the event is under way but headlines are that 88% of the visitors who attended considered the fair of huge value and 96% would recommend coming to the fair and recommending it to their friends.

We know that parents are one of the most important groups of people who support young people to make choices about their career options and often feel that they do not understand how apprenticeships work and benefit young people, so this year following the Apprenticeship Fair we delivered a bespoke series of seminars about apprenticeship with parents which were held across the road in the Rosebowl building in conjunction with the Beckett University. I am pleased to say that over 160 parents attended with 97% of those attending reporting that the session and the information, advice and guidance given was outstanding or good. We plan to offer further sector-based seminars supported by business leaders.

Underlining our commitment to supporting all people in the city to benefit from apprenticeships, we are also progressing a number of projects with the focus on promoting apprenticeships to under-served groups, including young people from BME communities and people affected by autism.

In the coming days, Lord Mayor, all Members of Council will find a copy of a magazine which is produced in collaboration with a social enterprise company called What I Could Be, and the magazine will be given to every Year 7 pupil in Leeds so they can learn about apprenticeships.

Lord Mayor, we will be bringing a report to the Executive Board outlining how we are progressing the work streams about promoting apprenticeships. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Do you have a supplementary? No. Councillor Robinson.

COUNCILLOR M ROBINSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Will the Leader of Council join me in welcoming today's official triggering of Article 50 and take this opportunity to confirm her support for my suggestion that the Citizens and Communities Scrutiny Board leads the scrutinising of the Council's preparations on Brexit related matters?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Blake.

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: "Welcoming" is a curious choice of words, given the seriousness of the situation that we are in. Actually, you know, I think the fact that it is being signed, it has been signed probably does bring a period of uncertainty to a close but I think the real concern that we have is that that does not mean that there is any plan in place to take the Brexit negotiations forward.

Whilst we have put the signature on the document, I think there is an enormous amount of work that needs to be done in the meantime and I think I speak for many people in Local Authorities across the country, not just here in Leeds, that we feel very strongly that we have not yet got an identified way of making our voices heard in the Brexit negotiations. The impact of exiting the European Union will be many and various going forward.

I think we should all come together, make sure that we have a very strong Leeds response to Brexit but that we work with cities across the North in particular that have many shared interests in taking it forward and make sure that we include all of our partners in those negotiations going forward.

I think to be quite honest with you, Matthew, the complexity of the negotiations going forward, it is probably likely that all Scrutiny Boards will have to be involved in assessing the impact but I am sure you are aware that the Citizens and Communities have already taken a paper on the particular issue of migration update and I think that led to a very informed debate and discussion.

Let us be clear, every single area will be affected by Brexit and I think we all need to move forward on behalf of our communities not only anticipating the challenges of going forward but making sure that we are open minded and look at all

the opportunities that could come forward from a seismic change in the relationships that we have at the current moment. *(Applause)*

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

COUNCILLOR ROBINSON: I do thank you, Lord Mayor. It worries me slightly that the Leader of Council says there is not a plan because the letter quite clearly sets out the grounds for negotiation, as does the leaked draft resolution from the European Parliament today which suggests that they know where they want to discuss issues as well.

What I would ask the Leader of Council is that she think again about one Scrutiny Board looking at this matter because it risks getting lost in the mire. This is the biggest issue of the day and that she would look, with the Chief Executive, at adding to the Council's website a section on Brexit to make sure that citizens of this city are updated on developments such as the right to remain or for their families abroad. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Blake.

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: If there is a plan then why has it not been discussed with us and why have we not had the opportunity to inform that plan going forward? I think that we could see the massive holes in that argument as a whole.

Do you know, we have already made sure that the city of Leeds feels that we are coming together as a partnership. Within days of the vote last June we called a meeting through the LEP of the universities, businesses, all different interested parties coming together. It might be that we decide that there needs to be one Scrutiny Board looking at this but at this moment I think we need to, as I say, keep an open mind and make sure that every aspect of this Council can look at the impacts of Brexit both in the positive and potentially negative sense. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: That is the end of Questions. Under Procedure Rule 11.6 any unanswered questions will receive a written response.

#### ITEM 12 – MINUTES OF THE HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD AND THE EXECUTIVE BOARD

THE LORD MAYOR: We now go to Page 12, Item 12. We Are now moving on to the Item to receive and comment upon the Minutes of the Health and Wellbeing Board and the Executive Board. Councillor Judith Blake.

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: Can I move the Minutes in terms of the Notice.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ogilvie.

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: I second, Lord Mayor.

## **Health and Wellbeing Board**

THE LORD MAYOR: Consideration of comments on the Health and Wellbeing Board will be made for up to 20 minutes. Councillor Stewart Golton.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am referring to the Minutes of the Health and Wellbeing Board that would pertain to first of all our agreement with Carers Leeds. I wanted to welcome this move because carers are the silent army that make sure that our city functions in terms of looking after those people who cannot look after themselves but are not completely looked after through the Welfare State either.

This is just to let you know that the move has the full support of the Liberal Democrat Group although we were somewhat frustrated because the best implementation of supporting our carers within our communities is to ensure that you know where they are, and when I asked the questions about how many lived in my ward so that I might better support them as a local Councillor, ensure that all the support mechanisms were available in the locality for them, unfortunately we do not have that information. I would like to hope that the department will hope to get that kind of granularity that can be shared with all Councillors so that we get to know at first hand what the needs are in our area and therefore call for proper support for those carers locally.

The second comment I want to talk about was the following paper, which was somewhat of a contrast, which was disappointing because the first part, the title of the paper was “Tackling Health Inequalities”, but it talks about how we were doing this through the Leeds Academic Health Partnership. We were hoping at the Board that we would have some evidence of how innovation in technology was helping currently and had been evaluated so that it would help even more in the future our health inequalities to be reduced locally. Unfortunately it seemed to be more concentrating on what is a good news story for us industry-wise that in Leeds we do have a lot of excellent small and medium sized companies that are producing health products, some of which could benefit the population in the future.

Unfortunately, the relationship with our own Leeds population, according to these projects, was really to see us as some kind of test bed and what I would like to see in the future coming from the Leeds Health Partnerships is actually to tackle the things that are most keen for us on a practical level here in Leeds, which is how can we best tackle the nursing shortage in the city so that we can actually get people who have the right level of nursing skills in the right place and that we actually encourage people who come to the city to study to remain within the city, and also to perhaps encourage some more small and medium sized enterprises, whether they be social or private, to flourish in the city in response to the issues that we have in our care system where locally accountable organisations can perhaps provide the gaps that we have at the moment and also provide the opportunity for local people to benefit from partaking in our mixed Leeds health economy. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Lamb.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am referring to Minute 51 on page 134 and Minute 532 on page 138. I particularly want to talk about the disadvantage people in Outer areas such as Wetherby and other parts of the city face in healthcare terms, particularly when, despite being in the city boundary, the healthcare that most residents are closest to is outside of the city boundary. I want to talk about a resident of mine with his permission, Ken Reece, about his experience which will highlight some of the problems.

On 9<sup>th</sup> February Mr Reece was admitted to Harrogate Hospital having suffered a series of heart attacks. He said he experienced brilliant care there. Two weeks later he was transferred to the LGI for surgery where again he experienced brilliant care. It took three weeks from being admitted from hospital to getting his appointment to look at his rehabilitation.

He was told the nearest place he could go two days a week was 15 miles away, it had to be in Leeds and either had to be in Seacroft or Holt Park. For him that is a two hour journey there and a two hour journey back. There used to be services in Wetherby which have now been cut because of various funding restrictions. The rationale for taking them away is that they were not particularly well used. No-one consulted with myself or my ward Members about this. One of the rationales was there is a flight of stairs that patients would have to go up. Now, I would content they would much rather go up one flight of stairs than have a four hour round trip and that probably the stress and pressure of that four hour round trip is going to have a much bigger impact on their outcomes than if they are able to access a service locally.

Mr Reece has a wife who suffers very severely with dementia, to the point that she is in a home in Starbeck. He goes every day when he is well to help with her lunch. He could access the same service in Harrogate, 6.3 miles from his house, that he is going to every day but there is no funding for it.

I am very much hopeful, knowing Mr Reece is not alone, knowing that Wetherby is not unique, there are other parts of the city facing the same kind of problems, that Councillor Charlwood will perhaps meet with myself and Mr Reece to understand the case properly and work with us to look at how we can get the CCG both in Leeds and in North Yorkshire to work together to make sure that the best possible outcomes can be achieved for our residents. Thank you, Lord Mayor.  
*(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Neil Dawson.

COUNCILLOR DAWSON: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. I am speaking on Minute 51 on page 134. I would like to talk about the hidden and largely invisible workforce in Leeds. There are around 72,000 people in this workforce and it is a workforce that changes very rapidly; people become carers and people cease to be carers. In the Outer South area alone there are somewhere between 7,000 and 12,000 carers.

Carers are people who look after others, mainly family relatives, not for financial gain but for love and from a sense of duty and responsibility. Most carers do not access services themselves and they only access services for the person they are looking after.

Carers come in all shapes and sizes and at our recent Outer South Community Committee Workshop the youngest carer was 14 and the oldest carer was 75. Research undertaken by the University of Leeds estimates the financial contribution of unpaid care in Leeds to be around £1.4bn per annum – a massive figure.

Supporting carers makes economic sense as well as being morally the right thing to do. Leeds Commitment to Carers acknowledged the crucial work unpaid carers do for our community for the health and wellbeing around the city. The more care you provide the more likely you are to experience bad health or negative impact on your wealth. 40% of carers experience significant distress and depression. Just 40% of carers in Leeds say they have as much social contact as they would like to have. For young carers, caring can have a negative impact on their education. 65% of carers who are struggling to make ends meet cut back on seeing family and friends and 73% of carers say that worrying about their finances is affecting their health.

Unpaid carers are crucial both to our communities and to the sustainability of health and social care in Leeds. Endorsement of the Leeds Commitment to Carers by the Health and Wellbeing Board clearly demonstrates that Leeds is committed to making Leeds the best city for carers. Being the best city in the UK for health and wellbeing also means being the best city for carers. It is vital that carers' important contribution to this city is recognised and that we further strengthen the support we can offer at a community level. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Josie Jarosz.

COUNCILLOR JAROSZ: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I wish to speak on the same Minute.

I really welcome this Leeds Commitment to Carers. In my ward I met a lovely lady, retired, she had spent the first part of her life looking after her mother who was blind, so she was a young carer. She then worked for a short time and then her father fell ill and she looked after her father. Did the State give her a certificate or an award or something for all the money she will have saved this nation? No. What they did is the put in to sanction her because when she applied for pension credit she omitted a vast amount of income she got. She had had this job for a little while and she got a pension of 75 pence a month, so they threatened to sanction her and you know what happens, or if you do not know I am pleased to lend you *this* film because you will soon find out what happens to people who get sanctioned.

Fortunately I was there but that is what happens to carers, they end up in poverty claiming benefits and if they dare to get 75 pence a month that they omit to declare, they are in for sanctions. Leeds Commitment to Carers seeks to address these

inequalities experienced by unpaid carers by raising awareness and encouraging action at both organisation and community level to help identify (which is a big problem), recognise and support carers. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Pryor.

COUNCILLOR PRYOR: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I wish to speak on Minute 52, page 135 of the Health and Wellbeing Minutes, specifically on the topic of health inequalities across the city.

I was in the Scrutiny Board for Adult Social Services and Health yesterday and we were presented with *this* map. This map details where in the city suicides are more likely to take place. The comment that really stuck with me was not about suicides themselves but it was a comment made where it said this map, if it did not have the title this is where suicides are, could represent any health issues in this city.

It just shows that the distribution of our health issues are concentrated in the inner cities. A child born in Holbeck can expect to live ten years fewer than a child born in Harewood and while we look at these health inequalities across the city, we cannot pretend that this is a random distribution because how many years you are going to live if you are born in Leeds is intrinsically linked to your wealth and the wealth of the area you live in.

What causes the drivers of health inequalities in Leeds are complex and often develop over long periods of time but we cannot let that complexity to the issues let this Government off the hook. The slashing of money to Leeds, cutting Public Health, cutting education while playing around with grammar schools down south, and pulling up the ladder while stalling social mobility is literally shortening the lives of many of the people in our inner cities.

The Leeds Health and Wellbeing Strategy commits partners to the reduction of health inequalities and specifically identifies a strong economy with quality and local jobs as a key contributor to its delivery. The strategy also recognises the need to maximise the benefits of information and technology with the potential to make a much larger impact.

Whilst much of this has been achieved to realise this potential since the launch of the strategy, much remains to be done before Leeds can fully claim to have realised its ambition. The key means to ensure delivery of these priorities is to ensure that they are integrated and inform investment across all sectors and services in Leeds.

Many of the solutions to reduce those causes and remove the barriers to inequality require sustained investment in partnerships and will take several years to deliver the promised benefits of a prosperous but compassionate city. We have begun this work in Leeds but we must continue to press this Government to not shirk their responsibility to our city because if they continue to cut, these problems will become only further entrenched. Thank you. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ghulam Hussain.

COUNCILLOR G HUSSAIN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. My Lord Mayor and fellow Councillors, I would like to speak on Minute 52 page 135, same as the previous speaker. I am really pleased to be able to talk about some of the broad strategic work that is being carried out in support of the Health and Wellbeing agenda in Leeds.

Leeds Growth Strategy (the latest version of it is currently under review) feeds into our Health and Wellbeing work. The Strategy sets out the need for our investment in people and skills to have a focus on wellbeing. By delivering more and better jobs and by delivering improvement to citizens' work-life balance, the Growth Strategy also sets out the importance of narrowing health inequalities between different parts of the city through identifying better design of space in neighbourhoods to help and encourage physical activity.

All of this fits into the Leeds vision to be a healthy and caring city for all ages where people who are the poorest will improve their health the fastest.

Another important strategic focus is on the role of digital technology. At the last Health and Wellbeing Board there was a discussion about the positive impact of the digital technology on self care and prevention. In the coming years there are opportunities for SMEs to establish new products in this field such as smart phone apps. Digital technology can be transformative for healthcare and can empower individuals to help them get what they want out of health and care services.

The Leeds City Region Enterprise Partnership also supports our work in this area, targeting investment and innovation into making the City Region a leading centre for zero carbon energy. Throughout the LAP Strategy there is a focus on improving quality of life and environment, elements that are crucial to Leeds's health and wellbeing.

Leeds is already a world leading city in health innovation and with one of the largest teaching hospitals in Europe plus exceptional NHS leadership and research organisation, we are well placed to lead the way in this field.

The collaborative work is key and we need to promote partnership work wherever possible, so all boards and groups across the city are working as one organisation for Leeds. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

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

COUNCILLOR CHARLWOOD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Thank you to all the Members who have spoken in this Health and Wellbeing Minutes section. Thanks again to all of the Members who work to the Health and Wellbeing Board. I think it continues to be an excellent partnership which we build on every time we meet and in all our workshops and our work. I really do appreciate that joint party working as well.

On the last Health and Wellbeing we had a really passionate presentation by Val Hewison from Carers Leeds and they are now multi award winning. They brought one of their awards with them and she was clinging on to it but very, very proud of it, they are so enthusiastic about the work they do.

We are really proud to have endorsed the Leeds Commitment to Carers and it really demonstrates that Leeds as a system, not just the Council, is committed to making Leeds the best city for carers.

The scale of the challenge has been described and it is huge but it highlights the wide-ranging work of the city to link up and improve the way that care is provided across the city. I thank Councillor Dawson for your passionate speech and you are right that recent estimates suggest around 72,000 people in Leeds may be providing unpaid care and it is vital work. Councillor Golton mentioned the ward breakdown – I am sorry we did not have that data for you but apparently I hear that there was an Outer South Community Committee Workshop on local issues around carers that maybe you were not at, I do not know. Anyway, we will find that information for you and I know how committed you are.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: It does not provide details. All talk.

COUNCILLOR CHARLWOOD: Around 24,000 people in Leeds are expected to take on unpaid caring roles every year with a similar number ceasing their caring role, so it is a flowing situation as lives change – people get poorly, they get better and demands on carers change.

Councillor Jarosz, you mentioned a harrowing case involving sanctioning and thank you for bringing that to all Members' attention. It really is shocking when we hear such desperate stories and it just demonstrates how much we need to do to support people and why we are doing what we are doing.

Carers are so crucial to our communities and to the sustainability of the whole health and social care system in Leeds and the contribution of unpaid care in Leeds is around £1.4bn per year, so their role should be valued and supported and that is why we brought it to the Health and Wellbeing Board, to really raise their profile even further.

Being the best city in the UK for health and wellbeing also means being the best city for carers. Leeds is recognised for our integrated approach to supporting carers with Carers Leeds, Leeds City Council and the NHS Leeds Clinical Commissioning Groups together winning the Health Service Journal Award, which is very prestigious, in the Integrated Commissioning for Carers category.

The Council commitment to supporting carers was also recently highlighted at their Executive Board in February where transforming short breaks for adult social care for unpaid carers was discussed. We are going into a twelve week period of formal consultation in order to support the transformation of short breaks for people

in Leeds. Short breaks can enable carers to maintain their social contacts, their life interests, their work, education or leisure interests and that is really important for their general wellbeing.

Councillor Lamb, you raised a very individual case as well. I am happy to meet with you alongside your constituent with officers around that. I am slightly confused about the two hour time between Wetherby and Seacroft, unless it is by bus or whatever. We can discuss that and I am happy to meet with you.

On to the next part of the agenda. We talked about innovation and system change, which is a key part of the LAP which Councillor Golton mentioned and the scale of the health challenge means that the approach taken to establish the placed-based partnership driven approach recognises the importance of building on interdependency between both sectors and partnership organisations.

There is significant potential through collaboration and potential to achieve so much more. Councillor Hussain also mentioned this as well and noted that increasingly the Health and Wellbeing Board Members have adopted a sort of social model to health which is really, really good to see. We are all looking at the wider determinants of health together.

The role of technology in the health and care sector really is an area that we are growing and we are innovating at quite a pace, actually, Councillor Golton, so I think it is important to recognise that. That should empower individuals to help them get what they want out of the health and care services that they use.

The practitioners must also be part of the digital transformation. mHabitat came to speak to us, they were excellent. There is lots of innovation in digital and precision medicine going on and actually the LAP has only been around for 18 months so they have done huge amounts so far. I think we will start to see the changes to the population and the disparity between health outcomes for the poorest people as we carry on with that work.

It is critical the city continues to build on its success in bidding for and attracting further investment. It will be really key to meeting the scale of the challenge and good progress has been made to establish the city as a national leader in digital inclusion and others. We have really got to drive and welcome innovation in the city, take all the opportunities you can find for bringing funding in and demonstrating the strong partnership between the people of Leeds and the institutions within it and allow more poorer people to improve their health the fastest through this joint collaborative working which Councillor Pryor so eloquently put. It may take years to build on but we are working together on it and I know you are as well. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Councillor Charlwood. Executive Board; consideration of comments on Exec Board Minutes will be heard until ten-past four.

## **Executive Board**

### (i) Children and Families

THE LORD MAYOR: We move on to Children and Families. Councillor Cohen.

COUNCILLOR COHEN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am speaking on Minutes 168, 169 and, with an incredibly fair following wind, 170.

In relation the City Strategy in relation to SEMH educational provision, much that is proposed is incredibly sensible. I would make two observations.

The first is that we must ensure that we do not simply talk about narrowing the gap for our low achieving vulnerable young people – that we actually make sure that that happens. Talking is great but as we all know from Ofsted inspections, we really need to see impact.

The other thing I would comment on is that we really must ensure an absolutely seamless transition for our young adults as they move from Children's Services to Adult Social Care in this area. I know these are being looked at but my worry is always we have been looking at these things for many, many years, and I include various administrations; we do not seem to have got it quite right yet. Hopefully we will urgently address that.

Turning now to the inspection of services for children with special educational needs and disabilities. It concerns me that the general vibe that is being given about Council, that this report is being sold with, is that it is overall a good report, it is a positive report. There are some positives within the report, that is absolutely the case and they are to be welcomed, but on any objective analysis this inspection report really is very mixed and highlights some significant issues. We cannot overstate the importance of urgently addressing those issues.

You know, Lord Mayor, at the beginning of meetings we declare personal interests. In fact, perhaps I should have declared one because as some of you will know – in fact many of you know – I have a son with special educational needs and so many of the things that are concerns within the report are things that literally impact me on a daily basis and I see on a daily basis and worry me like lots of parents with children with special educational needs.

Over all, the educational outcomes for children and young people with SEND in our city are poor. Why we do worse than other cities in relation to our children with SEND we do not seem to know, but we absolutely must get to the bottom of why we are not doing as well as others.

We seem as a city to have established something of an unrealistic timetable when it comes to converting our old SEN statements to the new Educational

Healthcare Plans. This is putting tremendous pressure, unnecessary pressure, on schools and colleges and I assure you parents feel that pressure too.

Finally, nearly all of the parents that inspectors spoke to during the inspection did not know of the Leeds Local Offer. How on earth that was the case is absolutely beyond me. We must do better. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Stephenson.

COUNCILLOR STEPHENSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Speaking to the Minute about the Future in Mind Strategy and I welcome the general and long overdue focus on social, emotional and mental health issues within the education sector, further welcoming recent commitments from the Prime Minister in January regarding transforming the way we approach mental health in schools, including that all secondary schools will be offered mental health training, a thematic review of children's mental health services and an upcoming Green Paper setting out plans to transform mental health services in schools.

Returning to the actual Future in Mind Strategy, I would just like to bring particular focus on Point 2 of the Council's eleven point plan, which states, "We will work with young people, families and schools to build knowledge and skills in emotional resilience and to support self help."

For the past seven years I have had the great privilege of serving on the Education Advisory Board at Green Lane Primary Academy, one of the trailblazing primary academies in Leeds. I am now Chair of that Board and over that time I have worked very closely with Mrs Tammie Prince, the Principal of that Academy. Mrs Prince is somebody who is not only an exemplary leader in primary education but someone who inspires innovation and she is also the leading voice nationally in the area of mindfulness in education and that is what I just want to touch on now.

For Members who are not aware, mindfulness is mental state where people focus on the present moment, in particular their own thoughts, feelings and the situation around them. Members who know me well know I am not somebody who particularly falls for these sort of extra spiritual type things. I was very cautious when I first approached this subject but I have been won over. It is absolutely amazing to see what effect mindfulness in education has certainly at a primary level in dealing with mental health issues.

Research finds that mindfulness training delivers decreased ADHD behaviours, decreases anger management problems, anxiety and depression. NHS studies have been focused around this issue as well and given that a third of 15 to 22 year olds suffer from mental health, it is clearly something we need to be looking at at an earlier age.

I am conscious of the time, Lord Mayor, so I will just close by saying I would encourage Children's Services in Leeds and CCGs to look closely at mindfulness and include that in the strategy and I will make myself available and our team at Green

Lane Primary Academy if the Executive Member would like to discuss that with us further. Any support we can give we certainly will do. Thank you, Lord Mayor.  
*(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor David Congreve.

COUNCILLOR CONGREVE: Lord Mayor, I am commenting on both Minute 168 and 169.

I would like to start by welcoming the new Future in Mind Strategy. This is a pioneering strategy for the country as it works across the health, education and social care systems, everyone working together to improve the social, emotional and mental health of some of the most vulnerable children and young people in Leeds.

Linked to this, last December Leeds became the 15<sup>th</sup> Local Authority to be inspected under the new Ofsted and Care Quality Commission, or CQC, framework. The inspection lasted a week and covered all aspects of services for children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities, or SEND, meaning that both the Local authority and our healthcare partners were inspected.

The inspection itself was extremely thorough and the three Inspectors looked at everything, focusing down to minute detail. This included looking at case files to ensure consistency across each service. They also spoke to providers, parents, young people themselves and service leaders at schools outside of Leeds where some of our children are placed.

I think it is only right to pause here and acknowledge the hard work and commitment shown by our staff in this area of work, not just during the inspection week but every day as they work tirelessly to ensure the best possible outcomes for some of our most vulnerable children and young people. The work they undertake alongside our partners is making a real difference to people's lives and that is something that we should be proud of.

What I thought was particularly encouraging about the outcome of the inspection – and this is one where no judgment is received, just a letter outlining strengths and areas for improvement – is that the letter was an accurate reflection of the self-assessment that had been carried out. Essentially, we already know the areas where we need to improve and there are plans in place to make those improvements. Indeed, I would be extremely concerned if there were vast differences between how we viewed our services and how the inspectors did.

There is still a lot to be done, particularly around dyslexia and improving academic progress for children with SEND and there are already actions in place to do this.

What we need to do now is to keep the momentum going. We need to continue to focus on constantly improving our services so that they are the best they

can be. I am confident that we can do this as we work with our partners to become the best city in the UK to grow up in. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Harland.

COUNCILLOR HARLAND: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I too will be speaking on Minute 168 of the extra pack.

The mental health and wellbeing of young people is something we take extremely seriously in Leeds and last month we launched our groundbreaking Future in Mind strategy. This is a partnership between Local Authority and the Clinical Commissioning Groups where we have developed a pioneering joint strategy that encompasses the city's social, emotional and mental health strategy and the local NHS Transformation Plan, bringing together the needs of young people in education as well as health settings.

The overarching drive is for agencies to work together to improve outcomes for children with SEMH needs. As mental health at last starts to be discussed more openly and become less stigmatised, it is essential that we continue to work together through increased partnership and closer working with other agencies, including Third Sector organisations, many of whom work on the front line and have built up years of experience and trust in helping young people deal with issues that affect them.

This strategy is so important because we know that ten per cent of children and young people aged between five and 16 have clinically diagnosable mental health conditions, yet 70% of children and adolescents who experience mental health conditions have not had appropriate interventions at a sufficiently early age.

We also know that 50% of mental health conditions are established by the age of 14, and 75% by the age of 24. What these figures underline is the importance of early intervention and it is delivering the right help at the right time that we need to be focusing on.

What makes Future in Mind unique is that we are the only Local Authority to be working in such close partnership with health colleagues on this agenda. This really is an opportunity for Leeds to shape the future delivery of services nationwide and a strategy that we should be championing at every level.

Every child deserves the best that Leeds can offer and this strategy is another step towards ensuring that every child gets just that. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: No more comments, it is ten-past four. We move to Councillor Mulherin to sum up on Children and Families' Minutes.

COUNCILLOR MULHERIN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Can I thank all of the speakers for their really thoughtful contributions to this part of today's debate. The importance of the issues of children and young people's mental health have been well aired today and in previous Council meetings. Councillor Charlwood earlier,

when she spoke on the Health and Wellbeing Board Minutes, spoke about the need to tackle the stigma of mental ill health and how better to do that than by actually starting in our schools and speaking to children about it.

The way in which we have developed the Future in Mind strategy working with partners, and it has been grasped wholeheartedly by a range of partners across the city, our NHS colleagues, Third Sector partners as well as others, is I think really exemplary. We are groundbreaking in the way in which we have brought together the education and health side of this work and we have worked together with children and young people in our Leeds way ensuring that their voices are heard and have shaped the services and support that will be provided to them moving forward, including the MindMates website, which I can recommend to all Members, particularly those who are school governors I would encourage you to bring that to the attention of your school governing bodies and make sure that they are getting full use of those resources.

Thank you very much for your offer as well, Councillor Stephenson. I am happy to work with all the schools in the city on this agenda, it is something that I am very passionate about and want to make sure that every school is embracing.

Children with SEND, one of the shining parts of the report that we got back from the inspection that took place in December was the fact that children with special educational needs and disabilities in our city described themselves as being proud to be citizens of Leeds. For me you could not get better feedback as a city for the way in which our children and young people are valued. They said that their voices were heard and for me I just think that is a credit to all of us in this room, to all of the work that goes on day in, day out across all of our children's services from the Early Years through to our college services and beyond. All of the children and young people in Leeds believe that their voices are heard and I think that is something that we should all take pride in and continue to strive to take forward in the work that we do.

In terms of the investments that we have made as a Local Authority, the £45m investment was recognised in our new Social, Emotional and Mental Health school build, the partnership we are taking with an outstanding provider of social, emotional and mental health school services. We are on site now in East Leeds with the first of those new schools and when they are all built that will ensure that more children and young people with social, emotional and mental health needs can have their education in their city and will not have to travel out of the area to seek the support that they need.

Again, reference is made to that transition from children's services through to adult services and again I am very pleased to say that we had an event, 150 people present, both children and young people affected, their families but also professionals working across the system to support them on their preparation for adulthood. Again, we have been pioneers in this work in the city as well. That took place in the Banquet Suite here just last week and again I am very pleased to say that that work is moving forward at some pace.

Just to say in terms of the gaps in achievements which I do recognise and again is something that again I am very keen that we make strides forward on, we have refreshed the Child Friendly Leeds strategy and the focus is now on three As – not the three Rs, the three As – focus on attainment, achievement and attendance. There will be a real focus on those areas where achievement is not what it should be and that does include our children with SEND and SEMH needs, hence the investment in the improved provision.

Finally, just to welcome the recognition of Leeds innovation in children's services through the final report, which I do not think we actually got to comment on in the Minutes because of the shortage of time but it does recognise the way in which Leeds is leading the way in its innovative children's services, that we have been recognised as a Partner in Practice by the Government in a way that we can actually go out and support other Local Authorities as well. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Blake, would you like to sum up the Minutes?

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am sure you will agree with me that I do not need to spend too long summing up on the Minutes after Councillor Mulherin's very comprehensive summing up of the short period that we had for Minutes at this Council meeting.

Councillor Cohen, I just want to reassure you and thank you for your comments that actually the issues that you raised were discussed at great length in Executive Board and I do want to reassure you that we established there a mechanism for making sure that we monitor the action plan. Obviously it will go to the Complex Needs Board but the Executive Board will want very much to take account of progress.

I think all of us will acknowledge the value of inspections are that they highlight the positive things that we do but also, and I think very much in this case they also recognise the areas that we know that we need to do more on and I think that was reassuring in itself that the areas that they picked up we actually are aware that there is more work to do.

I do just want to correct Councillor Mulherin on one issue. The SEMH building is actually on site in South Leeds in Belle Isle as well as we speak, and we are very much looking forward to the contribution that that facility will make for the whole of the south of the city.

I think we want to be very clear, I think one of the things that was highlighted when you actually go out and ask parents what they know about a particular issue, we have to make sure that that issue is not in terms of jargon that they perhaps do not recognise and I think that is a really important point, that once you get beyond the jargon and get underneath into the areas of work that they are engaging in, then they are fully on board and they do fully understand what we have on offer.

It just leaves me, Lord Mayor, to commend the report to Council to the further work that we will be doing and, as Councillor Mulherin has said, unfortunately we could not get on into the further papers certainly in her portfolio and others as well today for very special circumstances, as we know, but there is a huge amount of very good progress reflected in the papers today and I am very pleased to commend them to Council to support. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

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

We will now break for tea so be back at 4.45. If the Members of the public would like to join us in the Banqueting Suite you are very welcome.

*(Short break)*

### ITEM 13 – REPORT ON DEVOLVED MATTERS

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 13, Report on Devolved Matters. Councillor Blake.

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. All of you have received a copy of the report, I do not intend to dwell too long on the contents. I have to say though, I am pleased to see that the report is starting to pick up some of the varied areas of work that the Combined Authority undertakes. I will come to devolution later itself.

If you actually look through you will see there is quite a section as always on the transport issues and of course Councillor Wakefield is our guardian of all things transport at the Combined Authority.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Only when it goes wrong!

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: Any difficult questions can go to him later! It has been quite an interesting time for us. The last Transport for the North Board meeting told that Transport for the North is going to become a Statutory body and I think that is really important to all of us looking at how we can draw down more funding for infrastructure across the north and, obviously, having got the approval so far for HS2 we are now on with working from the Combined Authority into Leeds City Region and into Transport for the North for High Speed 3 and how we can actually connect the different towns and cities across the north and bring much needed economic benefit to all of us.

One of the items that has come to us for discussion is the Industrial Strategy and you will be aware that the Industrial Strategy is out for consultation so we are very keen to make sure that when it comes out the other end that the Industrial Strategy is very much place-based and that we can get more control over what we do locally. I think we are the best place to talk about the skills we need, how we deliver

those skills, make sure that our local kids, young people, are qualified to take the opportunities that are coming our way and how we actually get recognition for the fact that actually Leeds City Region is the third largest manufacturing area in the country – a fact that seems to escape many people and particularly people living in the south, if I can be so bold.

Just going through the different areas where we have been able to put grants in to different projects and I think an area that we need to look at very closely going forward is the whole area of housing growth, not just on a Leeds footing because I think all of us know that the development of housing in districts around the Leeds boundary have an enormous impact on all of us. Some very innovative and exciting work I think that we could do working together.

Kirkstall Forge has exceeded passenger expectations. We are lobbying, as I said before, to have a strong voice in Brexit negotiations. We have done a really good piece of work on inclusive growth with Stephanie Flanders in terms of how we can get people into work, those that are furthest from the workplace, and devolution. I have to say now that we seem to be into the New Year we as a Combined Authority wrote to the Secretary of State and asked for a progress update. He has written back to us and we are looking forward on the back of that to setting up a meeting with him to talk about the options.

Clearly it is important to say that the debate about Yorkshire is still very much alive and the Yorkshire Leaders from across Yorkshire got together and we are setting up a Leaders Board so we can take matters at county level into account. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor James Lewis.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Andrew Carter.

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. There is no doubt that some progress is being made and at the next Combined Authority meeting, as Councillor Blake has indicated, we have a paper on the Industrial Strategy which she has already referred to so there is no need for me to comment on it any further.

I did refer a couple of cycles ago to this proposition of a whole Yorkshire devolved area. From the last comments it would appear that Councillor Blake thinks that that turkey can still fly, an analogy I referred to previously. I would suggest to her that not only can it now not fly but it has been plucked and it is oven ready for eating at Easter. It has been made very clear that the Government are not going to contemplate anything that requires additional legislation, and that would.

There are two likely options on the table and what I hope the Government will do is decide which one of them they prefer and table it as the option. The options very simply are West Yorkshire and North Yorkshire, which gets over the North Yorkshire transport issues, or West Yorkshire, North Yorkshire, East Yorkshire and Hull. At some stage a decision will have to be made by somebody as to which of those is the option the Government would favour. Where I think Councillor Blake and I would agree, I do think the Government now – there are options there and they should state which their preference is so that we know precisely where we are.

On a more positive note, we had a visit from the Secretary of State for Transport a couple of weeks ago at the Combined Authority and it was very interesting because one of our concerns is that as we have not got a Devolved Authority, other Devolved Authorities with a Mayor are now getting additional duties, additional funding opportunities that we do not have. He was asked in terms of transport what is the situation if we do not have an Authority with an elected Mayor, and he made it very clear that the DfT will judge all bids for funding on the basis of the veracity, the deliverability and what they would actually produce for the area and that is the basis on which the judgement will be made, not on the level of Devolved Authority you actually have, whether you have a Mayor or not. Councillor James Lewis was there, he heard the same answer as I heard and I think that is very good because in other areas, undoubtedly places like Manchester will start to get other functions that we should aspire to.

I would just say this in closing. The transport investment now through Transport for the North, through the Combined Authority, through the Government, is substantial. It must not be jeopardised by wrecking tactics by the rail unions and I do hope the Party opposite will do whatever they can to make sure that that does not happen. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Golton.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I just wanted to comment on the ongoing debate about the shape of devolution and there has also been discussion, the Liberal Democrat Leaders appreciate we do not control any Councils but we do represent quite a few communities and devolution has to work for everybody.

Out of the options that Councillor Carter just outlined we agree that actually the people need to have a little bit more influence in the shape of how things go because there is certainly a very ideological drive in terms of insisting on elected Mayors, for a start. What is most important for us and what actually the mini-summit between Theresa May and Nicola Sturgeon pointed out as well is, devolution matters and for us in Yorkshire, City Regions are not really very culturally resonant but the county of Yorkshire is and the nearest that we can get to that geography the better because that resonance can work without and within. I think the option that we are talking about which incorporates as much of the Yorkshire geography as possible is the one that we would support and I think we share cross-party regret that South Yorkshire considers themselves sufficiently different not to join in that conversation.

You have to go with what you have got because as was pointed out, I do not trust Ministers quite as much as maybe Councillor Carter does when they tell us that transport investment is not subject to a Mayoral imprint because the proof is in the pudding, and at the moment the vast majority of transport investment outside of the London area is that which has been afforded to Manchester and the North-West and Scotland and if they are going to make statements like that then they really need to step up and deliver the evidence that we are being treated equally. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Leadley.

COUNCILLOR LEADLEY: My Lord Mayor, if you look at the Devolution Report which begins on page 141 you will see that paragraphs 3.3 and 3.6 are to do with highway and transport improvements which in overall terms everyone might see as being desirable. Many such decisions are now being taken at regional level beyond this Council Chamber by the West Yorkshire Combined Authority.

As you will know, on 17<sup>th</sup> May Leeds City Council is to have its own debate on transport in the form of an Extraordinary Meeting devoted to that purpose. Before that meeting all Party Leaders and all Party Whips must agree that the debate will be free and open so that all Members will be able to come forward with their own ideas and to criticise proposals which they find unconvincing. No-one should be Whipped or otherwise pressured in advance to support a Socialist tram, a Tory trolleybus, a Liberal tram-train, an MBI railway station, a Green free bicycle or a Garforth HS2 interchange.

New thinking from new people is needed. From what has been reported at the NGT Scrutiny Inquiry it seems that we have a number of senior officers and Councillors who have spent anything up to 30 years hearing everything, seeing everything and remembering everything about public transport in Leeds and at the same time learning very little about it of any value.

The Combined Authority does give greater or some regional power and discretion in transport investment but the other side of that coin is that it brings greater responsibility and a greater duty of care to avoid throwing money at daft projects and to avoid persisting for years with hopeless losers.

Also, the Combined Authority may at last challenge the virtual monopoly of the most profitable city bus services in West Yorkshire, eventually acquired following the unwise privatisations and deregulations of the 1980s. Such a challenge is long overdue and it is notable that no-one of any political party at national, regional or local level has done much about it so far.

There are some slight cracks opening which suggest that the bus operators may be becoming more sensitive to criticism. According to yesterday's Yorkshire Evening Post they are proposing to issue vouchers against the cost of unsatisfactory journeys and to reimburse taxi fares incurred by passengers when late evening buses

fail to turn up. Many such payments may have to be made if Brexit cuts off the supply of Polish bus drivers.

My Lord Mayor, if we are spared to come back here in another 30 years we may be able to show that Brexit did not cut the continent off from the outside world; rather it cut Britain's nose off to spite its own face. Thank you, my Lord Mayor.  
*(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: Tell Robert that – tell Robert.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Blake to sum up.

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: So, Councillor Carter, does that mean if Yorkshire does come through you will be volunteering to pluck the turkey in time for Thanksgiving at the end of this year!

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: I am adept at all sorts, Councillor Blake!

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: I am sure you are! Needs must, as they say.  
*(laughter)* I have the letter from Sajid Javid and do you know what the really ironic thing is in this? All the way through – and I went to hear him speak at the LGA as well and all the way through he kept saying, “You know, this cannot be a top down approach, it cannot be Government telling local areas what to do.” Well, what have we had in West Yorkshire and Leeds City Region? We have had exactly that, being told that we cannot have Leeds City Region because it does not fit the very tight prescriptive model that George Osborne put together, which fitted the Manchester model. Well, I am afraid the Manchester model is unique to Manchester. It does not lift and drop around the country and devolution deals all around the country have fallen because of the issues of districts and counties in particular which is the case in the Leeds City Region with the North Yorkshire District.

The letter we had from him sent out on 6<sup>th</sup> March again talks about devolution has to be locally led. That is exactly what we are doing. We are getting together and he says that he is not convinced that any geographical proposal at this time enjoys wide support from local stakeholders in Yorkshire. I have to beg to differ but it is up to those stakeholders to come together and actually start making the case for Yorkshire-wide devolution if that is what people want but, as we have said before, we are going with an open mind. We do believe that devolution is the way forward, we do believe that this region has suffered because of the centralised control of Government, we have seen that in the discrepancies in investment particularly from the south-east but it remains to be seen how much they penalise people who have not got Mayors because as things stand, apart from Tees Valley, that is going to be the whole swathe right up from Northamptonshire right up to the Scottish Borders on the east of the country. I do not think that is sustainable to penalise a quarter of the country.

One thing that we will have to work on, picking up on the points made, the Buses Bill is restricting bus franchising to areas with Metro Mayors. I do not think that is sustainable. We have to fight tooth and nail to get the powers back for bus, to get control over our bus services and that is what we will continue to do. Thank you. *(Applause)*

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

### **WHITE PAPERS**

THE LORD MAYOR: We will go to White Papers. We have got three White Papers, each will last no more than 45 minutes and will be voted on the motion and any amendments at the end.

#### **ITEM 14 – WHITE PAPER MOTION – BETTER LIVES STRATEGY**

THE LORD MAYOR: The first White Paper, White Paper Item 14, Better Lives Strategy. Councillor Caroline Anderson.

COUNCILLOR C ANDERSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would like to commend this White Paper to Members. I am very pleased that the Government was able to find itself putting in £2bn into the Adult Social Care budget on top of the funding from the Better Care Fund. This gives Leeds a great uplift in spending and commissioning power. For Leeds we will get, on top of the 3% Council Tax addition, £14.7m in this financial year. We must however, ensure that this money is spent wisely and not treated like a bottomless pit.

I am sure the Director will work with colleagues in the NHS and the private sector to deliver the best value for this extra money. This is much needed extra revenue. I accept, Councillor Golton, that no matter how much you get it would not be enough but the Government has seen that this is a priority and has sought to bolster the funding and I am very grateful that they have done this. It is a good start. We can address a number of priorities with this money, such as Neighbourhood Networks; their funding review may not have to be as difficult as it may have been. We can address care standards in the independent sector and develop new models of care where we can remain in the residential sector in some way addressing standards and working with care homes to improve their CQC ratings from “requires improvement” to “good” as in some cases that may only require some additional support and some good conversations with our Adult Social Care colleagues.

Of course, a lot of the Adult Social Care budget each year is used up due to increases in contract values because we pay the National Living Wage and ensure that our providers do the same. That is absolutely right and will ensure that staffing levels stay steady with low turnovers and maintaining standards in many areas of care.

We also need to work hand in hand with the NHS who are also going to benefit from us receiving this additional funding. I would call on them to help the Council with some of our funding and passing some of their money to us because our endeavours in the city and across the Neighbourhood Networks and other facilities and provisions are keeping people out of hospital.

I would also like to call on Councillor Charlwood to use some of the money either directly or indirectly to look after all of our adult population, 18 to 108 or however old our oldest resident is, and those under 65s. Under 65s often have greater and more complex needs – perhaps learning difficulties or mental health issues.

On 7<sup>th</sup> April an important event takes place here in the Civic Hall which I am looking forward to attending. This is entitled “A One City Approach” and will have speakers from the CQC, the Care Association, CCG and Health Watch. This gives us a good opportunity to hear about new models of care and to share ideas to move us forward. The funding will also give us a chance to review the Better Lives Strategy.

We need a good quality independent sector and I know from speaking to the Director that she would like to set up a Quality and Care team to work with homes and in partnership with the NHS to look at care.

Please support this White Paper. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Alan Lamb.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Stewart Golton.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. You will note that the amendment that we offer for this White Paper is short because we wanted to support the spirit of what was in there, especially considering that its wording is more consistent with Liberal Democrat Leeds policy than with Conservative policy until very recently, so I am glad that you have come over to our way of thinking.

We could not leave it unamended because to say that oh, the Government has given us some money, therefore it is all sorted, is somewhat dishonest. I think that is where we wanted to add a little hint of realism into the motion itself.

Adult Social Care and the demands upon it have come on a long way since we first started our Better Lives Strategy and the call for it to be reviewed to suit current circumstances is very salient and something that we should be doing.

The extra funding which has been mentioned, we know that the initial surcharge, which others call a precept which the Government allowed us to charge our local taxpayers, was actually only sufficient to cover the extra costs to allow the living wage to be covered in the contracts that we already had with our social care providers,

so it was not there to actually fill any future demand or to allow us to transform the services that we already had. This extra current funding goes some way to allowing some flexibility but we still have some very real obstacles in the current system which need to be overcome.

One of the things that has been regretful, actually, is that in addressing the budgets that the Council has for Adult Social Care, this Labour administration has actually overseen a greater privatisation of our local social care system than any Government has ever achieved in the National Health Service. It is regretful because we have over-relied on a part of the health economy which actually is overheating. The call for us to step back and review where we have got to is very timely.

As we have said before in debates within this Chamber, to withdraw completely as a Council from operating care services, especially in residential settings, is short-sighted because the response of the private sector to what we need is actually based on their needs. They have a business model, they know exactly where they are going to make the most money and it might not actually suit what we require from them and we have not actually been able to influence the private market in this city sufficiently for us to be secure in knowing that we actually have the market that we need.

What I would suggest, Lord Mayor – I realise I am coming to the end now – is that we need to encourage local ownership of our care area. We have already got the Neighbourhood Networks as a great example of how the Council can engage with local communities to actually deliver more. We need to make it even further. Going back to the comments earlier about the Leeds Academic Health Partnership and making change meaningful, we do need to develop our own local care market because we are accountable to those people out there who will search in increasing numbers care packages within this city and we cannot rely from companies which are based outside of this city and sometimes outside of this country to really be responsive to the needs that we find in our communities. A refresh and a review of the Better Lives Strategy will go some way to addressing that. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Judith Chapman.

COUNCILLOR CHAPMAN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Stewart has spoken about the need to review the Better Lives Strategy and the need to increase the funding available for end of life care. These are undoubtedly important issues that must be solved. However, I would like to speak today about a side of Adult Social Care that is often forgotten when we talk about the crisis and that is care for adults with mental health issues and learning disabilities.

One in four people in the UK will experience mental health issues each year according to the charity MIND. That is a quarter of the population, with many needing help beyond what friends, families and doctor can provide. Here are a few sobering facts about life for adults with learning disabilities in Leeds today.

Over 25% of those who use our services feel they do not have the control over their daily lives. This is worse than the year before and below the national average, and in the bottom three regionally. More than a third of adults with learning disabilities are no longer living in their own homes or with family. This is a dramatic decrease of nearly 15% in a single year and is the second worst in the region. Only half of the adults in touch with secondary mental health services in Leeds are living independently in their own homes either with or without support – again, the second worst in the region. Finally, of those who used our services more than 15% say that services did not help them feel safe or secure last year – another decline on our previous year end.

We are failing these people even as I speak. We must support them to live as fully a good life as they can and yet when more than a quarter feel like they have no control over their lives, there is something very wrong.

When we are below the national average it is not just a case of funding; it is a case of us doing better with the money we have been given. Of course I am glad that the Government has taken small steps to remedy the intermediate crisis within the social care system but it will not be enough to simply patch it up and let it limp along for another few years whilst the next crisis builds under our noses. There must be fundamental reform of social care funding to help it go on to a stable long-term footing and this must apply to all parts of the system, not just the older people's care which is rightly getting so much attention in the national media after being ignored for so many years.

Lord Mayor, for those that have failed our system we must all do better.  
Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Rebecca Charlwood to move a second amendment.

COUNCILLOR CHARLWOOD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Let me just start by saying that while this additional funding is obviously very welcome – and it is – it is still not enough and will not put an end to the funding crisis that faces social care. We have also still, I would remind Members, not had the guidance on how we are allowed to spend it but the guidance we do have, because it will be part of the BCF funding, Better Care Fund, is that it should help to facilitate hospital discharge, so I understand the points that have been made but I think we do have to consider the crisis in winter pressures and that is mainly what they expect us, we think, to spend it on.

Other reasons why it might not end the crisis. I think Councillor Carter said in the YEP after it was announced, the new funding was announced, and I quote “No-one can now be in any doubt that the Government is fully prepared to tackle the issue.” There is an issue with this because the Council's core funding has actually reduced by £214m annually since 2010. An additional £53m will be cut further from our budget in the next few years. £4.6bn was cut from social care budgets nationally in the last Parliament despite rising demand pressures that we all know about.

The LGA have further warned care for the elderly and disabled could face a potential funding gap of at least £2.6bn by the end of the decade. The King's Fund, the Nuffield Trust and the Health Foundation warn that the social care system faces a £1.9bn gap in its funding this year alone. ADAS warned in its budget survey 2016 that to maintain care at the same level of last year there would need to be an extra £1.1bn in funding. The Care Quality Commission warned last year that Adult Social Care was at a tipping point so warning after warning, year after year, and yet we have heard nothing and saw little to no action from this Government when Councils like Leeds warned of the consequences years ago, long ago.

Instead what we saw was a Government who did not even mention Adult Social Care in the Autumn Statement before the winter crisis hit in the NHS – a Government which decided to pass the burden of the crisis to local taxpayers through the use of the social care precept and a Government who took money away from one part of the Council and redirected it to another as the New Homes Bonus and badged this as new money, which it was not. To me that does not show, or anyone else, that this is a Government that understands the pressures facing our local communities.

The extra £1bn allocated in 2017/18 will still not be enough to plug the estimated £1.3bn to £1.9bn social care funding gap. That is using the cross-party Local Government Committee figures.

The £337m also earmarked for the following year will not be enough to plug the £1.1 to £2.6bn social care gap in that same year.

Lord Mayor, as I have already said, the extra money is very welcome but we must be honest about what this actually means for our communities here in Leeds. It is actually a bridge to the Better Care Fund which was cruelly backloaded – we were only going to get £1m, now that has been uplifted to help us to get the BCF working.

It is clear in the Conservative White Paper why amendment was necessary is that we have an Opposition in denial. It is in denial about the true extent of the damage caused by the austerity agenda. Lord Mayor, implicit in the Conservative White Paper is the assumption that the additional money is recurrent – well, it is not. This is the fundamental flaw. Their suggestions take no account of the immediate pressures to budgets and, importantly, the issue of addressing the issue of a long term sustainable settlement for social care which is so badly needed. Instead it seeks to use the residential care homes issue as a political football yet again. It offers no solution on how to improve quality in the independent sector and offers no call to end the crisis. All of the things that Councillor Anderson mentioned we have already said that we would like to do.

I will move my amendment. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor James Lewis.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Mark Dobson.

COUNCILLOR M DOBSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Adult Social Care is indeed in crisis and any money that comes into the system, no matter how small in the grand scheme of things, is welcome. I think the point has been made and well made today that it is a drop in the ocean in terms of what is required to protect our vulnerable adults into old age and look after the most vulnerable people in society.

That said, when any money does come into the system I suppose the key point is what do we do with it? How do we spend it? How is it best spent? For me, the White Paper put forward by Councillor C Anderson resonates because it gets to the crux of an issue that has long been a hobby horse of mine, which is around the care provision and what that care provision should look like in this city, and we believe it is still a fundamental mistake to put all our eggs in one basket in terms of care provision.

We have had this argument so many times in Council I thought I would take a slightly different tack today and personalise the issue and talk about a person, a real person that is out there who will not be listening to this debate today but I hope her family are and they can take some comfort from what we are going to say and hopefully voting for this White Paper.

Here is the crux of it. A resident from my ward came to me several weeks ago with a story about her mother, who is in a care home in Leeds that we have deemed an adequate place for people to go when our care provision closes. The lady involved – no name, no pack drill – has been in that unit for nine weeks and in that amount of time she has lost two stone in body weight. One of the reasons is they are provided with frozen food that on several occasions has actually run out and when the daughter of the lady concerned queried this, they were told they could not have in-house kitchen facilities because they are cost prohibitive, but the Council are paying £790 a week for this person's care. I think in any circumstances that is a good whack, isn't it, and I think that person deserves to at least have hot nourishable meals every day.

The loss in weight has led to bed sores. It could be because the poor woman is skin and bone or it could be because for the last nine weeks they have just twigged they have been putting the wrong sized incontinence pads on her and they have been leaking.

The lady concerned is on a fork-mashable diet and yet when her daughter turned up the other morning, they had given her toast for breakfast. Have you tried mashing toast, anybody? Another bit of audience participation, John – hands up if you can mash toast. It is like plaiting fog – it is not going to happen. What I have done in that particular case is referred it to the Member whose ward it is in and I know she will pick it up because I knew her parents very well.

We have been castigated in many quarters over our stance on The Green but this case study demonstrates exactly why we need to get two things right – capacity but also quality. One slight amendment I would have put in the White Paper “could be the wrong approach” – Caroline, it is the wrong approach.

I would very much support a review and another trip for this issue back to the Executive Board as soon as is humanly possible. Thank you, Lord Mayor.  
*(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Neil Buckley.

COUNCILLOR BUCKLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Actually I am a little bit surprised at Councillor Charlwood’s amendment because it calls for reduced privatisation and she actually used that phrase in her speech, she said we want to lessen privatisation and roll it back or some such thing.

This is the complete opposite of what she has actually been doing with the residential care sector. The Labour administration is carrying out full and total privatisation, as previous speakers have said and I will come back to this, if I may.

Just to row back on this a little bit, we all know the good news about life expectancy – it is increasing at an enormous pace and obviously for all of us here this is very good news, but the proportion of the Council spend on Adult and Children’s Services is increasing accordingly. We all agree on this, it is a fact, so we should therefore all welcome the Government’s additional £2bn funding package for Adult Social Care announced for 2017/18. This means that Leeds will now receive an extra £29m in Government grant over the next three years.

I have to say, however much they go on about these things and complain and distort some of the figures, this should be welcomed but then we come back to the matter of who provides the care. This is where I have to say that the administration do not seem to understand their own policies because despite the lack of private sector homes rated as “good” the administration has decided to go down this road of full and total privatisation in this sector. I warned about two or three months ago about the uncertainties being suffered by the private sector providers, the uncertain ongoing financial viability, some unsustainable business models, the living wage, other kinds of cost pressures, all sorts of things. I urged them at the time, Lord Mayor, to maintain an Authority presence in Leeds in the sector and then to enter into a partnership with the private sector in order to drive the standards up, at least to “good” or if possible higher.

Instead, what they are asking us to do today to vote for, and what they are asking their own Members to vote for, is this full and total privatisation – something that some of the more thoughtful former Members of their group have decided they are not able to stomach and have followed their consciences.

This policy is incoherent, Lord Mayor, it is misconceived and should be brought back to the Executive Board as soon as possible. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Robert Finnigan.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. When the Labour Party voted to close Siegen Manor along with other care homes across Leeds, supported by Morley's sole Labour Councillor – who also voted to close Siegen Manor – we suggested an alternative. We suggested at that particular point a pause, that we spent a bit of time reconsidering and reflecting. That really has not occurred and I think we have been proven to be right.

Certainly the story covering the Morley papers this week is about a private care home that is looking at closure because its standards are so poor and certainly at the point where we were doing everything from referencing back to calling in particular decisions we were concerned that you did not have that mixed economy. There was a rush to privatise Adult Social Care services across Leeds.

Subsequently we had the Social Care Levy and I do not agree necessarily with what Stewart is saying because that builds year by year and I accept that the first year will have covered the increase in wage levels but future years does give you that particular flexibility. We have got even more flexibility at this particular point but privatising is not the answer. You need a mixed model of care. Even at this late stage we would call on the administration to reconsider its closure programme to make sure that there is that mix, because the private sector certainly can in some cases provide the care that is appropriate but in many cases does not and you are removing the opportunity to be able to drive up those particular standards. It is about being able to deliver a mixed market, some of it provided by the Council, some of it provided by the private sector, and that keeps everybody honest and that drives up standards.

There is little point whingeing about the previous Conservative Government and the previous Coalition Government. The previous Labour Government had 13 years to do something about Adult Social Care and chose not to actually bother, so it is Governments of all persuasions over the years have avoided dealing with this issue.

The more we depoliticise it and the more we agree that something has to be done at national level rather than scoring cheap political points, then the better we will be because ultimately we do need to be in a position where this is dealt with at national level with consensus. More money needs to go into Adult Social Care, that is glaringly obvious. It is welcome that we are getting some extra cash at this particular point but we need a long term solution and that means that we need to look at national level, lobbying Central Government to come up with some sensible proposals that look at bringing that extra cash in. Ultimately, that is about us paying a bit more in terms of taxation. There are no other ways of actually achieving this. We have to have that honest discussion and that honest debate with voters about the fact that if you need better Adult Social Care you are going to have to dig into your pockets that much deeper. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ann Blackburn.

COUNCILLOR A BLACKBURN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Our Group believes that this Council should retain some Local Authority residential care homes in Leeds. There are too many care homes in the independent sector who have not received a “good” rating from the CQC whereas the Council care homes do have or did have – those that are still open do have – a “good” rating. This is why we supported keeping Siegen Manor, The Green and Middlecross, which are homes for people with dementia, open.

To solely rely on the independent sector to provide care for our elderly is short-sighted. We need to ensure that the care homes we offer to the relatives and the carers of elderly people for their loved ones is good in all respects as they deserve no less. Thank you. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Paul Truswell.

COUNCILLOR TRUSWELL: Thank you, Lord Mayor. There is a welcome recognition, as has been pointed out in the Tory White Paper, that privatisation is not working but it is a shame that it is not directed at their own party because for the last 25 years the trajectory of Tory policy has been to push for privatisation of social care, residential care, and for Local Authorities to divest themselves of that care.

Councillor Anderson’s White Paper, a very leaky White Paper, reminds me of the old children’s song “There’s a hole in your bucket” and there is definitely a huge hole in the motion that Caroline has put down – in fact it is more like a colander.

In the words of the song, with what will we mend Caroline’s bucket? Well, not with the £4.6bn slashed from the social care budgets over the last five years; certainly not with the £240m cut in Government grant that this Council has faced or the £52m still to come, and definitely not with the so-called Adult Social Care Support Grant.

Colleagues will know this is the wheeze whereby the Tories have diverted New Homes Bonus into social care yet, according to the legend that is Alan Gay (God bless him) Leeds will receive £3.3m of this grant but will lose £4.5m in New Homes Bonus, a loss of £1.2bn – another hole in your bucket, Caroline.

In Leeds we have used some of the Public Health grant that was transferred from the NHS to support Neighbourhood Networks. That funding was first slashed in year and then subject to further recurring cuts – yet another hole in the bucket.

Anyone listening to debates in this Chamber – and Councillor Chapman hit the nail on her head in an excellent contribution, I thought – would think that the discussion and the debate about social care is all about care homes. It is not. Other people and other groups rightly demand their share of funding. They include people with learning disabilities, as was said, people with physical disabilities, people with mental health problems and, as Councillors Jarosz and Dawson rightly reminded us, we have to support carers in the absolutely vital role that they play.

There are even more holes in Caroline's bucket and some colleagues have actually referred to these. We face additional costs from the implementation of the 2014 Care Act, the introduction of the National Minimum Wage, the impact of now rising inflation and continuing rising demand for care and let us not delude ourselves that we are currently meeting people's needs. Changes in assessing the way needs are assessed has led to an estimated 400,000 fewer adults now having publicly funded social care compared to 2010. Age UK says 1.2 million older people have to manage without the care they need. Even more holes in your bucket, Caroline.

Perhaps even more fundamentally – and there have been some excellent contributions or parts of contributions from all round the Chamber on this – the biggest hole in the Tory bucket is the lack of a long term strategy for social care. Contrary to what Robert said, the last labour Government - belatedly, admittedly - was trying to tackle this issue until the Tories turned it into a political football.

Lord Mayor, we all have a stake in creating a decent and fair social system for our constituents, our relatives and friends and ourselves should we ever need it. It is time for fundamental questions about what social care should look like and how it should be funded.

The Government promised a cap on people's contributions to their care. That was kicked into the long grass. Now we have a promised Green Paper – no doubt as green as the long grass into which the issue has now been kicked. All this really goes to show why I have to say, "There's a hole in your bucket, dear Caroline, dear Caroline; there's a hole in your bucket, dear Caroline, a hole." *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR STEPHENSON: No wonder Labour lost power in 2010.

COUNCILLOR TRUSWELL: I am forming a boy band called the Red Dragons!

THE LORD MAYOR: We have only got time for two more speakers and Councillors Lewis and Lamb have asked to speak, so we will go first to Councillor Lewis. James Lewis.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I will not follow Councillor Truswell by singing to the Council Chamber but Councillor Truswell's beautiful melodious voice did wake me out of a little daydream I had slipped into, and I had slipped into this daydream listening to the parties down there because I thought that, listening to them, I thought maybe the fabled Overton window has shifted. We are always told if the Labour Party moves to the left then the whole of politics moved to the left, and listening to the Liberals and the Tories talking about public services, I thought maybe that had happened but then Paul woke me out of my daydream and I remembered the parties, and the parties had brought into the public sector. We will go back to the 80s and remember the Tories imposed compulsory competitive tendering on this Council and every Council around the table. Maybe Members from that era are still in the Council Chamber that came in and waxed lyrically about the benefits of compulsory competitive tendering then.

Let us not also forget, I did agree with Stewart – as I always agree with Stewart when he is having a go at the Tories about the inadequacies of funding but let us not forget that the Tories and Liberals together brought in the 2012 Health and Social Care Act which brought in the biggest privatisation of the NHS this country has ever seen. I do not think we will take any lessons about the structuring and privatisation from parties that have brought in those changes then and we have just seen the impact of bringing the market and the private sector and the NHS and then they come in here and think we will believe that it is nothing to do with them, they believe in something completely different.

This is the reality of the situation we are in. Again, we have to look at the impact of austerity on this. Caroline described the Government funding as a bottomless pit. It is 3% of the £400m savings we have to make and it is only in the budget for a couple of years. It is hardly a bottomless pit, she is right – it is a little dribble that will help us try and put a sticking plaster over the problems.

There are some sections, when you look at the Conservative Government's approach, billions to find in Corporation Tax, billions to find cutting Transaction tax, cutting the top rate of tax, there are some sections of this society for whom Her Majesty's Treasury is a bottomless pit and let us not forget it is not those people in need of Adult Social Care services in this country. Let us not forget where the Tory priorities lie and we will not become kidded at this end of the Council Chamber that somehow or other by adjusting our policies here we will somehow or other completely mitigate the grinding impact of austerity on this Council, the people in the city, our services and the NHS that people rely on so much.

Let us have a look again. I do not think Councillor Buckley had actually read our White Paper when he gave us his views on it earlier, because let us talk a little bit about what we are doing, let us talk a little bit about what we are doing as an administration in here.

We are actually, for all this talk of privatisation, actually we are transforming our Adult Social Care service and there is a potential there may well be more services provide in-house not out; we are working with the NHS on delivering kick beds and delivery initiatives like The Green to provide intermediate care. The Tories may have abandoned the NHS to chaos but we are actually trying to help out and trying to help people in the city who need our services. We will continue, as other people reflected, to support and invest in our Neighbourhood Networks. We will use any extra funding we have got not just to see the rise of the minimum wage as a pressure, it is not – these are people who have been paid far too little to do an important job and we will use any extra resources we have got to tackle the scandal of low pay in the care service. We are going to develop more extra care and we will work with all partners in the city to provide more nursing care.

Council, I think we can see visions of how Adult Social Care moves. What we are putting forward as a Labour Group about bringing services as people need them and working with the NHS, working to address long-term conditions and

actually putting that extra resource in and use our regulatory functions to show we have got teeth to bring up the standards in the care sector, or we see parties who, we see the Conservative Party and their running dogs who just simply push an agenda of austerity and privatisation. I think somehow or other a few words in there completely mitigate this. I support the Labour amendment. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lamb.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Dear oh dear! All this talk of holey buckets – there is only one bucket that should matter to you and that is the big bottomless bucket the Labour Party are looking into to find their support. It is incredible, it is the hypocrisy of them that gets you. This is the party that brought Britain to the brink of bankruptcy (*interruption*) this is the party that ran a deficit budget from 2001 to 2008 and left all the normal economic levers redundant for a recession and has left us in this financial position in the first place. There is no mention of that.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: What is the deficit now? Is it higher or lower?

COUNCILLOR: Higher.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we have some quiet, please.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: Lord Mayor, this is not the audience participation part of the meeting. (*laughter*) It is over, pay attention. Lord Mayor, there is talk of privatisation in all of this.

COUNCILLOR COUPAR: Deal with the truth then.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: I do not really accept their definition of privatisation when it comes to the Health Service, but just for the sake of argument...

COUNCILLOR: You know more about it than we do, Alan.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: Just for the sake of argument let us accept that for now. Say at the moment roughly seven, eight, maybe nine per cent of the NHS is privatised on their definition. The biggest amount of that occurred when Councillor Truswell was in the Labour Government for 13 years. One of the biggest reasons there is not enough money to go round...

COUNCILLOR TRUSWELL: And consistently voted against it.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: Yes but you did not do anything about it, you stuck in there, Councillor Truswell, just as you are doing with this lot.

COUNCILLOR TRUSWELL: I wasn't Prime Minister.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: One of the biggest reasons why there is not enough money to go round in the Health Service and for Adult Social Care is because of the ridiculous PFI contracts that were introduced by the last Labour Government under Gordon Brown. All the money that is wasted on having to change light bulbs, on getting stuck with meal contracts, all of those things, all of that money could be helping to solve these problems. *(interruption)*

Just for once, this Labour Council could stand up and say, “Actually, for all the moaning and bleating we have done, actually the Government has listened.” Perhaps if you did not moan and bleat about absolutely every single little thing you might be a bit better off, you might get a better deal out of the Government if you were a touch more constructive from time to time. I cannot recall any Councillor ever in this Chamber saying “Thank you Government, of whatever colour, you have given us enough money now, you can stop.” That never happens but just for once they have listened and given us some more money and the irony listening to this debate today around privatisation, we have got eight, nine per cent privatisation in the NHS on your definition but Councillor Truswell, and I know this sickens you to the stomach, this Labour administration that you are part of, that you are going to support their amendment, I suspect, is wholesale 100% privatising residential care in this city and you are supporting that. I hope you can look yourself in the mirror tonight, Councillor Truswell, just as you did in 13 years of a Labour Government.

COUNCILLOR TRUSWELL: It is difficult I have aged.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: You made all the right noises and said all the right words but you still support them. At least some of your former colleagues had the guts to stand up for their principles and go and do something else and take a stand. I suspect there are a few others along there who might be looking at their consciences very hard.

It is absolutely wrong and dangerous for this Council to completely withdraw from the care sector in this city. We are all going to come to regret it. Shame on every single one of you. I happily support the White Paper, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: Put you in your place.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Caroline Anderson to sum up, please.

COUNCILLOR C ANDERSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Thank you all for your contributions. Thank you, Councillor Golton, for your support for my White Paper and the offer to join the Liberal Democrats – one which I will not be taking up! I was not saying we should move back into providing care; I was saying we need to work closely with everyone to push up standards.

Councillor Chapman, I am pleased that you have highlighted the needs of young and middle aged adults with mental health issues as this is an area often forgotten. When we talk about Adult Social Care we immediately think of old people in care homes.

Councillor Charlwood, even if we do get a directive as to what to spend the money on it will free up some other money for you, in order for you to choose how you want to spend it.

The problem with socialism is that you eventually run out of other people's money. The Government has no money, it is taxpayers' money. Councillor Dobson, it is always informative to hear about real life stories and we must learn what we can from these experiences. I am sure the Member you have referred your case to will look into that for you.

Councillor Buckley, thank you for pointing out the muddle that is going on across the other side of this Chamber. I hope you have given the Members opposite something to think about when it comes to voting on this White Paper.

Councillor Finnigan, I am glad you agree with me on an absolute need to drive up standards. This is something we can address using this extra money with the expertise of the Adult Social Care team.

Councillor Truswell – typical! I just refer you back to what I said earlier about not having bottomless pits. How do you suggest that all the services we need to fund should be paid for? By taxing people at 90%. That would be useful – and don't become a singer!

COUNCILLOR TRUSWELL: Higher Corporation Tax rate.

COUNCILLOR C ANDERSON: Councillor Lewis, there was more privatisation under Labour in the NHS than there has ever been under the Conservatives. Labour outsources 0.5% each year; the Conservatives have outsourced 0.25% each year.

Councillor Lamb, I am grateful to you for reminding the opposites benches who has caused the most damage to this country – the Labour Party. I bet you wish you could outsource Jeremy Corbyn! (*laughter*) He might be able to set up a street band act with Councillor Truswell.

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: Nobody would want him!

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we then call for the vote on 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: Those 92 present; those for the amendment, “Yes”, 14; abstentions 17; “No” 61. That is LOST.

*(A recorded vote was held on the amendment in the name of*

*Councillor Charlwood).*

THE LORD MAYOR: Those present 92; those in favour 58; those abstaining 3; those “No” 31. That is CARRIED.

*(A recorded vote was held on the substantive motion.)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Those present 92; those for the substantive motion 58; abstaining 3; “No” 31. That is CARRIED.

ITEM 15 – WHITE PAPER MOTION – NATIONAL DENTAL PERFORMERS LIST

THE LORD MAYOR: White Paper 15, National Dental Performers List. Councillor Wilford.

COUNCILLOR WILFORD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I received an email from a constituent in my ward informing me of the mismanagement by CAPITA of the National Dental Performers List. This is a register of newly qualified dentists who are to provide NHS dental services. Without completed registration and an official performer number, dentists are unable to practise. This presents far-reaching consequences for dentists waiting for applications to be processed by CAPITA and for patients waiting for treatment.

This register was managed by NHS England but was contracted out to CAPITA in September of 2015. In doing this, the response to applications for processing has deteriorated, leading to prolonged delays for dentists waiting to go into practice. On qualification this presents a stressful time for men and women wanting to go into practice and it obviously has a knock-on effect for patients waiting for treatment.

I have read that some practices are struggling to make ends meet with staffing shortages, and consequently missing out on enthusiastic practitioners due to unacceptable waiting times for registration. This has also led to some dental practices unable to meet their outgoings, not having enough dentists to fully staff their practice and meet their clients’ needs.

In Leeds we have the Leeds Dental Institute which runs in partnership with the University of Leeds and Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust providing training and support in dental care for the next generation of dental practitioners. Most of them will more than likely be having anxiety and stress over their NHS National Performers List applications being processed by CAPITA.

NHS England are aware of these unacceptable barriers from CAPITA and agree that the situation is not good enough. Questions have been asked in Parliament and it appears that CAPITA are not monitoring their own performance in dealing with applications and there is no clarity over average waiting times.

Along with my constituent and the British Dental Association, I urge you to support this White Paper on behalf of those newly qualified dentists in the city of Leeds and to contact your MP asking them to sign the Early Day Motion 977 or write to Nicola Blackwood MP, the Health Minister dealing with this issue.

We need dentists working in practice and treating their patients, not stuck in a CAPITA waiting list. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Rebecca Charlwood.

COUNCILLOR CHARLWOOD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am very pleased to be seconding this White Paper motion on behalf of the Labour Group.

Some Members may be aware of the Early Day motion recently discussed in Parliament on this and it was led by Labour MP Steve McCabe, which expressed significant concerns over reports of CAPITA's mismanagement of the National Dental Performers List since it took over in September 2015.

It is the reported impact of this change in management which is having far-reaching consequences for both dentists and patients. As we know, the list used to be managed directly by NHS England but its administration was contracted out to CAPITA alongside other primary care support services.

Under the management of NHS England the average application turn-around time is around six weeks, but under CAPITA this has significantly deteriorated due to what has been referred to as "teething issues". This has meant that hundreds of applicants have had to wait months for their performer number just to be issued before they can start treating NHS patients, with the British Dental Association even hearing reports of some waiting for over a year.

These delays also mean that dentists are unable to work and earn a living while their application is being progressed, as we have heard. The BDA rightly highlights that dentists are being left in limbo when they could and should be busy helping NHS patients. They have also been made aware of NHS practices that are risking closure as a direct result of these failures and have stated colleagues are unable to meet mortgage repayments. We are now also hearing that nationally over 550 trainee dentists were expected to stop work on December 1<sup>st</sup> 2016 as a result of the backlog until the BDA manage to secure an extension to the applications process. Hundreds of other NHS dentists are reported as still being affected.

Lord Mayor, these reports do represent a cause for concern and it is critical that CAPITA is now supported effectively in order to return back to normal service so that practitioners across the country, many who are just starting their careers, can begin to treat patients.

While it has been stated that £30m-worth of savings has been secured as a result of using CAPITA, it is inevitable that serious questions must be asked by the

Government regarding the running of the Performers List. Thankfully, at a local level my understanding is that the work of partners has mitigated its impact in Leeds, specifically through the work of the Locality Team of NHS England who have worked with local providers and newly qualified dentists to minimise delays and ensure that dental provision has not been adversely impacted, which we are grateful for, but there still remain significant issues at national level, which is why it is important to support this White Paper and we are proud to do so.

Thank you, I encourage all Members to do the same. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dan Cohen.

COUNCILLOR COHEN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. It is an interesting White Paper this, although I think in fairness we are debating it later than we should; perhaps we should have been doing it at 2.30 instead. (*laughter*) Thank you. There are worse ones than that, I assure you! I am still in shock from your singing, you have got no position to comment, Councillor Truswell!

As we have been told that in September 2015 NHS England commissioned CAPITA to run the National Performers List service. The reason for the list is really clear, is to ensure patient safety, to ensure that dentists are suitably qualified, have up to date training, appropriate English language skills and have passed personal and financial vetting.

There is nobody in this Chamber, I am certain, who would say anything other than the delays that CAPITA have had processing applications is inexcusable but CAPITA themselves have admitted they have had teething problems and they have not tried to floss – sorry, gloss – over this very serious issue but they have pointed out that is what is a very key contributor to the delay has been the larger than usual number of dentists trained overseas who wanted to work in the UK and those are obviously more complex applications which are more difficult to process because of the due diligence that is necessary to carry out on them and ensure that they are properly processed.

As Councillor Charlwood told us, moving the list over to CAPITA has saved UK taxpayers £30m each and every year and will continue to do so going forward. That has to be a good thing so long as CAPITA can get it right and therefore of great significance – and something that I am actually quite disappointed has not been mentioned so far today – is the assurance both by CAPITA and indeed the Minister, the Under Secretary for Health and Innovation, Nicola Blackwood, the assurance that by the end of April CAPITA will be fully up to date with the dentists' applications and will be keeping up to date going forward.

It does seem an odd time to bring this White Paper when those assurances are in place and when the work does not seem to be moving at a sufficient pace that by the end of April we are going to be fully up to date.

I do query and question why we are bringing that White Paper now. Yes, there are questions to be answered and I am sure the Minister will be absolutely looking into why those delays have taken place.

When we look at the Early Day Motion it is interesting – it is an Early Day Motion we are being asked to urge all our local MPs to support – it has been in place for over a month and just 16 MPs have felt it necessary to sign it. I do wonder if the real reason, therefore, for this White Paper is not necessarily just about dentists but perhaps a reluctance generally with outsourcing.

From our point of view, if we can generate real savings to taxpayers then that is something we must examine and it is not something we should be too down in the mouth about. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR COUPAR: You should be on the stage!

COUNCILLOR COHEN: If you want to put your name down to speak, do so.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Robert Finnigan.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. We are more than happy to support this White Paper Motion. Certainly I think we all read the quite shocking reports about children's dental health which were showing that children were having teeth extracted at an alarming rate. Some of that is down to poor parenting, there is absolutely no doubt whatsoever about that, but some of it is about the difficulties many people have, certainly those on low income, finding an NHS dentist. Anything that can speed up that particular process to make sure there are more NHS dentists available as we start to deal with that quite dreadful situation we find ourselves in with children's dental health has got to be a good thing, so we are happy to support this White Paper Motion.

Clearly this is a cautionary tale about privatising things and perhaps the present Labour administration may reflect on that. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Neil Dawson.

COUNCILLOR DAWSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would like to support the White Paper put forward by Councillor Wilford on behalf of the Green Group. I believe there has been an acknowledgement already of the failures by CAPITA and the BDA has commented on this issue.

Before CAPITA won the contract the average application turn-around time was approximately six weeks; now it is more likely to be six months and in some cases up to one year before applications are processed.

I think the other thing, picking up on what Councillor Cohen said, I think there was an assurance already given back in November that this would be cleared up

by the end of January. It has not been cleared up by the end of January so I am not sure if we can rely on it actually being cleared up by the end of April.

CAPITA is a very large and successful company, one that has grown significantly over the last six years benefiting from outsourcing work in both public and private sector. The strap line in their annual report is “Smarter services, better outcomes.” Perhaps not if you want to be a dentist.

The turnover of CAPITA has doubled nearly in the last six years to about £5bn. Profits from CAPITA have doubled almost to £541m in the last year. Dividends paid to shareholders have increased by 58%. CAPITA has spent £1.1bn on acquisitions of many different companies in that period. They have a lot of employees based in Leeds and, indeed, in Morley as well.

However, CAPITA as a company, the Corporation Tax that they have paid has barely changed. In fact in 2016 they are paying £9m less in Corporation Tax than they did in 2010. Really it is the equivalent of somebody doubling their income and not paying any more Income Tax, which is nice if you can get it.

CAPITA has done nothing wrong, I am sure they are diligent and pay the taxes that are due. It is really this Government that is responsible. For seven years we have been told that austerity is necessary, we need to cut public services, tighten our belts and we are all in this together. Theresa May says she is committed to the JAMs, the “Just About Managing”. I ask you, are CAPITA a just about managing company? No, they are not, they are very profitable and very successful. They can afford to pay more in taxation.

This Government is very good at rewarding large, profitable companies and they are going to reward them further with further cuts in Corporation Tax taking the rate down to 17 pence from what it was at 28 pence back in 2010.

We are told that we cannot afford to invest further in the NHS, we must cut welfare payments. In the Budget ordinary workers who happen to be self-employed were told they must pay more. I think it is time we need more balance in our economy. CAPITA certainly have questions to answer about their terrible record on their mismanagement of the National Dental Performers List but equally this Government has to answer questions about its policy of favouring large corporations, wealthy individuals and bending over backwards to help those who need help the least. They seem to be the priority for this Government, not the JAMs. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Terry Wilford to sum up.

COUNCILLOR WILFORD: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. Thank you very much, Councillor Charlwood, thanks for your support on this. I like the idea about the £30m savings for the taxpayer, possibly rather than the quality of service for CAPITA to actually process these applications.

Councillor Cohen, patient safety, etc. There was a lot of humour in there as there was in Councillor Charlwood's as well – 2.30, floss over things. Perhaps you took it a bit too far, assurances from CAPITA. Can we really rely on CAPITA in this outsourcing? We will have to keep our eyes peeled and perhaps monitor that.

Robert Finnigan, thank you very much Councillor for your support there. I agree about children's dental health as well, it is an issue, as my friend Councillor Buckley said about the sugar in soft drinks in hospitals, NHS, so we are all aware of that one.

Neil Dawson, failures by CAPITA, six weeks, etc. I think they do make a lot of money but that is probably besides the point in this case because we are talking about dental practitioners getting into practice. The only thing I can say about CAPITA from my own point of view is I think they have got their finger in too many pies.

Thank you very much for supporting on this White Paper. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: We will go to the vote.

COUNCILLOR A BLACKBURN: Can we have a recorded vote?

COUNCILLOR D BLACKBURN: Seconded.

*(A recorded vote was held on the White Paper Motion in the name of Councillor Wilford)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Those present 87; those in favour 87. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

#### ITEM 16 – WHITE PAPER MOTION – AIR QUALITY

THE LORD MAYOR: There is a Procedural Motion now in the name of Councillor Yeadon.

COUNCILLOR YEADON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. In accordance with the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 14.9 I seek leave of Council to alter the wording of the motion in my name to include the amendment in the name of Councillor Finnigan.

THE LORD MAYOR: On this occasion we do not need a seconder so can we seek leave of Council. *(A vote was taken)* That is CARRIED.

Councillor Finnigan.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: It says here to move that under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 13.2(d) and 14.10, which I am sure we are all aware of, that leave of Council be given to withdraw the amendment in my name.

THE LORD MAYOR: Have you got a seconder?

COUNCILLOR LEADLEY: I second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: To seek leave of Council for the withdrawal of the amendment in the name of Councillor Finnigan. *(A vote was taken)* CARRIED.

Council has given consent to the request of Councillors Yeadon and Finnigan and will now consider the altered motion in the name of Councillor Yeadon. Councillor Yeadon.

COUNCILLOR YEADON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Lord Mayor, the reason for our White Paper today is to outline the commitment of this Council in tackling air pollution in our city. You only have to switch on the news or log on to social media to see that this issue is rightly becoming more and more prominent. From the VW emissions scandal to the ClientEarth court cases, air quality is recognised as a huge environmental challenge and understandably people are concerned.

It is because of the enormity and significance of this challenge that we are keen to gain cross-party consensus and I thank the Groups who have taken this White Paper in the spirit it was intended. I would also like to acknowledge the work of Scrutiny on this issue and the contributions that Members from across the Chamber have made through the Improving Air Quality Breakthrough Group.

I have continually stressed that the importance of the cross-party approach is why it is important and I am delighted that the Greens are supporting our motion today and I am happy to include Councillor Finnigan's amendment.

Lord Mayor, we recognise that it is the most vulnerable people in our communities who disproportionately feel the burden of air pollution which is why this Council has been taking this issue seriously, taking up a proactive response to reducing air pollution across our city well before the Government's intervention in 2015.

The groundwork has been done since 2011 and has strong foundations which the Council is building on. In 2014 we trialled small EV vans and thanks to this work we have now switched 66 of our fleet vehicles to low emission vehicles. In 2014 we outlined the steps we were taking to address the vehicle emissions, including greening the Council's own fleet, improving public transport, improvements to taxi and private hire, an alternative fuel infrastructure, improvements to HGVs and encouraging shifts to active travel.

Transport improvements such as the development of the Elland Road Park and Ride and the Cycle Superhighway means that we now can encourage people to travel

differently into the city centre. Since becoming the Exec Member for Environment and Sustainability, I have prioritised improving air quality and am taking this issue so seriously that I am currently awaiting delivery for my own electric vehicle.

There is no one solution to protecting and improving air quality. It requires action at an international, national, local and individual level. It requires action in a range of areas including transport, housing and economic development and this is why it is vital that we take an holistic approach across all departments.

In Transport we are making major investments in bus, rail and cycling infrastructure which will significantly improve air quality and reduce carbon emissions. Free parking is offered to Leeds residents with low emission vehicles in the city centre and £1.9m has been secured to support a regional network of electric vehicle charge points across West Yorkshire for use by the taxi and private hire trade.

We are working closely with Public Health to advise vulnerable groups on ways they can reduce their exposure to pollution. Additionally, we have launched the Clean Air Leeds campaign to promote key messages across the city. We are working with schools to develop greater awareness of air quality and how everyone can play a role in improving it. On 15<sup>th</sup> June Leeds will be taking an active role in the National Clean Air Day, hosting many events at key sites across the city to raise awareness and help support behaviour change. I hope that all Members will be taking part in these.

Air quality is a challenge for the city not just for the Council, and that is why we are engaging with businesses so that they are also prepared for the future. I would like to thank all of those who have already pledged to do their bit, but we cannot be complacent and more needs to be done. This is just the beginning if we are really to make improvements that we so desperately need in air quality.

We need a comprehensive strategic national approach from Government as we prepare to introduce the CAZ. This is not a problem Local Authorities can solve alone. While we are pleased to have been awarded grants from DEFRA to support our work, we lack the necessary powers and resources to tackle the issue properly. The current fund for Local Authorities in England to improve air quality is woefully inadequate, particularly if more cities are identified as non-compliant. Most importantly, we need joined up thinking across all Authorities and Government Departments to tackle this public health crisis.

This Council is calling on Government to take urgent action and bring a Clean Air Act fit for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. We need a national framework to help cities move forward to 2020.

The challenges we face are significant, Lord Mayor, but there are challenges that we remain committed to tackling head on to make Leeds as cleaner, healthier place to live, work and visit. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor David Blackburn.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Jonathan Bentley to move the first amendment.

COUNCILLOR J BENTLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I do not doubt Councillor Yeadon's sincerity on this issue but her White Paper just does not reflect what she has just been saying and certainly her re-writing of history over the last six years certainly does not reflect what has been happening.

On six occasions over the past six years this Group, the Liberal Democrats, raised the issue of the city's poor air quality and asked the Labour administration what they were doing about it. Two White Papers calling for low emission zones; questions to the administration about progress on low emission zones since 2011. As recently as 2014 when the effects of poor air quality on premature deaths was well known and well understood, this administration, this Labour administration, was showing unbelievable complacency with comments like, "The air quality position in the city is broadly within acceptable standards." In 2014 that is what you were saying and you say that you are not being complacent.

In rejecting the low emission zones that we have always called for, in 2015 they said that "The unknown economic impact and uncertain levels of public support outweigh the benefits of reducing deaths from air pollution." That is the sort of comment we used to get from the tobacco industry when we complained about smoking.

In 2015, embarrassingly for this administration, their decision not to go for low emission zones was overturned because the Government imposed them and they had to implement them by 2020, so eventually, after six years in which over 300 premature deaths a year are attributed to poor air quality, we get this White Paper saying what the administration is going to do. Six years later. Forgive us for being totally underwhelmed by it.

After six years of trying to do anything, trying to avoid the issue, what are you actually proposing to do? You say you continue working closely with DEFRA. You do not have much choice in that, it has been imposed upon you. You are going to look for funds to help local businesses deal with the impact of Clean Air Zones – something we suggested you do six years ago. You are going to call for more legislation. We do not need more legislation, we need action, we need commitment, we need progress.

The one thing we are being asked to do, the only call to action in this White Paper, is to get involved with Clean Air Day on 15<sup>th</sup> June. I spent an hour at a cross-party meeting on air quality the other day with Councillor Yeadon and other colleagues and listened to all the stunts and gimmicks that you are all going to get up to on Clean Air Day. I think you were getting it confused with Red Nose Day. It was like being in an episode of W1A.

It epitomises the approach so often taken by this administration. It is all about the appearance, the press release, the glossy leaflet, the photo opportunity. All activity, no real achievement.

This White Paper is so bland there is nothing you can really disagree with but we have amended it to stimulate some action and some progress. There are actions we could be taking that do not rely on DEFRA or legislation, things under our control as a Council. We control taxi and private hire licensing so with a bit of courage and imagination a lot could be achieved in that area. Councillor Finnigan's withdrawn amendment says what we can do in Planning and we would support that.

Lord Mayor, it is three years until the Clean Air Zone is supposed to come in, is going to be imposed. That is another thousand premature deaths. Rather than use that as an excuse to do nothing, let us get some action going on things that we can do now and look for some real achievement and save some lives. I move the amendment Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Ryk Downes.

COUNCILLOR DOWNES: Thank you, Lord Mayor. In seconding the amendment in the name of Councillor Bentley, I have to agree with the comments that he has made. That is nearly 2,000 premature deaths we have had within the city due to inaction and whilst I was pleased to hear Councillor Yeadon's comments, as Councillor Bentley said they are not backed up by the White Paper. The White Paper does not call for enough action, it does not get us anywhere fast and that is what we need to do.

The Government has come down hard on Leeds because Leeds is one of the worst cities in the country for air pollution and, as I mentioned at the last Council meeting, at the end of my road just 50 yards from where I live is one of the worst zones in Leeds, therefore one of the worst zones in the country. We really do need to do things now to start saving lives within our city.

I really would have liked to have seen some more action. I am pleased that you have accepted the Morley amendment because we do need to look through Planning to see whether we have got 70,000 new houses, according to this administration, coming along, and that is going to have an impact with all those additional residents and all the additional car journeys etc. We have got clogged up roads, as I said in the earlier part of the meeting, along the A660, A65 heading into Leeds from my ward. That is only going to be exacerbated. We need to do things to take cars off the road. We have a public transport system which is failing. We have got reduced numbers of buses coming from our ward these days than we used to have. We need more, not less. We need to do more throughout the city.

One of the other concerns that I have and I think Councillor Yeadon may just have touched on this but I would really like to make sure it happens, I was in a Licensing meeting recently where we were looking at the bid of £1.9m for the

charging points across West Yorkshire. Great, excellent, it is a start. Not enough, we need more. We need more imagination. When I quizzed the officer, what else are we doing on the issue of clean air, she said, "I don't know. I am just doing this." I hope that was just because that officer was tasked with that one job and we are not going to be working in silos on this because we need an holistic approach that tackles it all the way across the city agenda. We need co-ordination to ensure that we move forward.

This White Paper does not take us there quickly enough and it does not give me the confidence that we are going to get there. At the danger of being flippant I think there is the potential that there is a lot of hot air here and we need clean air. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Barry Anderson to move a second amendment.

COUNCILLOR B ANDERSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Can I first of all start by thanking Councillor Yeadon for genuinely trying to find a way forward that we can all agree on. We were given enough notice, we were given notice so we chose not to accept the olive Branch that you put out to us but to reflect back, we often criticise when that does not occur but on this occasion it did occur.

Why have we chosen to go down that particular route? Based on my colleagues to the right and to my left, the Scrutiny Board still has not got to the bottom as to the accuracy of the data and what is happening and until that happens I think it is a bit premature to be going ahead with some of the ideas that are coming forward, because until we get the data right we could end up making a fundamental error by taking the wrong set of data and extrapolating that forward, because I am told that that was one of the problems in the past. We need to look at what we are going to do there.

We need to make sure that we do not rush to judgment as to what is causing it. Yes, it is a major symptom of death, nobody, I think, is disputing that, but is it the principal one? There are probably other health reasons as to why that is occurring.

We are concerned as to whether or not, maybe not necessarily Councillor Yeadon but maybe some other people in our Group and also some officers will continue their anti-car rhetoric that they have been bringing forward in this Council for a number of years. Anybody who drives a car, as far as some people are concerned, are absolute pariahs. As John Procter just said to me just now, you are not going to talk about housing. Well, if we are going to build 70,000 houses and a heck of a lot of them are going to be in Outer areas, unless we do something about the public transport system these people are going to have to get in their cars and drive into the centre, so from that point of view I am mentioning housing at that point.

One of the things the Government has said is that the charging will be up to the Local Authority discretion, so let us hope you use it and use your discretion properly not to penalise but to incentivise people to change their behaviours, but not to penalise them to do it.

We also need to look at what is going to be the impact on the employment and businesses of some of the people on your side today. The taxi drivers, how are they going to be affected by this and what is going to happen? We need to address that issue. We need to listen to what the Scrutiny Board recommendations are and once the Scrutiny Board recommendations have come forward, then we act accordingly.

To follow up on something I was going to ask in a question earlier on, like Councillor Downes I am still waiting to find out what you are going to do about Pool Main Street. It was not me that was complaining that there was a problem on it. You were the ones that said there was a problem on it so what is the solution to it? Can you come forward as quickly as possible so that we know what we are doing?

The last thing I am going to say is, Gordon Brown was the one who came forward with this shift to diesel and I was one of the mugs that did it. I got a diesel car and it was not the greatest decision I ever made in my life, unfortunately, and that is part of the problem. It is how we address that.

It is for that reason that we are saying that you need to look at the transport policies that are being developed in the city and also the various planning policies. We would have backed Councillor Finnigan's amendment because we think it is right that we do need proper planning policies to be put in place so that we can start getting the developers to appreciate the air quality problems that they are going to cause with some of their problems, because unfortunately we cannot trust Highways Planning Officers all the time to come up with the necessary way of solving their problems.

Most of us who have been on Planning for a while very rarely see Highways Planning Officers saying "We have got an objection to this." Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Alan Lamb.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Robert Finnigan.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. There is a lot on social media about virtue signalling. Virtue signalling is about appearing to be virtuous when you are actually doing nothing.

For those of us who are of a certain age we might remember a cartoon called Catch That Pigeon. In Catch That Pigeon Muttley, who was the dog, was always nattering at Dick Dastardly to get a medal for things that he had done well. What we do not need is a medal or a badge or any virtue signalling. What we actually need is real action and let us see if we can put this into some real terms and real people's lives.

The recent application at Lane Side Farm in Churwell for 550 houses. You would have thought that at that particular point there would be some acceptance that would generate problems in terms of congestion and pollution levels. The Panel were told about a clean air zone literally round the corner from this particular site. The Panel were told about the problems on the ring road and the levels of congestion and subsequently the rising pollution levels as well.

Unfortunately, the Labour Members on that particular Panel remained unconvinced and the problem that we have here is that the congestion levels, although they impacted on Morley North residents and while accepting that from the Labour Party's point of view whatever happens in Morley North is of no real concern seeing as they have not won an election there since 2002, the people who suffer the most because of this level of congestion are the people who live on the Cottingley estate. They are the ones people, many of them on low incomes, the ones that are dealing with the increased congestion when dealing with the increased pollutions levels and they already suffer problems in terms of the impact on their health.

The fact of the matter is that if you are looking to do something practical and real about clean air then it needs to be deeply integrated into Planning policies. You can no longer give developers the green light to congest more, to pollute more and basically give them a pat on the back and say that is entirely and utterly acceptable.

If we are going to do something real, we are not just going to be virtue signalling, then we need to make sure it is deeply integrated and that future Planning decisions take into account the impact that these large developments, many of them in the Outer areas, have on health issues, pollution levels and congestion levels. It is time that we put communities and not developers first. Thank you, Lord Mayor.  
*(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Blackburn has indicated he would like to speak now.

COUNCILLOR D BLACKBURN: Thanks, Lord Mayor. I waited until we got the amendments out because I wanted to hear what you said.

First of all when Councillor Yeadon approached me to consider seconding this White Paper and I discussed it with my Party, we came to the conclusion that while it was very basic it was not very controversial and that basically it was something that everybody in this Council could support, cross-party. Clearly we were wrong with that.

I have got to say, Councillor Anderson, with the Tory Group on this one, I think we are going in different directions over cars and that but basically at least the amendment from the Conservative Party mentioned about Scrutiny and I think one of the things is that we have got to take into consideration that there is a Scrutiny Report that has got to be done and we have got to take what that says into consideration, so I think we cannot go ahead too fast.

With the one from the Liberal Democrats, I have got to say on this I think Councillor Yeadon is giving it her best shot and I think we should support her (*applause*) but I do not see what going back before she had that post and criticising the administration is a good way forward because together is the only way we are going to get anything resolved on this. Some of the issues are going to be difficult for some of the people in this Chamber. They might not be for my Group but they certainly will be over *that* direction and we have got to take everybody with us.

There was a report – to get back to my notes now – last August from academics at the University of West England that exposed the ghastly truth of a public health crisis that claims the lives of 50,000 British citizens and an annual bill of £20bn and this report clearly showed that successive Governments, whatever political party, including ones that had Liberal Democrats in previously, have not even been trying to do anything and have not done anything to help Local Authorities in this area.

We need Central Government, Local Government, business and the general public to take the issue seriously. Doing nothing is not acceptable. Previously we have tinkered; now it is time for action and that action has to take into consideration what comes through from the committee that was set up by the Exec Member that Jonathan and I both sit on and also Scrutiny for a direction forward, but we have to do something and we have to do something that changes the way we go forward.

In my view the motion should be something we should be able to unite behind, not fall out over. If I had taken the same route as the Liberal Democrats what I would have done is I would probably have stuck eight pages of our manifesto on an amendment and then read a speech, got three votes and gone home very well satisfied but achieved nothing. At least this way we can achieve something together. (*Applause*)

It is our view that we believe that engagement through cross-party working on areas where we can agree and debating where we do not agree, where there are obvious differences, is the way forward, not playing party politics. I support this motion. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Sarah Field.

COUNCILLOR FIELD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. We welcome anything that improves air quality links to quality of life and life expectancy and great progress has made the city unrecognisable from the 60s and 70s but, of course Leeds, like many other major cities, still has significant issues and we support the White Paper in the name of Councillor Yeadon.

However, we hope that any Government interventions are made with a light touch so that Leeds can control its own future and fortune in this regard. To take the Inner Ring Road, for instance, should that really be our focus or should it be where people live, shop, work and have a higher percentage of pedestrians?

We also cannot allow it to distract from our aspirations to remove heavy polluting vehicles from the city centre and any forthcoming work must be where we have identified need such as the A660, one of our most highly populated and polluted roads.

In financial terms we stress that there must be new Government money for this, or who is going to pay for commercial vehicles to be up to European standards by 2020?

To be clear, we do not see any of this as an imposition but it is a challenge. We accept the administration has come a long way with the Park and Ride at Elland Road, Junction 45 coming soon and the move to compressed natural gas but it still has more to do and we hope that Leeds itself is wholly centred in the decisions and there is no one size fits all approach to satisfy targets.

Unfortunately Councillor Yeadon missed us but we do support the White Paper and particular welcome absorbing Councillor Finnigan's planning amendment. Thank you. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Alec Sobel.

COUNCILLOR SOBEL: Thank you. I think it is worth going over the timeline because a lot of good points have been made in this debate and it is important to know how we have got to this point and how we are moving forward. I fully accept a lot of the points Jonathan made and he was right, in 2011 there was a Liberal Democrat White Paper put forward asking for them to take a feasibility study around air quality. That feasibility study was undertaken and not only do we undertake that for two years in partnership with Bradford and the university, we have implemented more air monitoring stations.

I did find it interesting that Barry said we needed to have further evidence gathering because we have been gathering significant evidence over that period from 2012 to 2014 after that White Paper.

Then in 2014 again, I acknowledge a White Paper was put down by the Liberal Democrats and it was amended and the amendment, which was in the name of Councillor Dobson who was then the Executive Member for the Environment, did say that we would go forward to looking at implementing a low emission zone. In December 2014, so in the same year, there was an Exec Board report, Low Emission Zone Feasibility Study, which was the publication of the work that we did and that was before the ClientEarth court ruling, before we were named by DEFRA around the air quality issues, so we were being proactive in the development of a low emission zone.

It is really important that we gather that evidence basically, we took the time, because if we had gone and tried to implement a low emission zone without this evidence base we would not have had that accepted, but that was overtaken by the

mandating of having a clean air zone. A clean air zone is different to a low emission zone and is more wide-ranging.

The other thing that we need to bear in mind is that over that whole period, and I take Barry's point on this, around diesel, that the evidence base around diesel, what diesel did and how NO<sub>2</sub> emissions from diesel affect us has changed, perception has changed around clean air. What I would say about diesel is that diesel is a good fuel type for cars or other transport going on long journeys. If you live near a motorway and your main journeys are long distance down that motorway, then diesel is a better vehicle type than petrol, none of which are as good as electric vehicles, I am sure Councillor Yeadon will agree – and you might hear some more about electric vehicles shortly – but in terms of city driving diesels are a disaster, not just for personal vehicles but in terms of buses, in terms of commercial vehicles in terms of heavy goods vehicles which we have to acknowledge to have to reach their end point after having been on the motorway to transport goods.

So the clean air zone that we are mandated to have a Class C clean air zones takes in all of those types – private hire vehicles, small commercial vehicles, HGV and buses.

What the other thing I would say is in that period as well the Council did action in terms of our own fleet. We now have 70 electric vehicles so it is not as though the Council ignored the problem. The most powers we have are within our own fleet and we have taken action and we are taking further action, we are bringing forward an alternative fuel station which is at a quite advanced stage now, and once that is in place then we can convert more of our fleet to alternative fuels which improve the air quality and move us away from diesel.

Getting away from diesel is a really core issue and the Mayor of London, Sadiq Khan, has called for a scrappage scheme which we fully support and I hope other Members in this Chamber support that, because without that making the conversion will be very difficult. Thank you. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Rebecca Charlwood.

COUNCILLOR CHARLWOOD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am speaking in support of Councillor Yeadon's motion. Air pollution is not just an environmental threat, as we all know and have spoken about. It is now accepted as one of the greatest public health risks in the UK. It is associated with much greater health risks than was understood even a decade ago. All the time more adverse health effects are emerging.

Members will all be well aware of the serious consequences poor air quality can have on our health. The facts are well know but worth repeating. Air pollution contributes to around 40,000 deaths in the UK each year. Globally the figure is three million. Currently it is the fourth largest risk to public health behind cancer, obesity and cardiovascular disease.

Studies show how exposure to everyday pollutants, particularly nitrogen dioxide, contribute towards cardiovascular disease, lung cancer, respiratory disease, asthma and stroke. Recent studies have also found a connection to dementia.

A report by the Royal College of Physicians and the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health estimates that the impact of air pollution costs the UK health economy around £20bn every year. In Leeds the estimate is that poor air quality contributes to around 350 premature deaths per annum and we know from speaking to local health services that spikes in air pollution have also been reflected in attendances at hospital through asthma attacks.

Public Health England has an important role to play and we are working closely to advise vulnerable groups on how they can reduce their exposure to pollution alongside the carbon reduction and vehicle work.

I really welcome the work Leeds is doing to improve the air quality and I am part of the breakthrough project that is doing that. We need to increase the use of sustainable transport, cleaning the Council's own vehicle fleet, promoting car clubs and car sharing and developing incentives for low emission vehicle take up. I also took it to the Health and Wellbeing Board to encourage partners in the city in the NHS big institutions to think about how they can contribute as well.

I am really pleased to see Leeds taking an active role in our National Clean Air Day, raising awareness to improve the air we breathe in our communities. The messages on this day draws on the two most compelling motivations for action – to improve our health now and to improve the air quality for our children.

When the evidence shows that air pollution disproportionately affects the most vulnerable groups in our society, it is crucial now that the Councillor cleans up its act and takes a robust approach to improve air quality for the most vulnerable people in the city.

Lord Mayor, we can all be part of the solution, we can all make greener, healthier choices every day and together we can improve the air we breathe, and I will support Councillor Yeadon's White Paper. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Al Garthwaite.

COUNCILLOR GARTHWAITE: Poor air quality is hugely important. Many parts of the UK have illegal levels of nitrogen dioxide mainly due to vehicle emissions and over 90% of the UK population is exposed to particulate matter PM2.5 levels which exceed safe levels held by the World Health Organisation. It is communities who feel the health burden the most so that is why the Council has developed the Leeds Air Quality Action Plan, as Councillor Yeadon has outlined.

As a Headingley Councillor I know that air quality is a very important issue for our residents, particularly along Headingley Lane and the Otley Road, the A660. Air quality is monitored at various stations, as many of you know, and I have *here* a

map which shows the areas where the air quality stations are situated. You cannot really see it but the worst air quality is concentrated in the areas of worst health. There are exceptions, I accept, Pool High Street that has been mentioned and so on, but that is the case.

In Headingley the air quality monitoring station is at the Original Oak pub. This monitoring station has found that Headingley is twelfth worst for Particulate Matter 10 and ninth worst for Particulate Matter 2.5. This is even worse than it seems because some areas that are actually worse are places that people do not walk round much, like Armley Gyratory. Places like the A65 or Headingley, where people do walk regularly, it is actually very bad and the Headingley campaign for better air quality has been developed by local Labour Party Branch Members and residents to raise awareness and to promote change.

So, buses. The Council is using lots of available powers to work with bus operators to switch to low emission vehicles and First Bus have started to introduce new Euro 6 clean air zone compliant buses for most of their fleet which will include the main services on the A660 and we will keep up the pressure. However, I am realistic about buses. Last night it took me an hour and 20 minutes to go from a Headingley community meeting to my home. This is a very simple journey of four and a half miles. I waited 25 minutes for one bus that did not turn up, I got two other buses, I arrived home at quarter to eleven, cold and tired. We have to deal with bus services.

So, raising awareness. Encouraging more people to think about air quality is key to changing behaviours. I am really pleased the Council has created the campaign brand Clean Air Leeds. This is vitally important. Communication is key. We are developing social media campaign, we are doing market research on public attitudes and behaviours. Another thing, we are working closely with Shire Oak Primary School in Headingley to pilot air quality awareness. I know that Councillors Yeadon and Sobel and also Councillor Walshaw, a governor at the school, went there during their Green Week. The school has been really helpful and is informing further school campaigns and the Headteacher is helping with an air quality education pack for schools.

As you know, the National Clean Air Day on 15<sup>th</sup> June is taking place throughout Leeds. I really do hope that you will all get behind it and really support it. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Alan Lamb has indicated he wishes to speak.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am rising to speak in support of Councillor Barry Anderson's amendment to the White Paper. I think it is frustrating in many ways that we do not have a form of words that we can all agree on at this time. This is a really important issue and I have to confess I am quite late in the day coming to realise that and I agree with Councillor Bentley that as a Council collectively we are really very late in the day coming to recognise this issue and do

something about it. We should have been looking at it five, six, seven, eight years ago and looking at measures to introduce to tackle the problem but we are where we are.

Given where we are, actually the White Paper is a few months premature. The first disappointment in the White Paper, Councillor Yeadon – and you did acknowledge it in your speech – no mention of the Scrutiny inquiry that is being undertaken that was instigated when Councillor Procter chaired the Environment and Housing Scrutiny Board and Members of all sides have been working extremely hard, including getting representations from DEFRA themselves to come to and give us evidence. We have not finished that work yet. The evidence base will not be known until May. We are having another meeting in May of the Scrutiny Board. The danger is in a rush to decide measures now at this moment, we do not know whether they are the right measures in the right places, we do not know if the consequences of those measures will actually contribute to more deaths. If, for example, small businesses such as taxi drivers in this city who potentially could be disadvantaged against their competitors in other cities are tipped into poverty, we do not know what the impact of that is and if that will contribute to more deaths.

Really we should be looking at this in three or four months' time once Scrutiny has done its job. I am firmly of the view that it would not be difficult at all for us to find a form of words that every Member of this Chamber would agree with and to find an action that we could support but it is not an option today and I have a suggestion for Councillor Yeadon, that we use the Council Procedure Rules and withdraw all of the motions in front of us today. We have had a very interesting debate and I think some very important points have been made but there is an opportunity potentially that we are missing to not put down the measures that we need. We do not know whether there are unintended consequences of what is suggested. I suspect when Scrutiny reports these White Papers will not have gone anywhere near far enough and there is going to be more work needed to be done.

I make that offer in all sincerity to Councillor Yeadon. I do believe we could come back in June or July and my colleagues and I and I am sure all parties would be quite willing to sit down with you once Scrutiny has reported, once it has made its recommendations, and that we find a way that every single Member of this Council can say this is what we are going to do about this issue, we take it incredibly seriously, we have the right measures to put forward and we are going to tackle it and we are going to save those lives every year.

Lord Mayor, I make that offer in all good faith to Councillor Yeadon. I very much hope she will accept it. It is very difficult for us to support the White Paper as it is, we certainly would not vote against it; simply for the fact we do not want to say we absolutely recognise the importance of this issue and I really hope you will take this offer as it stands in good faith, withdraw all of the papers and let us come back with a form of words later in the year that we can all agree with. Thank you, Lord Mayor.  
*(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: We have no more time for any questions, I am afraid, so Councillor Yeadon to sum up.

COUNCILLOR YEADON: Thank you, very much, Lord Mayor. You put down a White Paper to try and get a bit of consensus and you don't! I think that is the outcome of this.

I will start, I think when we put this White Paper down we really did try to word it in such a way that we could find some kind of consensus and agreement. We did think about it. In the back of my mind I did have a feeling that the Lib Dems were going to say you are not going far enough and that the Conservatives would say oh, hang on a minute, you might be doing a bit too much and so I think to find a middle ground was our attempt and it was an attempt done in good faith and that's that.

Let me just start with Councillor Bentley and Councillor Downes. I am going to take you as a block if that is all right, because you said very similar things which again was looking at a history, I think I was accused of re-writing it and speaking hot air.

I want to just say that this White Paper, like I said, was done in good faith and the suggestions included in your amendment are things that we can look at and we will consider and you have had opportunities to bring those to the cross-party group that we established to have these kind of debates and I think to come here and downplay the role of that group which you are members of is contradicting the role that you play on that as well.

We are going to take your suggestions away and we are going to give them proper, fair consideration and bring it back to the cross-party group that you are members of and I would hope also that Scrutiny would play a part in that as well.

Just moving on to Councillor Anderson I like you, Barry, was one of those people who was duped by different, numerous Governments I think who convinced us that diesel was a good thing and so I drive my diesel car feeling incredibly guilty, I have to say, and so I am pleased that will no longer be the case soon.

It is an issue that we all have to acknowledge that successive Governments of different colours did say that diesel was an effective way and I think we have to acknowledge that, which is one of the reasons why we think it is important to have some kind of a national strategy about how you deal with that issue, because although I know that soon I will no longer have my diesel car, that diesel car will still be on the road unless you have got a national strategy or maybe a national scrappage scheme dealing with diesel.

Pool Main Street is a really interesting case and it is something that we are having to do more work around to actually look at why. I think it is the particular topography of the ground that is creating that particular reading and I know that from the studies that we have done it is car users which is the majority of those emissions,

so we are doing some specific work around that and we will get back to you as soon as we can.

I also thank you for recognising that there is an attempt here, and an honest attempt, to try and gain some cross-party consensus.

Councillor Finnigan, I agree, we do have to look at real action, we do have to consider air quality in every single thing that we do including planning, including how we operate as a Council, how we meet, how we have our daily lives so I completely agree and I thank you for being so supportive.

Councillor Blackburn, I absolutely agree with everything that you said and I thank you for acknowledging that I have sincerely tried to take this issue forwards since I have taken on this portfolio and it is important that we take everybody with us because we will not resolve this problem on our own. It has to be holistic, joined-up. Thank you for everyone else's support and for those who did not, well, you know, never mind. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: We will call for the vote then on the first amendment in the name of Councillor Jonathan Bentley. *(A vote was taken)* That is LOST.

The second amendment in the name of Councillor Barry Anderson. *(A vote was taken)* That is LOST.

The substantive motion in the name of Councillor Yeadon. *(A vote was taken)* That is CARRIED.

That is it, thank you all. You are going home half an hour early!

*(The meeting closed at 6.57pm)*

This page is intentionally left blank