

**COUNCIL**

**11<sup>TH</sup> JULY 2018**

**VERBATIM RECORD**

This page is intentionally left blank

**LEEDS CITY COUNCIL**

**MEETING OF THE COUNCIL**

Held on

Wednesday, 11<sup>th</sup> July 2018

At

THE COUNCIL CHAMBER,  
CIVIC HALL,  
LEEDS

In the Chair:

THE LORD MAYOR  
(COUNCILLOR G LATTY)

---

**VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS**

---

Transcribed from the notes of  
Ridgeway Transcription Ltd,  
28a High Lane, Ridgeway,  
Sheffield, S12 3XF  
07790 640517

---

VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF LEEDS CITY COUNCIL  
ORDINARY MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 11<sup>th</sup> JULY 2018

THE LORD MAYOR: Good afternoon everybody and welcome to Council. I am obliged to tell you that the meeting is going to be webcast so do not do what I did the first time and be eating a bar of chocolate right in front of it! Please put your phones on silent or off. I have done mine already.

It is a special day today so I hope that we are all going to mutually wish the England team good luck. (*Applause*) If you all behave properly we are going to end in time for you to get home in time for the match, or to the pub in time for the match, because we are going to finish at 6.00, if all things go according to plan.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

THE LORD MAYOR: Also on the sporting front, Josh Warrington, we congratulate him on winning the IBF (I don't know what that means) World Featherweight Title. International Boxing Federation, I would think! Josh is the first boxer from Leeds to win a world title and I am actually going to host a civic reception for him a week on Friday in the Banqueting Hall. I trust that an invitation has gone out to all Councillors who are interested in boxing to come along. It is in the Banqueting Hall because we expect it to be quite a big do.

Now then, the Queen's Birthday Honours. It is quite a list and I am going to read who has got what:

The Queen's Police Medal – Paul Money, former Police Chief Superintendent for West Yorkshire and now Chief Officer for Safety Leeds, for his dedicated service to policing. (*Applause*)

CBEs have been awarded to the Chief Constable of West Yorkshire, Dionne Collins, for services to policing and the British Association of Women in Policing, and to Robert Lee Shaw for services to health and social care. (*Applause*)

OBEs have gone to Professor Denise Bower for services to engineering and the construction industry and to Jack Tordoff for services to business and the community in West Yorkshire. I used to work for Jack at one time!

MBEs have gone to Alan Creighton for services to the Energy Industry; Chief Superintendent Maboob Hussain for services to West Yorkshire Police and to charity; Mrs Lorraine Long, for services to children and families; and Mohammed Raj for services to racial equality, diversity and inclusion. (*Applause*) Rosamund Sellars for services to the arts and the community in the North of England.

Finally the British Empire Medal has gone to Mary Brennan for services to the community in Cross Green Leeds. (*Applause*); Phil Gomersall for services to horticulture, particularly allotments (*Applause*); Professor Ralph Kester for services to rugby (the game, I imagine) (*laughter*); Mrs Bernice Pearlman for services to the community in Leeds in West Yorkshire. (*Applause*)

There is some sadness here because the death of the former Lady Mayoress Gillian Hudson. She was the wife of David Hudson who himself was Lord Mayor in 2001/2002. She passed away on 5<sup>th</sup> June. In view of her passing and the strong connection with the Council, I would like you all to stand for a minute's silence.

*(Silent tribute)*

### PROCEDURAL MOTION

THE LORD MAYOR: Right, proper business. Councillor Dowson.

COUNCILLOR DOWSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Based on the cross-party agreement reached at the Whips' meeting yesterday, I would like to move in terms of the notice, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Cohen.

COUNCILLOR COHEN: Second and reserve the right to speak, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Golton.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I was not expecting to speak on this item but then again as a Leader of one of the Groups on the Council I was not aware of just how serious the issue was that had been brought up at Whips. I appreciate that the Chief Whip has said there that it was cross-party agreement. It was not all-party agreement, I will have to correct, as there was no positive assent from the Liberal Democrat representative and it should be noted that the Morley Independents were not represented at that meeting.

What I will say, Lord Mayor, is it is all well and good to be patriotic and to show your support by being witnesses to an event which is something that we will probably only see once in our lifetime. However, we also have a responsibility as elected representatives and I am not sure that it is the right message that we send out to the people who voted for us just a few months ago that actually our priority on the day when we are supposed to be discussing important issues and holding the decision-makers of this Council to account, that we decide to knock off early so that we can go watch a football match.

If this had been discussed at greater length I would suggest that a better alternative might have been made which was, for instance, that we could finish early but through so doing start early, or there could be some provision made for those members who are particularly keen to see the beginning of the match to watch it from the Banqueting Hall windows while the rest of us got on with the business that we hold important.

I will say, Lord Mayor, to those people especially who are newly elected to this Chamber, I do not think that at the first business meeting that they attend they should be expected to support a relegation of their duties (*interruption*) and I think this motion is one that asks them to do so. I do not know where the decision came from but it should have been discussed at far greater length.

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: Rubbish. Mealy-mouthed.

COUNCILLOR P GRAHAME: Absolute rubbish.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Cohen.

COUNCILLOR COHEN: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. Thank you very much. Well, do you know, there six of them and they cannot even agree between themselves. *(Applause)* I had the pleasure of being at our Whips' meeting yesterday where we had a very detailed conversation about today's business, where we went to great lengths to ensure that the important matters to be discussed and dealt with today could be discussed and dealt with today and it might surprise members, having heard Councillor Golton's speech, that some of the proposals as to how we might rearrange business came from the Liberal member that was there. *(Applause)* Wait – it gets better! You have had your turn to speak nonsense, it is my turn! He made it clear at the meeting that he had spoken to some of his colleagues. Again, there are only six of them. He agreed with us, “colleagues” is plural, he had spoken to half his group and they all seemed to support it.

Lord Mayor, today is a day where we have to rightly show solidarity with the national team *(applause)* who have reached for the first time in many years the semi-final of the World Cup. We have ensured that the business that is absolutely needing to be dealt with today will be properly dealt with today without the need to rush at all.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: What about the Minutes?

COUNCILLOR COHEN: We would have never got to the Minutes today because what we did agree to do was ensure while still covering all the fundamental points we have less speakers on the Core Strategy. I realise your mathematics is as poor as your timing on this matter but we would have never got to that issue.

Lord Mayor, as I say I second and I am sure we will support this resolution. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dowson, would you like to sum up?

COUNCILLOR DOWSON: I have just moved it in terms of the Notice, Lord Mayor. All the comments that Councillor Cohen has made actually are quite relevant and accurate.

THE LORD MAYOR: In that case we will take a vote. All those in favour of that motion. *(A vote was taken)* In that case the motion is well and truly CARRIED.

#### ITEM 1 - MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD 24<sup>TH</sup> MAY 2018

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dowson.

COUNCILLOR DOWSON: I would like to move that the Minutes be approved, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Cohen.

COUNCILLOR COHEN: I second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: In that case, again, a vote. (*A vote was taken*) That is CARRIED.

## ITEM 2 – DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

THE LORD MAYOR: Now we come to Declarations of Interest. I invite any members to declare disclosable pecuniary interests. No.

## ITEM 3 – COMMUNICATIONS

THE LORD MAYOR: I will ask the Chief Executive for any communications.

THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Just two that I would like to report to Council, both in response to White Papers. The Right Honourable Nick Hurd MP, Minister of State for Policing and the Fire Service in respect of the White Paper on West Yorkshire Police Funding considered by Council in March; and the Private Secretary to the Office of the Parliamentary Undersecretary for the Environment, very important, in respect of the White Paper on Leeds City Council's Waste and Recycling Strategy, also considered by Council in March. The responses have been circulated to members of Council.

## ITEM 4 – DEPUTATIONS

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 4, Deputations.

THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE: To report there are four Deputations, Lord Mayor. First, Special Needs and Parent Support Yorkshire, SNAPS; second, SPARS, Stop the Park and Ride in Stourton; three, Wetherby Area Transport Group; and four, Supporters of Garforth Cemetery.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dowson.

COUNCILLOR DOWSON: I would like to move that all Deputations are received, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Cohen.

COUNCILLOR COHEN: Second, Lord Mayor.

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

DEPUTATION 1 – SPECIAL NEEDS AND PARENT SUPPORT YORKSHIRE  
(SNAPS)

THE LORD MAYOR: Good afternoon and welcome to Council. If you would like to make your speech now please, it must be no longer than five minutes but before you start would you introduce your colleagues, please.

MS D HINGERTON: Good afternoon Lord Mayor, and members of Council. This Deputation is presented today by the charity Special Needs and Parent Support Yorkshire, or SNAPS. I am Debbie Hingerton, a Parent Trustee for SNAPS. My colleagues are Chris Eatwell, Chair of the Board, Malcolm Hall, Vice-Chair, Lewis my son, and Harriet, his carer.

Firstly the good news – we have come to talk to you about what we can do for you, not to ask for financial or other support for SNAPS.

SNAPS was started in 2004 by a group of local parents concerned at the lack of provision in Leeds for therapeutic support for their children with additional needs. In Autumn 2014 SNAPS was providing hydrotherapy and swimming lessons at the rate of one hundred 20 minute sessions per term on Saturdays at Pennyfield SILC. We needed to extend our reach so we wrote a business plan, we brought in new Trustees, created a proper budget and redesigned our practices. We started thinking of SNAPS as a small business but with the heart of a charity and as a result in the last three years we have grown from being open on occasional Saturdays to every Saturday and from one hundred sessions to 500 each term.

We have opened our second site at Broomfield SILC and from employing four part-time staff in 2014, we now have 25 employees and contractors in our team. We also have a programme of activities for school holidays.

To help you understand the importance of SNAPS to the families who use their service, let me introduce you to Lewis. He and others like him are the heart and soul of SNAPS.

Lewis is my son - he is nine years old, and has severe Cerebral Palsy and spends a lot of time in a wheelchair. We came to SNAPS when Lewis was ten months old, not knowing anyone or anything about our son's disability or SNAPS, but the group was very welcoming. We realised how many families are out in the community often feeling isolated, with children with a wide range of needs, many of which are difficult to meet. It was good to know that we had other people to talk to and share our fears with of how to deal with everyday situations and work, and somewhere safe to go where no-one judged you or your child. We now attend SNAPS as a regular whole family event, with our other two children, which has given them a greater understanding of other children with additional needs, and supported them in being able to discuss with their friends how life is different for them.

In SNAPS we are able to share experiences and listen to other parents and carers, offer support where we can, share ideas and battle stories, learn about what services are out there for families and where the gaps are in support and provision. Knowing we are



not alone in our struggles is been very important. This involvement has helped us feel part of the wider community.

For Lewis, attending SNAPS has given him the opportunity to develop his independence and social skills, and he loves to meet his friends there. He has had the chance to try hydrotherapy and rebound therapy, which are beneficial for his disabilities, and there is also lots of fun there.

SNAPS has progressed without any financial support from the Council. We are an open access organisation, providing high standards of professional support, and we charge only a quarter of the cost of our sessions to our families. The rest of our income is from trusts, grants, community and corporate sources. We are growing.

We believe that our independence gives us a unique voice in the city to help this sector provide more support for hard-pressed families with children with additional needs. We have also helped to start Leeds CANN, the Children's Additional Needs Network, comprising of 36 Third Sector and Statutory organisations working to support such children.

Our independence and access to a wider network of families through Leeds CANN puts us in a unique place to help the Council deliver the twelve wishes within the Child Friendly Leeds Charter, but in particular, make those wishes relevant to those families with additional needs. For instance, I would point to Wish 1 which relates to easy travel across the city, and Wish 3, covering places and spaces to play and things to do.

Our families tell us that because of physical barriers it is not easy for children with mobility issues to access all areas and also that play areas are not designed with the needs of our special needs children in mind. As a result, our families often feel that the wishes of the Child Friendly Leeds Initiative are not relevant to them.

For SNAPS, our ask is that we are more involved in how the Council consults with, relates to, and makes decisions concerning families with children with additional needs. We would like to help the Council to more effectively extend the aspiration of a child friendly city to the special children and families that we serve.

Please can we help you in helping our special children and families. Thank you for listening and thank you for your interest.

*(Standing ovation)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dowson.

COUNCILLOR DOWSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would like to move that the matter be referred to the Director of Children and Families for consideration in consultation with the relevant Exec Board member.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Cohen.

COUNCILLOR COHEN: Delighted to second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: In that case we will have a vote, please. *(A vote was taken)* That is well and truly carried.

Thank you, Mrs Hingerton, for coming to the meeting. The Officers from the department that will deal with this will be in touch with you very shortly. Thank you very much, good afternoon. *(Applause)*

#### DEPUTATION 2 – STOP THE PARK AND RIDE IN STOURTON (SPARS)

THE LORD MAYOR: Good afternoon and welcome to Council today. If you would like to make your speech now, you must not speak for more than five minutes and would you please introduce the gentleman with you.

MS M SPENCER: Thank you very much for allowing us to speak. Thank you to the Lord Mayor and elected members. I am Mary Spencer and I am Chair of SPARS, which is Stop the Park and Ride in Stourton. On my right is Rob Chesterfield, who is part of our committee, and Martin Fitzsimmons, who is also part of our committee. Thank you very much.

What do you think of when you hear about Belle Isle and Hunslet? I will tell you what I have heard when I have sat on charity boards, accessed funding, travelled across the city and listened to local Councillors throughout Leeds. I have heard that it is an area of deprivation, poverty, paternalism. We don't get fancy shops, we don't get fancy restaurants, bars; we get charity shops, relocation of sex offenders, drug users and those with anti social behaviour.

That is not what I see. What I see are warm, funny, caring people who work hard and have consistently contributed to the wealth of this city but get little or nothing in return.

A recent YEP article, comments from the CEO of Leeds City Council said,

“We are half way through a £10bn investment pipeline that is doubling the size of the city centre by regenerating the South Bank through a revamped HS2 train station”

The stealth of our ward calling it South Bank and our green spaces is alarming and the worst part of this is the proposed Park and Ride in Stourton. Hunslet and Belle Isle have been a dumping ground for planning and ill-thought schemes. Leek Street Flats, new roads, compulsory purchases, community cleansing, thousands of dwellings.

THE LORD MAYOR: Mrs Spencer, just a moment. You are deviating.

MS M SPENCER: I am not, I am getting there.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can you get straight there?

MS M SPENCER: I am back on it. So why are we opposed? It is being built next to a cemetery with no regard to the families and friends of those buried there; it will

increase traffic on our roads, especially Belle Isle Road where there already has been many fatalities; no real alternatives investigated. I was told recently by one of the consultants employed by Leeds City Council that it was the only site that was possible within the timescale to use Government allocated money because it had previously had planning permission, it was owned by Leeds City Council and it could be up and running in 2019.

70-plus buses on Low Road and Hunslet Road, most of which will be empty and cannot be used by local residents because the bus stops are not in appropriate places; bus lanes will replace a traffic lane, increasing congestion, noise pollution and fumes for local residents; local taxes funding cheaper bus fares for non-Leeds residents; creating eye-sores, creating light pollution.

We already in our area have the highest morbidity rate for respiratory problems and this will just add to it.

We already have two Park and Rides in South Leeds – we do not need another. All Leeds residents know that congestion issues are in the west and north of Leeds. The site is not suitable, and we will show that at a later date with our Environmental lawyer, because of surface coal mining, drainage, subsidence and sink holes opening in the locality.

It is short-sighted to have a policy that destroys local green fields that are not linked to other travel hubs, for example a railway, when this site will be obsolete in ten to twelve years with electric cars. This flora and fauna will be permanently destroyed and an area of concrete desolation left in its wake.

Removing horses from the site that have been there for over 40 years; a continued investment of public money into a private bus company.

Why are we angry? We are angry as a community because there has been no meaningful public consultation and despite the use of 6,846 hours of officers' time – and we have got that through Freedom of Information – you might find it hard to believe that not one of those hours was used at the beginning of the consultation to send letters out to local residents to tell them what was happening and where this Park and Ride was exactly going to be.

There is a drop-in session tomorrow to discuss issues before it goes to Planning and the residents in that area, 2,500, got letters – got letters yesterday.

THE LORD MAYOR: Mrs Spencer, can you now draw this to a close, please.

MS M SPENCER: They got letters yesterday giving very little time for them to attend because obviously people have lives, it is summer time and it means again that there will be a lack of consultation.

What do we want? We have a plan.

THE LORD MAYOR: Mrs Spencer, I am afraid I am going to have to ask you to stop there. If you had not deviated you might have finished.

MS M SPENCER: OK.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dowson.

COUNCILLOR DOWSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would like to move that the matter be referred to the Director of City Development for consideration in consultation with the relevant Exec Board member.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Cohen.

COUNCILLOR COHEN: Seconded, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. In that case could we have a vote, please? *(A vote was taken)* That is CARRIED, one abstention.

Mrs Spencer, thank you for coming today. Officers from the relevant department will be in contact with you as soon as is possible. Thank you very much. *(Applause)*

### DEPUTATION 3 – WETHERBY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP

THE LORD MAYOR: Good afternoon and welcome to Council. You are now able to make your speech. You must not speak for longer than five minutes and would you please introduce both of you before you start.

MR R PRUDHOE: Good afternoon, Lord Mayor and Council. I am Richard Prudhoe and I am accompanied by a fellow Walton resident, Brodie Clark. We represent eight parish Councils from the Wetherby area trying to resolve poor or no provision of public transport as identified in our neighbourhood plans.

There are a large number of referrals from our area to hospitals in Harrogate and York. The only direct public transport link to York is from Wetherby, which does not run during evenings or on Sundays. Patients and their visitors from outside Wetherby need to change buses at Wetherby or Tadcaster, with poor links and long waits. Our area has a high percentage of older citizens and poor public transport links (especially to York) make access to hospitals difficult for both patients and visitors. Older people need regular public transport to easily get to doctors and hospitals.

The lack of appropriate bus services also has an adverse effect on health and wellbeing. By restricting access to social activities and increasing isolation, a further burden is placed on social care and health services.

I present to you one of a number of case studies gathered by our representatives. Edith is a 72 year old lady and has had two knee replacements, one excellent, one not so good, and has had a heart attack and a stent fitted and who suffers from breathing problems. She does not drive and the walk to the bus stop can take up to twenty minutes. She cannot rush or it exacerbates the breathing problem.

She had an appointment at York hospital for 4.00pm. To get to York requires at least two buses, possibly three depending what is available. The timescale, bearing in mind her condition, is about three hours. She is advised to allow up to two hours for her appointment. The last bus to Wetherby leaves York at 5.20pm. She therefore cannot return by this route. She must therefore return by a different route via Leeds, using TransPennine. Assuming she is able to make the connections, this will again take about three hours and she may get home by 8.20pm in the evening. This means she has to spend six hours travelling and two hours for an appointment, a whole day, and she is totally exhausted for the next few days.

A direct link to York would have avoided this unsatisfactory situation. Residents in Walton want a link to York and Tadcaster.

Limited public transport links to York also impact on access to employment. A large proportion of residents commute to York and Leeds and we have also an industrial estate at Thorp Arch, which includes the British Library (a major employer). Lack of good public transport for employees, students and potential employers can be a barrier to getting to work, education and business growth and development.

School children are also affected and parents need to take them to school and take time off work to do so. Lack of public transport also affects their opportunities to participate in social activities after school.

There is no public transport to the Aire Valley and East Leeds Employment Zones, although our area is well placed for them.

Significant housing development in our area and the lack of any acknowledgement of this in transport policies is an opportunity missed with a real danger of significant increases in air pollution. This is already 34 micrograms per cubic metre in Wetherby due to the increased car usage caused by the lack of public transport.

Additionally the Connecting Leeds booklet, Transforming Our Bus Network, states: "We are passionate about getting our transport system right for everyone who lives in, works in or visits Leeds". Unfortunately significant parts of Leeds have not been accommodated in this proposal and it seems focused on improvements to existing services only.

We urge Councillors to make a fairer distribution of the funding available to provide transport to areas which have inadequate or no public transport and to encourage WYCA to maximise the opportunities afforded by the Bus Services Act (2016) to deliver useable bus services to the outer north east area.

The advantages are clear: reduced use of private transport; increased use of public transport; improved health and wellbeing; and access to employment for more vulnerable citizens will result in reduced pollution for all.

The eight Parishes that we represent - Bickerton, Bramham, Boston Spa, Clifford, Collingham, Thorp Arch, Walton and Wetherby. Inevitably they all have slightly different objectives from the public transport but the one common theme is that

if these Parishes could be connected via a regular public transport to Tadcaster, it would open up the Coastliner service connecting them to Leeds, York and beyond. We would welcome assistance in achieving this small but significant step for our fellow residents. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dowson.

COUNCILLOR DOWSON: I would like to move that the matter be referred to the Director of City Development for consideration in consultation with the relevant Exec Board member.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Cohen.

COUNCILLOR COHEN: Second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we have a vote please? *(A vote was taken)* In that case that is CARRIED.

Thank you very much for coming today. You nearly beat the clock but not quite! Officers from the department that will deal with this will be in touch with you very shortly.

MR R PRUDHOE: Thank you very much for listening. *(Applause)*

#### DEPUTATION 4 – SUPPORTERS OF GARFORTH CEMETERY

THE LORD MAYOR: Good afternoon.

MS S TOULSON: Good afternoon, Lord Mayor, and members of Council.

THE LORD MAYOR: Hang on a minute, I have a little bit first! Welcome to Council. You are allowed to speak for five minutes, no more or we shut you off. Would you please begin by introducing the pair of you.

MS S TOULSON: Thank you. Good afternoon, Lord Mayor and members of Council. We are supporters of Garforth Cemetery. My name is Sarah Toulson and this is Clare Gray, and we are here to speak on behalf of other bereaved parents and families who have loved ones in Garforth Cemetery.

We are here this afternoon to ask Council to reconsider the Executive Board decision to remove mementos and items of importance for bereaved families when remembering their loved ones.

We do understand and accept the rationale of why this policy was adopted by the Council. We see many examples across the city where graves have become untended, they are overgrown and unkempt or where a series of completely inappropriate objects and structures have been placed on graves. Clearly, for the benefit of everyone, not least those visiting loved ones, this needed to be addressed.

However, the implementation of the policy has been quite different. The Executing Board accepted the recommendations of the Scrutiny Board that existing examples should be left *in situ*. This has created a situation where the worst examples that we would all like to see tackled and dealt with will remain but often very modest and subtle additions to graves in lawned areas such as ours will be removed. Surely that was not the aim of the policy.

It appears to us that the policy has now become more about an easy maintenance schedule for the Council rather than addressing the real problem and this to the detriment to all of us, not least recently grieving families. My daughter Amy passed away last year very suddenly and unexpectedly. Despite having bereavement counselling and being on medication following being close to a breakdown, the unimaginable pain of losing a child is just too much to bear and I know it is a pain that will be with me for ever; in fact it gets worse as each day goes on.

Although back at work I know that I would be unable to get through each day without first going to visit Amy and seeing her grave looking lovely. The families I have met over the past year have similar stories to tell. The resting places of those we have lost have become so sacred and we need to be able to look after them, just as we cared for our loved ones before they died and so that they can always be part of our lives.

In addition, we would like the Council to review its entire policy around how the bereaved are dealt with when accepting a Council plot. Yes, it could be argued we knew we were signing up for a lawned area but we would argue that anybody at the height of bereavement and in such a state of shock would literally sign anything put before them, leading to the situation we have now.

Councillor Dobson has been most active in supporting us from a Garforth perspective but we believe that this is an issue for all Councillors citywide. We know that no one in the Council has set out to create a policy that will cause distress but we do believe that the Council was sold this policy on a false premise and it is now being used as a tool to progress nothing more than an easy maintenance schedule for Parks and Countryside.

I am aware that there is a huge focus on mental health for children and families at the moment within the Leeds Health and Wellbeing Strategy, which states that Leeds is the best city for health and wellbeing and that this starts with the care and compassion that we show each other. We do not want to appear disrespectful towards the lawn only policy but it feels as though what we are being asked to do to our graves will greatly affect our mental health and that does not fit in with the aims of the strategy.

Of course, losing a loved one is always devastating but I cannot describe the feeling of watching your child being lowered into the ground to a place that will become their bedroom for ever. I am sure many of you here like to decorate your children's bedrooms or simply just tidy them up to make them look nice, and that is all that we want to be able to do.

The families have some ideas of how we could reword the policy to make it mutually beneficial and we would be more than happy to meet to discuss these ideas,

and we hope that you will agree to refer the matter back to the Executive Board for urgent reconsideration. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Mrs Toulson. Councillor Dowson.

COUNCILLOR DOWSON: I would like to move, Lord Mayor, that the matter be referred to the Director of Communities and Environment for consideration, in consultation with the relevant Exec Board member.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Cohen.

COUNCILLOR COHEN: Second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: May we have a vote, please? *(A vote was taken)* In that case that is CARRIED. Thank you, Mrs Toulson, thank you for coming today to this meeting. Officers from the department will be in touch with you as soon as is possible. Thank you for coming.

MRS S TOULSON: Thank you so much, thank you. *(Applause)*

#### ITEM 5 – RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD – SUBMISSION OF THE LEEDS CORE STRATEGY SELECTIVE REVIEW

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lewis.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I was not expecting to be up so soon.

THE LORD MAYOR: We have a tight schedule.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: I am desperately looking forward to having a Council meeting where we do not have a debate on Planning. I cannot remember the last one where I was able to stay sat down and not talk about the Core Strategy, Core Strategy Selective Review, SAP, whatever. That is not because I do not welcome a debate, it is just that we always have the same debate about it and we will hear the same comments today as we have heard many meetings before.

All I really want to do is to remind people of the process we have gone through. I have particularly looked at Barry's amendment, or whatever you call it, where he mentions a fixation with 70,000 as a housing target. Let us just remember where we started from. I had the rare privilege of actually having Planning within my portfolio back at the beginning of that whole process and I remember the huge amount of work that we put into arriving at a figure which was based on solid information insofar as you can ever have solid information predicting housing numbers and demand over a long period of time.

This was not about politicians pushing a number in a certain direction. It was about the officers coming and saying, "Here is what the evidence is telling us." I was very glad, I have to say, when Councillor Peter Gruen, who has more masochistic



tendencies than I, took over that part of my portfolio and took it through the Council process.

This was never about a politically driven figure. It was what was the figure we had to show that we could get through a Public Inquiry that had sound evidence behind it. If I can remind you of that Public Inquiry, we had the developers all arguing for 90,000, we had the mid figure which was the Council's figure of 70,000, we had people arguing for 50,000 at the time. We did not have anybody arguing for 40,000 as I recall, at a time when the economy was certainly not in - or Leeds economy was certainly not in - the booming state it is now.

What else did we do? The Tories were busy always saying that the figure was inflated. We made a promise that we would review it. We reviewed it well within the three years that we said we would and what did we do? We again went through a huge process of amassing evidence, getting the consultants in, doing all the work to come to a figure that we thought was the right figure for the city.

We have taken that process further. Is any of this stuff that you can do overnight? Is any of this stuff that you can do on the back of a fag packet? Clearly no. As an administration and as a Council we have been very clear that we go with the evidence and we have to get that evidence through a Public Inquiry because if we have got it through one Public Inquiry, we have to get it through again. Again, there is always a Tory counter-factual view that if we had gone to Public Inquiry the first time with a figure of 50,000, that would have been accepted. I do not think there is any evidence whatsoever to suggest that that is true.

The Tories keep on coming back to the issue of Planning. Why is this? I do not think there is anything else that you really feel that you can talk about. There is nothing out there that you seem to be able to latch on to as a big issue. Planning is the one where you can absolutely cause confusion and mayhem out there because people do not have a huge grasp of the issue. I will come back to the whole issue of Parlington at the end of this to remind people of quite how dishonest the Tories have been on this.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Lewis.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: We are dealing with the NPPF, the Tory legislation. We are doing the best that we can. I am pleased to move this, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dowson.

COUNCILLOR DOWSON: Second and reserve the right to speak, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Barry Anderson.

COUNCILLOR B ANDERSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Can I first of all just start off with a quick apology. There has been a typographical error in the information that I submitted to you. Stourton Grange is not in Kippax and Methley, it is actually in Garforth and I apologise for that mistake that was made.

That said, yes, we need housing, there is no doubt about that and yes, we think a figure of round about 42,000 is right now. Not then, I accept that, but right now, it is correct now. What you are bringing forward now is too late. Three years ago you promised that you would do something about it and you have done nothing. You have dragged your feet and as a result of that you personally, the lot of you, have lost appeal after appeal after appeal because if you actually go along to them you will see how our officers are destroyed every time on the five year land supply. You give the planning applications through in the Plans Panels but then when you divide that into the target you have got, it is impossible for you to achieve it. You have made it so difficult for you, you would not realise you made a mistake. It takes a very powerful person to stand up and say "I am wrong, I am sorry, I will do something about it."

Some of you actually agree with what I am saying because during the recent local elections some of you disavowed what you had been doing in this Council Chamber, in debates in a number of places throughout this city. You were saying "Not me guv, I did not vote for this. I voted for something else." You are totally wrong.

The timing. You have gone backside foremost. Some of us are going through the SAP process just now and it is painful because the one glaring error is the 70,000 target is just standing over the top of everything anybody is talking about. You cannot get a point across because at the end of the day the 70,000 figure is there and it is destroying any chance we have of getting achievable and sustainable development in this city. You have got it totally, utterly wrong.

Your housing requirements are wrong. Your Housing Market Character Assessment Areas are wrong. You will not accept that that needs to be changed. Affordable housing, yes, to start on some of the more positive things, yes, you have addressed the affordable problem that we have got in the city going up to 7% I think is a start in the right direction and it is also good that we can start taking off site moneys as well so that we can get the money invested in affordable housing where we need it.

I would also recommend the space measures that you were introducing as well. I think that is vitally important that we get that in place.

The green space, the work that you are doing in getting green space, we have not been very successful in securing green space so what more are we going to do. I think this is going to be good in terms of what we are doing.

This whole thing is just one muddle and shambles, one after another. We have lost far too many appeals and between now and whenever the SAP is actually finally signed off we will be losing appeals as well because it does not matter whether you take the developers' 2.3 years or the Council's 4.4 years, we have not got a five year land supply, so our communities are going to be losing all the time and the developers know it. They are bringing forward sites now that not even the Council thought about bringing forward. They are being very clever in what they are doing.

What we needed was, we need to get this through as quickly as we can. We need to get it done quickly and I would impress upon you to get the Government and to get the Inspectorate to get something done. We need this in place now, then we need the SAP review that is unfortunately going to have to go as well so Richard will get his wish

and at another Council meeting we will have another debate because we have got ourselves into this spiral.

Get yourself out of it, get it out quick, let us get going and let us work together. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Andrew Carter.

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: I second, my Lord Mayor, and I reserve the right to speak, which I shall be taking up.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Leadley.

COUNCILLOR LEADLEY: My Lord Mayor, we have been waiting for this in Morley since 2008 when the Regional Spatial Strategy imposed excessive housing targets on Leeds. The City Council lost control of its housing land supply within a year when it began to lose green field housing appeals. It has never regained control since despite the occasional victory such as Kirklees, Knowle where local politicians and residents had to work very hard to get the Government to face up to a statistical reality. Stuart Andrew MP had a majority of 331 in 2017.

Core Strategy Selective Review does have some smaller components such as charging points for electric vehicles, small increases in affordable housing targets in the city centre and surrounding inner areas, minimum floor space standards for new dwellings unless you are a student and energy and water efficiency, but there can be no doubt that the centrepieces are a reduction in the 16 year housing target from 70,000 net of demolitions to 51,952, a fall of about 30%.

This was not ideal. I made clear that our view was that 46,000 would have been the best net target but 51,952 was as good as we were going to get and less than the 55,000 which had seemed likely a few weeks earlier so, as must now be fairly well known, I proposed the 51,952 offered by officers at Development Plans Panel last December and was seconded by Councillor Jim McKenna.

If we had reasonable housing targets we would stand a better chance of building the houses and flats which our people need by getting away from the land banking and wheeling and dealing in land which have been so characteristic in Leeds in recent years.

We in Morley do not support the simplistic adoption of the Government's 16 year base target for Leeds of 42,384. This would be too tight for such a large and diverse Planning Authority as it would give no slack or leeway and no room for micro-variations in need and demand between the eleven Housing Market Characteristic Areas.

We do not know whether the SAP Inspectors now in session will accept the Broad Location Strategy devised by officers to deal with the uncomfortable fact that SAP will have to be decided on the old high numbers before the lower Core Strategy numbers are in place. It is hoped that some of the hectareage needed to satisfy the old targets can be shunted temporarily by SAP on to Broad Location in green belt and then shunted back by the Core Strategy Review, which will confirm the land is green belt after adopting the new targets.

Whether this will be accepted by the SAP Inspectors or whether they will reject it as a smoke and mirrors trick remains to be seen. Leeds's change of mind was done suddenly at the eleventh hour and the amendments to the SAP had to be done in an extremely hurried way.

A 16 year housing target of 51,952 is within striking distance of our 46,000. Reducing by fewer than 6,000 at the Core Strategy Inquiry, which could be reasonably described as an adjustment, would give the idea figure. We will be abstaining today but only for that reason. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dobson.

COUNCILLOR M DOBSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. For those of us who attended this morning's Site Allocation and Infrastructure session, I expected at any moment the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse to come charging in to Room 6 and 7, such is the muddle that we have managed to get ourselves into. Clearly this city needs a Site Allocation Process and a robust Core Strategy, but what could be more telling, Lord Mayor, than we find ourselves in a situation where we are debating a review to the Core Strategy in Council this afternoon and in a Site Allocation Process in Room 6 and 7 today when we are trying to find our way through to reach agreement or not on whether the Council's Site Allocation Process with 70,000 should be adopted.

I have to say this morning was scary – very, very scary indeed, because whether we were talking about roads, whether we were talking about school provision or whether we were talking about broader transport needs, there was clearly no strategic plan or plan on the ground to back up the numbers. *Mea culpa* – when I was on that side of the Chamber I voted through on those numbers because I realised we needed a Site Allocation Process – still do. I have to say I got it horrendously wrong because we boxed ourselves into the worst of all possible corners now.

Are there some ways out? Let's hope so. Let us think constructively. If the Site Allocation Process that is currently being reviewed is passed, and green field land in Broad Locations is sacrificed, will we have the opportunity to then rein back from that position? That really does concern me because obviously in the ward that we represent we are in the eye of that particular storm, so the worst scenarios are we end up with a poor SAP that is adopted that means that vulnerable land is put at risk for absolutely no good reason. Based on this morning's sessions I am not even sure that the Site Allocation Process as presented is going to find favour with the Inspector, which leads us to the apocalypse scenario – we have no SAP, it is rejected and then we are as vulnerable as ever, especially on the PAS land that is of such concern to us all.

Will the revised Core Strategy Review lead to a review of a review of a SAP? Who knows but all I do know is this, these delays are playing into developers' hands, badly. We are now in the eye of a very, very dangerous storm. All I would say that, pardon the pun, it is not just a developer's field day, it is a developer's green field day and that should be a major concern for all of us. We have found ourselves in a horrendous fix. Let us try and work collectively to dig our way out. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Field.

COUNCILLOR FIELD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. We are asking what do we need from a Revised Core Strategy. On 1<sup>st</sup> April 2017, 20774 units had planning permission. Of these, 14,675 had detailed planning permissions. Considering that the 2021 units are under construction, this left 12,654 units with detailed planning permission that had not yet started, so surely this begs the question why must we sacrifice the green belt when builders land bank, and this seems to be a question which is consistently ignored by this administration. We now find ourselves with a Site Allocation Plan including the Broad Locations before we have a Revised Core Strategy.

We want to be very clear, the Housing market Characteristic Areas are not fit for purpose and we consider them to be completely discredited. The houses being built at Stourton fall in the Garforth and Swillington Ward, but not the Outer South East HMCA. Then we have Peckfield in Outer South East in our ward but in Aberford Parish Council, now, of course, unfathomably split between Broad Location and Early Delivery. The so-called community engagement has been dumped in favour of cobbling together a completely unsustainable bolt-on both environmentally and economically. If that was not enough, we then have Parlington on the edge of our ward but in the Outer North East HMCA.

Garforth's already creaking infrastructure will simply not cope and we now need to look at what is passed and acceptable and have the numbers added to our figures rather than stick to the HMCAs which have absolutely no credibility.

A Revised Core Strategy that will lead to yet another SAP review must finally tackle these issues and crucially the HMCA anomalies, as we have been consistently calling for. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor McCormack. May I remind members, this is a maiden speech and deserves the usual courtesies.

COUNCILLOR McCORMACK: Thank you, Lord Mayor. First of all I would like to start by saying it is a pleasure and a privilege to be standing here today representing the people of Garforth and Swillington.

The Core Strategy and Site Allocation Plan is probably the biggest, most important issue that has faced our ward and our neighbours in recent times. That is why I am encouraged by what I see in the Core Strategy Selective Review so far and that the administration seems to have come to its senses in realising that its original housing requirement figures were woefully over inflated, yet they still seem intent on saddling us with a higher number than we need.

If the news of national household projections released by Communities and Local Government show a demographic starting point for Leeds of 2,600 homes require per annum, why is the administration insistent on working to a figure which amounts to almost 13,000 more than that? How can we have confidence in the figure of almost 52,000 the administration has now conjured up?

Such a high figure does not offer the protection to the green belt that we require and the delay in the process has exposed our ward to unsustainable development which is not environmentally sound.

To give credit where it is due, I must say that at yesterday's SAP Inquiry Mr Elliott, speaking on behalf of the Council, equipped himself fairly well in fending off the developers' bulldogs who are still straining at the leash to get their paws on our lucrative green belt land but the only way we can prevent this is by agreeing a sensible housing requirement figure, deliverable through the provision of brown field and previously developed land. It would be criminal to concrete over Parlinton and insane to allow an unsustainable bolt-on to Garforth and Stourton Grange.

If the administration is serious and genuine about planning for the right homes in the right places, then they must prove to us that these are not just empty words.  
*(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor David Blackburn.

COUNCILLOR D BLACKBURN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. It seems to me that all along we have been doing this the wrong way round. For the last two days a lot of us have been in the Banqueting Suite, spending quite a bit of time in there, dealing with a figure of 70,000 or so, and even when the Inspector was questioned, what is going on here today has no bearing at all on that and, I have got to say, puts us in a funny position where some of us are concerned about the Broad Locations situation, but we were not going to say anything because we are not going to help the developers, because we do not want it building on like, I think, Members in the administration don't.

We have taken too long. All the Opposition Parties, for a very long time, have been saying the figure was too high and have been pushing for this and it took the Government to come out with figures to change your mind. I remember I got a phone call from Tim Hill, "I want to see you in the morning, we are over in Manchester, things have changed now" and a great panic within this. We could have done this a long, long while ago and we could have got past this stage before we went and had the SAP Review.

The thing is, it seems to me that we will have the SAP Review, this will go to the Inspector, then we will be stuck in there for another two or three weeks later on this year and then next year we will have a SAP Review. The thing is, what are we going to do in the meantime? This should be the figure already.

I have got to say, I would like to vote against this because I still think the figure is too high but what do you do? We have got to move it forward, we have got to go forward some way or the other and you put us in an impossible position. Why oh why did you take so long, because it was obvious to everybody a long time ago that the figures were wrong. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Campbell.

COUNCILLOR CAMPBELL: Thank you, Lord Mayor. It is often said that the victor re-writes history. Unfortunately I think in Richard's case it is not actually the

victor who is trying to re-write history, it is the loser who is trying to re-write history and probably, I think, for the benefit of many of the newer Members on the Labour Benches.

I think it is fair to say that they have had as much trouble as the rest of us have in trying to explain what the Council's policy was in relation to what is quite frankly massive house building.

I take issue with the point about a politically driven figure. Well, no, I don't take issue with you actually, because the politically driven figure came from your side. That 70,000 figure was a figure that the Labour Party brought forward when we were discussing it at the original discussions. We were not told at the time that that was one of a group of figures. We were not told at the time that our experts that we paid a considerable amount of money towards had actually given us a range of figures, a considerable number of which were lower than that, much nearer to where we are talking about being today. No, a political decision was taken that 70,000 was the figure.

Then the comment about a promised review. You only promised the review because you were dragged screaming and kicking into it by everybody on this side and you probably did get very, very tired of us standing up at Council meetings and saying "You have got this wrong." Quite frankly, you have got this wrong and the mess we are in at the moment, be it with the current Core Strategy or even with the review, is of your making. Only you can accept responsibility for this so we are in a situation where housing pressure is considerable, you have made us a hostage to housing developers and their build-out rates and you have created a situation we are where we are, consistently losing appeals to housing developers to build on sites across the city. No site on the Core Strategy or the review is safe. None of the Broad Locations are safe. In fact, Broad Locations does not really mean much other than we have saved it. Several of you claim to have saved sites. Yes, you have saved sites – you have saved them for later use. They will be built on because of decisions that made.

We are in a difficult position. As David says, we should have been doing this a long, long time ago. In fact, you should have accepted what the Opposition were saying on the Development Plans Panel at the very beginning, which was the figures are too high. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

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

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. The figures were too high because unfortunately housing policy was mixed up with the Council's desire for income generation. It is a perfectly understandable sentiment. If you are getting your money tap switched off from Central Government, you are encouraged therefore to find other income streams that can bring the money in and the 70,000 housing figure promised not just extra Council Tax, especially if they are all built on the outer edges of the city where they turn into five and four bedroom houses, which does not really help those people trying to get on to the housing ladder, but they do bring in a nice Council Tax figure with them.

Of course, the Government is not faultless in this because they were encouraging Councils to build new houses and as many as possible so that they could get a New Homes Bonus.

Lord Mayor, the revision from the 70,000 to the 52,000 as the preferred housing target now from the Council is one which is rational because it is going downwards. However, there is no recognition from the leadership opposite which originally set the 70,000 target, that actually they have done something wrong. Actually the Broad Locations – which is something that we have made up, remember – the Broad Locations terminology is a little bit like a physical embodiment of that because they think that they can go out to the communities in Leeds and say to them, “Your land is safe now, it is back in green belt”, whereas actually – and I know Members have been doing it because Councillor Bruce has been doing it in Rothwell, telling people “Don’t worry, it’s all back in green belt” but they forget that it says “Broad Location for Development”. It does not mean it is back in the green belt for ever, it means that you have just got it for a little while longer and then the bulldozers are going to turn up.

Unfortunately, because of the way that this has been mishandled, the bulldozers are turning up a lot sooner than we anticipated and actually they are turning up on land that this Council never even anticipated being built on, like the PAS sites in Carlton. I have to say, from a strategy that was supposed to be about income generation it is certainly costing us a lot potentially in legal fees in the court with the developers.  
*(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lamb, please.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Councillor Lewis in his opening accused us of causing confusion but, of course, we find ourselves in the farcical situation this week where here we are arguing about reducing the housing targets to 50-some thousand, and we spent three days in another part of the building arguing about where to allocate land for 70,000. Is it any wonder people are confused and to say that is our fault, well, what a cheek. What a cheek. You are the people who have delayed and delayed and delayed bringing forward this promised review. Excuse my language, Lord Mayor, it is completely arse about face. We should be setting the number and then allocating the sites. That is the way it should be done and most commonsense people would think that is the way to do it, but not Councillor Lewis.

Why does this matter, because I have heard some of the new Members in some of the seminars say, actually the number is not high enough, 70,000 is not enough, there should be more houses. I am sure many of you have heard that in meetings. The problem is, we all want to see more houses built...

COUNCILLOR R GRAHAME: What about Scholes then?

COUNCILLOR LAMB: ...we want the right type of housing, we want houses that people can afford to live in, that people can afford to buy, that they can afford to rent. In Wetherby, for instance, we have already delivered 42% of our housing target for this plan period but they are not the right type of houses in an area that already has an average house price of £485,000, we are getting more million pound-plus homes on green fields. That is not helping people in your wards, it is not helping people in



Farnley and Wortley, it is not helping people in Armley or Bramley because when you have a number that is too high and what you do not seem to understand and what Councillor Lewis bizarrely either does not seem to understand or does not want to acknowledge is, when your target is too high that puts the decision about what type of housing is built and where it is built in the hands of developers and there is no control of where it goes in this Council. There is no accountability for it, that is the consequence. You get the wrong houses in the wrong places and nobody in any of the communities that any of us represent benefits from that. That is why you have to listen, you have to acknowledge that you have got it wrong and it is time to get this down to a sensible target as quickly as possible. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Cohen.

COUNCILLOR COHEN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Let us be really clear on this. Our Group welcomes the reduction of the Housing Requirement from 70,000 to 52,000 but we are absolutely unequivocal that we do not think it is far enough.

The recent Government consultation, Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Places, gave a figure of 42,000. In fact, that is also backed up by latest data and indeed population estimates. It is a more sensible figure.

Councillor Lewis said at the beginning, “It is not that I don’t welcome debate; it is just that we keep having the same debate.” Well, we do keep having the same debate because you simply will not listen. I wonder sometimes whether it is will not or just cannot understand what a monumental error you are making.

Those of us that have had the mis-pleasure of having to sit in the SAP hearing across the way have seen the absolute nightmare of a procedural mess that has been created by your administration by having to have this plan before a new housing requirement is agreed. Utter, utter chaos. I really would urge Members across the way to go and sit in it and see the mess that officers are in. It is truly, truly embarrassing at times.

If we do things the right way round we would not have to allocate sites where ward Members have serious concerns about the sites we are allocating. We would not have Members having to say things like:

“The capacity quoted here would swamp the local highways network with traffic; that this site is linked only by country lanes already struggling with the recently built new housing in the area and is already going to be considerably increased; that these sites would effectively infill the little green space that is left that distinguishes these two historical locations; that these green fields should be retained to protect their distinct identity; that this woodland is home to wildlife and a precious community resource for recreation for generations; that these sites are not sustainable because there are not enough school places.”

Who might have said such a thing? Councillor Lisa Mulherin in your submission to the Site Consultation in February 2018. An Executive Member, colleagues – an Executive Member who voted for the position that we are now in.

Indeed, if you read Councillor J Lewis’s submission to the SAP you would see another Executive Member’s concerns about site allocations and infrastructure.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: Read mine out. It is very good, Dan.

COUNCILLOR COHEN: I am going to run out of time, it was fab.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: Very well written, Andrew, thank you.

COUNCILLOR COHEN: Council, I would like to quote Richard Lewis. He said, of Labour and this administration, “We are in this bubble where we do not know what is going on in the outside world.” He is quite right, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Wadsworth.

COUNCILLOR WADSWORTH: Thank you, Lord Mayor. If you were a member of the public reading the YEP or watching on social media you would think 52,000, that is something that I should welcome because that is a big reduction from 70,000. Then you would read the YEP about the SAP hearings that are going on across the way and think why are they talking about 70,000 because we are going to get 52,000. We are not necessarily going to get 52 and we are not necessarily sure that 52 is right because the administration over there are not sure themselves. They originally persuaded that 70 was right, now they are trying to persuade that 52 is right but the Government seem to think that 42 is right. A member of the public is just totally confused about numbers.

To add insult to injury we have now got Housing Characteristic Areas of which we are talking about Broad Locations, green belt all that sort of thing which we are stuck with and we reduce the numbers and get even more tied in with those Housing Characteristic Areas because you do not necessarily end up developing the brown field that you want to develop for affordable housing; you end up still developing a lot of green belt sites.

The public just cannot understand it. They cannot understand why we are still discussing 70,000 when we actually think 52 is right, or 42 is right and we are making a mockery of it. We just cannot get it right. Then we are going to re-consult in the next less than a year. Are we actually going to get all of that consultation through, proper consultation, and are we going to listen to what people say in the time scale? I doubt it.

So, Richard, you just have lost it altogether, haven’t you? You just do not really know where you are with this and your own Members are telling you that the figures are wrong, sites are wrong, everything is wrong so you do not really know. I will not use the phrase that Councillor Lamb used because I am far too polite, but he is definitely right. There is another thing that comes into play is the ballot box and, Richard, the public gave you a warning in May in the ballot box. Maybe they will carry out this time, you never know in May 2019. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Collins.

COUNCILLOR COLLINS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. The Core Strategy is an essential document for our city but it needs to be correct and not riddled with loopholes – loopholes that developers can use or, indeed, our own officers. I am not convinced that the new proposals do enough. Our Planning Officers can still too easily put housing on strategic green infrastructure, if they wish to do so.

I cannot claim to have read the Core Strategy from cover to cover but I have on several occasions had to read through chunks of it in order to answer a question or help solve a problem. I have even drilled down into the appendix layers of documents and policies that were saved from the UDP.

The Core Strategy is mostly a well drafted document and I agree with much of what it says and the proposals it lays out. I do not agree, however, with the old target numbers, nor the new target numbers set out for our city. The numbers set are far too high and there is no clear evidence as to where these numbers have come from.

I also have concerns regarding the plans to change three of our policies relating to green spaces and infrastructure. Some of the new text proposed includes, “Use the development process through the local plan to strategically deliver the best type and the best quality of green space where it is most needed in Leeds.” Surely that last part of the sentence should read “everywhere in Leeds.”

I appreciate that there is an inspection process relating to these changes but to date you have not listened to anything anyone opposing your ideas has said. Why should we believe that you have included any of the feedback that you have received recently into these changes? On behalf of many hundreds of residents, our Party asked three years ago for a review of the numbers. It is bordering on criminal that it has taken you so long to get to where we are now. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Stephenson, please.

COUNCILLOR STEPHENSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. It was quite interesting earlier on to hear Councillor Dobson refer to the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse because I cannot help but notice that the sun is indeed shining on the righteous today on the Front Bench of the Conservative Group and we can put aside our usual humility because today is a day to feel righteous, because today is the day you finally admitted that this side of the Council Chamber were correct that we needed a downward revision of the housing target numbers.

They do not go far enough and we will keep talking about this, Councillor Lewis. You say you are fed up of repeating the same arguments over again. Well, you have managed to prove the definition of insanity indeed is doing the same thing time and time again and expecting a different result.

We have been arguing this now for years and you have come up with a figure of 55. We think it should be 42 moving forward. The Government has done its bit, it believes it should be lower as well.

I just want to comment on what that figure would look like in practice so everybody watching this today can understand. In respect of the Harewood ward, the figure proposed by the Council will get rid of a part of an allocation of Grade II listed green belt. The figure proposed by the Conservative Group would delete that allocation altogether, make it unnecessary.

In a recent written question to the House of Commons our Member of Parliament in Elmet and Rothwell asked the Minister if it is right that the Council should be pursuing a Core Strategy review separate to its Site Allocations and as I described and read out at the Site Allocations meeting examination yesterday, the Minister finds that the Council should produce a plan based on adequate, up to date and relevant evidence. Evidently you are not. As has been described by Councillor Lamb, we are having one hearing in this Council at the moment and today we are voting on something very different. My constituents will be more than aware of what that means in reality. Thank you, Councillor Grahame, for your interjection because now we can write our leaflets in Scholes and make our residents in Scholes know exactly what you think on the Labour Benches about development in Scholes and we will let them know that the Scholes sites are not safe under the hands of Labour.

I will not be as polite as Councillor Wadsworth because I mentioned a day of reckoning and there will be another day of reckoning, Councillor Lewis, because you talk about you do not understand why we keep talking about planning. We talk about it because it is the issue that our constituents are bothered about, and if you realised that you would not be sat on a majority of 75. I will put you on notice, because as you are coming for the green belt land in the Harewood ward, we are coming for you next year, Councillor Lewis. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Robinson.

COUNCILLOR ROBINSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Let them all calm down, the game has not started yet! Somebody once said to me many, many years ago, "Matthew, buy land because God ain't making any more of it." Well, it is interesting because I had no understanding of what they meant when they first said that and now, after sitting in the Site Allocation Process, I most sincerely do. I have had to sit there and listen to the QCs of the developers and I would love to be a pound in wealth behind those QCs as well because every time they hear an inquiry is coming in Leeds they must think that the bank has opened. The only person who is making any money out of it are them because we have allocated the wrong number here and that has come up year upon year upon year.

Councillor Lewis has said he does not want to hear any more about planning, that we should change the record. I would love to talk about education; I would love to talk about healthcare; I would love to talk about transport but if you allocate the wrong number...

COUNCILLOR: What about Brexit?

COUNCILLOR ROBINSON: I will happily talk about Brexit with you any time because your constituents voted the same way that I did.

What I would say is that if you are not getting planning right you are never going to get education right, you are never going to get healthcare right, you are never going to get transport right. (*interruption*) I thank them for their interjections and I am happy to have a debate on this at any time, but what I am trying to say to you is that you have now already revised down to 50,000. 42,000 is the logical position, it is the position that has been published by the Government, it is an evidence-based figure, it is published through a consultation.

What was very clear when 70,000 was first published was that it was not right for anybody. The communities did not want 70,000 because for them it was ridiculously too high. The developers did not want 70,000 because for them it was far too low. Actually there was no way that you could ever get an agreement on this and this idea of a King Solomon routine of finding 70,000 was a silly position to get yourselves in and it has produced this mess that we see in the Banqueting Suite and in Community Room 6 and 7 at the moment.

Now is the time to be big, be bold and say do you know what, we need to revise this down. We need to listen to the overwhelming representations that are coming in from across the city because I have read them from across the city and from Members opposite as well.

I know that if you listen to those voices actually we can deliver a plan that is sound, we can deliver a number of houses that is sound, we can deliver affordable houses and we can deliver for Leeds, but chasing over-inflated figures will put green and pleasant land at risk and we should remember that and if we ignore it, it will be to every Member's folly. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Seary, and again I remind Members, this is a maiden speech.

COUNCILLOR SEARY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. The issue of housing numbers and as a consequence the Site Allocation which, as we know, is currently ongoing in the Civic Hall. This has been rumbling for well over five years and whilst I am new to the Chamber, I have heard this on the doorstep for a number of years. Local people are rightly concerned about the sheer volume of housing that is proposed in the current administration. Indeed, SAP hearings, rather confusing for someone new in the Council, are currently deliberating over allocations of 70,000 houses in Leeds whilst debate is all about reducing that number to 52,000, a move we think we will welcome but is that enough, Lord Mayor?

On this side we will be going for a lower number of 42,000, as proposed in the Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Place Government consultation. This proved once and for all the Core Strategy 70,000 target was too high, a point that my colleagues have argued for years, unfortunately without success. This has left areas of Pudsey and communities in Pudsey facing development that they do not want and they would argue do not need. Sites such as HD2-73 on Tyersal Lane, all examples of where justifiable concerns about infrastructure supporting the housing that is proposed – dentists, doctors, leisure facilities and road infrastructure, all massive issues and our residents are rightly concerned about the plans brought forward by the administration.

Pudsey does need new housing but it needs to be in the right locations and we need to deliver the type of housing that is affordable housing – housing for the first timers to get them on to the market. We need new housing and it should be not on the green belt and it should be valued, we should value the green field sites. Building expensive executive homes, three, four, five bedrooms – not what our community needs. By setting that target too high the administration went wrong.

We welcome the reduction in the housing numbers set out in the Select Review but it could and should be lower, my Lord Mayor. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Taylor, please, and this is a maiden speech.

COUNCILLOR J TAYLOR: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would firstly like to thank Leeds officers and Members from all sides of this Chamber for welcoming me to this role, particular Members of my own Group whose support has been invaluable.

With the Site Allocation Plan hearings under way, I feel it necessary to provide comment in this Chamber from the perspective of my constituents in Horsforth and Rawdon. Moving green belt sites to Broad Location status in the latest review has not convinced me nor concerned residents that the administration is serious about protecting these sites and by allocating so many sites to the back of the queue, so to speak, makes the cynic inside believe that this is merely safe today, concrete tomorrow stuff from the administration.

Locally during the election Labour attempted to convince voters that the administration is not to blame for the threat to our green belt by pointing to national policy. However, nowhere in the NPPF does it state that these green belt sites should be built on, especially when Leeds has access to so many brown field sites still to use. Genuinely affordable housing will be built by converting old office buildings and abandoned mills, not by concreting over green belt in our towns. The four, five bedroom executive properties built on green belt sites will not make Horsforth and Rawdon more affordable, particularly for aspiring home owners like me, nor many others like me in my community.

In their report, February 2018, the Campaign to Protect Rural England identified nine years' worth of brown field sites available to Leeds that would stimulate the local market, provide much needed first and second time purchases and crucial space for social housing. These identified sites must be used first in compliance with national policy. This can be achieved by the administration admitting that they got their figures wrong, that Labour's 70,000 housing target was too much and that the new target of around 52,000 is equally as flawed as it does not take into account the houses already built during the recent period.

A lower, more achievable target suggested by the Conservative Group of around 42,000 would remove green belt and crucially green field sites from the plan, preserving the integrity of our towns and villages and prevent the irreversible change to our area that has got no support in our community. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Peter Gruen, please.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: Not a maiden speech, I think! Lord Mayor, I plead guilty to the charge that we have a fixation. We have a fixation that this will be best city it can be. We have a fixation that this will be a prosperous city. We have a fixation that this will be a welcoming, friendly, diverse, compassionate city. (*hear, hear*) We have an ambition that we will make those changes and we recognise that the bedrock of this is good planning; that we have planning which is ambitious for this city, good quality design, good quality architecture, good buildings, good connectivity and that is why week in, week out my colleagues and I and officers strive to get the best development in this city. What is wrong with that? Who disagrees with that?

From that bedrock on we will say to developers and you should recognise, when you get planning permission, go out and build. There are 18,000 units which have planning permission in this city and are not being built out. If you built those 18,000 we would have no problem at all with the five year land supply. No problems. Why have you not asked your Government to be much more lenient about the planning system and allow us to count into our five year land supply those figures, and why should developers be able to sit and land bank year after year after year those 18,000 units and mean that we then have to look for new sites?

I have not heard a single word from any of you about that and that is what is criminal in this system, the fact that the Government is hand in glove with the developers. When you tell us about we are losing appeals, for God's sake, use your memories. In 2009/2010 Tory Lib-Dem, Councillor Campbell you were there, your administration lost eleven appeals and paid £1m out in losing eleven appeals. (*Applause*) We did not, you did. Yes, we are also losing appeals and we wish we were not losing appeals.

Then you tell us we are dragging our feet. What caused the biggest delay in taking forward the Site Allocation Plan? Councillor John Procter. He brought forward Headley Hall as a development. He persuaded Development Plans Panel that Headley Hall was the single best development that the Harewood and Wetherby Councillors fully backed. He also told us that Thorp Arch should be an employment site and he persuaded us to go along with it. That is where the delay comes in.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Gruen.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: Do not cry crocodile tears to us. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Walshaw.

COUNCILLOR WALSHAW: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Is it an extra minute for those of us rocking the Southgate look or not! Lord Mayor, what a debate. Planning truly is the show that never ends but actually it should never be the show that ever ends because planning should be responsible and flexible. Government guidance, by the way, is to review all our plans every three years so we have heard some discussion about the Core Strategy Review – when was that started? We agreed, we said when the Core Strategy passed in 2014 there would be a review within three years. Well, it is two-and-a-half years so we are ahead of the game there.

I think in this Chamber this afternoon there has been a lot of shall we say somewhat wilful misinterpretation of the various statutory processes that planning needs and has to have within it. I think perhaps the best pictorial representation I can use for that for Members is, when I was a kid my granddad used to love to play that game where you put your hands on top of each other like that all the time – I used to find it endlessly funny when I was two or three. That is actually a good description of the planning system because you need at all times to keep your layers, as many layers of your planning amount intact as possible.

When Councillors say why are we having a Core Strategy Review when we are reviewing a SAP that has the previous housing number in, why? Because we have got to keep these layers intact all the time, that is how the system works. Looking at the system at this point in time and saying this is the wrong way round, Councillor Wadsworth, just won't cut it.

We have to be, as the administration, grounded in real evidence and real law and real policy. Wishes and horses evaporate like dust in the face of public inquiries and planning inspectors' iron hard gazes.

We have to be evidence led, we have to be factually led. I have heard some, just moving on to the Government Housing formula, touching faith in that this afternoon – some touching, touching faith. That formula in 2011-14 when the Core Strategy was devised on the evidence base available then would have bequeathed on us, inflicted on us, a housing target of over 90,000 units. I put it to colleagues that that is too broad brush a formula. In fact the Government admitted that it is too broad brush a formula and really it is not about us. It is not about Leeds and with the number of alpha personalities in this room I know this is going to be hard to take, but if you picture a line between the Humber and the Avon, it is about all those Local Authorities south of that line who are very reluctant to build new housing, yet that is where all the housing demand is, leading to a toxic combination of high rents and high house values and thus huge mortgage burdens on our families in those areas. That is what that formula is there to solve. It is not about us.

Therefore, I contend it is not suitable just to be applied willy nilly to us. We need to have a serious econometric analysis that looks at what is really happening in Leeds and that is what this administration has done.

Just very briefly, why do we do all of this? We need to make progress on the Core Strategy Selective Review, we really do. To vote against this would be indeed criminal on our communities and a gift for avaricious developers and indeed, let us look at that. I was in the SAP yesterday supporting the officer team, and picture it, Lord Mayor, down one side there as Councillors, the officers and elected Members and green belt campaigners. Down the other side was an assorted collection of barristers and the general glitterati of the development sector. To save our green field sites, to protect our communities, that is why we do this. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Andrew Carter.

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. If Councillor Gruen had been in the SAP inquiry yesterday afternoon he would have heard



me challenge the developers on the 17,000 units land banked by them in this city and this side has been challenging the developers on that for years and years and years and we will go on doing just that. It is a disgrace.

My Lord Mayor, I thought there was one thing on which some people opposite, the socialist people opposite, and I might have in common. We are both against blood sports. I was wrong. I have watched three days whilst Council's senior officers have been thrown to the sharks by that administration and particularly the men just referred to, the men and some women in suits who sit opposite us, the cast of *The Sopranos*, as we like to call them, into whose hands your administration have given the control of housing land supply for housing. Your administration, nobody else.

Councillor Gruen, it is a bit rich – I feel a bit sorry for Richard Lewis, actually because it is not actually Richard who started the problem. It is Richard who did not sort it out but it is you, and you well know you, who started it, because you mentioned my friend the MEP John Procter. I need to remind you that on adoption of the Core Strategy in November 2014, Councillor John Procter moved the following amendment to the Core Strategy:

“That Council commits to undertake an immediate review of overall housing numbers in light of population projections and Ministerial statements, to commence in tandem with the forthcoming consultation on Site Allocations, to be completed before specific Site Allocations take place.”

The amendment was lost 61 to 36. All the people here voted for that amendment; you voted against it. You gave assurances – *you* gave assurances – you would start a review. Three years later...

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: We did.

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: You did not. Three years later, and it is in the verbatim, Councillor Richard Lewis, three years too late, started the review. The fault is yours and only yours and the worst thing of all is that Members on your side have gone round telling the people of this city that sites in their wards have been saved from development when they have not. As the Inspector made quite clear on the first day of the SAP inquiry, the inquiry is on the provision of 70,000 houses, a figure now everybody apart from some of your most left-wing Members know is unsustainable, downright damaging and will result in more houses built in the wrong places, not the right places. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Richard Lewis, please.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I have been taking notes of all the comments and I have to say that there is very few that have said anything different, interesting, some have been desperately misleading. I did love the comment from one of the Councillors from North East Leeds about affordable housing. We all know, particularly the people who have ever sat on a Plans Panel for that area, John Procter went out of his way to stop any affordable housing being built in the Wetherby area – any plan. I remember Members of the Lib Dem Group when they were in cahoots

with the Tories actually, probably against their better nature, going along with such schemes.

I am quite surprised that Barry in his amendment mentions Parlington because let us be very straight about this, Parlington is only in there because a delegation of Members from Wetherby and Harewood came to see me and said they wanted a solution that was a one site solution in that part of the city. I would have been absolutely happy to have had pepper-potting across the villages in Outer North East but I think what they really mean is they do not want any development in Outer North East.

We have been talking about the people in suits. It is fascinating that the business sector who I talk to want us to have a 70,000 housing figure but we do not want anything in Outer North East. Why is that, I ask? Because they all live there, yes.  
*(interruption)*

Parlington is absolutely – you cannot deny blame for Parlington and Ryan, please do not interrupt, you are the key person who was dishonest over Parlington because I would not have minded if you lot had come back and said we have changed our minds but no, you did not, you elected to go for a campaign of attacking and mis-information through this Council Chamber – utterly unnecessarily when you could...

COUNCILLOR J McKENNA: Shameful.

COUNCILLOR STEPHENSON: Point of order, Lord Mayor.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Come on, when it would have been quite legitimate for you to try actually be honest and say we have changed our minds...

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lewis...

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: ...but you did not because you cannot do that and that is the problem with you over so many aspects of housing. You cannot be honest.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lewis.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: We have comments about evidence, I do not see any evidence.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lewis. I have been trying to draw your attention to the fact...

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Sorry, Lord Mayor, I got a bit carried away.

THE LORD MAYOR: We have a point of order raised.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Apologies, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Could you please explain what the point of order is.

COUNCILLOR STEPHENSON: It is a misrepresentation, Lord Mayor. Slight misrepresentation, Lord Mayor. I think the Executive Member just referred to something, a meeting that was had and something that had changed afterwards. I would just like to remind the Executive Member, I was elected in May 2016 and you might want to make clarification. You pointed your question to me. I think you got your dates slightly mixed up. May 2016.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Which Standing Order?

THE LORD MAYOR: Which point of order? What is it related to?

COUNCILLOR STEPHENSON: Misrepresentation

THE LORD MAYOR: Procedure Rule? (*interruption*) Please could I have a bit of silence, please, just for a moment. Bear in mind - I said quiet for the moment whilst I speak. I know as little about this as you do, I am relying upon the Legal Officer here.

Your point of order must relate to an alleged breach of Council Procedure Rules or to a Statutory provision and you have to identify it.

COUNCILLOR STEPHENSON: I was seeking a point of personal explanation but as we have gone on I think I have made it and I am happy to withdraw it.

THE LORD MAYOR: That was something entirely different. Councillor Lewis, I will give you an extra minute – half a minute.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: I think I have probably come to the end of what I need to say. I had got to my point of excitement but I still say the same about Parlington, that the ward Members of Harewood and Wetherby could have been honest with us and could have come back and said this is something we have changed our minds on. You did not and you tried to put the administration in a bad light with your own electors in a totally dishonest way and I will stick by that and no matter what you chunter on, I will keep to that point.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: You did not need our help to do that, Richard.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Overall, we have looked at the figures, looked at the figures put in front of us by the Government, the 42,000 figures. As Peter or Neil pointed out, that was based on a formula.

THE LORD MAYOR: I think you are pushing the boundaries, Councillor Lewis, could you rapidly finish.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Absolutely. That formula would have thrown up a figure of 97,000 way back when we were doing the first target, so let us be honest about this, let us have less of the same old statements that we keep on hearing from you. Let us actually face up to the issue that we represent the whole city not just the Outer areas and we have to think about those areas and the huge issues of overcrowding and over population that we are seeing and we have to address. Thank you, Lord Mayor.  
(*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: We are asked for a recorded vote. Will somebody second it? (*seconded*)

(*A recorded vote was held the amendment in the name of Councillor B Anderson*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Present 97, those in favour 30, abstaining 6, and those saying no 61, so that is LOST.

We will now take a vote on the original motion. (*A vote was taken*) That motion is CARRIED.

#### ITEM 6 – APPOINTMENT OF HONORARY RECORDER

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor James Lewis.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dowson.

COUNCILLOR DOWSON: I second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Leadley.

COUNCILLOR LEADLEY: Lord Mayor, I missed the Whips yesterday afternoon because I was at the SAP inquiry, but I had already had the Whip to keep this comment fairly brief.

There is a saying that you learn something every day and I must confess that after 15 years on Council until I read these papers I did not know that the city had an Honorary Recorder – perhaps about the last remaining formal link between the City Council and the Courts. Councillor Elliott does remember that when she was Lord Mayor she did meet Judge Collier at a formal event. We are asked to note the retirement of His Honour Judge Collier and approve the invitation to His Honour Judge Kearn to become Honorary Recorder of Leeds, which I am sure that we will do.

I would like to learn a little bit more about the post and its links with the city. Thank you, my Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor James Lewis.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I will set up a working group so everybody can get involved! (*laughter*)

THE LORD MAYOR: We will vote. (*A vote was taken*) That is CARRIED.

#### ITEM 7 – REPORT ON APPOINTMENTS

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dowson.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Harper.

COUNCILLOR G HARPER: I second, Lord Mayor.

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

### PROCEDURAL MOTION

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dowson.

COUNCILLOR DOWSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Based on the cross-party agreement reached in the Whips' meeting yesterday I would like to move in terms of the Notice.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Cohen.

COUNCILLOR COHEN: Once again second and reserve the right to speak, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Golton.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(interruption)* You know you want it! Can I just say, referring to my earlier comments about the curtailment of business at this Council, it is the job of Back Benchers at full Council through scrutiny of the Minutes, for instance, to scrutinise as a whole group that decision making which is made by those who do it on our behalf and also the Scrutiny Boards in particular have a responsibility to ensure that the quality of decision making is improved.

I think the decision to defer bringing this report to this meeting is actually going against the tradition of parity of esteem which has been built in this Council between the Executive and Scrutiny. I just wanted to make the point.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dowson.

COUNCILLOR DOWSON: It is coming home in September! *(Applause)*

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

The next item is the Scrutiny Annual Report. which is being put off to a later date in the interests of football.

## ITEM 9 – REPORT ON AMENDMENTS TO THE EXECUTIVE ARRANGEMENTS

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dowson.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Harper.

COUNCILLOR G HARPER: I second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: May we have a vote on that. *(A vote was taken)* That is CARRIED.

## ITEM 10 – QUESTIONS

THE LORD MAYOR: We now come to Questions. We have got a 30 minute period on this and I am going to be really strict on it. Councillor Cohen.

COUNCILLOR COHEN: Will the Executive Board Member for Learning provide an update on when the Head of Learning will take up their post at the Council?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Pryor.

COUNCILLOR PRYOR: Thank you, I will be delighted to provide an update. As the Shadow Executive Member will no doubt be aware, we have been going through several recruitment processes within Children and Families to ensure there have been strong educational leaders who can work with all schools settings to improve outcomes for all.

I am afraid when I got your question asking when the Head of Learning will take up their post in Council we do not have a position called Head of Learning so I tried to work out what you were asking in your question and we have got a few, so I am more than happy to talk through them all – I know we are not really in a hurry this afternoon! *(laughter)*

We have a Head of Learning Improvement, a Head of Learning Inclusion and also a Deputy Director of Learning, so I will talk you through them all.

The Deputy Director of Learning has been appointed and is starting to go through the transitional arrangements before his start in the autumn term with the precise date currently being negotiated with his employer. He is an experienced educational leader who has worked as the head of a virtual school in other Local Authorities as well as having a track record of transforming inadequate schools into outstanding schools. He has been a Headteacher in both primary and secondary schools and has led maintained schools and academies, so you will be pleased about that one.

The Head of Learning Improvement will go out to recruitment in the autumn term, a process which will be led by the new Deputy Director. In the meantime there are interim arrangements in place in addition to the secondment of primary and secondary headteachers who are working with the Authority to ensure the voices of the Headteachers and schools are at the forefront of the education strategies and the improvement work.

Finally, Councillor Cohen, the Head of Learning Inclusion is a post which has been filled by an experienced Principal Educational Psychologist who has worked within the Authority for a number of years. Leeds has maintained a strong School Service Improvement service despite reduction in Government funding and we are recruiting a number of School Improvement Advisors to guarantee a good level of support to all our schools and setting. Thank you. *(Applause)*

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

COUNCILLOR COHEN: I do, Lord Mayor, thank you. It is interesting because at my briefing yesterday the Director of Children and Families was talking about the vacant post of Head of Learning, so it might be there is some miscommunication there that we need to pick up.

Given that that post has been vacant, Head of Learning Support, given that we have had vacancies in the department for over two years and the capacity amongst senior leadership on schooling issues has led to a number of regrettable misjudgements and U-turns – Roundhay Primary School, Post-16 SEND, School Transport, Fearnville, Outer North East Secondary Schools, standards of schools in West Leeds – have you learned the lessons as a department and will you ensure, as you are new to the post, that capacity issues across senior leadership within Children and Families are addressed, especially with a view to ensuring that we avoid these issues again in the future?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Pryor.

COUNCILLOR PRYOR: Yes. *(laughter and applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Bentley.

COUNCILLOR J BENTLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Would the Leader of Council confirm that a recently elected Labour Councillor is being investigated for an alleged election offence?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Blake.

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: I can confirm that an electoral irregularity has been reported for investigation and I am sure you will agree, Councillor Bentley, with any situation like this, until the police have conducted their enquiries it would be wholly inappropriate for us to say anything more on the matter in this Chamber.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Bentley.

COUNCILLOR J BENTLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I was reluctant to ask this question because I would have thought in these circumstances either the leadership or the Whip would have taken the opportunity to talk to us privately about this. Our Whip did attempt to do so but was rebuffed.

My understanding is that the Leader says – perhaps she would like to comment on this – that enquiries are being made by the police. I have spoken to the police officer conducting those enquiries who tells me he has completed his enquiries and the file is with the Crown Prosecution Service, so we have advanced. That is not quite accurate that the police are still investigating.

In January 2017 this administration was held to account for a cover-up of Members who had not paid their Council Tax and they came back and said they would be more transparent in the future.

This is no ordinary allegation unrelated to...

THE LORD MAYOR: Can you stick to the point, Councillor Bentley?

COUNCILLOR J BENTLEY: I am sticking to the point. I am asking for the Leader of Council to comment on this, Lord Mayor. This is no ordinary allegation...

THE LORD MAYOR: Where is your question? The question?

COUNCILLOR J BENTLEY: Would the Leader of Council comment on this, which is related to my first question. This is no ordinary allegation that is unrelated...

COUNCILLOR J McKENNA: It was not only Labour Members, Lord Mayor.

COUNCILLOR P GRAHAME: Lord Mayor, that is totally wrong.

COUNCILLOR J BENTLEY: ...to being an elected Member and if the allegation is correct it shows deceit towards the Returning Officer and the electorate, so does she agree with me...

COUNCILLOR J McKENNA: No.

COUNCILLOR J BENTLEY: ...that the honourable thing is for the Member to stand down...

COUNCILLOR J McKENNA: Absolute rubbish.

COUNCILLOR J BENTLEY: ...while the allegations are being considered (*interruption*) and if they do not do that, for the Labour Group to take appropriate action? Thank you, Lord Mayor. You may notice I have not mentioned the name of anyone.

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



COUNCILLOR BLAKE: I think this Council looks on Members who try to claim political point scoring in this manner in the correct way. I am not impressed by the way you have approached this, Councillor Bentley, and I will just repeat what I have said. We would none of us want to jeopardise any investigation and I think your point-scoring attempts are shameful and it will be dealt with appropriately and in the correct manner with regards to Members of this Council. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Groves.

COUNCILLOR GROVES: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Please can the Leader of Council update Members on rail services?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Blake.

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: You have a very soft voice, Lord Mayor. We are all waiting to hear from you and it is actually quite hard to hear you.

THE LORD MAYOR: I will start shouting, if you like! *(laughter)*

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: I know, I never thought I would have to make that point.

Thank you, Councillor Groves, for your question. It seems hardly credible that it is just a year ago since the bombshell hit us via a journalist for the Financial Times, I have to say, that the Secretary of State was planning to completely go back on the Government's word to electrify the Trans Pennine route. Here we are a year later and it is hard to really express in words the catalogue of disruption, delays and absolute carnage, it has been described, of the situation on the railways across the north of England. Shambolic, unacceptable – all of the different words that we know, caused by the implementation of the new timetable leading to cancellations, delays, overcrowded trains, short formed trains – the situation is still carrying on.

Most of us I think in this Chamber will know someone personally, if we have not ourselves experienced just the impact of what this means on every day life. People not being able to get to work; people not being able to get home to pick their children up from childcare. Everyone knows someone affected. The economic impact, can you imagine a situation where a whole line, the Lakeland line into Cumbria, has had no trains, a period of time with no trains running on it at all at a time at the beginning of the most important tourism season in that part of the world and the direct impact that has had on the economy.

This also comes on the back of the incredible situation on East Coast Line where the Secretary of State has taken the franchise away yet again from a company at enormous cost to the public purse.

We know incredible chaos and then again, just a few days ago, we have heard that planned improvements for December later this year are not going to be delivered on time again. We know that the ongoing debate about electrification continues. I think it is up to all of us to really stand together and demand answers to what you can only describe as complete and utter chaos.

We have had evidence coming from the Select Committee in the House of Commons just last month finally absolutely nailing it that the north has suffered from drastic under-investment in infrastructure for decades, a situation that the Secretary of State, Chris Grayling, has tried desperately to argue against, rubbishing IPPR North's figures on every occasion.

The really shameful thing in this and the question that everyone is asking is who is responsible for this carnage? You listen to the announcements from the Secretary of State blaming Network Rail, blaming the operators and just not accepting that when you ask the question of who is responsible for this situation, it is the Secretary of State, Christopher Grayling.

So we have seen repeated headlines but this does not do anything to help the travelling public across the north. We have through Transport for the North managed to get some compensation – not enough, we are still pressing for more. I have been asked to look at doing a review with the current Minister for Rail, Jo Johnson, into exactly what has gone wrong over the last few months. What actually led to the catastrophic introduction of the new timetable and to understand how and when decisions were made.

A real lack of democratic accountability, that is what we know, but let us now from this Chamber start calling for a national debate. We need to take back control of our railways, we need to end the broken system of franchising for running rail in this country and let us start it now. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Groves? Councillor Dobson.

COUNCILLOR M DOBSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Does the Executive Board Member with responsibility for Policing believe that elected Members of Council should have parity with the public when it comes to protection under the law?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Coupar.

COUNCILLOR COUPAR: Yes, thank you, Lord Mayor. I would just like to clarify things. Elected Members of Council do have parity with the public when it comes to protection under the law and if there is an instance, or maybe instances, whereby an elected Member does not believe they have been afforded the necessary protection, then this should be raised with the appropriate authority in order that the matter can be reviewed and any failing in the service addressed appropriately. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dobson.

COUNCILLOR M DOBSON: That, Lord Mayor, is where I need the Executive Member's support, so does she therefore agree with me that when, on the Saturday before the May election, a Member of the Labour Party attempted to disrupt a legal and legitimate election activity, the second time he had attempted to do so in as many weeks, that person should be subject to the full available sanctions of the law and have no protection from investigation from any quarter? Does she further agree with me that following any false allegations made by said person against a Member of Council that

were investigated at great expense by West Yorkshire Police and were subsequently proven to be false, that person should face the full available sanctions of the law for time wasting and making a false statement? Finally, will she agree with me in my calls that the Chief Constable of West Yorkshire Police agrees to meet me in my attempts that the person concerned is subject to the full weight of the law and there is no protection from investigation or prosecution by writing to Dee Collins to that end?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Coupar.

COUNCILLOR COUPAR: Yes, thank you, Lord Mayor. It appears to me, I am not sure about other colleagues, that some Councillors have needed the police attention more than others in this Council Chamber. Can I remind Council that the police have undergone a significant cut in the budgets recently while demand for police resources has gone up.

I ask all Councillors to give the police service the respect they deserve as they continue to deliver excellent service under ever more pressures.

If I could be so bold as to suggest that this Council Chamber is better served when Councillors use it to further the interests of their constituents and not themselves.  
*(Applause)*

Finally, Lord Mayor and Councillor Dobson, I am more than happy to meet with the police, I am more than happy to meet with Councillor Dobson and the request could have quite easily have been made without it coming to full Council's attention.  
*(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Renshaw.

COUNCILLOR RENSHAW: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Would the Executive Member care to comment on the recently published UCL Institute of Education research "Hierarchy, Markets and Networks – Analysing the 'self-improving school-led system' agenda in England and the implications for schools"? Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Pryor.

COUNCILLOR PRYOR: Thank you, Councillor Renshaw, for the question. You are, of course, referring to the recent results of a four year study funded by the Nuffield Foundation that showed two-thirds of Headteachers believe that inequalities between schools are becoming wider as a direct result of Government policy.

Case studies were collected from 47 schools across four different localities. Almost 700 Headteachers were surveyed and Ofsted results over a ten year period were analysed. It was an extensive piece of research and what did it find? Among many other things, it found that instead of schools gaining more autonomy under changes to Government policy, they were actually more tightly regulated than ever before due to the pressure to get good exam results and Ofsted ratings, or face the threat of being taken over by a multi-academy trust against their will.

Many schools described how they have reduced their curriculum offer to focus relentlessly on test outcomes, leading to a loss of the enrichment programmes that are so important in schools. The focus on exam results and Ofsted inspections has led to increased competitiveness between schools as there is clearly an incentive to prioritise your own school, not just over helping other schools, but also and more worrying, over the needs of particular groups of students and groups of children, and by that I mean the most vulnerable, with Headteachers in the report giving examples of how decisions they make regarding children are influenced by Ofsted concerns.

The research goes on to show that higher performing schools now admit relatively fewer disadvantaged pupils meaning that this increased autonomy is actually fuelling more inequality. How on earth can this be right?

There is no increased equality of opportunity as schools start to market themselves to attractive families whose children are more likely to bring home the results that the school needs. The current system is not encouraging equality – it is fuelling and worsening a gap that already exists, increasing inequality of opportunity between the haves and the have nots.

I am not clear how this stacks up with Theresa May's promise to fight against the burning injustice of poverty which she said when she entered Downing Street, but I think she has got other things on her plate at the moment. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Renshaw, anything further? Councillor Lamb.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Will the Executive Board Member for Planning tell us how many planning appeals have been lost on sites unallocated for housing?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Richard Lewis.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. As you did not put a time frame on this I am starting in 1974, I hope that is OK. *(Applause)* No I am not, I could not get the officers to do the work I am afraid, Alan. I would have done otherwise.

To give a short answer, Members of Council will be well aware of the extensive interest that housing developers and land owners have shown over several years and across political administrations in pursuing planning permissions, regardless of the wishes of the local community or of the City Council. As a Local Planning Authority the Council has always taken seriously its responsibility to prepare and keep up to date a Local Plan for the city which provides clarity and certainty for all about where housing should be provided across Leeds.

Unfortunately, landowners and developers have continued to exploit National Planning Policy which is dominated by the need to ensure delivery against highly technical housing targets with a five year future supply always available to secure consent on unallocated sites.

The long running and still to be concluded saga of Kirklees Knoll in Councillor Carter's ward demonstrates that where landowners and developers think there is money to be made, they will not take no for an answer. In this case, despite the Council's refusal of planning permission being upheld twice by different Secretaries of State on appeal, after three public inquiries they are still dragging their case out through the courts for a second time. I am sure all Members would agree that the Council and local residents have better things to do with our time and public money than put up with this.

Kirklees Knoll is not, however, an isolated case and unfortunately developers are using the guidance handily provided by Government in the NPPF about Councils needing to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable sites and to show that delivery is happening to cover up the industry's own deficiencies in actually building on sites that the Council has allocated and instead to pursue less suitable sites that, as I speak, the Council is attempting to protect through the SAP, which is currently a public examination in another part of this building.

Since 2016 the Council has been taken to appeal through public inquiry at the following sites, which were not allocated for housing and where permission was refused by the Council: Grove Road, Boston Spa; Breary Lane East, Bramhope; Leeds Road, Collingham; Bradford Road, East Ardsley were all granted permission by the Secretary of State in December 2016. Sandgate Drive, Kippax was granted permission in August 2016. Church Close, Pool, was granted permission by the Inspector in June 2018.

*(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lamb, supplementary?

COUNCILLOR LAMB: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I do have a supplementary. Unfortunately I was not born in 1974, Councillor Lewis, so I will not go back that far.

I am glad you particularly mentioned Grove Road in Boston Spa. Many of the sites that are referred to are PAS sites. Would he agree with me that sites such as those and other sites currently considered as windfall, such as Primrose Hill in Boston Spa, other sites in Wetherby and across the city, should be included in the HMCA target numbers, thus securing more green field land and protecting it for the future?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lewis.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Lord Mayor, I think with every appeal that we face we should take the appropriate advice and listen to both our own officers and the legal advice we get from elsewhere as to what actions we take to protect whatever sites are under threat. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Golton.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Does the Executive Member for Learning, Skills and Employment believe in fair funding for Leeds schools?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Pryor.

COUNCILLOR PRYOR: Yes.

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

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Taking that reply into consideration and also the earlier reply about the iniquities of the school system that he gave to Councillor Renshaw, can he please confirm whether it was himself or his colleague, Councillor Mulherin, who agreed to subsidise an academy for the payment of their cluster fees which was not something which was afforded to the other schools within that same cluster?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Pryor.

COUNCILLOR PRYOR: I believe Councillor Golton is referring to the Rodillian cluster. Our duty to children and young people in Leeds is towards all the children and young people in Leeds, and to that end we negotiated a deferment of Rodillian's payment to the Rothwell cluster – a deferment – to ensure that all local children would be able to access cluster services regardless of which school they attended.

I have to say I am surprised and disappointed about this question because I would have assumed as a local ward Member Councillor Golton's primary concern would have been the wellbeing for all children in his ward. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Yes, all my schools, not one of them.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: "My schools".

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Iqbal.

COUNCILLOR IQBAL: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Would the Executive Member like to comment on the recently published Care Crisis Review?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Mulherin.

COUNCILLOR MULHERIN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Thank you, Councillor Iqbal, for giving me the opportunity to speak on this very important national issue.

The Care Crisis Review was published just last month and it highlights national concerns about the crisis in funding for children's social care and the increasing pressures placed on families by the Government's funding cuts and austerity programme.

Government welfare reforms have led to an increase in child poverty and many families are struggling to make ends meet even if they are in work. The national population is increasing and nationally the number of children being looked after by Local Authorities up and down the country has been steadily increasing for many years.

Due to these national challenges Councils are facing significant demand-led cost pressures, effectively diminishing their ability to respond to the care crisis.

The Care Crisis Review outlines a number of options for change to address the current crisis and supports the call from the Local Government Association and the Association of Directors of Children's Services for the Government to make up the £2 billion shortfall in children's social care that is anticipated in the next two years to ensure that sufficient resources are available to Councils to meet their responsibilities to children and families.

In Leeds Government funding cuts have resulted in the Council having around £251m less than has been cut from Local Government budgets since 2010 with a further £15.3m reduction expected in 2019/20. Despite the pressure placed upon us as a Council by ever increasing Tory Government funding cuts, Leeds City Council has been highlighted as an example of best practice within the Care Crisis Review Report for our restorative work with children and families here in Leeds. The expansion of family group conferencing through the Leeds Family Valued approach on a scale not seen anywhere else in the UK is featured as a case study within the report to demonstrate the success of how systems change in facilitating highly significant reductions in the number of children coming into Local Authority care and in the number of child protection and child in need plans over the life of the programme,

This is just one example of how Leeds has protected and invested in early help and prevention to improve the lives of children and families across the city. The report highlights investing in these services as an option for change. In Leeds we have continued to invest in children's centres, in youth services, in school clusters to name but a few of the ways in which we ensure that children and families are protected and that their interests are served.

We have invested in prevention and I think it is a disgrace that the Government does not recognise the importance of early intervention and prevention as an invest to save approach that, given a sustainable funding stream, could dramatically reduce the number of care proceedings nationally and generate savings in health, education and criminal justice services across the country.

As a DfE Partner in Practice, Leeds has gained national recognition for our work to transform Children's Services and for adopting a restorative approach. Through this we are continuing to buck the trend in the terms of looked-after children in our city. Whilst there has been a national increase of 11% in the numbers of children in Local Authority care, to date we have reduced the number of looked-after children in Leeds by 13.5% since 2011. That is estimated to be the equivalent to a saving of around £15m annually to this Local Authority, demonstrating that investing in prevention can be and is more effective than trying to cure.

In order for Local Authorities nationally to invest, we need to be pushing the Government to invest the £2 billion that is desperately needed in Social Care and I would urge all Members in this Council to read the report and champion the findings of the review to ensure that we as a Council can keep on supporting, protecting and caring for children in our city. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Iqbal, do you have anything more to say?

COUNCILLOR IQBAL: After this comprehensive explanation I do not think there is any need for a supplementary. I would just like to thank the Department for their hard work in this. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Gettings.

COUNCILLOR GETTINGS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Following the amazing regeneration of the city centre are there any plans to upgrade the area round the Grand Theatre on Upper Briggate and the area moving down towards Quarry Hill?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lewis.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I never thought we would get to this one, Bob, with these answers.

COUNCILLOR GETTINGS: I didn't either!

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: I must just correct you, New Briggate, not Upper Briggate. I know we have a Lower Briggate but that is New Briggate.

In keeping with our overall vision for the city centre, this area is the focus of both Council and partner activities to deliver transformational change. Quarry Hill is undergoing very significant and transformational change to the new developments by Leeds City College and it was a pleasure to climb up to the ninth floor of their new building only the other day on what must have been the hottest day of the year. Modus plans for residential and mixed use developments and the recently let Council contract for £16m worth of works that will reconfigure and transform the Leeds Playhouse and create new high quality public realm at Gateway Court and Playhouse Square.

Significant highway and public realm investment have already been made in and around St Peter's Street to improve the accessibility and setting to Quarry Hill, the bus station and Kirkgate Market and as part of the Connecting Leeds Transport Strategy consultation there are further proposals for a number of schemes that, subject to detailed approval, will continue to transform the city centre which includes the refurbishment and upgrade of the public realm at New Briggate, Vicar Lane and surrounding streets, comprising relocation of north-bound bus services from New Briggate to Vicar Lane and closing New Briggate to all vehicles apart from emergency and other vehicles servicing local businesses between the Headrow and Mark Lane to improve bus reliability and allowing the creation of a new pedestrian space at the lower end of New Briggate.

Footways will be widened to ensure there is ample waiting space for passengers whilst making it easier for people to access Vicar Lane by improving the streets that link Vicar Lane to New Briggate. Redesign of the adjacent Dortmund Square public realm which includes the potential to create improved linkages to Mark Street and New Briggate, the Headrow and St John's shopping centre, and the green space within St John's Churchyard. Improved pedestrian crossings on Vicar Lane and Lady Lane with better crossings above the Inner Ring Road that will help connect North Street and Mabgate with the city centre core. Measures to enhance the environment of Vicar Lane to provide more greenery and support the regeneration of the area between Eastgate and York Road.



These improvements will work alongside Opera North's transformational project to revitalise the Grand Theatre and create new facilities. Opera North is currently seeking planning and listed building consent for a significant project, which involves facade remodelling and the introduction of additional uses including restaurants, educational facilities, an extension of the adjacent Linacre Harewood Studios.

The Council is also continuing to work with Hammerson, the owner of the majority of land between Vicar Lane, the Headrow and the Quarry Hill area. The site is currently being used as temporary parking and Hammerson has re-let units on Vicar Lane and on Eastgate on a short to medium-term basis to encourage an access street frontage. Hammerson are currently developing options for the redevelopment of the wider site following discussions with the Council, and it is hoped that updated proposals will be brought forward in the autumn. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Gettings, do you have a supplementary? No. In that case time is up on Minutes and in accordance with Procedure Rule 11.6, any unanswered question will receive a written response.

#### ITEM 12 – REPORT ON DEVOLVED MATTERS

THE LORD MAYOR: We have Devolved Matters, so I will call on Councillor Blake.

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would like to move the report in the terms of the Notice.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lewis.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: I would like to second.

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

Now we can talk about having a short break. This is not a tea break, this is a comfort break and I would like us to be ready to start by quarter-to four on that clock. Thank you.

*(Short break)*

#### WHITE PAPERS

THE LORD MAYOR: It is a minute past quarter-to, I said quarter-to so we are starting.

#### ITEM 13 – WHITE PAPER MOTION – TRANSPORT

THE LORD MAYOR: We are starting with White Papers and the first White Paper motion, transport, Councillor Buckley.

COUNCILLOR BUCKLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. This White Paper motion is not intended to be anything like a point scoring exercise. It is put down as a positive contribution to this whole debate about transport. Indeed, this group and other groups, all parties, have been happy to sit in the cross-party Transport Committee since its inception. Actually I think at this point it is only right to thank Councillor Wakefield for his previous Chairmanship of this and of the Combined Authority Transport Committee. I think he has been a great Chairman and he will be sadly missed.

We are concerned on this side that the administration's so-called big plan on transport could turn out to be a lost opportunity and it could be a damp squib. We contend that the plans are lacking in ambition and are actually somehow old-fashioned. We recognise that even with £174m from the Government and the add-on sums in addition to that, there are constraints. Well, there always are constraints and we realise that but our concern is that the administration are completely throwing in their lot entirely with buses, or almost entirely with buses, and we know that patronage on buses is on a long-term downward trend. It is a well documented set of facts.

There is no point dragging up things like on the Labour amendment like ancient arguments on deregulation. That was 30 years ago. We have to think of the future now. This should be all about the future and not about the past.

The administration made a statement about two years ago and they have repeated this in various guises since, and it went something along the lines of well, we still aspire to hope to plan to maybe have the possibility of a mass transit system of some sort in the future. It was an extremely woolly statement indeed and there still appears to be no plan for the medium to long-term. Mind you, this is despite Councillor Wakefield's enthusiasm for Hyperloop. I have to say, he said that he is looking forward to being sucked through a plastic tube at 600 miles an hour.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: I feel like I have been! *(laughter)*

COUNCILLOR BUCKLEY: It takes all sorts, Keith. Mind you, on the route between the city centre and the airport if it gets up to 600 miles an hour he will probably end up in Morecambe!

Then he and Councillor Lewis come right back down to earth having gone into this one extreme and extol the virtue of what are basically diesel buses with some add-ons.

Leeds is the biggest city in Europe without a mass transit system scheme of some sort and the administration keeps repeating that they want Leeds to be the best city in the United Kingdom. Of course we all do, but where is the plan that will actually give us this? Leeds is a big city and needs big ambitions and big plans and the leadership to go with it and we fear it does not have it. We are not big town – we are the third biggest city in England and Councillor Richard Lewis also said Leeds must not get left behind in these matters. Well, we are behind. We are behind Manchester, we are behind Sheffield, we are behind Newcastle, we are behind all the Core Cities in these transit schemes.

The air quality issues in with all of this. At Prime Minister's Questions last week Jeremy Corbyn asked all his questions about buses and he brought all his powers of intellect and modern thinking to bear on the questions but even he said that stationary buses and stationary traffic caused by buses increases air pollution. I think this is a statement of the obvious. If Leeds is not careful this could well happen here in future years and then the pressure will be on with the CAS to include cars and vans in the clean air system which will be a self-defeating situation.

We have heard nothing about adding another lane, an extra lane on to existing roads, notably the A61 North, only about forcing cars off the inside lane so down into one lane. This really would be disastrous. Human nature is what it is. Drivers need to be attracted to the bus service, not forced on to it. They need to be attracted to it because it is fast, it has wi-fi, there are shelters at all inbound stops.

THE LORD MAYOR: You need to draw to a close, Councillor Buckley.

COUNCILLOR BUCKLEY: I am sorry, Lord Mayor. I will just finish with one final point. One final question about HS2. HS2 should be harnessed to bring more private investment into the whole scheme for the future. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Andrew Carter.

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: I second, my Lord Mayor, and reserve the right to speak.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Bentley.

COUNCILLOR J BENTLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Councillor Buckley's White Paper is OK, but it really does not go far enough. It does not recognise the difficulties that are put in the way of Local Authorities wanting to invest in large scale transport investment, and although he dismisses talking about regulation and de-regulation, that is what we should be talking about in order to move forward. Public Transport is a public service – the clue is in the name. Although the private sector has a role to play in the delivery of the service, you cannot have a really inclusive transport system if you are relying on the market and the market is only relying on profitable routes.

Not that this administration has a particularly good track record of delivering a transport system that meets the needs of all communities in Leeds. Members will remember the time and money wasted by this Council on trying to develop the ill-fated trolleybus system and I am not going to go there, but over £200m on a 14 kilometre route - hardly an inclusive approach.

We do welcome the Council's approach to investing the £174m for the Leeds Local Transport Plan. Perhaps not all the detail but that can be dealt with through the consultation, but the approach of spending the money across the city on a number of routes and on the railway infrastructure as well is one that is supported and we see as part of the Inclusive Growth Programme.

The real key to increasing patronage is fare pricing and fair fare pricing. Until the Local Authorities get control over this, either through franchising or quality contracts or even direct ownership of bus companies, we are in the hands of the market and the market is not inclusive.

That is why our amendment calls on the Government to give the same powers to West Yorkshire Combined Authority as enjoyed by Transport for London and the same access to funding. The people of London get five times more spent on transport than the people of Yorkshire and the North-East, so no wonder London's economy is growing and sucking the economy from the northern economies as well.

It is not just a question of more money from Central Government or more devolution. As an Authority we need to be producing our own initiatives to increase bus patronage, so our amendment asks the Council to look at initiatives for generating income to fund public transport and reduce car use for the community with consequent benefits for air quality, public health and general comfort.

One initiative which is well worth looking at is a workplace parking levy. Nottingham City Council have introduced a scheme to put a levy on every employer within the city who provides more than eleven free car parking places for their staff and in the first three years of the scheme it has raised £25m which has been ring-fenced for public transport investment and anyone who has been to Nottingham will have enjoyed really good public transport there. You will have seen they have a tram and they have their own buses. Reading Council, also are really keen on public transport, is also looking at a workplace parking levy. It is a scheme where locally raised revenue is invested in local need and it is well worth looking at.

Lord Mayor, I move our amendment which proposes a strategy of public investment and local revenue raising. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Harrison, and I remind Members this is a maiden speech.

COUNCILLOR HARRISON: You are not going to hear it now! I second the amendment and reserve the right to speak.

THE LORD MAYOR: That would have been a maiden speech! *(Applause)*  
Councillor David Blackburn.

COUNCILLOR D BLACKBURN: I have got to say, the White Paper motion, as Councillor Bentley said, as far as it goes it is OK and I think everybody could go along with it. I think there are some weaknesses in what we have at the moment perhaps because the amount of money we are dealing with is not particularly that large. In fact, I can recall the last Transport Working Group that Councillor Wakefield chaired and several of us who were in this triangle where there was nothing that stretched from the Stanningley bypass corridor right over to Stourton and covered most of Councillor McKenna's ward, all of my ward, most of Pudsey and Morley North, Morley South and Beeston. Basically there was nothing there and the fact is the public transport for most of our constituents in that area is buses and predominantly First Bus and that is where the problem lies.

In that part of the city you have got a duopoly. You have got First Bus and you have got Arriva and no competition, the system has not worked. We need some control over that and I would suggest, as we have discussed before and I think the motion went through Council where we agreed that we supported franchising, what we have got to do is, we have got to constantly say to Government that that has got to be the way forward because that is the only way you are going to get bums on seats. We control the timetables, we control the fares and effectively control where those buses go and they go to where people want to go.

I can remember probably in about 2004/05, something like that, when I was on Metro and every party on Metro was arguing for franchising and I have got to say in fairness to the present Government it is not all them because the previous Labour Government would have had to deal with it when it came to that. There was a lot of good talk but not much action. That is what we are going to need, that is what we need because most of us in this city will be relying on buses and the fact is we need them so we have got control so they will work for the city and not work for private enterprise. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ann Blackburn.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Richard Lewis.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I was just sitting reflecting on is £174m a life-changing sum. I think it is if you are a Euro-millions winner, not necessarily for changing the transport in a city like Leeds but it is money that we have got and it is money that we can use wisely to encourage others to invest, and that does mean the bus companies to invest in new vehicles.

I think there is an issue of what can we do now and that is very much what we talk about in the cross-party group and there is the thinking about what do we do beyond that. What is our thinking beyond the next five years, beyond 2021 and I have to say what we have been thinking about mainly up to now has been how do we use the money that we currently have, and I think that is quite right because we have to spend that money. I certainly would not want us to be in a position where we give any of it back but we are not just spending it on buses. We are looking at, as you all know, new rail stations, new infrastructure in the city centre to encourage people to use public transport.

For me the big issue is actually that issue of confidence in public transport because what we have is people seeing public transport as always being the second best or the third best option. We have got to change that idea and actually the only way you can change it is by speeding up the buses. Speeding up the buses, if you do it right, actually speeds up other traffic in the city. It is not a kind of one wins, one loses. If you can get people out of their cars – and I speak as someone who is waiting for my bus pass to arrive – you will get people using buses. That is quite a difficult trick to pull off and it is very difficult, particularly when as we all saw who are on the Transport Committee down at WYCA the amount of money that is available to subsidise bus services is

reducing so we are in that strange position where we do have the capital funding to do things, we just do not have any revenue support and that is a huge problem.

I would very much like us to think it is not just about – I think the cross-party group is very much about us working together and working through these problems, it is not just about oh that is a bus, that is second best. If we have got a bus that is zero tail pipe emissions, which is where we will be I would think probably next year in terms of one service and probably a large number over coming years, that should send a signal to the city we are serious about cleaning up the city and we are starting to do it. That does not preclude talking about what I see as perhaps the stuff we really do not understand yet. It might not be Councillor Wakefield's Hyperloop but it might be, if you think about where we are talking about wagons running in tandem with one driver, that there is a whole potential for different initiatives and different technology to come in that might make some of the stuff that we have been talking about previously utterly redundant.

I very much argue that everybody in this Chamber has an interest in making what we are doing work. We do have a huge problem that we do not have control. I would love us to have control as we used to have and I am sorry, Neil, that people do go on about bus de-regulation but that was the most damaging piece of legislation in terms of public transport that we have had in this city in the past 50 years and we cannot forget about it and we do want to put it right.

Let us, all of us, work together, come up with some real answers and let us all argue for proper investment in the north in public transport and I say that across party, not just £174m. If we are to talk seriously about the kind of stuff you are talking about it does require big Government funding and that goes way beyond that and I hope all parties will support that. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Groves.

COUNCILLOR GROVES: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would like to start by thanking Councillor Wakefield for the enormous amount of work that he has done at the West Yorkshire Combined Authority, some of which you are going to hear in my speech.

I would like to support Councillor Lewis's amendment to the Conservative White Paper for the following reasons. Buses are the backbone of local transport and they are still the most popular choice for many Leeds residents. Buses help us to tackle social isolation and they bring our communities closer together. They are a lifeline for many of our poorest communities and vulnerable residents who rely on them for education, training and employment as well as vital health services.

Buses not only deliver inclusive growth, they are significant for Leeds's sustainable development. Like many other emerging cities, Leeds's population is increasing and will continue to increase along with the developments such as the East Leeds extension. Therefore, it is crucial we focus on ways to keep traffic moving smoothly across the city for years to come.

Buses play a pivotal role in this. Each bus takes around 30 private cars off our congested roads. Buses are also a greener and healthier alternative, protecting our environment and supporting our legal requirements to reduce air pollution in the city.

These are just some of the many reasons why Leeds and the West Yorkshire Region have set ambitious targets, and rightly so. We do need to increase bus patronage over the next ten years. Concrete plans to achieve this are already in place and thanks to Councillor Wakefield and the team at West Yorkshire Combined Authority, the scheme was launched under Councillor Wakefield, the MyDay Bus Scheme for younger people launched on Monday to increase greater bus use. The scheme enables 19 year olds to travel anywhere in West Yorkshire for only £2.60 a day and I have sent that to all of you, so I hope you will share it with your constituents.  
*(Applause)*

This will have a beneficial impact on the next generation who will be able to set their sights on training and job opportunities. We know this approach has worked in other areas. In Merseyside, for example, discounted tickets delivered an increase in bus usage by ten per cent in the first twelve months. In Leeds we have listened to over 8,000 residents who said they want to have faster and more reliable bus services. We are now ready to progress plans to improve the bus passenger experience through our new Transport Strategy and the Leeds Public Transport Investment Programme.

Improvements will include the creation of bus priority measures, corridors, cashless ticketing options and an introduction of 284 new low emission buses and the expansion of our park and rides. Over the 30 years of - and I should know this word as well because Councillor Truswell uses it nearly every day – deregulation, our bus services have worsened. We know that the current bus network in Leeds does not work in the best interests of the people who live and work here. We also know that plans to improve bus services and the usage is dwindling and that will only go so far.

In order to build a world class bus network we require two things from the Government. Firstly we need our Government to hold the north in the same high regard as the south. It must distribute transport investment immediately. This gap is widening and this is not acceptable.

Do you know that public funding for local bus services in England outside London has been cut by 38% since your Government came to power, an average of 480 routes cut per year and did you know that in Yorkshire we receive a pitiful £844 per person in comparison to London where it is £4,155. Thank you, Lord Mayor.  
*(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Leadley.

COUNCILLOR LEADLEY: My Lord Mayor, there may be a hidden meaning which I have not grasped in this White Paper – Tories bewailing bus usage dwindling by 18% in 20 years seems like vegans complaining about meat shortages or militant teetotallers campaigning against beer price increases *(laughter)* or is it a case of huntsmen pointing out they have that they have all but exterminated a pack of despised foxes. What is the purpose of it?

Bus passenger numbers peaked in 1951; since then there has been a slow and almost constant decline. The 18% said to have been lost in Leeds in the past 20 years was from a fairly low base. As one of the few Members of the Council who does not own a car, I know that reduced services make bus travel harder and harder, especially on Sundays and in the evenings. If cash is paid for casual single journeys buses become so expensive that they put off new adult passengers so they tend to cater for semi-captive markets such as school children and free travel pensioners.

Since the 1980s bus passengers have been put off in a number of ways such as the abolition of controls on fares, privatisation, the failure to stop the conglomeration of most operators into a few large bus groups, the near elimination of municipal bus undertakings and deregulation, which is in many ways more complicated than the 1930 Road Traffic Act which it replaced. For example, different operators running along one route cannot agree to a co-ordinated timetable because that would be anti-competitive, even if clearly in the best interests of passengers, bus operators and probably road users in general. Perhaps the White Paper is meant to say that we should give up on buses and invest in something else. I hope a truly ambitious transport strategy is not a coded call for a return to a Leeds only vanity project like Supertram or NGT.

I doubt whether Keith Wakefield was entirely serious when he was reported in the YEP last week to have advocated a 600 mile an hour public transport Hyperloop, although you never know. As recently as February last year there was a call in the YEP (not from Keith Wakefield) to build a monorail from Otley to the White Rose Shopping Centre in Morley.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: That was Colin Campbell!

COUNCILLOR LEADLEY: Longer serving Members of Council may know that over a period of years I asked for Supertram or NGT to be traded in for something else – even flood relief, for instance. What amounted to trading in eventually came about moving the £173m of NGT money into the Leeds Local Transport Fund, which has been divided mostly sensibly so it should bring real benefits.

What always must be remembered is that Leeds is not that big a city. The true city or the main urban area has a population of about half a million, which is highly marginal for mass transit which would need favourable factors which are not there such as convenient disused railways to make it viable. We do need to think ahead about what we will do once the £173m has gone but bearing in mind what has happened in recent years, I would urge a bit of caution. Mass transit in Leeds alone would not work but a link from Leeds to Bradford might.

The final truncated length of NGT was about 19 kilometres, only one kilometre short of being long enough to get from Leeds to Bradford, a route which would be far more useful, generate less opposition, be cheaper to build per route kilometre, have two way traffic and intermediate journeys all day and have far more stops than the current railway. Thank you, my Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lamb.



COUNCILLOR LAMB: I support the White Paper in the name of Councillor Buckley. It is right that we look to have the most ambitious plan possible for our city in whatever measure but in transport it is particularly important. Council heard from some of my constituents in a deputation earlier about the blatant lack of bus services cross border around North Yorkshire and York and for huge numbers of my constituents they simply cannot access big parts of the economy either for employment or if you are an elderly person without a car who lives in one of the villages in the Outer North East you cannot access the night time economy of York, you cannot access the night time economy of Leeds, you cannot access the night time economy of Harrogate and the same applies for medical services, as you heard from my constituent so eloquently earlier in the day. It is one of the frustrations for me that not a single penny of the £173m helps to ease that problem in our area. Surely if we are going to be a fully inclusive city and look for inclusive growth we should be looking to include every part of the city and make public transport accessible to everybody in every part of our city. Either everyone matters or no-one matters and it is important that we take that forward.

In terms of the motion from Councillor Buckley, it is quite right that we should be ambitious. I have been a part of the cross-party working group as well and it is a point that we have made many times. We do want to be ambitious and while there have been a number of tongue in cheek references to Councillor Wakefield's proposal for Hyperloop, it is that kind of thinking and imagination that we need. We need to go beyond just Leeds borders, we need to be thinking about how you get from York to Bradford, how you get from Harrogate to Leeds, how you access the whole region, how people can access jobs, employment opportunities right across the city. I think that is where we need Councillor Lewis really to step up to the plate and show some leadership in this and really look to work with all of us, because it is the responsibility of all of us to have a really bold vision and that is what this White Paper seeks.

I think we are minded to accept Councillor Blackburn's amendment, I think that is something that we can support and I think it is incredibly sensible but, Lord Mayor, I really do hope we can get a strategic vision. I hope Councillor Lewis perhaps will find the same sense of direction for this as he had when he was driving the buses now that he is leading the charge for them. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Wadsworth.

COUNCILLOR WADSWORTH: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am speaking in support of Councillor Buckley's motion. It is about being a critical friend. I do not think we want to oppose everything that you are doing. It is just about we all sit on cross-party groups and the move is for better public transport but a total reliance on the bus network is really not where we want to go. You will say you have not relied on the bus network, you have put up park and ride at Kirkstall Forge, but the park and ride at Kirkstall Forge is actually too far away from the road for anybody to use so it is no good. Of course, you are then going to put a park and ride, a bus-based park and ride, at Stourton and you have heard today that some of the members of the community are not happy about that. I think it is all about taking people along with you, all of this. To get people to use the bus they have to be happy with the bus, comfortable with the bus and the bus has to be relative with time scales.

In my own area a load more time has been put into the service between Yeadon and Leeds City Centre because of what you have done down at Kirkstall Road at the bottom of Haddon Avenue where you have hardened up the cycle way and slowed up all traffic but in doing that you have slowed up buses considerably, because the buses have to sit in the congestion there because it is a pinch point which has been made worse by the structures that you have put in.

With Scott Hall Road your intention to consult with that, your consultants did say to me “We are just consulting on putting the bus lane in, we do not know about what services are going to run down there.” Well, why put a bus lane in if you do not know what services are going to run down there, or whether there is going to be a park and ride at Alwoodley Gates or not.

It is about the strategy. You have to have a strategy. To do that in Scott Hall Road you have to know that buses and cars would gain by it and with Scott Hall Road, knowing it as I do, I do not think they would.

The other thing is around the city centre where buses are picking up and dropping off everywhere. If you are a tourist in the city centre and you want to get a bus to Roundhay Park and you come out of the railway station, you have no idea where it is picking up or where it is dropping off because we have not got a central hub. I cannot believe that we could not have a central hub for buses to pick up and drop off somewhere close to the railway station and maybe a link, a walkway or something like that to actually allow people to do that.

It is all about joined up thinking and it is really about having a strategy of bringing people on board, because if you do not take the people with you, then you will not get more bus patronage. Really, just to say that First Bus are doing an awful lot by putting in new buses, they would have to put new buses in anyway under CAS because you are making them do that, so they would do that anyway, so just to give them money to put new buses in is really a bit of a red herring.

You did speak, Richard, about having lorries all running together. I thought you were going to go on and say we can have all buses running together. We get that now, we do not see a bus for a long time and then we see seven at once.

With regard to fares, because fares have been mentioned earlier, I think it was the Councillor over there (I just forget who it was) that mentioned it around the young people’s ticket, £2.60. I remember the time when we used to let young people get around for £1 and now it has gone to £2.60, so that is not really a decrease, is it, and it is not going to get young people to use it. (*interruption*)

It is about getting people on buses.

COUNCILLOR J McKENNA: Long time since you were 15, Paul!

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: A lot longer than you were!

COUNCILLOR WADSWORTH: If you don’t want to listen you won’t go home as early, will you! They say it is about getting people to actually use the bus because

they want to and if you do not do that, patronage will not go up. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Andrew Carter.

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: Thank you, Lord Mayor. The purpose of Councillor Buckley's White Paper is not to be unduly critical but to put a marker down about not losing sight of the ambition and the vision for something better that we can achieve with a relatively modest amount of money. As Councillor Lewis rightly says it is a lot of money but it will only go so far and only address certain things.

One of the issues I think we have got as a city is there has been so much disappointment. Let us be fair, under successive Governments I was the fellow who sat there in front of the Secretary of State for Transport who then happened to be Alistair Darling, to be told when we had gone through every hoop and got everything in place, that he was not going to give us the money for Supertram. It is interesting, Supertram would have been running now, had we got that permission that day. I will never forget what I was told – "Go away and think about a bus-based system." It was the view of everybody cross-party that that was not enough for a great city like Leeds, and it still is not.

I find Councillor Leadley's comments profoundly depressing because he can criticise mass transit and he can criticise looking forward to the future to a different way of providing public transport, but he does not actually suggest anything. He just warns us of Supertram or NGT. I will not touch on NGT other than to say a lot of warnings were given about going into an inquiry with a couple of hundred objectors still in place and no attempt being made to get them on side. You want to think about that when you think about what is going on through there and in the Banqueting Hall over this next few weeks because, interestingly, a long discussion on infrastructure investment, public transport, the private car today in the SAP inquiry and the Council did not come out of it looking very good at all.

We want to work with you but we want to make sure that we are looking to the future as well as the immediate present and that is where we are concerned. The other area where I do have a concern – and it was touched on by Councillor Wadsworth. Most people who have been here a while know my view on bus franchising – we should have it - and I am a bit critical that it has not been pushed as far as I think it should have been. I would like to know how far we have got with the current Secretary of State because it is in his gift, although we are not a Devolved Authority it is in his gift to allow us to introduce bus franchising and we should be pushing for that.

First Bus, or First Group, shall I say, are going through a very interesting time in their company's history. I do not want to cause them more problems than they have got but as anybody who studies the financial situation realises, they lost £300-odd million last year and the Chief Exec has resigned. They have no new Chief Exec in place, as far as I know we are dealing with the head of First Bus, not First Group. Will he be head of First Bus when there is a new Chief Exec? Given the amount of money, and while it might not be the totality of the £170-odd million, we are giving them a lot of investment for these proposals. I want to make sure they are actually going to be delivered as we want them and we are not just paying for something a company has to do anyway. I

think it is a very valid point that Councillor Wadsworth has raised and it does need addressing and it does need answering. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Harrison. Maiden speech, by the way.

COUNCILLOR HARRISON: My second chance! I find the whole tone of the debate so far about transport thoroughly depressing and distressing because there are many, many hundreds of thousands of people around Leeds and West Yorkshire who do not use the buses and they seem to have been largely ignored. I think really that is why I want to second Councillor Bentley's amendment because it takes a much broader appeal and looks right across the piece at various different options.

I fully accept as a Local Authority we have very, very little control in terms of what we can do to legislate for transport other than the road and for buses. However, given that the city and West Yorkshire has very grand ambitions, this is unsustainable. I also think that, given that Government wants to create a Northern Powerhouse, we have got to look far broader as well at transport, particularly mass transport, because if we do not then all of these ambitions will just have to be parked and left in the sidings.

Therefore, it is right that the Combined Authority with the support of this Local Authority has the same powers as Transport for London regarding transport of all types.

I was really disappointed when I was invited to join the cross-party Transport Group because actually it is really a talking shop about buses and it does not address the whole issue of transport. I fully appreciate that we have got a couple of cycling Superhighways, and I use them myself, but it is still not going far enough and fast enough, not for a city of three-quarters of a million people. If you go to similar and comparable cities around Europe you will find various alternatives from underground to even Hyperloops and many, many trolleybuses and trams. We are relying on buses and people in cars. We are not giving them options and alternatives. In fact, when it comes to rail we are making it more and more difficult.

Meltdown Monday, which happened on May 22<sup>nd</sup>, was simply a lightning rod for how Northern Rail has treated this city and the wider West Yorkshire region for decades.

In recent years the level and quality of service has declined and it has declined on an ongoing basis. For ten years prior to Meltdown Monday, commuters into Leeds and around West Yorkshire have suffered constant delays, cancellations on rolling stock that was old, broken and quite frankly unsafe in many respects. At the same time, the cost of rail transport has risen and customer service has plummeted and while this shambles has been inflicted on passengers, the attitude of the management at Northern Rail has been one of ignore, deny and lie.

It is typified by the attitude towards passengers trying to take advantage of delay/repay. They are just being told that trains are not late enough. It is really not good enough for people coming from some of the outer sides of Leeds, and I do not even want to think about getting in from North East Leeds, I would not even try it because there is no rail service and the buses are shambolic.

Northern Rail can get away with this why? Because this Local Authority does not take them to task on it. We stand on the sidelines and just let them get on and after the event we complain. We should have been ahead of the game for Meltdown Monday but more, we should have been doing things for the past ten years. Commuters have consistently complained and nothing has happened.

We have now got £173m to spend between now and March 2021. What I would urge this Authority to do is develop a strong strategy, a time line and a budget that it puts before the Scrutiny Committee on a regular basis. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: We have to draw this to a close, please.

COUNCILLOR HARRISON: You can shout me down, it is my maiden speech and I really, really do not care!

THE LORD MAYOR: This is the Lord Mayor shouting you down.

COUNCILLOR HARRISON: I know my time is up. Thank you for listening, just take it on board and I second Councillor Bentley's amendment. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: I call on Councillor Buckley to sum up.

COUNCILLOR BUCKLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. First of all can I thank all the contributors who have made some interesting points. Just turning to Councillor Lewis, we all are working together in this cross-party way but two things came out from what he actually said. He said almost nothing about the long-term future. The medium-term future, it was all about now and the next two years so there are no thoughts at all about improvements beyond 2021, something like that.

In addition, he made some comments which were echoed I think probably by Councillor Bentley that it all has to be Government money, the Government must do this, must do that, it must give us some more money. We have heard a lot, particularly at Combined Authority, about HS2 and how it will transform the station. This has got nothing to do with the £174m, obviously, but it will be coming along and in due course from then you have got HS3, but the whole point about this is some imagination to say to potential investors "At year zero we are going to have HS2, we are going to have this fantastic hub starting in Leeds and fanning out in all directions. Give us your investment, give us some plans, tell us what you can do on the basis of this fantastic new development."

Also, similarly with Councillor Leadley, this comment which he has made before, actually, about Leeds being quite small, it is only half a million. Councillor Lamb explained it is not because people have just been talking about the problems of getting from Wetherby, the Outer North East and the Outer regions in general. This is Leeds; we represent all these areas, not just the inner city.

Councillor Blackburn made some very sensible remarks about franchising which we can support. Going on to Councillor Groves, nearly all her remarks were about buses and she mentions poor communities, under-privileged communities who rely on buses. We all agree with that, obviously. They have to serve that but if the buses, if the

whole bus network is going to be viable and profitable, it has to make a profit of some description from somewhere, the system in the future, it has to cater for everybody not just that market. It has to attract people who have cars, not just the under-privileged.

Councillor Harrison, she said she is depressed. I hope as things go along in her career her she gets less depressed. She is a Liberal Democrat, that is true, so maybe not!

COUNCILLOR: Depressed is their default position!

COUNCILLOR BUCKLEY: Also she then went on, and I am surprised they did not over there, actually, to say about the TransPennine trains and all the problems with that and the Government is wrong there. That has got nothing to do with the £174m which is to be invested in Leeds.

Furthermore, I would just say in conclusion, actually, that Councillor Lewis talks about this deadline of 2020/2021. He might like to bear in mind that had he used a little bit of connections and a little bit more thought into the matter, perhaps the deadline might have been elasticated slightly or a little bit more co-operation. It only needed a request and you never know, he might have said yes. Thank you, Lord Mayor.  
*(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Buckley. We will now go to the vote. In the first place the amendment in the name of Councillor J Bentley. *(A vote was taken)* That is LOST.

There is a second amendment in the name of Councillor David Blackburn. *(A vote was taken)* That is LOST.

A third amendment in the name of Councillor Richard Lewis. *(A vote was taken)* That is CARRIED.

That becomes the substantive motion in the name of Councillor Richard Lewis. *(A vote was taken)* That is CARRIED.

#### ITEM 14 – WHITE PAPER MOTION – NHS FUNDING

THE LORD MAYOR: We now move to White Paper Motion NHS Funding. Councillor Lay.

COUNCILLOR LAY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. First of all can I take this opportunity to thank everyone who works in and supports the NHS in its 70<sup>th</sup> year but I also want to thank those who work in social care because if it were not for them the NHS would be even more overwhelmed. It is my opinion that both the NHS and social care are the best of us, the best of our compassion and the best of our society, so thank you.

This paper is not really about NHS funding. It says it is NHS funding but this White Paper is not. It is an opportunity off the back of the celebration of the NHS to

talk about how we fund social care, primarily adult in nature but not forgetting children's needs.

It is also not about the local Leeds Health and Social Care sectors which are undertaking a journey both strategically and operationally to drive partnership and collaboration in health and social care. Some Members of the Health Scrutiny Board saw evidence of this earlier in the week when we had a very informative session on the Leeds Healthcare Environment so I wholeheartedly agree with Councillor Charlwood's sentiment in her amendment that Councils are best placed to deliver social care, but that is not the purpose of this White Paper.

I often find it strange that health and social care seem to want to pool their human resources, their infrastructure and their aims and objectives together but not pool their budgets into one. I think the overall point of my paper is about valuing social care as much as we do the NHS. It is about funding social care properly and sustaining it now and in the future.

There are a couple of ways we can do that. One, by creating an Office of Budget Responsibility for Health and Care, and the second by a long-term funding solution.

An Office of Budget Responsibility for Health and Care would be an independent arm's length national body making recommendations, independently analysing spending and setting out how much money will be needed over the next reporting period – usually five years. It would be one of a growing number of fiscal, independent organisations around the world, including our own Office of Budget Responsibility.

How can we fund social care now and in the future? I think it is time that we introduced a new hypothecated tax, a ring-fenced tax if that is what you want to call it, and abolished the outdated and now generally seen unfair National Insurance.

Why do we need to do that? Well, according to the LGA we have a £2.5m shortfall in funding for social care and again, according to the LGA this year, the total budget across all 152 Local Authorities with responsibility for Adult Social Care is £16m and £7m for children. It is actually quite significantly less than that that the NHS gets and yet it is just as crucial, in my view, and that is a rise of 3% and 7% respectively on the previous years. That led to 147 of those 152 LAs clawing back some of that rise through the Adult Social Care precept.

We cannot continue to fund social care locally by the precept and I am pleased that both the Labour administration and the Conservative Opposition recognise that in their amendments, because the precept will not fill the gap. Only a dedicated ring-fenced tax for health and social care will do that.

Finally, as I say in my White Paper, social care is crucial and equally important to the health and wellbeing, the economics and life chances and opportunities of those using these services. Social care is the glove that fits over the hand of health and should be afforded the same parity of esteem, central funding and long-term funding and should get the same sustainable spending that the NHS gets. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor David Blackburn.

COUNCILLOR D BLACKBURN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I take pleasure in seconding this motion. I think the things that this highlights is not a new situation. I think Government cuts and resources to us and various other things have highlighted it, but going back 20 years we saw the beginnings of this, an older population and more of the resources of local Councils have been spent on social services and then having to cut back because they did not have the money, and then in more recent times what we have had is the precept. It is quite clear with an older population you need a different method of financing it and it has got to be financed similar to the National Health Service at a national level because the two go together. An elderly population needs more healthcare and to help with that we have to make sure our social care is there to reduce those costs, but we cannot do it just by adding to the Council Tax because if we carry on as we have done over the last 20 years, in another 20 years that is all we will be doing. We will not be having – well, we probably won't be running any schools anyway but that is a different matter - we will not be doing any other services but social services.

We have got to find that way forward and we have got to do it rapidly. I think the White Paper offers a way forward of doing this and that is why I am supporting it. Clearly both the Labour and Conservative amendments appreciate that as well but it would have been nice if we could all speak in one voice because I think it is a position that we all can support. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Caroline Anderson to move an amendment.

COUNCILLOR C ANDERSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would have liked to have supported your White Paper, Sandy, but I could not support the wording, the way that you had laid it out. As was pointed out by our Chief Whip at the start of today's meeting, the Lib Dem maths is somewhat suspect given that you believe £20 billion is a moderate amount, or is this another decision that you did not actually support or, God forbid, you were not consulted on?

My Group fully supports the extra £20 billion promised to the NHS and in our budget amendment we called for more money to be put into Adult Social Care this year to give to the Neighbourhood Networks specifically. Both the NHS and Adult Social Care could use up every penny of income tax, National Insurance and Council Tax. Obviously that would be ridiculous because there are so many calls on the public purse, so how do we fund Adult Social Care other than by precepting the Council Tax? It cannot be beyond the wit of Members of this Council to come up with innovative ideas.

I will not give you a list of solutions because I do not have a list. What I do know is that we need to look beyond just increasing taxation year on year, although it is accepted that we all may need to pay a bit more. What I do know is that we do not need to spend even more money on having another tier or bureaucracy by introducing an Independent Office of Budget Responsibility for Health and Social Care to oversee a ring-fenced tax. What would that achieve? Precious money that could be spent on our population's health and social care down the drain. That is certainly not the solution that we need.



Let us think outside the box. We do not yet know what the split of £20 billion will be between Health and Adult Social Care, or even if there is to be one. This will hopefully become clear. There is, of course, an inextricable link between the two. Our vast reach of Neighbourhood Networks actually saves the NHS in Leeds a lot of money and the relationship that Adult Social Care officers have with Leeds Teaching Hospitals Trust has ensured that even more has been saved through developing excellent processes when dealing with discharges from hospital to home or to temporary, intermediate or long-term care.

Let us all work together to find an innovative way of making whatever extra money comes our way directly or indirectly to this Council from the £20 billion stretch as far as possible. We also need to secure and agree a long-term solution acceptable to all as £20 billion does not come along every year. I look forward to working with you all on finding these solutions. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Matthew Robinson.

COUNCILLOR M ROBINSON: Second and reserve the right to speak, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Charlwood to move an amendment.

COUNCILLOR CHARLWOOD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I think first of all I would like to just associate myself with Councillor Lay's comments about thanking everyone who works in the NHS and social care. I think that was a very nice statement to make at the beginning and I think the Conservative amendment also shared some very supportive cross-party comments on the strength of the Health and Wellbeing system in Leeds, our joint working with the hospital and the social work joint work about discharge. It is good to hear the positives that we have together.

I would also like to say happy birthday to the NHS which is wonderful. Somebody said recently I think that the NHS was born at the same time as the social care system was born and so if we are going to give one a birthday present you really should give the other one a birthday present as well.

I think the nature of my amendment was really about saying that while there are some really interesting ideas in Councillor Lay's proposal in ring-fenced taxes, interesting, I can see the point in that, what I think I am keen to do is make sure that we do not sleep walk a little bit into a situation where the Department for Health and Social Care has centralised control over social care and that that gets taken away from Councils. It is a bureaucratic point but I think it is really important, actually, in talking about our sovereignty and governance of our own budgets here in Leeds. The Better Care Fund is one way that the Government seeks to integrate funding between the health system and the social care system and actually when they had the Dementia Tax debacle and had to give something and said actually you can increase your precept for local taxes instead of having that cap which I think Eric Pickles brought in of 2%, they suddenly said you can raise local taxes instead. They had to put money into social care and the way they did it was to put it into the Better Care Fund which the Department of Health actually has quite a lot of control over how it is spent.

While I agree with a lot of the sentiment of what you have written I would not like to advocate allowing that to happen because I think the points in my amendment try and highlight that actual innovation and the great ideas and the great practice that has been mentioned by Councillor Anderson as well happens because social care is placed within this City Council.

I think austerity over the last eight years has been a choice of this Government with the Coalition before it. It was a choice and I think if we have gimmicks in a way about how you tax things and actually we just need to fund social care properly through general taxation and fund the NHS properly as well.

I think that is the central point I do not want to move away from. We want the Council which has been cut by up to 50% of its revenue budgets over the last eight years to get proper funding for social care from which we can deliver partnership working and innovations so we have. We have got the recovery beds at The Green and Suffolk Court and at SLIC which have been really amazing, incredible successes, getting people out of hospital, avoiding admission, really, really positive work there that I think we all recognise now.

We have got the Reablement Service which gets people home quicker, it also keeps people well in their own homes. We have made the right decisions in a time of austerity again and again and I think really we need to hold on to that and not let that go to a centralised pot. I move my amendment, thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor James Lewis, please.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Elliott.

COUNCILLOR ELLIOTT: Thank you, Lord Mayor. We are used to hearing from Councillor Finnigan in this Council Chamber. Morley and Leeds City Council lost a talented politician in the May elections. This is politics, I am here in his stead speaking to the White Paper and celebrating, as we all do, the 70<sup>th</sup> birthday of the NHS along with the urgent need to address the under-funding issues associated with Adult Social Care.

To listen to some commentators you get the impression that the NHS is on its knees, a failing organisation in constant crisis. It is almost heresy to suggest the NHS operates reasonably well but could do better. It is almost regarded as a hate crime to propose we look at other health systems that operate across the world and learn from them if they do things better than us.

I have written down here lots of facts, some from the King's Fund, the Nuffield Trust and the often quoted Commonwealth Fund Mirror, which everybody has on their iPad. I am leaving that out and I am going on to say that we need to have that honest discussion and debate on how the NHS can do better. It needs to be more sophisticated and have discussions than just additional demands for extra resources. The NHS needs

to do better with the resources it has, even if it does require additional funding to cope with the demographic change it faces.

It needs a more imaginative approach and better mix of public, friendly society and private healthcare providers working in partnership to offer more services and better choices for patients.

We need to stop promoting the fake news that the NHS is being privatised. Indeed, the biggest culprit in terms of privatisation was the late Labour Government with its poor value for money, PFI contracts. One of the major reasons NHS funding is presently being siphoned off is to cover the PFI charges instead of being used for patient care.

Adult Social Care as well as the NHS also needs additional resources and sustainable future funding arrangements, a challenge avoided by previous Labour Lib Dem and Conservative Governments. There is probably a need to put up taxes to cover this additional funding need but an honest discussion needs to be undertaken with all, including those on minimum wages whose income will fall should such a proposal be introduced.

Lord Mayor, we welcome the 70<sup>th</sup> birthday of the NHS but we need better options and broader thinking if we want the NHS and Adult Social Care to survive and thrive for another 70 years and beyond. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Golton.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: I beg your pardon, Lord Mayor, I was overcome by being impressed by Councillor Elliott and her maiden speech as a Leader.

COUNCILLOR: You should have voted for her...

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: I will get you later! Yes, Lord Mayor, back to the serious issue of social care and health. I attended the Local Government Association Conference last week and it was noted that actually our party was the only one that sent their Leader. It might have been there was no demand for any other occasions but yes, we were the only one to send our Leader.

What I did note is that throughout at the conference, whether you were Labour or Conservative or Liberal Democrat and if you were in any kind of position of Authority in a Local Authority, you appreciated that Health and Social Care needed to be fully funded and it needed to have some local oversight to make sure that the services that were delivered in your area were appropriate to the needs of your area. What was pretty pertinent, actually, was that besides Vince Cable turning up as the only Leader, every time that funding was mentioned for Local Authorities Leader after Leader said, "I am spending 60% of my budget on social care and children's services." Virtually everybody, from whatever party they were, yet the only people to actually turn up from the governing party were James Brokenshire, who was brand new and did nothing but say "I'm listening" and they send Suella Braverman from the Department for Brexit to tell Local Authorities that everything is going to be great once we leave Europe.

What was missing most notably was there was nobody from the Health and Social Care Department. Nobody came to talk to Local Government about our role in delivering better outcomes for our people by making sure that Health and Social Care actually work together within our Local Authority. I think that is part of the problem because the money problem is seen to be a discussion between the Health Minister and the Treasury and we are just bystanders and we have to mop up whatever deal is delivered between those two protagonists and I am afraid the appearance of James Brokenshire did not fill anybody in that hall with any great deal of confidence that he is actually going to be a great advocate for us on Local Government.

I am afraid we need to have this kind of debate in this Council Chamber because I think every Council in the country, whether they are run by Labour as in Leeds or whether they are run by Tories, or the few that are run by Liberal Democrats, they all need to be sending the same message to Central Government which is, do you know what, stop messing about with saying you cannot afford something. Let us have a whole new deal for social care and health and let us make sure that Local Government is not missed out. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Stephenson, please.

COUNCILLOR STEPHENSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. For future reference, Procedural Motion 14.16 is what everybody will need in future!

I just want to comment very briefly on this White Paper in supporting the amendment put forward by Councillor Anderson, because I think getting lost in all this we forget what the Government is actually already doing and that should be welcomed, as it is in the amendment. We should also remember what was in the manifestos on which we all stood. I am slightly surprised in the Labour amendment it seems to reference that social care should be kept with Local Authorities and therefore insinuate that social care and health should not be merged together. I am unsure as to whether – it is certainly unclear – as to whether they are arguing that the NHS services should come under the control of the Council or whether we should put social care into the hands of the NHS. That is quite unclear in this amendment.

Let us look at what is actually happening in the Government's commitment to the NHS. We know, as the amendment states, we have got over £20 billion a year going into the NHS, a ten year plan for world class healthcare and more doctors, crucially more nurses, delivering improved cancer survival rates and crucially better mental health support as well; ensuring that every pound is spent wisely. This is quite interesting, because there is an internal market that is going on at present within all the various NHS organisations and I know Members in this Chamber who probably will not be surprised to know but take something as simple as toilet rolls that you have got some NHS organisations paying one figure in bulk for toilet rolls and something like 50% more in cost than others and we need to address those issues which is where efficiency savings and spending money wisely come from.

Of course, all that extra money that is going into the NHS is going to have to come from us as a country contributing a little bit more and also including funds returned from Brussels after Brexit. *(interruption)* I am glad you fell into the trap,

Labour Members and Councillor Golton, because using funds returned from Brussels after Brexit to invest in public services.

I will tell you what, that is a politician that I could vote for, that is. Who do you reckon said that? It was not a Conservative politician; it was not a Liberal Democrat politician. It was the Messiah himself, Jeremy Corbyn. It was his words, not ours, so we will have no talk about Brexit dividends coming or not, which leads me on to, quite nicely, this argument from the Liberal Democrats which is going to come up later but we know it is Liberal Democrat policy nationally that Brexit is so bad there is going to be no extra funds coming back etc, etc. If that is the case the £20 billion that is going into the NHS is part funded by what is coming back from Brussels, so where else are you getting the money from if you do not believe that is going to come back, because a hypothecated tax as you called for, the one pence rise in Income Tax which is going to hit the hardest the worst, only raises £12.9 billion over the next three years, so where are you going to reach the £20 billion a year from within five years?

The militant people over here will probably say increase tax on the rich. If you did that the 45% rate, if you increased that that raises only £250m so that is not enough. Therefore you are going to have to look at things like raising National Insurance as well which again hits the poorest the hardest. If you replace National Insurance it is additional to National Insurance so again you are hitting the poorest the hardest.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Stephenson.

COUNCILLOR STEPHENSON: I will end my sentence Lord Mayor, it is not an easy thing to raise more money but we do have to be mindful what is already happening. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Now we have Councillor Jenkins and this is a maiden speech.

COUNCILLOR JENKINS: My Lord Mayor, comrades and fellow Councillors. I will be using my maiden speech to talk about something which is, like myself, now 70 years old. I have worked as a psychiatric social worker in NHS therapeutic communities and have been a hospital patient, having had jaundice when I was born, then polio, then prostate cancer at 58, so I am indebted to the NHS. The NHS is one of our nation's cherished institutions. In a poll conducted by YouGov in February this year, two-thirds of respondents said that they considered the establishment of the NHS to be Britain's greatest achievement.

These sentiments are echoed by the residents of Killingbeck and Seacroft, who signed this birthday card at a gala in Seacroft last Saturday. When it was launched by Aneurin Bevan in July 1948 it was the first time anywhere in the world that completely free healthcare was made available on the basis of citizenship, need and not the ability to pay. Only 70 years ago healthcare was a luxury that not everyone could afford. The NHS was founded on the principle that the health service should be available to all free at the point of delivery and financed from taxation.

In the last 70 years it is thanks to the NHS that we have all but eradicated infectious diseases such as polio and diphtheria. The Labour Party founded the NHS for

the many, not the few. The Conservatives have a chequered history of support. As early as 1953 the Conservative Government requested an inquiry into the cost of the NHS with a view to dismantling it. This backfired with the Guillebaud Report in 1956 which declared the NHS value for money. The USA has an alternative – spend twice as much and fail to provide access to health for the whole population. Even Prime Minister Thatcher declared in 1989 that the NHS will continue to be available to be all and to be financed mainly out of general taxation. Now, currently, we might be treated to episodes of Hancock’s Half Hour

Two subjects that cause me concern are mental health and the profits of drug companies. The largest category of spending in terms of condition in 2010 was mental health at 11%, but it is not meeting the need and waiting lists for IAPT are too long. Spending on medicines has experienced a rapid increase in recent years rising from £13 billion in 2010 to £17 billion in 2016. The annual rate of increase in spending on drugs far outstrips the annual rate of NHS budget increases.

The NHS has had an extremely positive impact on mortality rates and overall life expectancy. However, there are still great disparities across our city. This leads us into provision and funding of social care. The principles of Labour’s national care service include the implementation of a maximum cap on limit on care costs at a lower level than currently set in the Care Act regulations and the raising of the asset threshold to a higher level than under the current system.

The NHS is extremely important to the people of Leeds. As well as providing healthcare free at the point of delivery it also employs a great number of people. Those jobs must not be outsourced to wholly-owned subsidiaries which are still threatened next year by the Trust. It is vital that we and the trade unions resist these expensive consultancy-led adventures in privatisation. Under a Labour Government the NHS will be coming home. I support the amendment. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor James Lewis, please.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I rise to speak in support of Councillor Charlwood’s amendment to this White Paper. I think it is an important debate for us to be having in the Council Chamber about how we focus on social care. Councillor Jenkins spoke passionately about the NHS and I just want to touch on some of the things we provide as a local Council, but first of all I was slightly curious, as I often am about Councillor Stephenson’s intervention and running through various parties’ manifestos for the 2017 General Election. If sticking to a party manifesto is the be all and end all I wait for Theresa May to implement her hated Dementia Tax that cost her her majority at that General Election. That is the idea, that is where the Tories come from but not only did they publish that policy manifesto, within a week they had dropped it. That shows how coherent their vision for the funding of social care is.

We look again how they have tried to move forward. We have had some glossy changes in the way they have adjusted it. They have put the title Social Care into the Ministry of Health but they have not put any more money into social care and I think we need to look very clearly around what the future of social care is.

First of all, we do need a debate on how we fund social care. We have heard some of the same old ideas from the other end of the Council Chamber around different ways we can reach into the purses and wallets of hardworking people in Leeds to fund social care, but actually we need to be looking at some of the real alternatives to funding it; look at some of the real loopholes in the tax systems, not a little bit more on income tax for working people or a little bit more on Council Tax but look at things like taxing corporations, the biggest and most profitable corporations properly; taxing excess pay; taxing offshore property loopholes; taxing the top 5% in society who have done so well out of the Conservative Government while social care has been left to wither.

The only option the Conservatives came up with to fund social care was graciously allowing us to put a few more per cent on our Council Tax for people in Leeds.

Let us not forget, the only rise in spending in social care that has not been covering the falling grant for this Council was people in Leeds paying more Council Tax. That is the only way the Tories have come up with extra money for social care. They have cut our budget for the Council by £240m a year, they have put an odd million grant here, there and everywhere in to do it but the only substantial increase has come from people paying extra Council Tax. They have not made it a fairer society where everybody bears the cost of it and there is where we want to move forward.

Also, we cannot forget again that social care does not sit in isolation. This is why we value social care as part of Local Government services. It is the parks and sports centres that we provide that keep people active; it is the community centres, it is the libraries, it is the voluntary services that we fund through our services that keep people active and involved in their communities. Those services are an important part of looking after people, keeping older people and they have been devastated by Tory austerity, their unfair cuts to Local Government.

Let us talk about fairer funding for social care but let us not forget that everything we do as a Council that helps people live more fulfilling and independent lives. That is why we have not just got to fight for social care but fight for more money into our Council services and turn back the tide of Tory cuts to Council services. I second Councillor Charlwood's White Paper. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Robinson.

COUNCILLOR M ROBINSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I wish to second the amendment in the name of Councillor Caroline Anderson and I echo the comments of Councillor Lay thanking all of our health staff across the country, whether they work in the NHS or whether they work in social care for the incredible work that they do. Since we are celebrating birthdays it would be remiss not to mention the 100<sup>th</sup> birthday of the RAF as well, people who have gone and fought and lost life and limb and suffered abroad to fight for our freedom in this country. *(hear, hear)* Many of those being some of the prime people who have come back and used our health services and our social care as well.

Indeed, my ward colleague as well who has quite rightly been mentioned, who is a carer for his mother. I think it is interesting, I would be delighted to see far more

profile given to carers across this city and across this country for the hard work that they do. Some of the challenges of care have only recently come to light to me from conversation with Councillor Firth and it is incredible the sacrifices that they make.

I am interested in the debate and I think that, a bit like Councillor Anderson, I was so close to supporting Councillor Lay's White Paper and then I read it and it is the wording that was the problem for me. Part of the challenge I think, it is like that old Blackadder joke, can I just change one thing – the words. Some of the challenge around an Independent Office for Budget Responsibility for the Health Service and the risks that creating some more quangocrats that actually take money away from health spending and social care spending as opposed to making sure that we deliver a fine service.

There is a discussion to be had around how we fund health and social care in this country. The comments by Councillor Lewis around taxing the corporations until the pips squeak just is not going to wash, because I am afraid the risk from doing that is we actually risk jobs and we have seen employment increase in this country. In fact, as we are about to discuss in some of the Inclusive Economy and Growth White Paper, we have seen jobs increase and one of the best ways to make sure that you tackle health and wellbeing is for people being in work and having a job and actually bashing business is not the way to do that.

As we look at the Health Service and its 70<sup>th</sup> birthday, it is right to say happy birthday but it is also right to take the chance to review what has gone previously. Quite rightly Councillor Jenkins said that we have tackled things like polio and eliminated that in this country. Infant mortality has vastly improved since the Health Service was born. Actually, the venerated Nye Bevan, who has led the Health Service in its initial start up, it was Winston Churchill who first actually conceived this idea in 1943 who said, "We must establish with broad and solid foundations a National Health Service." I feel that this is cross-party what we need to be talking about here and I implore the date to continue to be cross-party.

I would also like to comment on one thing that Councillor Elliott said. As we look and review our Health Service in this country and look at social care and how we can make it even better to survive in the future and see another 70 years, it is about accountability and it is about not just venerating the Health Service and saying actually it is perfect, because we know that it is not. It is not creaking at the seams but at the same time it is not perfect and there are many, many ways that we can improve the Health Service, we can improve social care. Bringing it together to make sure we have one service with one oversight I think is a far better way to do that than risking having things off and I would encourage the debate to continue and I second Councillor Anderson's White Paper amendment. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Khan.

COUNCILLOR KHAN: Lord Mayor, I am speaking in support of the amendment to Councillor Lay's White Paper. Our National Health Service is something that has always been held up as the best in the world, something we are truly proud of. Why, then, is the Government so afraid to provide the funding that clearly needs to maintain it? Last Christmas the National Health Service was in crisis. All non-urgent



surgery was delayed, around 55,000 operations, outpatient and day surgery appointments were cancelled. 17,000 people were left waiting in the back-up ambulances in the last week of December as hospitals were too full to take them in.

The number of elderly people rushed to A&E from care homes has gone up by 62%. At least a quarter of those care homes are in need of improvement, yet the Government are not properly financing the sector unless, of course, you happen to be a Virgin Care in Sussex, former Health and Social Care Secretary Jeremy Hunt's own constituency, in which case you received £200m in the last year. It would appear that the Government can afford to fund private companies but not the National Health Service or Adult Social Care sector.

Last year research by the BBC showed that nationally England, Wales and Northern Ireland had not hit one of the three key hospital targets in 18 months. England has seen the biggest decline. In 2012/2013 it hit its key hospital targets by 86% of the time. Last year it missed every monthly target. In spite of what the Government says, the fact is that the chance of not being seen within the target of four hours in A&E has actually more than doubled in the past four years. The proportion of people waiting over 62 days for cancer treatment has risen by a third. Additionally, the chance of delay when you are waiting for an operation has increased by nearly three-quarters in the past four years. Of course to anyone a delay is annoying but for some people a delay can have a huge consequence to their treatment and recovery.

The recent announcement increase in funding to the National Health Service, while a right step in the right direction, is simply not enough. The Institute for Fiscal Studies has said that while it will help to stem further decline, it will not meet the need or contribute to improvement in services.

This Conservative Government has failed over and over again. When it comes to privatising not just the National Health Service but also the other social care sector, there can be no excuse for the contempt with which our hardworking health care professionals are treated. No wonder so many are leaving. In the last year, in which we are celebrating 70 years of our fantastic National Health Service, I think of no other way of describing the Tory Government's record as a national disgrace. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: I call on Councillor Lay to sum up.

COUNCILLOR LAY: Thanks, Lord Mayor. Lots there really and I would like to thank everybody for their contributions. Going through some of those contributions, I will start with David. You are absolutely right, demographics has changed. When I first joined the NHS when we were celebrating our 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary I hardly ever saw anyone over 80. Now I see many, many, many and I see centenarians that I never saw before.

Caroline, I initially had welcomed a significant increase in funding and then I did a bit of research and realised that the £20 billion, whilst it equates to 3.4% annually, just to keep going we need 3.3% to stay fixed where we are over the next 15 years and if we actually want to improve our NHS we need 4% over 15 years, so I actually took it out and put "moderate". I am comfortable with that because it still is not enough – it still is not enough.

Rebecca, I would not want the Government to run local services. I think Ryan makes a fair point though, we have had lots of previous Labour prominent politicians talk about having a health and social national service, so we are going to have to decide at some point whether we want to have Government running our social services along with our National Health Service, or whether we want perhaps to have our Local Authorities pre-1948 running our hospitals and social services, or we continue as we are.

Judith, I was a bit confused, actually, if I am honest. I was not quite sure whether you were loving the NHS or dissing the NHS, if I am honest. All I do know is the public loves the NHS the way it is, it likes its treatments free at the point of access. There are two forms of privatisation, though, as many of you know. It depends on which way you want to look at it. You can either have private providers who deliver the services still at the point of delivery and still free at the point of care to residents, or you can introduce charges for some things. It is six of one and half a dozen of the other. There are two lots and the Labour Party always comes down on the idea that if a private company is running any aspect of the NHS, that is privatisation. We have always had private organisations running the NHS. In fact, in 1952 Bevan resigned – it was not over private companies running the NHS, he resigned over the introduction of prescription charges by a Labour Government. Government is difficult.

Ryan, £20 billion, yes, let us be honest, the Conservatives, the Government was dragged kicking and screaming into this rise for the NHS. Your Government was not and is not doing it out of love for the NHS, they are doing it because they knew they were on the wrong side of the tracks.

Stewart, as always mate, fantastic! *(laughter)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Sandy, your number is up.

COUNCILLOR LAY: Finally, if we funded Adult Social Care properly we would reduce demand in the NHS and you would not need so much money in the NHS. It is not rocket science so it does not have to always be increased funding for the NHS. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. We will now move on to the vote. First of all we will vote on the amendment in the name of Councillor Caroline Anderson. *(A vote was taken)* That is LOST.

We move on to the second amendment in the name of Councillor Charlwood. *(A vote was taken)* That is CARRIED.

We now move into the substantive motion which is the motion in the name of Councillor Charlwood. *(A vote was taken)* The motion is CARRIED.

#### ITEM 15 – WHITE PAPER MOTION – INCLUSIVE GROWTH

THE LORD MAYOR: Now we can move on to White Paper three in the name of Councillor Blake, Inclusive Growth. Councillor Blake.

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am very pleased to be moving the last White Paper of the afternoon. It has been an interesting afternoon so far.

I just want to really bring Council up to date. We have talked a lot about our ambition to be a compassionate city within a strong economy and I really think it is important that we keep this theme going and to bring Council up to date with the launch of the Inclusive Growth Strategy that we had in the city just a couple of weeks ago.

I think we have an incredible story to tell about Leeds and, despite everything our economy is growing and we have 34,000 more jobs in the city since the recession despite the shrinking, of course, of the public sector which we regret enormously. We have 8,000 more businesses, many of them growing and hiring and innovating right across the city. We have also secured 19 foreign direct investment projects into the city last year. Leeds and Manchester really are the two most attractive cities in the north bringing investment from overseas in, and we know we have an incredible talent pool and diverse communities to draw from with world class assets, innovative businesses and beautiful countryside.

I think we are doing a great deal in terms of really promoting the city and the great sporting events that we have had in the city have really helped us to get out and sell the message that not least the last one that I think set the tone for England's performance in the World Cup when we were fortunate as a city to welcome England playing Costa Rica at Elland Road and you could really see the difference in the spirit and no surprise at all that seven of the squad are Yorkshire home grown. It is that investment in our talent that we have to really work on.

You know, it is not just about attracting investment. It is not just about businesses coming here to grow. What we want to achieve is for that business to bring huge benefit to the people who live and work in our communities across Leeds. We want our economy to be for the many, not the few.

We know we have some significant partners in the city who are helping us in our agenda and really signing up to work with us, but really and truly we know how much we still have to do and we know that the scandal of poverty in the United Kingdom today is very much with us here in Leeds and I believe tackling inequalities associated with that poverty is the greatest challenge that we face in the city.

We work with business so we expect them if they come to Leeds to work with us, to make sure that jobs are ring-fenced for people in our communities. In my own ward, in Middleton Park Ward, working with Paul and Kim, incredible work when Asda came in making sure that almost well over 90% of the jobs that came in through Asda went to people in the local community. That is not an easy thing to do and the work that had to go on to get people into the workplace who have been out of work for a long time takes incredible courage, incredible commitment and we know that we can do it.

The real stand out things for Leeds that stands us out when we look at other cities is, I believe, for many, many years the fact that we put the people of the city first. It is in the DNA of our city and that is what we have to work on. So many people are struggling with the impact of poverty and that failure of public policy since this

Government came in eight years ago, you can see it everywhere that you go. That is what we are working on.

We know we have 155,000 people in absolute poverty, including 26,000 children and much of this is the absolute scandal of in work poverty. We have introduced the Real Living Wage in Leeds City Council, we are really leading by example and that is what we need to do, and the launch of the strategy was all about going out and reaching out to partners across the city.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Blake.

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: We want to make sure that everyone comes together in collaboration to work with us so that everyone in this city can live and thrive.  
*(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Pryor.

COUNCILLOR PRYOR: Lord Mayor, I am delighted to be seconding this White Paper as I believe it underpins the vision of this administration for the future of Leeds.

Our ambition is for a compassionate city with a strong economy where all citizens benefit from economic growth. The Inclusive Growth Strategy outlines how we, along with our partner across the city, will work together to develop a strong future workforce whose skills match the requirements of business, as well as helping to upskill the current workforce to improve growth, productivity and pay.

We are faced with continuing austerity from Government, with no sign of it stopping. We know that poverty levels are increasing and as Councillor Blake pointed out, particularly in work poverty. In Leeds there are 69,000 adults living in in work poverty. Not only that but in 2015/16 over 25,000 people in our city accessed a food bank. You may have seen the appointment of our new Brexit Secretary – today's Brexit Secretary – who talked about food banks and how they were not a problem at all and just thought oh, it is a bit of a cash flow problem – did not understand at all the levels of in work poverty of people in our country. It is absolutely shocking.

We need to be much smarter when it comes to thinking about the future employment needs of the city. We need to work alongside partners to anticipate where the skills gaps will be and how we fill them. We need to increase apprenticeships and help people into the jobs we need. How can we build on our position as the biggest financial and digital sector outside of London? How can we make the most of our retail and tourism offer?

We have a great deal to offer but we have the potential to offer so much more. This strategy and the White Paper underlining our commitment to gain support from other stakeholders and businesses as we continue to push this agenda forward is vital for the future prosperity of Leeds.

As I mentioned earlier, austerity is here and has created huge inequalities. Everywhere we look poverty is the underlying cause of so much that needs correcting.

We have seen the impact poverty has on health outcomes, on educational outcomes and on crime rates, just to name a few of the issues that we face day to day as Councillors. We need to tackle this and the Inclusive Growth Strategy will address this by filling the skills gap and developing, attracting and retaining a strong workforce.

The continued regeneration of the city, investment from the private sector as they show their confidence in Leeds and our position within the Leeds City Region and Northern Powerhouse makes us uniquely placed to grasp this opportunity.

I would urge the Opposition to support this White Paper and to work with us as we tackle inequality and make Leeds a city with opportunities for every single citizen. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lay to move an amendment.

COUNCILLOR LAY: Thanks, Lord Mayor. This is a strange White Paper, if I am honest. I am not really sure what its purpose is. I have just listened to two speakers take nine minutes of my life and I am no clearer as to what it is trying to achieve.

It seems rather strange that a Labour administration who are so keen to tell us how wonderful they are brings forward a White Paper that tells us so little, and then asks for us to have a State of the City. I do not think we have ever done that. You normally choose what the State of the City is, it does not come via a White Paper does it? I cannot remember it coming via a White Paper.

Why do I put forward my amendment? I am worried, I have to say. I am worried that no-one is talking about the elephant in the room. The impact of Brexit on growth. It is over two years since the UK voted narrowly to leave the EU and just under nine months until we do, and so I thought I would give the opportunity to this Council to take its head out of the sand and debate the impact of Brexit on our city, its citizens and its businesses. Since the vote to leave there have been 33 White Papers and although we have debated Transport three times, planning numerous times, Adult Social Care five times, we have never discussed Brexit and its impact on this city. The biggest issue facing the nation, this city, its businesses and its people, and we have never debated it. Maybe it is because the two main parties in this Chamber are as paralysed as their leadership. They are in the strange situation –or we are in the strange situation – where we have a Brexiteer leading the predominantly Remain Party in the Labour party and a Remainer leading a predominantly Brexit loving Party. At least for the time being she is, isn't she.

Yet outside the political elite, grave uncertainty remains for both British and multi-national businesses operating in the UK with thousands of jobs seemingly under threat and question marks hanging over possible future tariffs and investments, so I have a number of questions to both the Leader of Council and the Leader of the Conservative Group. Do they agree with the Chief Operating Officer of Airbus who recently said, and I quote, "This is not project fear. This is dawning reality." Or perhaps they agree with the recently departed head of the CBI who said, and again I quote, that "Parts of the UK's manufacturing industry could be damaged to the point of extinction." Do they agree with the UNITE union, who have voted to support a final say vote or, as Jeremy Corbyn said yesterday (and I do not expect you, Andrew, to agree)

“The future of jobs and investment are now at stake. Those jobs and that investment are not a sub-plot.”

My request to Council is, let us have a State of the City but on the potential risks of Brexit and what we are going to do about it. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Golton, please.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I actually quite like simple White Paper motions, so I am not quite as critical as my colleague is of Councillor Blake’s motion here and I think it is a very good idea that is within it that we should have a debate, a State of the City discussion around inclusive growth. I do not also question Councillor Blake’s belief that she would like to get a strong economy and a compassionate city during her leadership.

What I will say is, the strategy which has been put forward is very ambitious and it talks a lot about what we can all achieve together and it sets the challenge down and I am sure that because of the relationships that Councillor Blake is building with business in the city that there will be a lot of people that will sign up.

We have to be honest with ourselves in that Councillor Blake has not been helped in her ambition by some of her colleagues within her administration, or even within the administration before her leadership.

Lord Mayor, one of the reasons why I was not particularly happy about the curtailment of our debate today is because I wanted to talk about the Annual Schools Standards Report which demonstrates once again, twelve months on from a previously damning report, that this city lets down its children from poorer backgrounds in terms of the gap in attainment between what they achieve and what middle class children achieve in this city. If we are ever going to have an inclusive growth economy that works for everybody in this city, then we need to make sure that we are creating the next generation of job seekers that are able to access the inward investment that Councillor Blake was talking about in her introduction to this debate, and I was hoping I was going to get some clarity out of Councillor Pryor as to how he was going to achieve that as a fresh broom in an area which needs some serious attention because, Lord Mayor, the fact is that while this Labour administration has been in this city, in charge of the city and telling us that they are for the many, not the few and they want to narrow the gap between our poorer communities and our rich communities, actually our ten Super Output areas in terms of the most deprived in this city have gone backwards. That does not just mean to say that they have got poorer because the general national economy has got poorer because of the mismanagement of the Tory Government. No, it means that actually on the league table of all Local Authorities our poorer communities are deteriorating at a faster rate than over Local Authorities. That is some reflection of the level of focus that we have offered them so far.

All that we will say, Councillor Lay has talked about the precarious economy that faces us in the future as investors in our economy think twice perhaps about whether or not this country, let alone this region, is the first place for their investment. We need to be doing even more about how we can shape the skill set of our own population to make sure that they are able to access the few jobs that we have got.

For the likes of Councillor Lewis to talk about being a landlord and being proud to take on Amazon, which was a company which was criticised by union after union because of its poor employment practices and then to say well, if we do not have them it will go somewhere like Wakefield, that is not going to give us a great amount of confidence about the commitment for us in terms of creating really good entry level jobs for our population. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Coupar.

COUNCILLOR COUPAR: Yes, thank you, Lord Mayor. I do hope, Councillor Golton, that your lift improves somewhat as the day goes on because you must be the only one in the nation that is so down at the moment, I have got to say.

I will be speaking about the importance of the Inclusive Growth Strategy to our communities in Leeds and I am really pleased that the strategy focused so heavily on the importance of empowering our local communities. It is vital that they are supported to reach their full potential rather than having a top down, centralised approach imposed on them. One of the strategies, Twelve Big Ideas, is supporting places and communities to respond to economic change and there is a great deal of work within my portfolio which demonstrates how this ambition is being realised.

For one, our empty homes strategy is a good example of this administration improving neighbourhoods. Where previously empty homes encouraged blight, we have brought many back into occupation. Over the three years of the scheme 129 long term empty properties were brought back into the Council housing stock. In addition, 1,257 property owners were written to and informed about the scheme and of our interest. 960 of these properties are no longer empty, showing a far-reaching impact beyond the headline 129 units.

We are also targeting investment and intervention in the areas ranked the most deprived in England through our priority neighbourhoods work. This is a new approach which prioritises our collective endeavour, resources, working with partners and utilising our Community Committees. This work is about doing things with and not to people, encouraging culture change both within the Council and across our local partnerships.

I am really pleased that the Inclusive Growth Strategy recognises the importance of connecting those areas that surround the city centre with the new jobs and opportunities that will come through developments such as the South Bank and the Innovation District. Improving transport links is certainly an area which is important and where we had a good conversation in the first White Paper.

It is also important that we support growth and investment in our main economic hubs away from the city centre, such as the Aire Valley Enterprise Zone, Thorp Park, White Rose and Kirkstall Forge, so that communities local to those areas can really benefit.

Community Hubs are an area that demonstrate the principles of the strategy in encouraging a placed based approach. Now, I know that Councillor Golton likes to have

a moan about the hub programme but the feedback has been extremely positive. 15 community hubs have now opened across Leeds, providing accessible and integrated services where they belong, right at the heart of the community. Hubs support the growth of Leeds in a number of ways and end of year figures for 2017/18 show that 2,773 customers have been supported into work through Job Shops. An additional 415 customers were supported into work through our personal work support package. Each of these people helped into work has their own unique story and I would like to share one with you today. A 44 year old woman who has been in remission for cancer and was referred to Connect Well and the Reginald Centre, which is the Chapeltown Community Hub, is a Social Prescribing service which works in partnership with primary care to navigate people to relevant services and support groups within the community. In addition to Connect Well this lady was also referred to the Job Shop for support into work, completing a customer service course as part of the Reginald Centre Community Learning Prospectus. She has been successful in gaining employment as a home carer, using the flexibility in her shifts to find time to volunteer as a community health champion.

As well as helping many people into work Customer Services provision has experienced an uptake in enquiries since the introduction of the Community hub model.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Coupar, your time is up.

COUNCILLOR COUPAR: The Inclusive Growth Strategy is about ensuring...

THE LORD MAYOR: Please bring it to a close.

COUNCILLOR COUPAR: ... people and places contribute and benefit from growth to achieve their full potential. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Harper.

COUNCILLOR G HARPER: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am speaking in support of the motion in the name of Councillor Judith Blake. I am sure some of our newer Members will have found out they get lots of strategy documents and many of them just end up stacked in piles on the space of a shelf but the Inclusive Growth Strategy is completely different.

It sets out clearly how tackling poverty and inequalities can itself create economic growth. It shows how to create a city with a strong economy where everyone benefits. The work that has gone into getting major organisations and stakeholders in the city on board with this idea is absolutely terrific. The strategy contains pledges from big institutions and stakeholders showing what they will continue to do to deliver inclusive growth to benefit the citizens in Leeds.

I feel it is especially important for inner city wards where residents suffer more than most from the effects of deprivation, inequality and lack of opportunity. In recent years we have seen businesses in Leeds provide more opportunities for young people in that situation. For example, in my ward we worked with BAM, the developers, when the First Direct Arena was being built and we put on a number of job fairs to provide opportunities for young people. Working with the Council's Jobs and Skills we



promoted three jobs fairs and targeted areas where we knew there were high levels of unemployment and encouraged young people to attend. This resulted in many apprenticeships and job offers and was a great example of working with the private sector to provide these types of opportunities for the young people in our wards. We need to see more work like this, we need to keep promoting this and encouraging others to play their part. Only then will we see the results of this work on tackling the core issues of poverty and inequality. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Campbell.

COUNCILLOR CAMPBELL: Thank you, Lord Mayor. As my colleague Councillor Lay has said, I am slightly bemused by the need of the Labour Group to put forward a White Paper which actually asks us only to do one thing, which is to agree to have a State of the City meeting, something we have had every year for the last five, six years and presumably to have one which enables us to monitor the Inclusive Growth Strategy.

I do not know when we are going to have that meeting because we have not got a date for that, presumably some way down the line although we may not get to it if the Inclusive Growth Strategy does not work. Councillor Lay has indicated there are clouds on the horizon, I think is the best way to describe that, and I am sure that Councillors Cohen, Flynn and Stephenson will raise that subject at some length.

I have to say, Lord Mayor, none of us, and this is why I am somewhat bemused by the whole reason for us being here and discussing this, none of us wish to do anything that does not address inequalities, poverty or social exclusion, but the thing that worried me about the speeches that the officers wrote for the two Councillors who have already spoken is that we simply seem to focus on certain areas of the city and certain groups. I thought our function, and I suppose that is the difference between Anglo-Saxon socialism, which is espoused over there which is basically you look at the lowest ten per cent of the population and try and move them up out of that lower bracket quite forgetting, of course, that actually somebody has to drop down back into that to fill up the space, to the socialism that I think I am quite happy to...

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we cut the conversations, please, we have somebody speaking.

COUNCILLOR CAMPBELL: It is all right, Lord Mayor, nobody is listening to them. (*laughter*) To the socialism that I am quite happy to support which says our function is to work for the benefit of everybody within the city, so we can measure inclusive growth if everybody gets to be better off, if everybody gets a job. Not if people in Little London get a job, and I wish they would, I have always been mesmerised how if you think about it at the centre of the city we have the richest economy in West Yorkshire and yet that is adjacent to some of the poorest communities. We have never been able to cross that divide and I do not know why, and I would love to know why, but my view is quite simple. If you are unemployed in Hunslet, if you are unemployed in Wortley, if you are unemployed in Wetherby it does not matter that other areas of the city have more people who are unemployed. It is your problem and it is our job to deal with that problem for everybody within the city, not just one section.

I think, Lord Mayor, if you really want us to say are we having a State of the City meeting, the Leader could have called for that straightaway, we would have accepted it mainly because we never really have much say in the matter, but why have we bothered with this really in a time when the city and the economic power of the city is under some threat, why are we having this debate now when we could be having a proper debate about where do we go and how do we deal with the situation. *(Applause)*

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

COUNCILLOR M ROBINSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. A lot of sense spoken by some of the speakers already, actually. I welcome the tens of thousands of jobs that have grown in Leeds and been created in Leeds and I would remind Members in this Chamber that those jobs are created by business and private enterprise and individuals actually taking a risk and starting a business and employing more people. They are not created by strategies, that is not where they are created from though I do welcome the strategy in many ways because it does point out some laudable aims but with very few targets or benchmarks that are in there. We have got very little to assess the Council against and see whether we have met them or whether businesses, indeed, met those targets.

It is very interesting, as you look through, it is hard to disagree with some of the Inclusive Growth Strategy because a lot of it is motherhood and apple pie. You would struggle to oppose it in many ways, but what you need to do is set something that is far more ambitious and benchmarks that you can be set against.

We have talked a lot about education. In education that is exactly what schools do; they set benchmarks, they set targets and that is where they push students to try and achieve those targets. Often we would stretch targets as well. That is not within the strategy.

Having a State of the City meeting seems like exactly what other speakers have said, it is something that the Leader could call but where is this going to Executive Board? Where is this going to Scrutiny Committees to be regularly assessed against and actually targets that they can hold the administration to account against?

If we want to talk about growth in the City Council they should really have a look at the looming MRP problem and the Treasury Management Reports that come out because Members opposite would do well to look at that when the Executive Board papers are published. There is a crisis coming in terms of debt levels that is being ignored and the worry for this Council is, you can publish all the great growth strategies that you want but if there is no money to pay the bills, that is going to be a really big problem.

Education that has been mentioned within the Growth Strategy is an incredibly important way to alleviate poverty and a way out for many, many people. What we need to do is see far more attention paid to Early Years, because the problem is not necessarily starting in our secondary schools, it is started in the first couple of years of children's lives. That is not mentioned within the Inclusive Growth report.

Finally I would like to turn to the amendment that was put forward, which seeks to ignore the will of 17.4 million people across this country who voted with the biggest democratic mandate that was ever achieved in the history of votes in this country.

What I think that we really need to understand is that Brexit means leaving the Customs Union, leaving the Single Market, leaving the ECJ, making sure we are free to strike our own trade deals and making sure we end free movement. Control of our borders, control of our money, control of security, control of our future as well.

We have been hearing about clouds looming on the horizon. I see a very different forecast. I see sunny uplands coming, I am afraid (*laughter*) that is what I see. This is a chance to throw off the shackles, throw off the shackles of what is not a free trade bloc but is actually a customs union that makes us look within ourselves as opposed to out at other countries. What I would far rather see when we talk about an Inclusive Growth Strategy is something that means that people who come to this country not from just Poland and Portugal but actually are coming from as far wide as Pakistan and Peru, that everybody who comes to this country can succeed. We look beyond the EU and we look beyond Europe for what we want to do. We actually look to make sure that we see emerging markets for our growth because if we do that there is a far brighter future, there is a far more opportunity to trade with far more people and an Inclusive Growth Strategy that takes that into account and takes a global future into account and a global Britain into account, and hopefully a global Leeds into account, will be one that succeeds, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Flynn, please.

COUNCILLOR FLYNN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Unlike the vast majority of the Members opposite, I actually attended the launch and very impressive it was, by the way. I saw, I think, two Members of the Opposition, or two Members of the opposite side of the Chamber there. I might be wrong about the numbers, of course because that seems to have caused some problems earlier in the meeting.

Anyway, back to Inclusive Growth and just to echo what Matthew said about the suggested amendment, I agree with every word you said, Matthew. Absolute nonsense, sadly, I am afraid. (*laughter*)

What is Inclusive Growth and what does it actually mean for the city? One definition I have seen is economic growth creates opportunities for all segments of the population and distributes the dividends of increased prosperity both in monetary and non-monetary terms fairly across society. I do not think anyone would argue those aspirations. The phrases that I think are particular important are about “for all segments of the population” and “being distributed fairly across society.”

Judith, you have extolled the virtues of collaboration, partnership and role models and encouraging inclusive growth and tackling barriers to employment. At the launch there were a number of very impressive speakers – a lady called Renee Hunt from Sky explained in some detail how she had managed to increase the number of female employees in technical roles within the company by using some fairly innovative methods of doing it.

Almost every speaker I think who spoke there spoke about the importance of inclusive growth, how important it was for the future of the city and basically the importance of working together to include inclusive growth.

Many of the people there – employers, universities, schools, the NHS, the Council, third sector, entrepreneurs, innovators, in fact every major institution I think that was there, supported the strategy. Again, I do not think anyone would argue with that.

So what was missing? Last month I attended the launch of an equally impressive strategy here in this Chamber. It was the Learning Disability Strategy. We had people from all over the city speaking at that launch and most of those people who spoke had a learning disability, and very impressive they were too.

That strategy had a large section in it devoted to the employment prospects and the need for a plan to set up a partnership with local employers who were particularly sympathetic to that particular area of the city. Bearing in mind that less than 7% of people with a learning disability and autism are in employment and that number has been in steady decline for the last five years, surely that merits inclusion in the strategy.

However, this is the strategy and I cannot find anything in it that addresses the issue and very little about disability, for that matter. It is not to suggest that this city is not striving to improve the lot of anyone with a learning disability or autism or with a disability, but I think it is a surprising omission given the context of Inclusive Growth.

Lord Mayor, if it is not too late can we please add another big idea to this strategy to ensure that the employment prospects of some of our most vulnerable residents are included and to ensure that there is a clear and visible link between the Inclusive Growth Strategy, the Learning Disability Strategy and the Health and Wellbeing Strategy. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Stephenson, please.

COUNCILLOR STEPHENSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I think I am the last Member to speak from these Benches, so it would be remiss of me not to mention, whilst we are mentioning many happy returns to the NHS and the RAF, we should also mention my ward colleague, Samuel Firth, whose birthday is today, so happy birthday Sam (*applause*) and I know we might be a bit nervous about electoral irregularities – I can confirm he is over 18 and eligible to stand! (*laughter*)

COUNCILLOR LEADLEY: Very hard to believe though”

COUNCILLOR STEPHENSON: On this point, Lord Mayor, it is fair to say you have got to broadly welcome everything that was in the document there. I was with Councillor Flynn representing the Conservative Group at the launch as well and I think actually one thing that has been missed out today and should be mentioned is the role of our Chief Executive in this as well, because those of us who were there, and I think all the businesses there as well, welcomed his role at the real leadership that he is providing for this city as well.

I say this not as negative criticism but as positive feedback and criticism, looking through the document one thing that is not there is a clear strategy for international trade built on the opportunities this city now has moving forward.

When I was first elected two years ago my maiden speech was about the opportunities for international trade after the Brexit vote. Whatever we think about Brexit, those opportunities clearly will be coming and I called for an international trade envoy for the city and a formal strategy for international trade, and this would have been the prime opportunity to bring this in.

I say that because this is a good document and a few weeks ago, I think three or four weeks ago now I was in South America with work and I was in Buenos Aires talking to the Argentine Chamber of Commerce. They were talking about the markets that are opening up in Argentina that are markets that we could access, and they really want to expand their services markets. It struck me that Leeds is the biggest economy outside of London for financial services and otherwise and there is a prime opportunity there for Leeds to exploit moving forward. It would have been good on Tuesday next week when I meet the Argentine Ambassador (*laughter*) to be able to present him with, look, here is the guide. In fact it is tea with the Argentine Ambassador! (*laughter*) It would be great to be able to present this to him and say here is a clear strategy for your country to invest in Leeds, and it is meant as positive criticism. It is not negative, it is just an opportunity left there to go.

I cannot leave without mentioning our friends the Liberal Democrats, and I am sorry Councillor Golton and friends, I know I have picked on you quite a lot today but you make it so easy! (*laughter*) You really do. A second referendum. Councillor Golton, I remember in 2010 when you were the Liberal Democrat candidate in Elmet and Rothwell when you took 16% of the vote – remember those good old days, Stewart, 16%? 4% last time. Your manifesto said that the Liberal Democrats want a referendum on our membership of the European Union. You have had a vote, Stewart. In that referendum in Rothwell your constituents voted to leave the European Union and you and your Party and still banging on about a second referendum.

Move on from the issue. Get behind what is happening and get behind what this city can do moving forward to make good benefits about growth, about the opportunities that Brexit will bring this city. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: I call on Councillor Blake to sum up.

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: Not a good day, Stewart, not a good day!

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: I was just enjoying that. It is a shame to stand up and interrupt the flow. Do you know what, Councillor Lay just reminds us that the Lib Dems have just got a one trick pony, that is it. That is all they can talk about and I have to say to you, when we moved the Culture White paper back in January what did they talk about but they talked about trying to link it to Brexit. It reminds me of when they were standing for Parliament in the run up to 2010 before they actually had the rare experience of having to deal with responsibility and everything they talked about was abolishing tuition fees. Do you remember that? That is the sort of thing.

I think it is really interesting that both Sandy and Colin do not see the point of this. That speaks volumes to me. They obviously have not really looked at the document, they were not involved in the launch and I think, Billy, your comments having been there, you could go back and say to them all the points that they picked up were actually there and picked up on.

Stewart, thank you for your words about the ambition and the challenge, and the challenge is absolutely crucial in this, but I think you are looking at the debate on Minutes with rather rose tinted spectacles. I think Education and Learning was the sixth down the agenda. The opportunity of actually discussing them under the Minutes in this Council would have been very rare so actually we have done you a favour because you have managed to get your comments in now.

You know, the whole thing underpinning this that we have not discussed, and I regret cutting the meeting short in this sense, is what we actually need is to have more powers, more resource, more control over what we do locally through devolution and that is what we have to aim for. Our model in devolution actually does pick up the need for it is not just post-16, although that is important and very much involved in the strategy that we are talking about today, but it is about getting hold of the whole education agenda in this city again. What a nonsense that education is so centralised. You cannot run hundreds and thousands of schools from Whitehall and expect to get the outcomes you need, and we know and I am really pleased that the research that has just come out has really enhanced the role of Local Authorities in the improvement agenda, and more of that to come.

What we have heard about today is a whole range of links. We did not stress on the health aspects. They are absolutely crucial and all the way through, and if you had been at the launch you would have heard me say that the Inclusive Growth Strategy is absolutely joined at the hip with the Health and Wellbeing Strategy. The other aspect not just about disabilities but about mental health, how we actually help the thousands of people in this city who are really struggling as a result of mental health.

Matthew, I think you have been spending a bit too much time in the sun, love! You need to get out a bit more, I am sure. *(laughter)* The really serious – can I just say, the really serious point about bringing this to Council, first of all we got criticised if we...

THE LORD MAYOR: We have a red light, Councillor Blake.

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: ...are going to take it to Executive Board. This is a tough agenda, it is hard, it is difficult. It means everyone has to change what we do...

THE LORD MAYOR: And it is over, it is a red light.

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: ...we have to challenge Government policy and we have to do it together as a whole city. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: We will now vote on that White Paper.

The first vote on the amendment in the name of Councillor Lay. (*A vote was taken*) That is LOST.

We now move to the motion, which becomes the substantive motion in the name of Councillor Blake. (*A vote was taken*) That is CARRIED.

ITEM 11 – MINUTES OF THE HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD AND THE EXECUTIVE BOARD.

THE LORD MAYOR: Before you can wrap up for the day we do have Item 11, and we are now moving on to receive the Minutes of the Health and Wellbeing Board and the Executive Board. Councillor Blake.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dowson.

COUNCILLOR DOWSON: I will second, Lord Mayor.

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

That does wrap up the business of the day but it has just occurred to me that I have made a gross error of omission. Councillor Dawson over there is back in his seat for the first time after quite a long absence and it is nice to see him. (*Applause*) I commend you for having stuck it out this long, quite honestly! Welcome back. Here endeth the lesson, go and watch the football!

*(The meeting closed at 6.04pm)*

This page is intentionally left blank