

LEEDS CITY COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

Held on

Wednesday 31 October 2007

At

THE COUNCIL CHAMBER,
CIVIC HALL, LEEDS

In the Chair:

THE LORD MAYOR
(Councillor B Cleasby)

VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

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

VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF LEEDS CITY COUNCIL MEETING
HELD ON WEDNESDAY 31st OCTOBER 2007

THE LORD MAYOR: Can I move us now on to page 2 of the Order Paper having closed that Extraordinary Meeting - and, again, many congratulations to each of our new Aldermen - and start our ordinary meeting. Again, the instruction is to ensure your mobile phones are switched off, please.

I do have one or two announcements. It may come as some surprise to many of you that Councillor Lobley has announced his engagement to Amy. Apparently that was in July. (*Applause*)

It may come as an even bigger surprise to know that on 19 October Councillor McKenna actually got Andrea to the point where they got married. Very well done! (*Applause*) You will see later that there is now another McKenna on the Order Paper.

It is also a great pleasure to announce another anniversary. John Wilson is celebrating 30 years with the Council. (*Applause*) He told me last night he has spent the last 15 of them in the last six months with me! (*Laughter*)

Could I pass on the congratulations that I have already sent to Leeds Rhinos on their astounding success in the Super League Grand Final. We are in the process of discussing a suitable date with them for a reception and it is looking like it could be February now.

I am also pleased to announce that your Lord Mayor is supporting our soldiers' Christmas Appeal and that will be going to all our staff and hopefully you will all support it to provide those extras for those serving us in foreign fields.

It is also another anniversary. It is the 100th anniversary of women being eligible to stand for Council. Many have been doing that all the time I have been Lord Mayor because I have been using that fact as a second fact, the first one being the 50th anniversary of the founding of the EU this year. I have been building, as I went through this speech, to finishing with our own 800th. As I say, it is the 100th anniversary when women finally won the right to stand for Town Hall elections after a campaign ignited by a letter in The Times newspaper. The first elections where women were entitled to stand took place on 1st November 1907, so those who are married to female Councillors might like to provide them with a glorious champagne and strawberry breakfast tomorrow. Councillor McKenna, I hope you are listening.

For those in the public gallery, you also now have the opportunity to stand if you wish to and join all our ladies on the floor here.

Since our last Council one of our Freemen passed away. I think we should mark the occasion to celebrate Jane Tomlinson's achievements with applause, so would you join me, please.

(Standing ovation in tribute)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. That is the end of my announcements and I hope I have not missed anybody out. They have been coming in all week, have the announcements for me to make.

Can I therefore call upon Councillor Procter to move that the Minutes be received.

ITEM 1 - MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 18TH JULY 2007

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: I move that the Minutes be received, Lord Mayor.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Therefore can I call for the vote? I think that is carried but I should formally ask for those against. Abstentions? No. Therefore that is CARRIED

ITEM 2 - DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

THE LORD MAYOR: Can I, then, move us on to agenda item 2, Declarations of Interest. A list has been published. Councillor Jarosz.

COUNCILLOR JAROSZ: Could I declare an interest on White Paper, is it, or item 12, British Legion. I am a member of the Pudsey Branch of the British Legion.

COUNCILLOR MINKIN: Item 14, my husband is a season ticket holder for Leeds Rhinos, so personal interest.

COUNCILLOR COULSON: Member of British Legion, Lord Mayor, Item 12.

COUNCILLOR ELLIOTT: Lord Mayor, I am a member of the British Legion, Item 12.

COUNCILLOR TOWNSLEY: Item 14, Lord Mayor, I am also a season ticket holder at Rhinos.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: I am not sure about the exact item, Lord Mayor, but the White Paper on the Rhinos, my nephew plays for them.

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: On the same item, Leeds Rhinos, in my capacity as Leader and Deputy Leader of Council, which is noted in my declarations of interest, I have received numerous occasions where I have been given corporate hospitality by the Rhinos and by Carnegie, so that should be declared publicly.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: Lord Mayor, yet another Rhinos season ticket holder, but don't tell anybody in Castleford!

COUNCILLOR SMITH: On the same White Paper, as I was at Manchester cheering I hope that just made the difference!

THE LORD MAYOR: Is there anybody else?

COUNCILLOR LOWE: I suppose I should declare that my nephew is a member of the youth team at the Rhinos! *(Laughter)*

THE LORD MAYOR: I should declare that I have been on a civic visit to Durban and I did not see any rhinos! Can we move on? Thank you.

Can I ask for a show of hands now to show that you have read the list or you have amended the list and you have given all the declarations you need, so could I see a show of hands, please, which really should be everybody? Thank you.

ITEM 3 - COMMUNICATIONS

THE LORD MAYOR: Can I then move to agenda item 3, Communications. Chief Executive?

THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE: There are no communications to report, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you.

ITEM 4 - DEPUTATIONS

THE LORD MAYOR: Agenda Item 4, Deputations. You will see on the Order Paper that there are two; Local Residents concerned about Britannia Quarry, Morley, and the second one, Queenswood Heights Tenants and Residents' Association regarding antisocial behaviour in the flats.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: I move that the Deputations be received.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Second.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can I, therefore, call for the vote? That is CARRIED, thank you.

DEPUTATION ONE LOCAL RESIDENTS CONCERNED ABOUT BRITANNIA QUARRY, MORLEY.

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

COUNCILLOR A SLINGSBY: Good afternoon, Lord Mayor, fellow Councillors. The deputation is local residents concerned about Britannia Quarry which is just off the Rein Road. This lady is Janet Raley, this is Mr Armforth at the far side, these two people is Mr and Mrs Mallett. I am Albert Slingsby.

This is a follow up to the deputation that we did last year as the conditions of Rein Road and Tingley Bar junction are pretty much the same in relation to dust, mud and stones falling from the wagons as they are leaving Britannia Quarry. We are certainly not Luddites who go sneaking down at night trying to smash machinery, close them down or put folk on the dole. It is good to see that at least one of Morley's original industries is still surviving, the natural stone market, but why is it always the same few residents to complain about the conditions of Rein Road? Woodkirk Stone Management are surely failing to monitor themselves.

Council officers and quarry operators keep promising us that we will have the internal road brought up to standards. There was an e-mail in January 2006 where the managing director stated to a Minerals Enforcement Officer, that they had budgeted for that work to be done last year. In a letter dated 1/10 from Leeds Council to our MP it states that part of the required 15 year Mineral Review submitted - it has to be submitted before 17th February at the absolute latest which, eight months later, we are still waiting for it - it is proposed - please note only proposed - a hard surface to the access road from Rein Road down to the office block will happen. Proposals and promises are worth nothing until they are delivered. Queen Victoria made similar promises to the Maoris back in 1840, so we can live in hope that more practical work is done on the hard surface programme in the years of 2008/9 than has been achieved in the last 21 months.

I will admit we have had a stay of execution this last few weeks as only dimensional stone was going out and not aggregate. However, I did an unannounced inspection on 18th October and it was business as usual. The haul road needing dowsing with water because it was dry and dusty, muck had fallen off quarry excavators in the path of vehicles leaving the site after they had been through the wheel bath and both the wagon shakers were full or overflowing with muck.

These devices are intended to vibrate the mud off the wagon wheels as they run over them. Surely it would be more effective than defective if these pits under the shakers were cleared out occasionally.

There is still confusion for the public who to contact. Is it Leeds where about four or five different departments all saying, "It is nowt to do with us, pass it on, pass it on, contact the police." The police say it is Leeds Highways. Leeds Highways say that they have no jurisdiction on Road Traffic Act. Holbeck Police Station, they say contact the Council and, would you believe it, Trading Standards. We are just getting sent round the mulberry bush. Time and money we have spent on it and we just don't get nowhere.

In other words, it is like horse manure - if you kick it about long enough you will lose it, blah blah.

Right, surely it is not asking, when it comes to unsafe loads and untreated wagons, we are not asking for the moon if drivers check whether their loads are levelled off between the wagons, spill over the wagon sides before they are sheeted. Some wagons' sheets fit the load like a thimble on an elephant's backside and one or two wagons have gone out, one or two wagons have been reported by residents recently, this last two or three weeks or month, for going out completely unsheeted. When it is reported, we are imagining it, it did not happen.

Council officers appear to come in on a sunny day or wearing rose tinted glasses when they come because they do not see the same quarry I used to play in and I have lived at the side of for 60-odd years. Something is certainly not right.

When it comes to best practical means, we have had a gentleman spraying water on wagon wheels and under bodies because they are in the process of moving the wheel bath lower down to the quarry. The trouble is, the road is in that diabolical a state from the wheel bath as wagons come out of the wheel bath running up this unmade road, they are picking more muck up than what they are having washed off them.

THE LORD MAYOR: Would you bring your speech to an end? You have actually had your five minutes.

COUNCILLOR A SLINGSBY: Yes. There is confusion about the original track up. I remember - and I am leaving copies of company surveyor and Group Property Manager letters going back proving they have had had access out of Rein Road for 50 years and...

THE LORD MAYOR: I am going to ask you to stop there because you are beginning to make another speech. I think you have had a generous five minutes.

COUNCILLOR A SLINGSBY: OK, sorry, yes.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can I call upon Councillor Procter?

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Lord Mayor, it gives me great pleasure to move that the matter be referred to the Executive Board for further consideration.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: I second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Could I call for the vote? All those in favour? Thank you, that is CARRIED. Thank you for attending and for what you have said. You will be kept informed of the consideration which will be given to your comments. Good afternoon to each of you. (*Applause*)

DEPUTATION TWO
QUEENSWOOD HEIGHTS TENANTS AND RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

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

MR J CHRISTIE: My Lord Mayor, fellow Councillors, my name is John Christie. I represent the tenants and residents of the tower block Queenswood Heights in Headingley. This is my delegation.

We have 47 dwellings on twelve floors. There are two entrances, two lifts and two stairwells, shared by all occupants. Each flat has a balcony that borders our next door neighbour, thus who comes to live next door to you is of great importance for, if that someone is anti-social, it will have a very damaging effect on your quality of life. Such behaviour adversely affects all of us living within the building. If you are old and infirm, you will be in constant fear of crossing paths with such persons.

What kind of problem tenants am I referring to here?

One, we have an alcoholic aged about 50, who constantly plays loud music. This person has also on one occasion set fire to her flat, putting us all in danger.

Two, we have a drug-addicted criminal, whose door has been kicked in several times by the police. In January last, the door was smashed in half by the police and repaired by the Council. Tenant entry was then via padlock and the door was not renewed until August. It was an eyesore to us, but visitors to our block must have thought they were in a ghetto.

Three, we have a twenty-two year old who regularly goes out clubbing, loses her keys and then has no problem whatsoever at two or three in the morning to ring flat by flat until someone lets her in. If people refuse, she becomes very abusive and threatening. She has caused much physical damage to the building and on the 10th of this month, together with a female friend at just after 3 a.m. was involved in a violent assault on a taxi driver on the car park. I can speak of this because I personally witnessed it from my top floor flat. The police have charged both women and the case is ongoing.

We also have one tenant who has an extremely serious and infectious disease that can be transmitted via blood contact. If this person were to cut themselves, depositing blood on say, a lift button, then another person with an open wound would also press this lift button, is there not then a serious risk of cross-contamination?

- a) Placing this person in a multi-occupancy building puts all other tenants at constant risk. Equally at risk are all visitors such as friends and relatives

of residents, service personnel, postmen, other delivery people and the police.

- b) Isn't this gross-negligence on the part of the persons responsible for allocating this tenant to this property?
- c) Is the council insured for such 'obvious' high risks?

Of course this person has to live somewhere but surely, in a single-occupancy dwelling with its own entrance, reducing risk to a minimum. It is plain common sense that most of us have. For the record, this person does not behave anti-socially and is further a good tenant. Two other tenants periodically behave very anti-socially.

After many complaints, we spoke to Kirkstall Housing and learned that they were in fact no longer responsible for allocating properties within their ward. They then invited the allocations office up at Weetwood to send a representative to discuss the problems with us.

The first person that came to us was a Mr Paul Reed. We put our concerns across to Mr Reed and he gave us his reply in the most arrogant and condescending tone. Mr Reed basically said, "Things are the way they are, they will stay that way, and there is nothing you can do to change it!" and then, "If you are not happy with the behaviour of tenants, then complain to your local housing office". I reminded Mr Reed that his office had caused these problems and not Kirkstall Housing, to which he replied, "We only decide who lives where, we're not here to sort out any problems you have with these people, that is up to Kirkstall housing. Complain to them". I am sure you can all understand just how angry we felt. We complained bitterly to Kirkstall Housing about Mr Reed's attitude...

THE LORD MAYOR: Could I just stop you there? I have just received some legal advice. You must not refer to officers and you must not name them. Please continue and bear that in mind.

MR J CHRISTIE: Yes. After this, a more senior officer than the one mentioned came to us. This officer took the same attitude and stance as the former one, informing us that she had the final say on all matters.

Our solution. We strongly believe that all allocations and terminations should be carried out wholly by the local housing office and not some office up Weetwood that has not got a clue what's going on, dumping problem people into otherwise peaceful communities and turning them into battlegrounds and effectively destroying them.

One's local Housing Office used to allocate and when something went wrong, it was their job to terminate the tenancy. This system is a proven, tried and tested success; we ask that it be restored. We would like peace and harmony returned to our community.

We have a good relationship with Kirkstall Housing, which is now West North-West Homes, and in particular, Housing Manager Judith Wray and Estate Management Officer Daniel Massey have done their best for us. We would also like to express our gratitude to Councillor John Illingworth for his positive involvement in our community.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to express our feelings to you all, here today. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Can I call upon Councillor Procter?

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Lord Mayor, I move that the matter be referred to the Executive Board for further consideration.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: I second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Could I then put that to the vote? All those in favour? That, then, is CARRIED. Thank you for attending and for what you have said. You will be kept informed of the consideration which will be given to your comments. Good afternoon to each of you. *(Applause)*

ITEM 5 - REPORTS

THE LORD MAYOR: We move on to Item 5, Reports. 5(a) will not be taking place and so could I then call, on 5(b), Councillor Harris.

5(b)

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: Lord Mayor, we have witnessed today what we are able to do as a Council for former members of Council, and if we look round the walls of this room there are literally hundreds and hundreds of people who have given public service to the city who are remembered here and elsewhere in this building. We commemorate and we are able to confer on people the Freemanship of the city. Elsewhere in this city we are able to commemorate those who have given outstanding military service to the country and the residents of this city, but generally speaking we have no way of recognising other residents of this city, either born here or who have the good sense to come and live here. We have no way of recognising, commemorating and rewarding those residents and citizens of Leeds who give outstanding service to our city and so the purpose of the Leeds Award and the memorial award is to enable us in future, in a prestigious and in a completely non-political way, to be able to give recognition either posthumously or to those still living, to residents who have done something extraordinary for this city and those who are not politicians or members of the armed services.

Today we have the opportunity to nominate and I hope accept the first two posthumous recipients who will be recorded in the Wade Memorial Garden by having individually flagstones inscribed to commemorate what they did as residents of this city on behalf of this city.

The first is Wilson Armistead, who perhaps few people know about but thanks to, I have to say, the tenacity of a young student in Leeds, Alexis Bissett, who frequently over the last few years brought our attention following her research and pointed out to us the importance of this former resident of Leeds in the campaign for the abolition of slavery.

We now know, although Wilson Armistead's name is not one of those in the first rank in the abolition movement, nevertheless we know that he played a significant role in the efforts to have slavery abolished and so it is appropriate that his name should be recorded in the Wade Memorial Garden.

The second is Danny Freeman, whom we have previously discussed on several occasions and many of us will still remember how he sat up there, always the front left-hand seat in the public gallery and was a better attendee at Council than most Councillors. That was a minor issue. The most important thing was the amazing, selfless work he did over decades to raise money for the cancer sufferers

and, in particular, the Leeds and Yorkshire Children's Cancer charity, Candlelighters. Again, I hope we will all unanimously agree that Danny Freeman be the second person to be posthumously recognised for his work on behalf of the city and to be recorded in the Wade Memorial Garden. Thank you. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I was slightly unaware that I was to formally second this. I am happy to support the names and, indeed, the principle of recognising people who have served the city in the way that Councillor Harris has outlined. We do have certain views about the way you do that which are slightly different, and I think later on we might be able to express that, because it is important that we recognise names, but how we do it is a totally different thing and I think we have expressed our differences there, but I am happy to formally second this in terms of the principle of recognising people who have served this city.

COUNCILLOR ATHA: Can I speak on that?

THE LORD MAYOR: You can, Councillor Atha, yes.

COUNCILLOR ATHA: I want to oppose the proposal in relation to Danny Freeman. I think what you have done here is really quite wrong. You have put forward two names before we have discussed the principle.

There are many situations where a central memorial makes sense. The first one you mentioned is a reasonable one but for most people who knew Danny Freeman and knew of his contribution, knew where he made it and where, in fact, he should have some kind of memorial, whether it is a plaque or a line or whatever it may be.

To give you another example from my colleagues over in Morley, there was a most remarkable sports woman, Beryl Burton, in Morley. She was an outstanding example to all of us as an athlete and as a woman and as a person. She was a lovely person. If we are going to commemorate her - which I would like to see because we do not commemorate many women and we do not commemorate any women athletes - it should be in Morley, her home, and we should not try to hijack it and put her name on a slab in the central square in Leeds.

I think, Councillor Harris, it would be much better if we did not have to disagree on this but if you would wait until the debate takes place later on in the afternoon as to the policy and how it might best be done, we might then all agree in harmony that we come up with some sensible suggestion. I would say, having been to the Normandy Veterans' meeting at the weekend, they have a plaque there which is very suitable, it is an ideal spot. As a Trustee for Wade's Charity I am very happy to support the continuance of that kind of procedure but when it comes to people like Danny Freeman, he ought to be commemorated where he made his name and where he was well known. If we commemorate someone like Beryl Burton, it should be out there. If we commemorate one of the greatest writers in English literature, he came from Bardsey. It may be Bardsey would not be the place for him because he was a world writer and should be posthumously commemorated in the square.

I also think some of the people we commemorate justify a statue and a statue could not go into those gardens, so we must commemorate people appropriately and I did not know this was coming up in this way and I regret to introduce a note of disharmony when my Leader is seconding it, but I just want to make clear that my view is that some memorials should be placed outside that garden in Merrion Street and it is more appropriate.

I would point out at the moment that we have a statue of Arthur Aaron, VC. It is in the middle of a busy roundabout. To get to it is taking your life in your hands and it cannot be seen, yet if you look at it, it has all kinds of aspirational and inspirational aspects to it. It should be where it can be seen in some suitable spot. It would not be allowed in Merrion Gardens by the Wade's Trust, but it would be allowed elsewhere. That has been a delay of how many years, moving that and here we have a sort of knee jerk, let us put poor Danny Freeman on a stone slab inscription. I think it could be better than that.

I felt I had to make the view clear and it may well be that my Leader will be angry with me later for in fact speaking against him.

COUNCILLOR LEADLEY: I think in Morley we appreciate Councillor Atha's comments. Actually we got there first because there is already a Beryl Burton Memorial Garden within about 100 yards of the Town Hall, just off Queen Street and obviously the people who made that memorial garden must have had the same thoughts as he has today.

THE LORD MAYOR: In view of this now turning into a debate, we have noticed that there is a mistake on the Order Paper. Because there is an amendment down to item (c) it should be proper that we should vote on this on its own, so on that basis and having allowed two speakers, I think Councillor Harris should have the right of reply, as in any other motion. Councillor Harris.

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: It is unfortunate in the extreme that what we are doing today now is being tarnished in this way. I will speak later on why I am standing down as Leader of Council but I am saying now that openly this is one of the reasons, because I am saddened by what we have come to in this place. There was a time when without any question you would have accepted this proposal unanimously. There may have been differences. Keith Wakefield expressed a difference at Executive Board about Danny Freeman. Andrew and I quite openly said that we would look at the possibility of a plaque outside M&S for Danny Freeman but the discussion was informed by a senior officer that, of course, because of the Trinity Quarter Redevelopment, the place that Danny stood all those years within short order will disappear and his plaque with it, and then where do we commemorate him?

I regret so much that this tone has been introduced into this. We could have dealt with this differently in another way. I simply ask again of Council, I ask again of Bernard, I ask him, let us accept what ought to be proper recognition of people who have done the right thing for our city. Let us accept this unanimously now. Withdraw your opposition. We can discuss that elsewhere in a different way. Let this be a unanimously agreed award. Let it not be a point of dissention. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Can I now call upon the vote on the Report Item 5 as has just been discussed in Council? All those in favour? Against? Abstentions? Then I think it is fair to say that that is CARRIED.

5(c)

THE LORD MAYOR: Can I then move us on to late item, which is 5(c), and call upon Councillor Procter.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Move in terms of the notice, Lord Mayor.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Yes, I second the resolution on 5(c), Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can I call upon Councillor David Blackburn?

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Can I reserve the right to speak?

THE LORD MAYOR: Yes, you can. Councillor Blackburn.

COUNCILLOR D BLACKBURN: In moving the amendment I will just explain, our group looked at this. We were not prepared to support a general increase in allowances at this time. We think it is inappropriate but there are certain things within the paper that needs to be done now and we will support them.

COUNCILLOR RUSSELL: I second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can I then call for the vote on the amendment as put forward by Councillor Blackburn. Those in favour? Those against? I think the amendment is LOST.

Therefore can I call for the vote upon the motion? Those in favour? Those against? Abstentions? Then that definitely is CARRIED. Thank you, Council.

ITEM 6 - QUESTIONS

THE LORD MAYOR: Can I then move us on to the next page, which is Questions, and call upon Councillor Wakefield?

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Can the Executive Board member for Children's Services please update us to the financial position of the Children's Services Department?

COUNCILLOR BRETT: Thank you, Lord Mayor. The overall half-year position for Children's Services is a projected overspend of £2m. The projected spend on children's placements is currently forecast to exceed the budget provision by £1.1m, which is explained by a number of contributory factors.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Wakefield?

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Given that this Council has one of the worst education performances for looked-after children, given that you have a bureaucracy which costs £1.5m, given that you have taken £700,000 from Education Leeds, can you explain to Council why you took upon yourself to write such a patronising letter to Councillors asking for money to support looked-after children when you admitted that other Authorities mainstream their support to these vulnerable children?

COUNCILLOR BRETT: I am delighted, Lord Mayor, to set the record straight on this matter. There is, as I have explained to all Councillors in my e-mail, no child or young person who is hungry or lacking clothes or lacking a warm bed and all of our looked-after children and young people have a range of activities paid for by public funds.

The letter that I sent was asking all Councillors to consider their position as corporate parents. We all have a responsibility for our looked-after children. We already from public funds do a number of extra things that we are not mandated to do - we support 40 care leaders through university - but there are inevitably a number of items which we would like to do and, if this was our own children we would look very hard to try and find the funds for the exceptional things; a musical instrument for a talented child; a school trip that may not be part of the curriculum but which is

certainly something that the child would benefit from; a specialist hobby. It is these extras that my letter was about.

I would like particularly to thank all the Councillors on this side and some of the Councillors on this side who have used their MICE money to good effect to donate £2,850 towards this fund.

COUNCILLOR ATHA: My God, that will make a difference.

COUNCILLOR BRETT: That will not - and I accept, Bernard - cover all the things that we would like to do for our young people.

I have high aspirations for our young people and I pressed for the virtual head teacher who we have now appointed, because I accept that the educational achievement of our looked-after children is not good enough. We are addressing this and it is something that I think we will make significant progress on.

It seems to me that this is an issue where some Labour members at least think that the only acceptable way to fund items for our looked-after children is through the Council Tax. I have to say, I profoundly disagree. That, to me, is 1970s socialist baggage and it is one of the major reasons why I will never be a member of the Labour Party. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR ANDREW: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. Will the Executive Member for City Development please inform Council of the changes the Government is making in terms of the Planning Delivery Grant?

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. Unfortunately there is little information about the Government's proposed changes to the Planning Delivery Grant. However, in the Housing Green Paper published on 23 July entitled "Homes for the Future - More Affordable, More Sustainable", the Government states that:

"The Planning Delivery Grant has been a great success in helping local authorities deliver an effective and efficient planning service.

But because we regard it as so crucial that authorities maximise the supply of building land in their area, we intend to replace the Planning Delivery Grant with a new grant from 2008. A new Housing and Planning Delivery Grant will reward the delivery of both new housing on the ground and the identification of at least five years' worth of sites ready for development and a further ten years' worth in plans as required by their planning policy.

The new grant will be paid to those local authorities that meet their agreed development timetables for new housing based upon the requirement set out in PPS3. To ensure the optimum impact the housing supply element of the new grant will be targeted at areas where housing growth is a priority."

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Andrew.

COUNCILLOR ANDREW: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I just wonder if the Exec Member would agree with me that actually what the Government is doing is tantamount to blackmail?

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: I could not express it better myself. They are using every - Councillor Gruen, you may laugh but I suspect you will not be laughing ere long. Undoubtedly the Government is using every tool in its armoury to force upon Local Authorities and communities excessive numbers of houses and they are using now a system of effectively financial penalties. I would call that blackmail, yes, Councillor Andrew.

COUNCILLOR TAYLOR: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Would the Leader of Council comment on the progress of the 'Narrowing the Gap - Engaging the Private Sector' project that has been launched earlier this year?

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: Yes, Lord Mayor, thank you. Council will be aware that the Narrowing the Gap group that I chair every Wednesday morning has been working on a series of initiatives to bring greater coherency to what happens both inside the Council and across the city as a whole on Narrowing the Gap projects separately from other initiatives which have been long established and may be directly funded or promoted by central government.

Amongst those that we have been working on and have successfully launched have been the academy and the call centre which has a near 100% retention record for taking people from extremely straitened circumstances and then giving them a chance of employment which otherwise they might not have.

The Slivers of Time programme which was launched only two weeks ago, I believe, which again is a very innovative way of assisting people to get their foot on the first rung of the employment ladder, we know already that within the first few weeks 50 people again, who otherwise would have had no chance of employment, are now working and there are many other initiatives in hand which will be reported on as time goes by.

As regards engaging the private sector, there was considerable debate over this and scepticism expressed by the opposition as to whether it was appropriate that the Council should make a grant to the Leeds Community Foundation in order to use their services to generate additional funds or services in kind from the Leeds private sector to work specifically on Narrowing the Gap projects.

In this year's budget both organisations were given £50,000 between them with a target of leverage from that £50,000 to raise a further £250,000 in either direct donation or assistance in kind from the private sector.

I am pleased to be able to say that in the first six months of this year those two organisations have been able to secure in excess of £200,000 of direct grant funding or assistance in kind from the private sector which is now being directly directed to organisations and other charities within the city. I think Council would agree that that is an extremely good result, that £50,000 can be turned into £200,000 in the space of six months. If this now is repeated we will far exceed the target that we had originally set and those are extra moneys, extra resources to help the most deprived people in our city.

I might also add before I finish on this note, that we have also found another very innovative way of unlocking money which is in the Council purse, so to speak. You also had the opportunity to do this but somehow did not have the mental agility to work it out. The Council is the guardian of some £800,000 of money given to us

over the last century and placed in trust with us for organisations or use in parts of the city which no longer exist and yet we still sit on the money and it has been dormant, not being used for any purpose and certainly not for its original purpose, always intended to help deprived people in this city.

We have now begun a series of unlocking processes where that money is being handed over to Leeds Community Foundation to use for us and I am pleased to be able to tell council that of the £800,000 locked away in our vaults, £355,000 has so far been handed over to Leeds Community Foundation for them to use in grant assistance and funding for schemes in Narrowing the Gap in this city. That is money which you could have used in your 24 years but which, for whatever reason - as I say, it can only be lack of care lack of interest of lack of ability - you allowed to lie dormant. Imagine that - £355,000 so far unlocked equates to about £35,000-worth of spending year by year that can be used for Narrowing the Gap. Imagine if that alone had been unlocked by your administration - I have not done the maths but somebody here cleverer than I, I am sure, can work out what 24 times £35,000 is. I am bound to say it is a hell of a lot of money that could have gone to help people and you did not let it happen.

COUNCILLOR TAYLOR: Thank you, Lord Mayor. By way of supplementary, could the Leader of Council explain to us perhaps a bit more fully that these projects in particular are going to benefit the people of Gipton and Harehills, Burmantofts and Richmond Hill and Hyde Park and Woodhouse and all the other inner city areas within the city?

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: I am very glad for that opportunity. Lord Mayor, indeed, I can confirm and explain more fully that some of the projects that are already benefiting from the money and the assistance in kind generated in the engaging the private sector programme, some of those opportunities, for instance, are linking business volunteers into supporting the new Gipton Gateway Employability Centre; assisting - and this is over and above what LEGI is doing - with funding projects in the Harehills Middle School and Hillside Primary Schools in Beeston; linking businesses to support the opening of space at Little London Employability Centre; involving businesses in CHYEN Youth Employability Network run by Archway in north-east Leeds. I could carry on for ever and use up the full 30 minutes here.

Suffice to say by any measure, that is an administration committed to helping the inner city and to helping people in the most deprived circumstances. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Finnigan.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Could the Executive Member responsible for the Youth Service confirm the specific figures for the youth service budget for both Morley North and Morley South, including a breakdown of money spent on staffing?

COUNCILLOR HARKER: Thank you, Lord Mayor. The budget for 2007/8 for Morley North Ward was £76,072; for Morley South Ward, £81,206. In total, £157,278.

This is money available for front line services and does not include the cost of senior management or administration. Part of this money, £24,000-odd, is used to support six voluntary sector providers in the Morley area who do very valued work and are valued partners of the Youth Service.

This means that the remaining budget of just over £152,000 pays for the equivalent of seven full-time youth workers in the two Wards.

I think I need this afternoon to point out that this figure refers to area staffing only and does not include the wide range of additional youth service spending in the two Morley Wards. Connexions - Morley Wards enjoy the services of a full-time worker. In the area of health education there is a very important project jointly funded by ourselves and the PCT in the form of the health bus. The Youth Council, the Duke of Edinburgh Award Scheme, herb farm and the laser centre.

I believe that the range of programmes offered in Morley by our staff and by the voluntary organisations with whom we work to be impressive.

THE LORD MAYOR: Could I remind everybody that it is £50 for anybody if a mobile phone goes off in this Chamber. You have all been warned twice. Thank you. Question 5 has been withdrawn, so therefore can I call on Councillor Beverley.

COUNCILLOR BEVERLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. In the interests of promoting an interest in local democracy and narrowing the gap between Leeds City Council and the general public, would the Leader of Council please tell us if he will consider introducing webcasts of Council meetings so as to allow them to be viewed online, as is done in other Local Authorities such as Epping Forest District Council?

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: Lord Mayor, not wishing to sidestep the question, I fear it will no longer be a matter for me to decide so I am not able to give that assurance at all. However, in the spirit of the question I will endeavour to answer it.

I was always in favour - people may think I am off my trolley but I was always in favour - for instance, of us making use the screen in Millennium Square, at least to publicise the fact that this building was open to the public and that there were public meetings, explaining what they were and inviting the public to come in here, because although the public gallery is fairly well attended today, it has got an unusually high number of people in here, but *that* side is completely empty. Nevertheless, I was always in favour when I became Leader of Council of taking such steps in order to try and engage the public of Leeds more.

On this particular issue I can tell Council that I asked the Chair of Standards, Mr Wilkinson, to look at ways in which we may be able to engage with the public using better technology and a report did come back suggesting that this, indeed, is a good idea and that officers are now investigating whether it is possible. I must tell Council I am in favour. I am in favour of televising this place. It might calm us down a bit, although I am bound to say it did not have that effect on the House of Commons. I would be in favour of anything we can do to demonstrate to the public that we do have an important role and function in this city and that we have to do it in partnership with them and hopefully they in partnership with us.

COUNCILLOR BEVERLEY: Thank you. No supplementary on that.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Beverley. Could I call upon Councillor Murray?

COUNCILLOR MURRAY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Can the Executive Board Member for Learning please comment on this year's GCSE and A-level results?

COUNCILLOR HARKER: Thank you, Lord Mayor. The Examination results at Key Stage 4 have once again topped our previous performances in the city. Particularly pleasing are the results for five A* to C, what is now known as Level 2. The improvement in this area was 3.5%, bringing our city-wide figure to 55%. This is still not good enough and I would draw Council's attention to the targets that were set

at the last Executive Board meeting, that this city should by 2015 reach 80% of our 16-year olds achieving the Level 2 qualification and 95% of our young people progressing to further learning beyond 16, and that 60% of our 19-year olds should achieve Level 3 qualifications.

We should also congratulate our schools because early indications - and I say 'early indications' because the statistics are not yet fixed until the Government give them the official stamp - that our rise this year is an impressive 3.5%, which will be twice the national average. We should also recognise that there has been an improvement in the number of GCSE passes at 5 A-G.

I am going to name a number of schools who have made remarkable improvements in their GCSE results this year, in double figures in most cases: John Smeaton, Morley High, Boston Spa, Garforth Community College, Carr Manor, Otley Prince Henry, Pudsey Grangefield and Pudsey Crawshaw.

I would be remiss if I did not tell Council that there were four schools where the results gave cause for concern. I am pleased to report now that robust action is being taken to bring these schools on line with the better performing schools in the city. Education Leeds is working closely with these schools and in some cases help has been drafted in from successful schools who have the capacity to help.

On the A-levels it is less easy to give the results yet because they still need to be confirmed and many of them need to come in and be sorted, but at A-level the points scored by pupil per subject continues to improve. This is likely to be in line with the national trend. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

COUNCILLOR MURRAY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. The supplemental question is quite a simple one. These are the best results ever and the simple supplementary question is, are they good enough or, put another way, does every child matter? Of course, when Richard looks at the full results he knows that there is a significant...

COUNCILLOR HARKER: Question, please?

COUNCILLOR MURRAY: ...underbelly of underachievement and failure still in the city.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Murray, Council would appreciate it if you phrased it as a question.

COUNCILLOR MURRAY: OK. Is it not a fact, then, that if you look at one statistic, which is never highlighted but I think all of us know and understand it, that 80% of our children got an A-G pass including English and maths, is it not then a fact that 20% of them - 20% of a population of over 8,000, that is 1,600 children - left school without English and maths as a qualification to help them be able to get work and get into work? That is a fact.

THE LORD MAYOR: I think somewhere amongst that you did ask a question, Councillor Murray.

COUNCILLOR MURRAY: The question is...

THE LORD MAYOR: Please, Councillor Murray, I would appreciate it if you would stop there.

COUNCILLOR MURRAY: The question is, are we going to address this failure in the future with new ideas?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Murray, stop. Councillor Harker, if it is possible for you to answer Councillor Murray's speech I would appreciate it.

COUNCILLOR HARKER: Thank you. I am sorry that Councillor Murray did not pick up on the second half of my original answer to him. I said that we have set new targets, that we are not happy, but it should be recognised that year on year for the last four years that I have had the portfolio, the results have gone up and I am confident that results will continue to go up in light of the work that is being done with schools who are underachieving as well as encouraging the schools who appear to be achieving to get better results. I would draw attention, I think, at this time to the Achievement for All project which has now been taken up by all our High Schools.

I do believe we are on the right track and again, I make no apologies for going back. The Executive Board, the administration of this Council at its last meeting set targets of 80% for 16-year olds achieving Level 2 qualifications, 95% of our young people progressing to further learning beyond 16 and 60% of 19-year olds achieving Level 3 qualifications by 2015. That is the target we have set our officers and our teachers in our schools. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Robinson.

COUNCILLOR ROBINSON: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. Would the Executive Member for Leisure care to comment on the successful results at Hull recently when the Towns and Villages of Leeds achieved some remarkable awards?

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Yes, Lord Mayor. You are aware of these matters probably more than most, having been there officiating in your official capacity. I understand that no other city in Yorkshire gained as many awards as Leeds did. Nineteen towns and villages were entered, plus twelve in other categories, such as hotels and businesses. Overall the city received nine golds, nine silver gilts, 13 silvers, one bronze - a great credit to Council staff and most importantly the hundreds of people who volunteer their time. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR ROBINSON: By way of supplementary, you may like to comment on the recent prestigious Britain in Bloom awards. That ceremony was held at Coventry Cathedral recently.

THE LORD MAYOR: You are putting this as a question, Councillor Robinson, aren't you?

COUNCILLOR ROBINSON: I have already said, "You may like to comment", if that is all right. At this ceremony both Beeston and Leeds achieved silver gilt awards and I would like also to mention the White Rose Centre where the Royal Horticultural Society gave them their excellent discretionary award.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Robinson, stop there. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Lord Mayor, I would like to congratulate all those who won awards and also thank publicly Councillor Robinson for all of his work *(Applause)* in supporting Britain in Bloom. Frank has carried on a great tradition in this Council, Denise Atkinson having previously held the role that Councillor Robinson now holds.

This city has much to be proud of, particularly in the success that is Parks and Countryside and that is down to a team of dedicated staff and a long-serving Chief Officer.

In front of me are three awards that were recently awarded to the Department by the National Horticulture Week magazine and they are for - this is nationally, in the whole country - Best Playscheme, Professional Gardener of the Year and also Best Management of Open Spaces as well.

The Chief Officer responsible for all of these achievements is Denise Preston and I am glad that she has joined us today in Council (*Applause*) - you will get time to do that in a minute - particularly as Denise has announced that she is to retire early from the Council at the end of November.

I would like personally to thank Denise Preston for the assistance that she has given me over the years I have been in this role and, indeed, the years that I have been on the Council and wish her well in her early retirement. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: As members chose to ask such long questions resulting in speeches from Executive Board members, I am afraid that is the allotted time for questions. Any further questions will receive a written answer from the Chief Executive.

ITEM 7 - RECOMMENDATIONS OF EXECUTIVE BOARD

THE LORD MAYOR: Could we move on to page 9 of the Order Paper, Recommendations of the Executive Board, and call upon Councillor Harris?

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: I move in terms of the notice, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: You must be demob happy, Councillor Harris!

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can I therefore call upon the vote on agenda item 7? All those in favour? Against? Abstentions? That is CARRIED then.

ITEM 8 - RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CORPORATE GOVERNANCE AND AUDIT COMMITTEE

THE LORD MAYOR: Agenda Item 8, Councillor Bale?

COUNCILLOR BALE: I move in the terms of the order, Lord Mayor.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: In that case can I call for the vote? All those in favour? Against? Abstentions? That is CARRIED.

ITEM 9 - MINUTES

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 9, Minutes. Councillor Harris.

(a) - Executive Board

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: Lord Mayor, in moving the Minutes might I crave the

indulgence of Council for a few minutes? There are many of you who think I am about to award myself a bottle of champagne. No, I am not but it might come to me in a minute.

What I would like to do - and I hope this is a complete surprise to the person in question - is to pay tribute to somebody who has given extraordinary service both to this Council and to this city. Public service, as we all know, can be a very difficult, onerous thing and to maintain one's enthusiasm for a year, never mind decades, is sometimes difficult.

We may have political differences - we do have political differences - in this place, things get out of hand but I have always believed that each of us, in our own way, tries to do the right thing that we were elected for.

Bernard Atha has been on Council for 50 years. His service to this place and to the people of Leeds is absolutely extraordinary. This bottle of champagne is for him! *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Is he leaving?

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: He is not but I am! This bottle of champagne is for him, to thank him and, although I am sure he will be here for a long time yet and there will be more awards, commemorations, as the years go by, but this is to recognise and commemorate 50 years' of public service to this Council, to the people of Leeds. It is extraordinary and this is a small gift compared to what you are entitled to. Thank you for that. *(Presentation to Councillor Atha by Leader of Council and standing ovation)*

COUNCILLOR ATHA: May I respond?

THE LORD MAYOR: I do not see why you should *(Laughter)* but I am sure you will!

COUNCILLOR ATHA: This is a most remarkable and surprising gift. What I do not understand quite is the balls here. It is a load of these or whatever but I think the thought behind it is absolutely splendid. I am so relieved I did not heckle you when you got up *(Laughter)* because I would not have got this, except across the head!

I do think, though, it is worthwhile saying for just one moment, I have been in this Council Chamber for a long time and many other people have 30 and 25, 35 years is not uncommon. We have all had one experience, I think. When we are in here we can go like cat and dog but when we are outside the friendship between individuals is very strong and it is often stronger across the party lines than it is within the party lines, because these beggars know what you are like and you lot do not know quite so well.

I say thank you very much indeed. I can honestly say it is quite moving to receive it in this way. Thank you, Mark, and I am sure with your colleague across the way who has possibly contributed ten pence towards the cost *(Laughter)* - it may be 15, I am not sure - but thank you so much and thank you all.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Be careful when you drink it, Bernard! *(Laughter and applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Council. Councillor Atha was also last week drinking champagne with Her Majesty when he received his latest award. Councillor Harris, I think you need to move the motion.

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: Just continuing where I left off, Lord Mayor, just for a few minutes. If I may say, this is last meeting as Leader of Council and I wish to clarify one thing before I perhaps make a couple of other comments. I am not leaving Council. With the permission of the people of Moortown in May I will still be here after that. We will see, but Gerry has done a runner which tells you something, doesn't it? I am certainly not standing down from Council. My commitment to this place remains undimmed in that respect, and to the city.

If I may say, I have the dubious distinction, it seems to me, to be the first Leader of Council ever to stand down of my own volition without moving on to higher political office and not only have I no intentions of that, but I am sure there is nobody in my party who has any intentions of me doing that either, so that is not an option open to me.

Those of you who know me closely will know of the advice my late father gave me the night I was elected, which is a story I have recounted many times which was, as he called me, "Marky" – as he always did – "remember there are three certainties in life. Sadly we all die and for football managers and politicians, it always ends in disaster."

I decided a long time ago that my going would be at a time and place of my choosing and for many reasons 30th November is that time.

I have to say that I have concluded that I have done as much as I could as Leader of Council and if you continue after that point, then you are either deceiving yourself or you are clinging on simply to the trappings of power. I concluded that the time had arrived that there were other pressures on me to do other things and that I was no longer, if I had ever been, equal to the job and it was right that somebody else should take over from me, and in due course we will find out who that person is.

I want to say this – and again many of you who have spoken to me personally will know this. My great grandparents came to this city with nothing. They came with less than nothing, in the 1870s. They came hoping for safety. It could not have been anything else but safety and the possibility that they could earn a decent living. They could not have imagined that their great-grandson would have been given the opportunity to run the city. I do not say that to give myself a pat on the back but I say it because it is a great thing that this city allows the great-grandson of penniless, illiterate immigrants to rise to this position.

I never had any other ambition – in fact I never even had the ambition to do this job. I liken myself to Claudius, who was found slaving in a back room and everybody thought, "We'll give him the job, he is pretty harmless" and so it has proved to be. I never sought the job – the job found me out. I am grateful that I have had the opportunity; I have done my absolute best, whatever anybody thinks of me. Here I suppose I echo what Tony Blair did. I only did what I thought was right for this city. That is all I have ever wanted to do, what is right for this city. Perhaps there will be other ways and other opportunities for me to continue doing what I can for the city, but I am grateful that I was given the opportunity.

Finally, for those of you to whom I have been unpleasant and to those of you to whom in the next few hours I will continue to be unpleasant, I apologise. (*Laughter*) I hope you accept that apology in good faith. I am grateful to all of you for

the friendship and the working relationship and the opportunity I have been given. Thank you. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I thought it was only right and proper to respond on behalf of the Labour Group to Mark's recent statement and to wish him the very best in the future. In fact, I have to thank him for really surprising Bernard Atha in a way that I have never seen because his eyes started to dilate wider and wider as he got the bottle of champagne over! At that point I could hear himself winding himself up to heckle Mark *(Laughter)* and then suddenly having to back down and be gracious, and he was indeed. I think that alone has been worth witnessing.

The two things I think the Labour Group would like to express is, one, your absolute support and 100% commitment to fighting racism in this city. *(Applause)* I do not think anybody in this Chamber can doubt your commitment, not just based on your experiences with your great-grandfather, as you have just articulated, but your sincerity and passion for making sure that racism does not divide this city. I think we all owe you our appreciation for that outstanding role you have played.

The other one, I think, has been your health, which is hardly commented on, but I remember when you did have cancer and you were extremely brave and courageous and took it in good spirit and the good news is that you are back and I understand you are even trying to run again that marathon, and we wish you well in that.

On behalf of the Labour Group we looking forward to you, as you lose next year, doing more *(Laughter)* and we will put you under, later on, a slab in Queen's Square. In all honesty, Mark, on behalf of the Labour Group, thanks very much for your Leadership. I know you have apologised for being nasty to some of us and I look forward to you being nasty again later on in the afternoon. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I remember Neil Taggart, Mark, standing up in the Council, I think the first meeting, the Annual Meeting after the 2004 elections, and predicting that the administration would not last until Christmas.

COUNCILLOR W HYDE: He did not say which Christmas.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: No, he did not say which Christmas, Bill, you are quite right, and I always look forward to Christmas.

Interestingly, you would think, I suppose, if you were outside politics, that people having to work together extremely closely - which Mark and I have done over this last three-and-a-half years - from different political parties, would find it much more difficult than if you were all of the same political party. I think that maybe Keith would agree with me here - that is not always the case. Often, if you can agree on a set of visions, a set of targets, a set of things you want to achieve for the city that you all agree on and then you set about with a will trying to achieve them, you can indeed do just that.

Mark and I have not only worked extremely closely together over this three-and-a-half years but I think we have also become extremely good friends and I shall miss Mark for all sorts of reasons, not least his sense of humour. I am not going to repeat some of the asides that he passes to me in Cabinet or in LMT or in other private meetings, but they have always caused me to chuckle when sometimes I needed to have a little chuckle and I shall certainly miss Mark for that.

I will also miss him because one area of the work of the city, one of our key visions that all political parties signed up to, was Closing the Gap and nobody but nobody in this Council has done more to forward that agenda and to use every possible tool in the box to get more people included in the prosperity of this city and for that I think we all owe Mark a great debt of gratitude and I personally hope that his interest in that part of our shared agenda will continue.

Thank you very much, Mark, for working with me and thank you, too, for your friendship. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: Lord Mayor, just to add a few more words. Certainly when we, our group, were elected in 2004, I think we were regarded as a bit of an oddity, there is no doubt, at that particular point *(Laughter)*.

COUNCILLOR J McKENNA: You still are!

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: I am pleased to hear that. I was beginning to get worried that we were normal. I will take that as a compliment. Certainly we are an unusual bunch in an unusual structure and I think we have been grateful for what we regard as a very constructive relationship we have had with Mark over the years. We have done reasonably well in Morley and I think the people of Morley are grateful for that help and support that we have had.

We have a deep respect for Mark and his Leadership of the full Council. There is no doubt that we do not agree with everything, despite what our Labour colleagues I am sure would say. We do not agree on everything that Mark has suggested and proposed but we do have a healthy respect for each other. I do believe in time – it goes across the whole Council – that all of us are committed to trying to do the best for the communities that we try and represent and we try and do that in a constructive way.

Certainly we will miss his humour. Certainly we will miss his commitment to Morley and we wish him well in the future. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR D BLACKBURN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. For three years Mark, Andrew and myself worked together and during that three years, like Andrew has just said, I think Mark and I have become pretty good friends. Unfortunately our marriage at a political level, we agreed to disagree on some things but I have continued to work with him on the Narrowing the Gap Group. Unfortunately I was not at the meeting this morning but we continue to work on that and his commitment to that is 100% and he has done a wonderful job there, I have got to say.

The thing that I miss now, not going to Cabinet and not going to LMT, he is the best joke maker I know. Obviously we cannot repeat them in here but he has got a career as a comedian if he ever gives up politics. There is some correspondence gone between us and I hope you do not mind me mentioning this. He was talking about his great-grandparents coming here with nothing and when I wrote back to him I said, "Your great-grandparents will be bloody well proud of you, Mark, because you have done well. You have done a great job." *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Back to the order paper. Councillor Procter.

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

(i) Central and Corporate

THE LORD MAYOR: Can I invite members to address the Minutes?
Councillor Golton.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: I beg your pardon, Lord Mayor, I was overcome with the sentiments.

Lord Mayor, I would like to speak to the Minute which concerns the Comprehensive Spending Review. I was one of the few Councillors who actually attended the LGA Conference this year. I was there, Barry Anderson was there and Councillor Lewis was there as well.

It was noted because of the consensus that there was between all of the different parties there, all local Councillors - as you say, sometimes you find you have got more in common with people across the party spectrum than within your own party and on this one they were all agreed, the two big pressures that faced the Local Authorities were the spending on social care and the pressures that were there in terms of how we do our waste solutions and how we combat the growth in waste and recycling. Everyone agreed on that one.

It was also at the LGA Conference that Hazel Blears made her debut because, of course, there was a Cabinet reshuffle in the middle of it. First of all we had a very dazed looking Hilary Benn who found all of a sudden he was responsible for flooding and realised he had a very big job on his hands and then, of course, we had got Hazel Blears who came into the auditorium full of that spirit that she has which, I have to say, is quite mesmerising - or should I just say amazing - but she came in and she pointed out to us all that she had herself been a local Councillor and therefore, of course, she could feel our pain, she knew where we were coming from and basically she promised us a fair deal and greater freedoms for local government. I have to say the majority of us left that conference feeling that actually we might have someone who is worth talking to and we might actually get a result.

Unfortunately then came the Comprehensive Spending Review from Alistair Darling. We are all used to Alistair Darling not particularly looking favourably on Leeds. If you remember, he was the one who made sure that our Supertram was dead in its tracks whilst, of course, he made sure he got his own version for Edinburgh.

The Comprehensive Spending Review - I have to say, it was not slash and burn all over the place. It was noted that in areas that were of interest to the Government in terms of tackling terrorism and ID cards and transport schemes in the south and flood defence schemes in the south and, of course, extra spending on Iraq, those actually go above the rate of inflation. Of course, when it comes to the Local Government spending review, we found to our horror that far from Hazel Blears being one of us she had well and truly been one of them and certainly had not been on Mr Darling's back in terms of making sure we got a fair deal.

We got the worst deal in a decade. We got a 1% real terms increase over three years and, on top of that, we are also expected to make 3% efficiency savings each year on what we do.

In terms of social care, of course, a 1% increase is not even sufficient to provide the current levels of social care, let alone extend those benefits to the hundreds of new people who qualify as elderly people who are coming on to our books each year over the next three years.

In terms of the second pressure on waste, it is acknowledged by everybody - the Local Government Association, even the Government themselves - that each year we should be expected to be spending 10% extra, not just on things like what we are going to be debating this afternoon in terms of our waste solution plans, but just on things like increasing recycling, in terms of education - an extra 10% each year over the next three years. Of course, we just have not been given that money.

On top of that, of course, we also have the historical issue that Leeds as an Authority just does not get its fair share in the first place. When we do get our spending rounds we, at the last count, got £378 per head of population in comparison to £691 per head for Manchester and £500 per head for Birmingham, Newcastle and Nottingham.

On top of that, of course, we have a fantastic record of making efficiencies. Our officers have already looked at their budgets time and time again and created those efficiencies to mean that we are one of the slimmest, leanest Councils in the country.

Just to conclude, if the Government is expecting us to sit with at 1% increase and 3% efficiencies year on year over the next three years, what it is basically saying to us is that it expects the Council taxpayer to pay more but also it is prepared to see the prospect of real cuts in services in the name of prudence. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Can I call upon Councillor A McKenna, please.

COUNCILLOR A MCKENNA: Lord Mayor, I am commenting on the Financial Monitoring Report, page 43 Minute 59. The report outlines the finances of the Council, how much money we have and how much we have spent. This information is really important, especially to organisations who rely on Council for funding.

In 2006 we took away funding from Relate. You took away a lifeline for many people, people who need help and advice when they are going through a particularly bleak period of their lives. Relate means so much to people who turn to them in times of need and you have turned your back on them. I know from personal experience how sad and lonely a relationship breakdown can be and I fully support any organisation who tries to help people in this situation.

It was this year that I became involved with Relate and I am proud to say that I am now a Trustee. That is why I am so determined to keep bringing this situation they now find themselves in to your attention.

People on low income who used to get a discounted rate for counselling now have to pay a full rate of £45 per session. This is out of the reach of many families and, as a consequence, many people no longer can afford it. In fact there have been around 150 families or couples who have wanted to access the services provided by Relate who have been unable to because of the cost. You have made professional counselling a service available only to those who can afford it, in effect contributing to family breakdown.

Relate are not asking for a lot of money but what they do with that money would make a huge difference to so many people's lives. I still cannot understand why you took the funding away. It is a decision that you should be ashamed of. You were more than willing to see £100,000 written off in the unpaid car parking charges by Leeds United, yet you deny £23,000 to an organisation that purely exists on benefits of others.

Relate is a charity and they have been able to find replacement sources for their funding because the grant from the Council has been used for the core function.

Council, additional funding for charities is generally only made available for special projects. You directed them to the Leeds Community Foundation but just exactly how do we expect the Foundation to pick up? You have also asked them to help them bale you out for the looked-after children fiasco. This response is simply not good enough. Other Local Authorities - for example Bradford - offer a great deal of support to their local Relate. Why is Leeds so shamefully conspicuous by its lack of support? You have quite clearly got your priorities wrong. The way you have treated Relate and the people they help is shameful. I call upon you to justify your actions here and now and explain once and for all why you are wasting £100,000 on things like the Civic Newspaper when there are more important things than giving Relate the £23,000 they greatly need. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR HANLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Lord Mayor, I too would like to comment from page 43 Minute 59 on the financial health of the Authority in the first quarter of this year.

Lord Mayor, one of the reports was called in to be discussed by Overview and Scrutiny and it was a very interesting report to do with parking and the charges for parking.

The report was split into two parts, really. Firstly the officers felt that they should rationalise the charges across the city; there were something like 16 different charges for parking and this should be brought down to three or four charges, and I thought that was quite good. The report also said that they were looking for a 3% increase in the parking charges. I also think that 3% is quite modest, 3% of £1 or 3% of a quid, as us plasterers call them, is just 3p, so it is a very modest increase. It is only when you went into the actual detail of the report that we were finding things that were far removed from the 3%.

The report also said that parking charges had to be increased because the Council was facing severe budgetary pressures. I can understand that. I can understand it when I look at some of the things that happen in this Council with this administration and I think in particular to the costings of running the group offices. This will be a subject that we will discuss further in the future, I am sure, but if you look at just how the offices are costed, it is absolutely ridiculous.

Lord Mayor, the report also states that the centre of Leeds is the most expensive city of any of those measured. I would have thought that that might indicate you might reduce the charges, but in actual fact the decisions that they have taken increases the amount of revenue created in city centre situations by £22,000, so we will now be even more expensive.

It is interesting to note the Saturday charges for shoppers who come in. There was a situation where you could pay £2.50 and park up to five hours for any period that you actually wanted. I now see that they are changing this to charge £1.50 per hour, so if you stay for two hours the costs goes up to £3. Lord Mayor, the difference between £1.50 and £3 is not 3% - it is about 20%.

I found it very difficult to find anywhere where charges actually went up by 3%. I know that that might create difficulties with coinage etc, but nowhere could I find anything except absolutely exorbitant charges. The worst scenario was perhaps in the most vulnerable parts of the city and that is the Beckett Street park which services St James's Hospital. I have heard other people in this Chamber mention the words 'vulnerable people'. Keith Wakefield has, James Lewis has and so has

Stewart Golton. This is a place where people park when they go and see their sick loved ones and there is often distress, etc.

The actual increase across the board, Lord Mayor, is so far removed from this magical 3% that in all the cases, for all of the charges, they have increased them by 28% and that is absolutely appalling. A 28% increase in these circumstances and they hide behind the fact that the National Health charges their staff a bit more, so instead of approaching it in a sensible, managerial way of how to get the staff to part in the proper car park, they increase it by 28% and I think, frankly, that is absolutely disgraceful.

Just to summarise it, the last time Keith Wakefield was Leader of this Council, the charges were 40p and there was a lot of criticism at the time. If the 3% had been applied in these recent years, the charge would now be about 45p. This is per hour. It is now double that at 90p and I think that that is absolutely disgraceful.

To put it into terms of actual monetary value, we were raising something like £191,000 per annum. That has now increased to over £324,000 and that, Lord Mayor, can only be absolutely disgraceful.

Scrutiny Board wants...

THE LORD MAYOR: Can you finish there, please, Councillor?

COUNCILLOR HANLEY: Sadly that was not the case. Thank you.
(Applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Langdale.

COUNCILLOR LANGDALE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would like to speak on page 43 Minute 59 regarding Financial Health Monitoring. I would like to speak about how the Council chooses to recoup money.

Like many of my colleagues in wards across the city, I have a number of constituents who visit St James's on a regular basis. Councillor Hanley quite rightly pointed out that back in August when calling in this decision, some visitors using Beckett Street car park use it two and three times a day. Many of the people who use these facilities are the most disadvantaged in our society and these are the very people for whom this Council should offer protection. They are not to be used by this administration to make a quick profit.

What disappoints me, Councillor Pryke and Councillor Bill Hyde, both members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, both elected members of East Leeds where St James's is situated, yet both voted to increase the charges.

Councillor Pryke had the audacity to submit a White Paper last year in which he criticised the Leeds Teaching Hospitals for increasing their own car parking charges. He said, "It is just not that they charge for parking but of the amount by which they are increasing charges." He also recognised the inevitable knock-on effect for the communities near the hospital. It was Councillor Pryke who said that people in Lincoln Green, the Shakespeares and Harehills, already know what it is like to have bumper to bumper hospital parking all day outside their homes and businesses.

Therefore, could I ask Councillor Pryke how exactly increasing car parking charges at the Council's Beckett Street car park is going to solve these problems? Maybe it is the case that you just do not care this time, since it is your administration

that wants to make increases. It really is about time Councillor Pryke, that you and your fellow coalition Councillors in East Leeds began to stick up for the people that you are elected to represent rather than nodding through every policy of your administration without even a whimper.

Increasing car park charges every year opposite the city's main hospital is blatantly targeting the vulnerable and now the filthy, unwanted disaster of an incinerator. Maybe you could tell us, Councillor Pryke or Councillor Hyde, what is next on your administration's agenda to punish the people of East Leeds? Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR COUPAR: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would like to speak also on Minute 59, page 43, the Financial Monitoring Report. The Adult Social Care budget is again under significant pressure and is projected to overspend by £3.3m this year. It seems, Councillor Harrand, that not only are you unable to control the services in your department - you also cannot control the finances either.

Of particular concern to me is Roseville, who are under significant financial pressure. Last year it was decided that the door factory at Roseville would transfer to Environment and Neighbourhoods, as it was thought that they had the expertise to deal with the factory. Unfortunately, orders were not being generated quickly enough to keep the factory on track which, I must say, is not through officers' lack of effort. In fact on the contrary, officers have spent much time and effort trying to generate sufficient orders.

The uncertainty over the situation at Roseville has caused much upset and worry to those people who work there. On a recent visit many employees were telling me how much they enjoyed working at Roseville and how working there had given them dignity in other areas of their lives.

This so-called administration is letting those people down. Neither of our so-called Leaders of Council have seen this as an important issue that needed their attention apart from Councillor Harris, who made a hollow promise to resign if anyone was made redundant. Councillor Les Carter, what have you done to make sure Roseville has a future? I believe that where there is a will there is a way and, sadly, this lot have not got the will or the way.

At the Advisory Board, which met on Monday this week, new staffing structures were tabled which, if implemented, would mean job losses at Roseville - ten in the factory and eight in the laundry and other areas, 18 positions in total. Some of the people affected by these job cuts are disabled and some have a learning disability. It was stated that any staff on the Workstep programme made supernumerary due to this restructure could be kept on at Roseville until alternatives could be found. This restructure will generate savings of £300,000.

We on these benches demand that the future of the workforce is made safe and secure for the benefit of all at Roseville. We also demand your assurance that they will be given choice and control over their own future.

This administration's track record on employing disabled people is appalling. The number of disabled people employed by this Council is in decline. The figures show a marked reduction in the number of disabled staff over the last three years. You have even failed to reach your own targets, with only 3% of the workforce being disabled. Where is your commitment to the disabled or vulnerable people who need employment? You have even failed to take advantage of the Access to Work fund. Both Scrutiny and the members of the Roseville board have demanded action on a Council-wide policy to address the inequalities in employment for disabled people

and we are finally going to see the strategy launched in December. Why has it taken this long for the second largest Metropolitan Council in the country to write a strategy? You need to be ashamed of this fact and lack of commitment.

As always with this administration it is the people in most need or the ones who are most vulnerable that they attack, despite claiming in this Chamber they want to protect them. Councillor Harris, I am sure I do not need to remind you of the definition of redundancy. However you want to dress this up, people will lose their jobs that they are doing now. In other words, redundant. Your recent resignation did not state job losses at Roseville as your reason for resigning. I suggest that this is the real reason and, if it was not, it should have been. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Council, could I ask, if you wish to have private conversations - and this is pointed at both sides - would you do them outside of this Chamber? Excuse me, the Lord Mayor is speaking. I am sorry to disturb your private conversation but would you hold them outside in future? A speaker might eventually say something that you would like to hear. Can I now call upon Councillor James Lewis.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Of course, I am saying something that everybody wants to hear and I am grateful to you for bringing this Chamber to some order to hear it. Thank you.

I am speaking to Minute 59 on page 43, which is the Council's Financial Health Monitoring Report. I would like specifically to look at how the Council spends its money.

Like many members of Council here myself, along with my Ward colleagues Councillors Wakefield and Parker, Councillor Lyons, Councillor Langdale, we visited victims of the floods in June this year and we went to see people who quite literally had been washed out of their houses and lost many of their possessions, many of their household items, many vital things like cookers and washing machines that need replacing.

Therefore, I find it absolutely shameful that this administration has got itself in the position where £107,000 of the £130,000 - that is £107,000 out of £130,000 set aside for helping flood victims - is still sat in a Council bank account and is not helping out those people that suffered in the floods.

I find it extraordinary - absolutely extraordinary - as Andrew Carter I can see trying to sneak out here, we can see you sneaking out as they sing at Elland Road.

A COUNCILLOR: There is only one sneaker round here.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: It is quite extraordinary, he went whingeing on saying this city has not got enough money. This city got the money and your administration completely failed to help the most vulnerable and, as usual, was more interested in finger pointing, blame passing, fear mongering than it was in getting this money into the pockets of the people who suffered in the floods. I find it absolutely extraordinary. It just shows that in the last months of this administration as we all see it falling to pieces in front of us, that it is more interested in finger pointing than it actually is in helping out vulnerable people and this is a concrete example of how it does nothing for people in this city who are in need. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Councillor Lewis. You certainly made them listen! Councillor Ewens.

COUNCILLOR EWENS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am prompted by the very succinct report which Councillor Golton gave of the LGA Conference about the Comprehensive Spending Review, that the results of that may impinge on the funding available for regeneration in my own Ward, in Hyde Park/Woodhouse, where so far we have received helpful and well-sustained funding for a variety of things which are absolutely essential to the Ward and I would like to be reassured that this kind of funding will be able to continue. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: Thank you, Lord Mayor, speaking to Minute 92 on page 56 concerning the creation of the Leeds Award to celebrate those people who have brought real credit to the city. I am sure over the years we will look forward to these awards being given out equally to men and women from this city.

I would like to draw attention to Council that this year marks the 100th anniversary of the passing of legislation that allowed women to stand as local Councillors. Here in Leeds we actually had to wait until 1921 before we had a woman elected and in that year we welcomed two women to the Council Chamber, Gertrude Dennison and Maud Dightham. I am sure that everyone in the Chamber will agree with me that this is an anniversary worthy of celebration.

It therefore saddens me that, since you took power in 2004, the situation of the Leeds City Council ruling coalition has separated us out for national attention and national comment on the political scene. I believe that it is a disgrace that every single one of you over there should be ashamed of that we are the only Local Authority in Yorkshire with no voting women on the Executive Board. We are, in fact the only Metropolitan Authority nationally in that position. I think it is really shocking in this day and age and in a year where we are celebrating the inclusion of women, to ensure fair representation in Local Government, that Leeds is run by an old boys' club that does nothing to reassure the women of this city that they are valued and respected.

I hope this is drawn to the attention of Cuddly Cameron, that champion of diversity and gender equality, that for a modern 21st Century party it does not exist in Tory-run Leeds. In Leeds, in fact, we have the same old Tories.

I ask you, Andrew and Mark, are you really telling us that there is not one woman in either of your groups who is worthy of an Executive position? Do you really have such a total lack of respect for their capability as to think that only men are suitable for positions of power and influence?

You have had since 2004 to see if any of your female members are up to the task. You have not given them the chance and that alone speaks volumes to the female voters of Leeds.

I ask you in recognising through these awards the talents and achievements of women in the city, that I can rely on you to recognise the skills and talents of women in your own groups.

Personally, I hope it will not be a problem that you have to face after May next year, but surely with Mark's decision and announcement of his retirement, this creates an opportunity for you to make sure that a place is created on Leeds' Executive Board for a woman from either of your two parties. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR PRYKE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. A remarkable display by the Nasty Party over there this afternoon.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: That is disgraceful.

COUNCILLOR PRYKE: I am awfully glad that Councillor Blake has indicated her preference for tokenism. It was also a remarkable performance by Councillor Langdale and her personal attacks on me, for which I am very grateful. I would invite Councillor Langdale to read the papers that were submitted to OSC when Councillor Hanley brought his ill-fated request for Scrutiny of the increase in parking charges, because the arguments were made there by the officers and accepted by the majority of the Councillors at OSC that an increase in charging at the Beckett Street car park was justified because of the policies of the Health Trust.

Councillor Graham, who is the Chair of Health Scrutiny a few years ago - and I was a member of her committee and very grateful to be there - we agreed at the time that the increase in the charges by the Health Trust was being dictated to the Health Trust by the Government. That is by the Labour Government, which was forcing the Trust to increase their income from car parking.

That put a great deal of pressure on the Beckett Street car park because not only did the Trust charge their staff more for parking in their car parks, they also charged visitors to the hospital much more, so the visitors inevitably looked for elsewhere to park and they ended up parking largely in front of the residents' houses and flats in Lincoln Green and around the Shakespeares. I as a Ward member for that area have no hesitation in increasing the parking charges while the Government - your Government - increases the charges at the Health Trust.

You could prevail upon your Government to reduce the charges at the hospital. You could prevail upon the Trust that you run to make parking free in their car parks - that would relieve the pressure on the residents of my Ward - but, of course, you will not, because you have not got the guts.

You also mentioned incineration. I am surprised you did not blame me for the flooding as well. There is still time!

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: She will do! Pestilence!

COUNCILLOR PRYKE: There is still time. I would invite Councillor Langdale to get in touch with me and come and have a look at Beckett Street car park and I will arrange for officers to brief her on the true situation there so she will be a bit more enlightened in future. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR LYONS: Nothing but codswallop, exactly what he is talking about, you trying to put blame on the Government. You know, and me and Mark had words the other year regarding the false information that was going round about the Beckett Street car parking. You have put the charges up at the Beckett Street car park. You have the people wandering round giving tickets out when people are going to see their friends and relations, when they are going to see the surgeons, etc, and they are delayed, they are getting tickets. How much have you gained through the people that have got fixed penalty points, how much to pay, because they have had to wait to see a surgeon, because the operation has taken longer? The day wards there that are dealing with the people, you have put the charges up.

What he talks about Government, I will tell you now, you got up and spoke in answer to Councillor Langdale. I am telling you this, you have no need to invite here there - she is a nurse. She knows all about it. You do not. You live just around the corner. If you really want to see what is going on you come with me when they are handing tickets out to poor people that have been to see surgeons etc and are

coming back broken-hearted because they have been diagnosed with all kinds of things and then they are told that they have been given a ticket on their car. You have put the charges up.

Read the papers, read them again. If the charges have not gone up, you have not done it you say - who the hell has done it? Beckett Street, you. That is where it stays. Thank you. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR ATHA: I am back to my memorials, really. Just to repeat very briefly what I said earlier and I said it with all sincerity, I think it is important to have memorials to people who have made great contributions to the city. I think that memorials must be in the appropriate place and Merrion Gardens may well be the appropriate place for many - and I mentioned the Normandy Veterans as one example.

I think, however, if we are reading the report and not just the result of the Executive Board decision, the Chair of the Committee that makes the decisions about memorials should be an elected member. I am greatly in favour of elected Local Government and I think more and more we as Councillors - and I regret this happened under my Government possibly more than Mrs Thatcher's - bit by bit the powers of Local Authority members is being eroded and we are left with few or almost virtually no powers or no actual obligations to perform in a way that makes us responsible, so I think the Chair of this organisation should be an elected person.

Finally, I do think the wording of the 'Resolved' is an odd one. It says that, "All memorials take the form of a suitable inscription engraved in the flagstone of Merrion Gardens." Then the next says the opposite, that, "These arrangements should not preclude an alternative memorial..." In other words, if it is all memorials, all except the ones that are exceptional or alternative.

I think really it could have been written better but I am sure the meaning might become clear if we had an elected member in charge of the Memorials Committee and I hope that that is the case. I will just finish off by saying again, of course, Councillor Harris is responding. We have said some nice things about you earlier. I am going to continue that because I thought you had taught us all a lesson here.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: All for a bottle of wine!

COUNCILLOR ATHA: You, with your disposition, should not be drinking anything like this wine. I am going to say, you have taught us a lesson. You have been the first Leader I have known over very many years that if they thought something had happened that had cocked up, you were prepared to apologise. In fact over the course of your short period you apologised on three or four occasions, all about significant things, and in some cases where the responsibility was not directly yours.

I hope that we can continue that and others might actually catch the same disease of speaking honestly when they have made a mistake. I can indicate where I would start with them over there and that would include *you*. Thank you. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR DUNN: Lord Mayor, I wish to comment on Minute 93 on page 56, the Citizens' Memorial. Lord Mayor, I respect the spirit and intentions of this proposal. The idea of a memorial garden, a new garden of rest in Merrion Way, I think I could say with utmost honesty that I may have sown the seeds for this by being requested by the Normandy Veterans for a dedicated memorial of their own instead of at the Parish Church. I sought out the advice of the Wade's Trust and the rest is history. That memorial is in place.

However, one place does not suit all our heroes and this city has many heroes of many kinds in many fields. Danny Freeman is the one I refer to specifically. Danny Freeman loved to be where people were. I remember Danny coming into my area many years ago in one of the rough pubs and he was not afraid to go and sing where people were, choose how rough it was, because he was dedicated to his cause.

I would suggest that there are many people in this Chamber today who may be directly or indirectly will have had some benefit from the good work he did for the children. It is specifically for the children's cancer hospital that Danny created most of the funding.

Danny as you know - and we do not need any reminding - stood outside Marks & Spencer's in all weathers and Danny was a people's man. I have heard many suggestions of a memorial to Danny. One, not least, a living memorial where Danny and maybe Jane Tomlinson could be celebrated in an annual concert for charity where the good work that they did will carry on. Other suggestions are that there should be a dedicated memorial at the hospital where Danny did so much work for them.

I ask the Leader of the Council to have another look at this one and do not rule out if you feel it is necessary to put a stone in the garden of rest - that is fine, but people would like to see where Danny worked, whether the hospital, they would like to refer to the good work he did. If you do put one there, look at these other honours as well.

I ask for a revisit to this decision and I hope you will consider this. Thank you.

COUNCILLOR SHEL BROOKE: Thank you, Lord Mayor, speaking on Minute 59 page 43, and speaking as somebody who, since being elected to this Council in 2004, has been lead member for two departments and a Deputy Whip, I am not aware that I am actually a member of any old boys' club, so I am not quite sure where that comes from on this side of the benches.

COUNCILLOR ATHA: Are you sure you are a boy?

COUNCILLOR SHEL BROOKE: There you go. I have been sitting here listening to this debate for the past half an hour and I sometimes wonder which party is actually being represented over there, because it seems to be in opposition to its own Government in many of the things which are said.

I could talk about Councillor Lyons's comments about the parking charges but what I really want to come on to is Councillor Lewis. You did not think I was going to just let that one go by the bye. He sat there and made some points about the flooding money. That flooding money is 2% of the money which the Government cut from the EA's budget for flood defences and since those floods in June of this year, we have had precious little sign that we really are going to get the action we need.

I had a public meeting up on my Ward on Monday evening attended by over 400 people and the message that they all took home from that meeting from the Environment Agency is, "We are not going to do a thing. We have not got the money to do it." Other areas have got flooded. Yes, there is £1m-worth of damage. Old-aged pensioners in bungalows flooded six foot up the wall do not know when they are going to return, insurance companies not sorting things out. It is all very well putting things in after the cause and we all believe that and we will try and do something about that, but the simple fact is that money has been cut from those

severe budgets by your Government and you talk about pointing the finger over here and not doing things but perhaps you should start to represent your representatives in Parliament rather than...

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: I am. I am trying to get them the money that is sat in your Council's bank account. (*Interruption*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lewis. Councillor Lewis, this is the second Council where you have got just a little too excited. We cannot understand you when you get so excited and we do want to, I promise.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: We cannot understand him full stop.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Shelbrooke, continue.

COUNCILLOR SHELBRooke: Thank you, Lord Mayor. It is a good job that there are a few people on these benches who are going to try and represent the people of this city at Westminster and not just let them do whatever they want to do, so we carry on that good fight.

Quite simply, my point is. It is important to help people after flooding but what is more important is to make representations to the Government as they now stand and say that we have change in climate for whatever the reasons may be - and we can debate that another time but we do have a change in climate - and floods are going to occur more regularly and it is simply not acceptable to say to constituents in my ward that it was a one in 40 year event, tough luck, we are going to put it somewhere else, when dozens of homes have been wrecked. Councillor Lyons has had homes wrecked in his ward what, three, four times? It does happen, money goes there but it is limited budgets and we need more money coming from central Government and I urge members over there to talk to their party's MPs to influence this Government now. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR LANCASTER: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am speaking under Minute 92 page 56 in relation to the women Councillors being commemorated that Councillor Blake brought up. For the record, I would like to say I have been given every opportunity to be a member of the Exec Board by my party. It was down to my decision that I chose not to do that.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: You should apologise now.

COUNCILLOR LANCASTER: Maybe I have let my colleagues down in that way but I will not pay lip service. If I am asked to do jobs I will choose the job that I feel that I can do well, regardless of gender. (*Applause*)

For the record, 43 years ago I worked for an engineering company and I was the only female and when I came to Leeds my first job was hiring out plant and machinery. Those were really men's roles but I have never had a problem, I have always worked in men-related jobs. I have never, ever seen that as a problem.

COUNCILLOR COUPAR: Don't let them off the hook then, don't do it.

COUNCILLOR LANCASTER: The thing is, when I was offered that role I chose to do the Scrutiny Board because I felt that is where I fitted in and where I could do the most. At some point who knows what I might put my name forward to, but that is for me to decide for when it is best for me. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Well said.

THE LORD MAYOR: Council, could you just reassure me, is it a statement of fact that in fact there is not a female member of any party with a voting right on the Executive Board? Is that a statement of fact? We shall continue. Councillor Hyde.

COUNCILLOR W HYDE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Very, very briefly on page 43 Minute 59 and really in response to my two Wards colleagues' contributions from over there. I expect Councillor Lyons to be an expert on car parking as he is an expert on pretty much everything, as far as I can recall. Councillor Langdale, I am absolutely astonished about the reference to the car parking at Beckett Street. I understood, Lord Mayor, that she had some connection with the National Health Service. Can I tell Council that I have spent quite a lot of time in the last few weeks, for different reasons, at St James's Hospital, and never once have I been able to park in the Council's car park at Beckett Street. Why not? I have no proof but I am told that it is because the staff at St James's are taking advantage of the lower car parking prices on the Beckett Street car park and that is why we have this particular problem, so my colleague is quite right.

Could I suggest that members opposite who have any influence at all over these matters, persuade their colleagues on the Health Service Trusts to regularise the car park in such a way that our constituents, yours and mine, will be able to get on to the Council car park at Beckett Street. It will be a big help, Lord Mayor.
(Applause)

COUNCILLOR GRAYSHON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would like to speak on Minute 93 on page 56, the memorials policy. I think that people who do the work or carry out tasks which would lead to them being included on a memorial, normally end up doing that work more by accident than design and they really seek no memorial for the work that they have done. Their memorial is the work that they carry out at that point.

I must confess I am somewhat disappointed at the name of the new Bexley Wing at St James's Hospital. I am sure you could all think of a more suitable candidate for naming that rather than the Bexley Wing. I think the Tomlinson Wing would have been a lot more fitting.

One of the things I would like to comment on is in the Civic Hall downstairs in one of the side rooms is a memorial to people who have carried out a variety of tasks within this city and I would ask that that memorial be brought out and put on to display, if that is at all possible. I wonder if the relevant officer could deal with that task so that the memorial can be brought out, cleaned and put on to display somewhere in this building. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: I am going to ask Council, yet again, to settle. It is not fair to speakers when those around them are having private conversations and it is happening all around the Chamber. Please, let us settle, get through the work and then we can all have our conversations.

Can I now call on Councillor Harris to sum up, or to respond.

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: I am a fan of Sooty and Sweep and I have been trying to work out who I think Councillor Lewis reminds me of and I have just remembered - it is Ramsbottom the worm. Now, moving on to more important things. Don't you remember Ramsbottom the worm? There was Sooty and Sweep and Soo and Ramsbottom, the worm.

The parking controversy. Look, it is a controversy and it is an intractable problem. We have got to rewind to where it comes from. It comes from a hospital that has expanded incredibly on a limited site with inadequate parking in the first place, with the availability of parking that us, as an Authority, limited with an explosion in the number of vehicles both for the employees of the Trust and for patients or those visiting patients. It is a real case of two into one does not go.

The charges were not increased in order to punish people. The suggestion by anybody that they were increased to punish people - I can only call it laughable. It is a bit shameful to suggest that.

The charges were increased following a Scrutiny enquiry and if he is saying that it is not proved about the question of the employees, that was the anecdotal evidence to us and you can see, can you not, that if it costs more to park in one place then they will go and park in another place. I suppose to some extent we have got ourselves into a Catch 22 situation here. The charges were increased in an attempt to narrow the gap between the Trust parking charges and our parking charges in an attempt to free up space so that patients and visitors would have somewhere to park and it is, perhaps, a blunt tool and a worrying tool that is being used - I say to you genuinely - without a dramatic increase in car parking facilities. We are really in a Catch 22 situation.

I think it is worth commenting that one of the problems faced over the proposals or the semi-demise of the proposals for the children's hospital, that was included in that, was the cost of a huge multi-storey car park in an attempt to address this problem and because those costs pushed up the PFI costs, the hospital got given the thumbs down at that juncture.

We have got an extremely complicated situation. For Heaven's sake, stop saying that we are trying to punish people. There is no intention at all to punish people. We are trying to square, almost, an un-squareable circle and it is a situation of nobody's making. How many people did that get rid of? That was Mick, Councillor Langdale.

Councillor Mrs McKenna and Relate. I understand. I have had my own marriage breakdown to deal with. I understand exactly what you are saying. I know the pain, the unhappiness, I know the difficulty in trying to find somebody to speak to, but it did not fit the targets set for Social Services by central Government. That is why it has had to be reviewed and we have tried to find other ways of funding the gap but we are under constant funding pressures.

Councillor Blake, I think you have been adequately answered by Councillor Lancaster. Councillor Coupar and Roseville. I will pick that up under my summing up later on but I would simply say this to you. I have given public reasons for why I have stood down and I have been very honest. There are some private reasons which, my God, if I made public would have you lot scurrying for cover before you could turn round.

COUNCILLOR COUPAR: You do not frighten me.

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: It is not a case of frightening you. It is a fact and I have had the good sense and decency not to make it public. *(Applause)*

(ii) Development and Regeneration

COUNCILLOR MINKIN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I wish to move reference back on Minute 87 of the Exec Board meeting on 17 October 2007 on page 54. I will

also be referring to Minute 33 of the meeting of the Plans Panel West on 12 July on page 256.

I first want to make it clear that I am not referring to Resolution (a) or (b) on that Minute of Exec Board and I hope, of course, that (d) will become superfluous when you all agree to support my reference back.

The focus of our concern is resolution (c):

“That a 1.8 metre, high steel mesh fence with four gates to the two pitches at Tinshill Recreation Ground adjacent to Farrar lane, be procured and erected.”

It seems you have persuaded yourselves - or allowed officers to persuade you - that to fence off those fields is central to achieving the regeneration of Holt Park. It is not. The provision of the sports pitches and the fencing of them are not dependent one on the other. There is nothing wrong with putting good quality pitches on public open space. There is nothing wrong with a school having first call on those pitches. What is wrong is to fence off public open space.

At the meeting of Council on 18th July last, I referred to the exclusion of Plans Panel West members from considering the planning application to erect the fence and I thank the Exec Board member - I cannot immediately see him, he is at the back there - for ensuring that the matter did come to the public forum of Executive Board. However, I think he will agree with me - though he cannot hear what I am saying - that for it to take two-and-a-half years for it to be realised that the fencing did not need planning permission is a shambles, to say the least. My view is, though I accept the Chief Planning Officer's strict interpretation of the law - and well done him for coming himself to Panel to explain - it is a matter which needed to be put under the robust scrutiny of Plans Panel members and if it happened it would have been officers who would have decided, amongst themselves in private conclave - because that is the only way that officers can meet - to fence off public open space.

That 12th July meeting of the Plans Panel unanimously agreed three resolutions - that is on page 256. Could I just say that only (b), as I have just said but you did not hear me, Andrew, you made sure that that came to Exec Board for decision.

Matter (a), the matter that Plans Panel asked for, that the matter be referred to the appropriate Scrutiny Board with particular reference to the process and outcome of this application. It has not been to Scrutiny. It seems, as far as I can gather, that the Chair of that board confused that clear Minute from Plans Panel with a request received some six weeks later from Councillor Illingworth and decided not to put it on the agenda of that Scrutiny Board. Neither has (c) been followed up, that the matter be referred to North-West Inner Area Committee for discussion.

That meeting of the Inner North-West Area Committee on 28th June 2007 - which is actually on page 356 - does minute a discussion on that item and that issue but as of yesterday the Area Officer had received no such request to refer the matter after the meeting of 12th July.

My memory of that meeting and of the Plans Panel discussions is that just about all of us - and including all the Weetwood Ward members, I am glad to say, having listened to their constituents - did not think there was sufficient justification to fence off public open space. I hope that this vote today on this reference back will give all members the chance to think for themselves on the public interest.

We are custodians of public open space. Nobody else can do that. We cannot allow it to be fenced off on such feeble grounds. We cannot seriously put ourselves in the position of fencing off all sports fields used by children, which is the only logical conclusion of this decision.

I therefore request the following. Firstly, that Council resolves to refer this matter of fencing the sports field on public open space at Tinshill Rec back to its Exec Board on the understanding that it is the clear, collective will of all members that the fields remain open. Secondly, that the request of Plans Panel for Scrutiny does go to the relevant Scrutiny Board. Thirdly, that the matter is referred to the Inner North-West Area Committee for discussion.

Finally and briefly, nowhere does it seem to have been realised what the impact of fencing these fields, if you decide to go ahead, will have on the sports pitch strategy. Tinshill Rec is identified as the community club site for inner north-west Leeds. I know it is not ideal - we made that point ourselves, it could not be further to the outer edge of our whole area but only demonstrates how short we are of playing pitches in our patch - but that community club site requires a minimum five pitches. That cannot now be achieved - you are going to fence two of them off.

So I request that that report to Inner North-West Area Committee also includes an analysis of sports pitch provision for Inner North-West Leeds. I ask you all to seriously consider this matter and support my reference back. *(Applause)*

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

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I think there have been many occasions in this council when we have expressed concern about the problem of obesity with children. Indeed, I think we have a children's champion who also has responsibility for them, yet we now have a proposal which fences off open space for local people with children and themselves to do formal or informal play.

At the Executive Board, I want to make it absolutely clear, all of us support the proposals for the regeneration. In fact they started under our administration and therefore we want to see it completed. What we do not support is the fencing off of open space, particularly in this day and age with the concern or crisis over children's health.

At Executive Board we were given one line about the reassurance of people going off and the line was this:

"Following further negotiations unrestricted public access to them has been secured through the four proposed gates except during the periods of 8.00 am to 6.00 pm Monday to Friday and during term time and whilst booked community use was taking place."

I put it to you, that is hardly reassuring for local people who have had that open space all the time they have lived there and have used it.

I know that both the Chair and Andrew Carter said they were coming back with more proposals on that, but this is what we have to vote on today. This is the document that we have to say.

Also at Executive Board, I think something very serious happened, because the Chair of Executive Board, when I was trying to read the weasel words of Section 7, assured me that the two Liberal Democrat Ward members were now in support of

fencing it off. Indeed, later on I read that Councillor Jennings was also opposed to it and I will give you a statement. Councillor Jennings, who is there, very succinctly put, said that:

“The way this process had been handled was an insult to people in the neighbourhood who opposed the plan.”

This is as recent as July. He added:

“This is one of the most disgraceful events I have come across in my eight years in Council.”

Well done, Brian. Well done for standing up and well done for saying that.
(Applause)

I happen to know a local resident who actually lives on the corner of this fence, and he reassured me that both Councillors Susan Bentley and Judith Chapman promised them that they would vote against, so this is their opportunity.

A COUNCILLOR: That is playing politics.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Somebody else in playing politics because he believes that his local ward members are actually going to vote against and I think there are two things here. Either I have been misled and they are, or the community have been misled and they are going to vote against.

I think it is time and it is opportune now - and I am glad they are in this room - to stand up and make it clear to the local community who trust Councillors - they do not understand all the things - either they are going to stand up for them or they are going to betray them and I think this is a vote now, Lord Mayor, that we need to take. Thank you. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR HARKER: Lord Mayor, I think I ought to give some information. Councillor Minkin hinted that she thought the school could use the playing fields unfenced. It is my belief that the governors will retain the use of the playing fields of the old school should the fencing not go up. This is my genuine belief that I have been briefed on, and so the development of Holt Park in that area would have to be re-looked at because the governors require fenced playing fields for during school time.

COUNCILLOR JENNINGS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. It is very kind of Councillor Wakefield to read out my comments. I would like to explain, though, that those comments were directed completely against the actions of the Planning Department and the way they handled - and Councillor Minkin has referred to this - Minute 33 on page 256. For those members who are not aware, this item came to Plans West twice. Both times members I think unanimously - certainly the vast majority of members - voted to refuse it and then the Director of Planning - and I concur with Councillor Minkin's comments that it was in a way almost brave of him to attend the meeting because I think he knew he would get a lot of flak, and he did - but the way that that was handled is what I was specifically referring to in the comments that Councillor Wakefield has read out.

This is a complicated issue. It is not just a simple case of fencing being put up because it has to be put up. Councillor Harker has referred, I think correctly, to the concerns that the governors of Ralph Thoresby School have and the options that they have if this fencing does not go ahead.

I would also like to point out that Councillor Wakefield and, indeed, Councillor Minkin too to a lesser extent, were making out that the whole of Tinshill Rec, the whole of the open space was going to be fenced off. It is in fact approximately 16% of the Tinshill Rec area that is going to be fenced off and I can assure you that I will make sure that the school sticks to the conditions.

COUNCILLOR ATHA: Who can trust you now when you have changed your mind?

COUNCILLOR JENNINGS: Councillor Atha, I have not changed my mind. I was against it as a planning application. I am against the way the Planning Department handled it...

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: You have betrayed them.

COUNCILLOR JENNINGS: ...and that is what I believe should have been referred to Scrutiny, not whether the fence should go up or not but the way it was handled by the Planning Department, that one month they thought it was in the hands of we Councillors, members of Plans West, to make the decision and when we made a decision that in some parts of the Council or in the Planning Department was not seen to be one that they could support, they came back and took the decision out of our hands.

It is a contentious issue. I have had members of the public in the area support the fencing; I have had members of the public against it. I do not know who Councillor Wakefield knows who lives on the corner of the fence. I know a lot of people in that area. Those who know the area, the residents of Raynel Way are the ones who will be most affected.

Interestingly, the one decision that has changed, and I welcome this, is that the fence is no longer going to be built on top of the embanked fields, two pitches, but at their base, which massively reduces their impact. Yes, it is a difficult decision. I do not believe I have betrayed anybody and I do not believe I will be betraying anybody by not supporting this reference back, but I will say that I think it was badly handled, I think the public consultation obviously was not taken into account and I do not find myself happy with that, but I will finish the sentence I was going to say earlier before I was interrupted by Councillor Atha - I say as a Ward member and I am sure the other Ward members will do the same, if Ralph Thoresby School does not stick to the conditions that are applied, i.e. the fencing will be only secured during school hours, I will be the first to kick up a fuss.

Let me just point out, as part of the improvement of Tinshill Rec that goes hand-in-hand with the two pitches for the school, four or five other pitches which at present are almost unplayable on, particularly in the wet months in the winter, are going to be refurbished and made playable and be available to the public. A huge area of the Tinshill Rec is not even formal playing pitches, it is just open grassland. That is going to be landscaped and improved.

Yes, it is a difficult decision. I have made mine, it is a balance and I hope I have got it right and I will explain my decision and why I came to it to the people of my Ward. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: Council may have seen my little sister and I were just having words to try and clarify this situation. I will come to that in a minute. You may also have noticed I did attempt to walk away thinking that I had got what I needed to know and she beckoned me back and I did not argue.

First of all I want to deal with the history of this, which the opposition have got an amazing selective memory of. Let us go back to the very beginning because Andrew and I, then in opposition, were on Exec Board when the five school PFI - including Ralph Thoresby - came before us and included there, to everybody's consternation, the then controlling Labour group and us in opposition, was there need to fence part of the Rec? There was an inordinately long discussion backwards and forwards and everybody was agreed that it was completely undesirable but - and here was the great big but, underlined - it was a five school PFI and if we did not agree to the fencing the contract for Ralph Thoresby could not be signed, the five school PFI would go through the floor. We were between a rock and a hard place and that was you in administration and we in opposition.

Reluctantly, as I believe you in control, said we are going to have to do this and there was all party agreement for a most unpalatable decision because none of us liked the idea of fencing in public land. That is the history of that situation.

It is all very well for you to stand up now and point the finger at us as if somehow we are the villains of the piece. There is no alternative. We can refer it back up the yin yang. There is no alternative. There was no alternative then in regard to the five school PFI; there is no alternative now in terms of the regeneration proposals unless - unless - Council wishes to forgo those regeneration proposals and that is a decision that we can take if we so wish.

We are clear for our part, as unpalatable still as the fencing may be - and it is not as appalling as you are making out, as offensive as it may be - we are clear that that price has to be paid to finish off the job and get these regeneration proposals through.

What exactly are you suggesting? It is easy to say we are all in favour of regeneration but what are you saying if the fencing does not go ahead? I am afraid the consequence of that is you are voting against the regeneration proposals and you cannot have it both ways. We are learning in control there are some very difficult decisions to make. This is another difficult decision.

You are making out that somehow the whole of the Rec is being fenced off. Brian has made it clear that part which is being fenced off will only be closed to the public during school hours. We were given an assurance at Executive Board out of school hours it will be open public use. Are the public really saying now that they should have access, everybody should have access to school fields when the kids are there? That is contrary to everything we now accept about pupil safety.

I turn to the situation of Councillors Bentley and Chapman. It is correct at Exec Board that I said that they had opposed this as, indeed, they have opposed it. They continue to oppose it and to try and oppose it. Let me explain. They have continued to do that but in the end they have had to decide what is ultimately in the best interests of their constituents and ultimately in the best interests of their constituents is that these regeneration proposals do proceed. It is an extremely difficult decision. I am assured that they never gave any promises about voting against. They gave assurances they would do everything to try and dissuade us as an administration and to argue it through with us. They have done that, as has Brian Jennings, but this is decision time. If we do not do this, then the regeneration is lost and we are not prepared to have that happen. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: My Lord Mayor, can I start by saying that the people in the local area do feel that they have been let down, misled and double-crossed by certain comments that have been made in their community. I want to refer Council back to the 13th April 2005 Council and comment from Councillor Procter. He is

responding to Councillor Leadley and saying that he shares his concerns and I quote - I think I will read it out because that is the best way to do it:

“I think it was made clear at Executive Board that a number of us share the concerns about the separation of any public open space and the fencing off issue has been of great concern. I have to say there has been a lot of to-ing and fro-ing of correspondence with the Chair of Governors of this particular school this is allied to which is Ralph Thoresby and saying, ‘Unless we are allowed to fence off this school, this means that the whole of this PFI will collapse.’”

That was the line that had been fed to me for quite some time - that is Councillor Procter.

Interesting to note, he goes on to say that:

“When it came to Exec Board that suddenly was not the view in certain quarters and, indeed, it was not quite so crucial that the fencing off had to take place.”

I think there has been a real attempt here to re-write history on this issue and I think the most serious questions need to be asked about this, but I just want to ask one question. If the governors want to fence it off, do we have to agree with that request? There are many, many schools across this city whose pupils play on unfenced-off public space. If you are saying in Council today that as a result of this you are going to be prepared to fence off all of the playing pitches in this city because it is not possible for young people to play on unfenced pitches, then that is what you are opening up today. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR LEADLEY: My Lord Mayor, I think there are two parts to this problem, as you might say. The first is the use of a procedural device which retrospectively claimed that the fence did not need planning permission when it appears that the vote might go the wrong way, and that annoyed the members of Plans West. It might be a more common legal device than we would suppose, because earlier this year there was a High Court action to quash a planning permission in Morley and when the City Council seemed to realise that it was losing, it tried to claim that the works did not need planning permission anyway, but the High Court Judge was not having it and the permission was quashed.

I think that is all rather separate from the question of the fence, but on various occasions at two separate stages the application to build a fence has been to Plans West and I have always consistently opposed it. Setting aside the annoyance that was caused by the *volte-face* on the legal advice, I still remain opposed to the principle of the fence, which I think is separate. I shall vote for the reference back.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. Whenever I see the word “fence” I cringe these days and I looked at this item a few months ago and thought, how on earth have I managed to get saddled with dealing with yet another fence.

However, people do have short memories - very short memories - and in 2002 the decision was taken by the then Exec Board to move forward regeneration plans for Holt Park - long overdue. I think it was in February 2003, the then Executive Board agreed that Ralph Thoresby should be part of the five school PFI.

I have to say - and hindsight is a wonderful thing and perhaps we all should apologise for this - the then administration, the then Exec Board member - was it you, Liz? (she has got her head down) - the then administration and the opposition party subsequently in this Council, agreed to that five school PFI scheme inherent in which, as Richard Harker has pointed out, was the fact that we might have to fence that proportion.

COUNCILLOR MINKIN: Might have to.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Let me tell you, Liz, because at the time the Ward members were not the current Ward members but Councillor J L Carter, Councillor Barry Anderson and Councillor Keith Loudon, all of whom raised points about the PFI and what it might mean.

The view was taken - and we were put under a lot of pressure as I recall and I am grateful for Councillor Harris, whose memory is sometimes better than mine reminding me - that there was huge pressure about the PFI scheme if we tried to pull Ralph Thoresby out or not do it the thing starts to crumble.

I do ask the question actually of all of us including myself, what on earth were we doing - and it is not the only time it has been done - not making sure there were proper playing field provision that could be delivered for a new school that did not involve some deal which may or may not happen which could jeopardise a much wider regeneration scheme?

We are where we are. This all happened back in 2003 and 2002 and things have moved on. Let us just get away from this word that Keith Wakefield keeps using, 'support the fence'. Let me tell you, there is nobody supports a fence going up around playing fields. It is, unfortunately, a decision that has to be reached, regrettably, because of the position we find ourselves in with the regeneration scheme for Holt Park.

I am not aware that any of the three Ward members - and one has spoken - have said they are in support of it. I will tell you something else, if I was a member of the Plans West sub-committee who got this conflicting information, I would be as annoyed and furious as they are, because if ever there was conflicting advice given by officers to members, this is it. First of all you take a decision and then, "Well, actually, we do not need a decision at all." Members are quite rightly angered about that, but none of that gets us away from taking the very difficult decision that is before us upon which hangs, we are assured, the regeneration of Holt Park.

At the meeting it became perfectly - I have just had some clarification. In fact, Liz, you had no need to hang your head in shame because, of course, the Exec Board member who was responsible at that stage for the schools programme was Judith Blake - the female candidate in the general election in north-west Leeds that the constituents of north-west Leeds did not vote for.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Rejected.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Rejected. I hope you are not going to insult them and call them some sort of male club, Judith, because they did not want you!

My Lord Mayor, the simple fact is this. If we do not get ahead with this now, we will lose the regeneration, the training, the jobs, the sports centre. We will certainly put them in jeopardy. What I have assured members of is that a report will come back to the Executive Board about access, guaranteeing the proper access. Keith, by the way, those playing fields, as you well know, will be open. Those gates

are not going to be locked. The fence is there to protect the kids from the school when they are using it. That is what they are there for.

As I said, how we got into the position in the first place perhaps Judith had better explain. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Recorded vote, please.

THE LORD MAYOR: Is that seconded? It is.

(A recorded vote was taken on the amendment)

THE LORD MAYOR: The figures - present 95; 'Yes' 45; 'Abstain' 1; 'No' 49. That means the reference back is DEFEATED.

Could we move on, then, to Councillor Illingworth.

COUNCILLOR ILLINGWORTH: Lord Mayor, I rise to welcome Minute 40 at page 33. I am sure the Executive Board have taken the correct decision. For whatever reason the draft planning brief is widely seen to be unfair, affording excessive weight to the interests of people who are already well off and insufficient attention to the needs of some very disadvantaged local residents.

Lord Mayor, our city has a doubtful distinction. It has perhaps the worst sports provision per head of population of any Local Authority in Yorkshire and Humberside and among the worst of any core city, among the worst in the entire country. It is nothing for any of us to be proud of. At a time of growing concern about the problem of childhood obesity, our lack of outdoor recreational opportunities is an increasingly serious problem.

What is worse, Lord Mayor, is that Leeds is a two-speed city. What limited playing fields and recreational land we possess is mostly concentrated towards the periphery of the city. Our designated playing fields, we have already heard, for Inner North-West, are at Tinshill Recreation Ground. Sports provision for the inner city is absolutely dire.

Lord Mayor, the latest medical research points with increasing certainty to the critical importance of regular exercise for a long and enjoyable life. This truth was actually appreciated by the ancient Greeks but nowadays we understand the benefits of the cardiovascular system, to the immune system and to people's happiness and mental state.

Some groups within our city have a particular need to exercise more. People from a south Asian background suffer particularly high rates of diabetes, cardiovascular disease and for such citizens the need for greater recreational opportunities are particularly pressing.

It is therefore unfortunate, Lord Mayor, that the two most deprived areas in Leeds for recreational land are Harehills and South Headingley, both of which have considerable south Asian populations.

It is for these reasons, Lord Mayor, that the playing fields associated with Leeds Girls High School are of particular significance to the people in South Headingley and why it is of particular importance that the National Planning Guidance in PPG 17 should apply to these playing fields with full force.

Lord Mayor, it seems to me that the best outcome would be for this city to acquire all this recreational land and the swimming pool and the hall and to transfer the majority to local schools to be managed and shared with local communities for the benefit of young and old alike. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR GABRIEL: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would like to comment on page 45 Minute 66 about the development proposal at Elland Road and about the public consultation.

The comment I would like to make is, could I have your reassurances that there will be local community involvement throughout the process and would it be possible to set up a liaison committee with local residents from all the local community groups in the area?

My second comment is to thank Mr Steve Smith. I am also the Chair of Beeston in Bloom that came second in the Britain in Bloom's awards for urban category (*Applause*) and I have to say Steve was the only member of the coalition administration and officers who actually passed on their congratulations, which I did do to the rest of my committee. Thank you very much.

COUNCILLOR J McKENNA: Leadership style there, Steve!

COUNCILLOR DOWSON: I would like to comment on page 46, Minute 68, the former Headingley Primary School. I know that that decision has been deferred until November and that is possibly because it is being considered for a Government grant, Advancing Assets to the Community, along with another one in Beeston, a fund that very few of us actually knew was available to refurbish community properties.

In my particular Ward the comment I want to make is about the inconsistencies that actually are on show when you are looking at school premises and I would like to refer in particular to one in my Ward as an example, and that is the Miles Hill Primary School. I am not going to rehash the argument about whether Potter Newton should have stayed open or Miles Hill or both of them, because that argument has gone. Potter Newton is now called Millfields and it is open and children are going there, but we have the former school on the Miles Hill site. That is actually on the Beck Hill estate, which is one of the estates that are giving us most concern in the city.

Area Management asked to do a review to see which of the organisations that can help the residents of that community would like to have access to it to provide services. I will just run through of them quickly because there has been absolutely no consultation because Area Management were told not to consult, that the actual land was in the capital budget and that there was no point asking anybody because that had been done.

The police would like a facility in the area. Antisocial behaviour orders are rife among the young people there. At the moment there is a dispersal order on the Miles Hills, the Beck Hills and the Potter Newtons to actually keep young people off the streets, but we are not actually giving them any facilities to use to keep them occupied. That school could actually provide those facilities. The Youth Service are using a maisonette on the site belonging to East North-East Homes. Our housing list is phenomenally long and yet we are using a Council property to give young people access to youth service. This is a house. There is no room for them in there. The school itself would provide room for them to provide all the facilities the young people would actually need.

That goes to highlight another thing about this. Youth services at the moment are spending £330 per child that is actually accessed by them in Old Woodley. In Chapel Allerton, that includes Chapeltown and Beck Hills, it is £209. That is a huge difference. Surely it should be the other way round when we are looking at the deprivation indices.

Sure Start need more room. They want to move out of the bungalow, they need more space because of the number of people who are accessing, the children that are benefiting from Sure Start. The Family Intervention programme operates in the area. It is needed - Social Services will tell you that. It has nowhere to operate from in the area. The Chapel Allerton Children's Centre, need and want to access space on the Beck Hills. The wardens, they occupy a flat - again housing list huge, why are they occupying Council properties that people who are on the housing list are waiting for?

For goodness sake, East North-East Homes. Those of you may not know but the bottom end, the land adjoining the school is actually all the properties there are proposed for demolition. I have got the notice here from East North-East Homes for another lot of houses that have been demolished. That whole swathe of land will be up for sale for development and yet we cannot do a review, we cannot find the space in our schedules to find a little bit of time to do a review. Maybe Miles Hill School cannot be kept, maybe it is not economically viable, but surely we can build in a 106 agreement that whoever buys that big, valuable plot of land from us, the city, can actually build a room that the community can use.

Social Services are moving out of Roundhay Road. They are going to lease or rent property. They actually looked at Miles Hill School and I have got an e-mail here and it says: "We did not pursue any further detailed investigations on this as the site was no longer available for consideration." They were told not to bother doing any viability, it was not available to them.

Beechtree Steiner, an educational facility running out of a local centre, want more room. They would be prepared to pay for access, so we are not looking at capital and revenue budgets that cannot actually be balanced here - we are looking at an inability of the administration to see further than what is happening now and to look into the future and how much money can be saved by the police not having to constantly go down there, by the prison service because these young people are going to be occupied and turn out nice and well-rounded individuals. Sure Start, we have a duty of care.

THE LORD MAYOR: Finish it there, Councillor Dowson.

COUNCILLOR DOWSON: Last sentence - a duty of care to speak up for those who cannot or do not speak for themselves, to make a difference in our inner city areas and to really narrow the gap. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Lord Mayor, can I ask Council please, under Procedure Provisions Procedure Rule 22.1 that we can extend by 20 minutes this particular session, so I think we would wind up at five-past five and reconvene at 20-past five.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Procter?

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can I put it to Council? You are not wishing to speak on it? Thank goodness for that! Can I put it to Council for the vote? Is that agreed,

Council? AGREED I think that is agreed. We will go to five-past. Can I then call Councillor Morton.

COUNCILLOR MORTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am speaking on page 46 Minute 68 also, like Councillor Dowson, on the former Headingley Primary School.

When we talk about Headingley and the problems we have had with multi-occupancy, I have always felt that we do the wider area a disservice. The difficulties that I am not going to go into now we have in the north-west of the city cover a much wider area - all of Hyde Park and Woodhouse ward except Little London, all of Headingley, a substantial chunk of Kirkstall and with a frightening rate of change well into Weetwood.

I do not think that we have really got to grips with that, quite frankly, under either administration and the reason for that - and I think it is a perfectly valid one and an understandable one - is because the area is not - and I accept it is not - traditionally deprived in terms of income or health or the traditional indices, and it is stuck between a bit of a rock and a hard place, its historic character as a well-off suburb - indeed, Headingley, the first suburb the city had - and the quite legitimate desire to focus regeneration effort in areas of the city where there is real health and income distributions.

It reminds me a little bit of home when I go back to Cumbria. Cumbria cannot be deprived because it is pretty and beautiful and it is a national park when, in actual fact, it is a low wage economy, it is a seasonal economy, it has the highest ratio of house prices to earnings, it has no educational facilities, it only got its first university last year and so on and so on. You cannot be deprived if you are in a beautiful area.

My argument today is not that Headingley is the same as or as deserving of regeneration funding as other parts of the city. It is just that it is a little bit different in three categories. Firstly, Streetscene, my favourite ever piece of Council jargon was the statement that Headingley had the biggest concentration of negative Streetscene indicators in the city which, for everybody else, means it is the dirtiest Ward in the city. Sadly, I think it still is. Secondly, we have inordinately high volume crime rates, the highest anywhere in the city and, thirdly, we have a wider social breakdown. The fact that we have the lowest electoral turn out, the fact that we really suffer in terms of getting people to join committees or run residents' groups is simply because if 60% or 70% of your population moves house every year and is perpetually 18 to 24 - and this is not students' fault, it is just a fact - your traditional social structures break down and it has an enormous impact. If you talk to very hard-nose burglary detectives, they will tell you that this is an area that will never have its crime problem solved because it has lost the capacity to self police.

My contention then is - and I am grateful and I do not say this very often - both to Councillor Harris and Councillor Carter for deferring the paper on Headingley Primary School. I think it was a very good move and I am grateful to both of them - we need to look a little bit differently at the value that we have in our redundant primary school buildings because, quite rightly, this area will never be the first call on the city's capital resources or regeneration funding.

The question has been can we use the former Headingley Primary School, which is absolutely bang centre in the middle of Headingley, a community that is very old, pre-dates in some forms the Doomsday Book but has no civil buildings, as a regeneration project?

I am hopeful that at the November Executive Board meeting that we now have a deal. It is quite clear and I think, frankly, quite right, that we were never going

to get the building for nothing. That would have set an awful precedent for the rest of the city. I understand the concern and the pain - and Councillor Dowson is quite right in some of the things she said about disposal of these buildings, but we need the money for new schools and the cake is only so big. Can we do a deal that will allow us to get some value out of this school but maintain the school's capital programme?

On the basis of some of the work that Ward members have been doing and I have been heading up, I am now relatively confident that we can and I would use my last minute as a plea to the Executive Board to look at this sympathetically at its meeting in November.

We have had widespread community consultation. I think we can re-provide the old Headingley Community Centre facilities in the New Heart project at the primary school, that will generate a capital receipt, it will generate capitalised revenue savings that we can use, the Headingley Development Trust is happy with that, we have had consultation meetings with community centre users who, while not ecstatic, nobody is opposed to the scheme, Ward members are on board, and it seems to square the circle. We will get the capital funding we need to build these schools but we maintain this very, very important project as a regeneration initiative in an area that is not traditionally deprived but is deprived of so many things, and I recommend it to the Executive Board in November. Thank you.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Martin Hamilton.

COUNCILLOR M HAMILTON: Lord Mayor, I withdraw.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. In that case it is Councillor RD Feldman.

COUNCILLOR FELDMAN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. As the junior member of a very select club of past Chairman of the Leeds Grand Theatre and Opera House Ltd, I was very pleased indeed to read in the Yorkshire Evening Post prior to this Minute, which is item 90, that the Heritage Lottery Fund had approved the Stage 1 bid for refurbishing the City Varieties Music Hall and were to provide a lottery grant of £3m.

Before I had read the details in the YEP I could tell from the smile on Councillor Procter's face that we had won our bid. In fact his picture is in the Yorkshire Evening Post so often I think the paper ought to be called the Procter Evening Post!

However, my main reasons for speaking to this Minute are, firstly, to congratulate everyone who has been involved in the bid and we all know how tight money is and will be over the next few years.

Secondly, you may not be aware that the total cost of the refurbishment of the City Varieties Music Hall as at the moment is £9.2m and that this Council's contribution is £5.2, therefore leaving a shortfall of £1m to be raised by the Board of Management of the theatre.

Thirdly, to draw your attention to item (d) on this item that is before us and I quote:

"That the Leeds Grand Theatre and Opera House Ltd Board of Management be invited to commence their fundraising campaign."

Although no longer directly involved in the theatre, I feel it necessary to appeal to you to do what you can to help raise the £1m needed. If you have any business contacts who would help financially, or you yourselves for that matter wish to, please speak to Peter Sandiman at the Varieties. Your help would be much appreciated.

This theatre, apart from being the oldest variety music hall in the country, opened in 1865, is much loved by the general public and, in particular, by all those theatre goers who have fond memories of visiting it for The Good Old Days, as well as the usual shows.

We need to meet this financial challenge of £1m so that it can still run for at least another 100 years. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR A TAYLOR: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would like to comment on Minute 81 on page 50 and it refers to the former Harehills Middle School which, as you can see, is due for a massive facelift and an injection of over £5m. This redevelopment of Harehills Middle is very much supported by the local community and last year my former colleague, who is now I think a member of another political party - he seems to change his politics like most decent people change their underwear - sent out a letter to the local residents asking their opinion about the redevelopment in the Middle School and, surprise, surprise, he was photographed outside the school and numerous people completed the questionnaire and said how much they supported our view to refurbish the school in order to create jobs in the local community.

As most people perhaps will not know, the Harehills Middle School is a small site. You could not get a swimming pool in it and you could not get a sports centre on it, only - only - if you had to demolish local houses, and also a listed building. Imagine my surprise when yesterday I could not attend a meeting that was called very, very suddenly - I had to give my apologies - but I am led to believe that at the meeting there was a representation from members of the Labour Party against the refurbishment of the Middle School - against LEGI, against regeneration in Harehills and Gipton.

I will give credit to Councillor Harington who, I am led to believe, supports LEGI and supports regeneration and supports refurbishment of the school, but it seemed to me that there was a little sort of political cabal that was trying to cause mischief.

COUNCILLOR ATHA: Like yourselves.

COUNCILLOR A TAYLOR: It will be, let me tell you, your problem, thankfully, and not ours. I do not think we have chameleons on our side. Chameleons do not have spines.

The Middle School has been left empty now for far too long. It has become a magnet for antisocial behaviour, for drug dealing and for fly tipping. I warmly applaud this money that is coming into Gipton and Harehills, the most deprived Ward in the city and I thank the administration for all the efforts that they have done in making that possible and also the Camberwell Group for putting their expertise behind it in bringing this former A1 site back into use for the benefit of the local people which will create jobs, which will give a future to the people of Harehills and Gipton and that, I think, is altogether good. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

COUNCILLOR D BLACKBURN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I will not go on because Ronnie has just said it all - it is regarding the City Varieties, page 55 Minute

90. As a former director or over the last four years or so (*interruption*) - I resigned - I am delighted to hear that we have got this money from the Heritage Lottery Fund. The thing is, anybody who goes round the City Varieties will know that it needs some money spending on it very, very, very quickly and to me, we can have other things but that is working class culture and it needs to survive and it needs to be brought up to date.

I am really, really excited we have got this. I hope when we need some more we can get some more, but great.

COUNCILLOR KIRKLAND: My Lord Mayor, I am talking about Minute 91 which is on page 55 of part 1 of the agenda book. Progress at long last towards a major refit for Otley Civic Centre. It has been terribly slow coming but at least we are there now. The Ward Councillors would like to put on record their thanks to officers and members of both Leeds and Otley Councils and their advisors.

The current plan and the resolution before Council today set up the financial structure to enable the work to go ahead at an early date. On the elected members' parts, we will do our utmost to ensure that the process flows smoothly and that in the near future work will begin on the refurbishment that the people of Otley and Leeds can be proud of. I think this is very good news for Otley and for Leeds. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would like to agree with Councillor Morton on the issue of consultation on the Headingley Primary. I think the people associated with that are very professional and very committed and they have got some good ideas. Whether we support them or not I think is going to be subject to debate at Executive Board.

You are right about consultation and you are right about the poverty statistics, but if you move further down the road to a place called Hyde Park, you will see statistics there which demonstrate it is one of the poorest Wards in this city. You have 42% of children living in households on benefits. You have 16% unemployed and your letter last night, David, missed the point. It is extremely important if you are committed to closing the gap that you consult with people. You see, that is the bit that is missing. It is OK to consult in Headingley - I support it - it is OK to consult in Fir Tree over that school - I support it. Councillor Dowson mentioned how her community has been treated and Ward members have been treated. Why have we not consulted in Hyde Park? Why is they have been given almost a *fait accompli* on a library and a community centre and now they are consulted? Is that not the wrong way round when you are trying to give people some hope about the future?

This is why I would say simply this. I welcome Councillor Kabeer Hussain coming across to the Labour Group. (*Applause*) He is the only member who stood by his beliefs, who stood by his principles (*Laughter*) and stood by the community that he wants to go for and we welcome him on behalf of the Labour Group and we look forward to working with him to get more Labour members in that Ward next year. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Could I call next Councillor Kabeer Hussain.

COUNCILLOR HUSSAIN: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. Members of Council, I would like to speak to... (*interruption*)

THE LORD MAYOR: I keep asking all sides to respect each other and be quiet. Can I just say for the third time today - and remember these are verbatim

minutes - will you please respect each other and listen to what you have to say.
Thank you.

COUNCILLOR HUSSAIN: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. Members of Council, I would like to speak to the Executive Board Minute 41 on page 33 in relation to the sale of the Royal Park school building, which many of you probably know is in my ward in the north-west of Leeds.

I am deeply disappointed at the administration for not listening to the local people in the ward that I represent. (*interruption*)

I am delighted that we here in the Labour Group are calling for... (*interruption*)

THE LORD MAYOR: It seems to be a tradition whilst I have been in office that members have taken advantage of standing and not speaking on the Minute that they are supposed to speak on. It has happened numerous times today and I think it is unfair when Kabeer Hussain is speaking to then try to say he is on the wrong Minute when he has not spoken before.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: My Lord Mayor, Members do talk on minutes which sometimes do not relate to it. What they do not do is talk on a different portfolio completely. He is talking out of order completely and it is wrong.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Hussain, which Minute are you speaking to?

COUNCILLOR HUSSAIN: My Lord Mayor, page 46 Minute 68.

THE LORD MAYOR: Minute 68. Continue.

COUNCILLOR HUSSAIN: The plans for the redevelopment of the primary school have been shoved down the community's throats without any consultation with any other consultation with any other communities in that locality.

I feel, with regret, that this administration has begun a two-tier system in our city, one for the leafy suburbs and one for the inner city.

I make reference to an article in the Leeds Weekly News where it was reported that the Council bosses of this administration have given green light for consultation with respect to the future of the Fir Tree Middle School which is due to close next year. I must say I wholeheartedly agree (*interruption*)

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: This is unfair, Lord Mayor. This is totally unreasonable.

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: Lord Mayor, with respect...

THE LORD MAYOR: Just one moment, Councillor Hussain. What is your point, Councillor Harris?

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: One Councillor is on his feet and already speaking.

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: I am just pointing out to the Lord Mayor - I am not addressing him, I am talking to you, Lord Mayor.

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: Under what Council Procedure Rule are you speaking? Specify the rule you are speaking to.

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: Lord Mayor, I am merely pointing out, Lord Mayor, that no connection whatsoever has been made between this Minute and the matter on which he is now speaking and that is... (*interruption*)

COUNCILLOR GRUEN: That is not a point of order, Lord Mayor. Mark, specify the rule you are speaking to.

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: Lord Mayor, I am not speaking to him, I am speaking to you. There is no connection whatsoever between the two matters.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Harris, with respect, in a couple of minutes you will have the chance to respond because you will be summing up. Councillor Kabeer, could you continue?

COUNCILLOR HUSSAIN: Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: And do take Council's point. You did say you were going to speak on a particular Minute. Would you make sure you stay close to that and if you wish to use parallels with your own ward, illustrate them.

COUNCILLOR HUSSAIN: I wholeheartedly welcome the steps taken by the administration on the Fir Tree Middle School in terms of consulting the local communities but I cannot say the same for the inner cities like Harehills, like Councillor Alan Taylor has already mentioned, and Hyde Park, the Royal Park School building.

You are consulting in the leafy suburbs but you are forgetting the inner cities and that is the point I am trying to make. This is totally unacceptable. In any event, there should be consistent approach regardless of the location.

There are many angry residents in my ward to do with the lack of consultation. I quote Terry Donohue on 31st August this year in the Yorkshire Evening Post. He says:

“The news the Leeds City Council has ignored the local community in Hyde Park and decided the future of the Royal Park School, including the development of yet more flats, will come as no surprise to many.”

Furthermore on 24th August 2007 Dr Malik from the Leeds Muslim Council quoted:

“There has never been a clear and open consultation and there is a lot of anger and frustration in the community about this.”

Many of you might not be aware, my Lord Mayor, that the Hyde Park and Woodhouse Forum back in July, the forum that I chaired, it was noted as a key message that no decision should be taken at the meeting of the Executive Board about the future use of the Royal Park School building until there had been thorough consultation with all the communities in the locality.

It is with great disappointment that the Chair of that forum changed and manipulated and removed any reference to the Executive Board on the upcoming meeting, clearly trying to save the administration from embarrassment. (*Interruption*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Hussain, I am afraid the red light has appeared. Councillor Hussain, sit. Sit. Sit. Sit. (*Applause*)

All of you, listen. It is no good on this side carping at one member doing something when you have not carped all day at others doing a similar thing. At the same time, Councillor Hussain, I think you did stretch way, way from the Minute - way, way from it. You came with the intention of saying certain things whatever and you tried to say them and fortunately you were stopped by others who could see what you were trying to do. Perhaps in the future you will be more cautious and put your words closer to the Minute that you are speaking upon.

We are now out of time so I am calling upon Councillor Harris to sum up. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: My Lord Mayor, thank you very much. So, summing up, can I first of all go back to a long time ago, Councillors Atha and Dunn on the question of the memorial. I just want to underline again, which we did say in Executive Board, our willingness to consider other things as well. We have never said this is it, this is all that anybody can be offered, but there has been such a hole in what we as an Authority and city can do to commemorate people and, as you know I apologised publicly in the paper and to you that it has taken a long time to get both the memorial garden, which is posthumous, and the Leeds Award, which is for living people, to get both in place. Both are now in place but we have said we will consider other things in exceptional circumstances. I am sure my successor will hold to that.

Councillor Coupar, Roseville. Let us be getting it clear. I am not resigning. I am standing down as Leader. I have said again, if your side - and it may not be here but if you push, then I will blow the gaffe on certain things which, as I have said previously, will be so unpalatable for you - with Keith knows because he has made reference to it inadvertently - that you will be so ashamed it will be unbelievable.

On the issue of Roseville, I gave an assurance there would be no redundancies. There are going to be no redundancies. There has been no discussion of redundancy. There has been no mention of redundancy. I have spoken to the officers concerned who were at the most recent meetings. No discussion of redundancy, no mention of redundancy. I gave an assurance nobody will be made redundant.

If we turn to the problem as you put your finger on, which we have discussed here quite rightly, but it is an almost insoluble problem, the situation is this. Your administration created an organisation that depended upon replacement windows fed through the housing department when we were in control of the housing department. We are no longer, we have ALMOs and those ALMOs have chosen, as you said, in spite of officers' best efforts, to place their contracts elsewhere. They have made that commercial decision. We have implored - what do you want me to do? I know I am a cracking salesman but what do you want me to do? Do you want me to go out personally and try and get orders for Roseville? If you want, I will give it a crack because in the end that is the only thing that is left open to us. If the ALMOs will not place the orders the business is not there. It is a fact of life.

What do you want the people to do, Councillor Coupar? Do you want them to sit there doing nothing because there are not the orders for them and nobody is being made redundant, nobody is being chucked out? I have said previously that there may be a case for them of choosing to be redeployed elsewhere but nobody who has a disability will lose their jobs. I gave that assurance and for you or anybody

else on your side to say otherwise, you are making mischief. It is unfair and it is wrong to those people. It is wrong.

COUNCILLOR COUPAR: They are losing their jobs.

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: Councillor Ewens, a long time ago, asked about regeneration in Hyde Park and Woodhouse and she asked for certain assurances and levels of funding. I am pleased to give those assurances. In fact I have some very interesting statistics here. I can say last year and next year we will spend - this is over four years - a total of £1.2m in different revenue budgets in Hyde Park and Woodhouse and that is actually, when you look at what has come from the Wellbeing funds, £354,000 is Wellbeing, that is 42% of the entire Wellbeing budget for the four inner north-west Wards. So 42% is being spent on that one Ward alone, £1.2m on that one Ward alone and a further £144,000 of capital from the Wellbeing fund - that is 37% of the total available spent on Hyde Park and Woodhouse - a commitment to serious funding for a deprived inner city Ward and then we look at PFI credits, we have secured £95m-worth of PFI credits to be spent in that Ward. That is commitment to a deprived Ward and to try and make things better, how interestingly I would like to compare that with the leafy suburb - what leafy suburb might that be? The one I know best, which is Moortown, which has its own problems, I can tell you over a six year period in Moortown £400,000 will have been spent - £400,000 from a total from the new sources of SRB, Wellbeing, £400,000 in Moor Town compared to £1.2m in Hyde Park and Woodhouse.

If you look at the PFI credits, the total secured for Moor Town in that period is £15m compared to the £95m secured for Hyde Park and Woodhouse.

When we talk about the disparity and commitment between leafy suburbs and inner city, there are the facts clearly outlined for you and for any person to suggest that there is bias towards the leafy suburbs at the expense of the inner Ward, for any person to suggest that, I would say that that person would be a hypocrite and a liar. I wonder, Labour Group, do you have such a person amidst you? Do you have a hypocrite and a liar sat on your benches? If you have got somebody over there who is a hypocrite and a liar - anybody want to stand up and admit to being a hypocrite and a liar, or are you all being quiet now about who...

COUNCILLOR LYONS: Un-Parliamentary language, Lord Mayor.

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: What is?

COUNCILLOR LYONS: "Liar and a hypocrite"

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: No, I have not.

COUNCILLOR LYONS: You stood up in this Council and said...

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: I am sorry, Lord Mayor, I do not remember calling anybody a hypocrite and a liar. I said such a person might be, but I asked whether you knew if there was anybody on your benches who was a hypocrite and a liar and I am sure you do because, looking at the verbatim minutes which I have in front of me from 21 June 2006, Councillor Atha accused Councillor Hussain of being a hypocrite and a liar. (*Laughter*) On 13 December 2006 Councillor Rafique accused Councillor Hussain of being a hypocrite as well. I was not saying that he was. Those were members of his Group saying he is a hypocrite and a liar. (*Applause*)

Lord Mayor, I might just end on this point, and peace has not really broken out previously between myself and Bernard Atha, or even Councillor Rafique, but in

this instance I agree with them. (*Standing ovation from Liberal Democrat and Conservative Parties*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Your food is either going cold or burning. Can I now move to the vote on the Minutes? Those in favour? Against? Abstentions? Then they are CARRIED.

Can I at that point, then, adjourn our meeting until 25-to six. Twenty minutes, gentlemen and ladies. Thank you.

(Council adjourned for a short time)

THE LORD MAYOR: Welcome back, everyone. Two announcements. There will be a Council meeting in December, December 12th. Put that in your diary because I am so used to seeing you all sitting there I would hate the benches to be empty.

The other piece of news is that Councillor Jack Dunn has misplaced an envelope, he believes in or around the Chamber. If anybody has found it would they return it to Councillor Dunn.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: If you tell us what is it in we will tell you if we have found it!

THE LORD MAYOR: It has got a raffle ticket in it, apparently, to sell, and some money. It is serious, Council, apparently there is money in the envelope as well. Let us hope it is found and there is still money in the envelope.

ITEM 10 - WHITE PAPER MOTION - CONSTRUCTION OF AN INCINERATOR IN LEEDS

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we continue to agenda item 10, White Paper Motion and call upon Councillor Blake?

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. In moving this White Paper it gives me no pleasure at all to be on my feet again in this Chamber drawing the attention of Council to the woeful lack of leadership shown by this administration with regard to its waste strategy.

I would like to express my dismay that we are on the brink of committing this city of ours to a waste strategy that still has mass incineration at its heart. Despite all the debate we have had, the calls from this side over months and months to change policy before it is too late, this is the situation we find ourselves in. Do not get me wrong, there has been some progress. At least now you admit that there are alternatives - you denied this at the start - alternatives that are well advanced in other areas, alternatives that will lead to anaerobic solutions that will deal with 500 tonnes of waste, 1000 tonnes of waste, based on the most state of the art, cutting edge facilities anywhere in Europe; solutions that would provide local facilities backed up by major educational awareness-raising programmes.

Lord Mayor, this is what the people of Manchester and surrounding districts can look forward to. Why can't the people of Leeds look forward to this? Despite all your protestations, the case you are putting forward still favours energy from waste, a technology that destroys valuable resources and at a time when energy will reach its premium, your solution will develop a technology that loses energy, reduces flexibility and, above all, will massively reduce the incentive to recycle, re-use and reduce our waste stream.

Lord Mayor, my colleague Councillor Lyons tried for months and months to get you to come clean about the proposed site for the incinerator. You refused repeatedly until it slipped out in the summer - no debate, no formal acknowledgement. No surprises where the four possible sites have turned out to be. What a travesty for local involvement and local democracy.

Today we are witnessing a repeat of this style of leadership - or may I say lack of leadership. I understand that the outline business case for financial support for the Leeds Waste Strategy has been submitted to Government. In September we were promised that a report on this would be put to the October Executive Board for discussion and approval. Now it has already gone in, yet again with no debate, no approval and no scrutiny of its contents. The discussion and approval will take place after the event. I ask Council why? Why again are we being subjected to this cloak and dagger approach full of secrecy and suspicion? This city deserves better. We asked for a full and open debate - it is very, very sad indeed that we are not being allowed one.

I will tell you why I think this has happened. Councillor Smith has not had the courage to bring this forward for full debate. It is obvious from his amendment to our White Paper that he is in denial - denial that the business case that has gone in still has incineration at the heart of it. This is the so-called reference technology based on a reference site identified in the summer. I am sure in a few minutes we will hear him again trying to deny that this is the case but do not be fooled - incineration is this reference technology and Cross Green is the reference site.

We are asking you again, Councillor Smith, to come clean and oppose incineration in this city and, if you cannot, then explain to the people of Leeds exactly what this means. We are sick and tired of the lack of leadership all of you over there have shown on this issue, the lack of clear direction and fudge that has resulted in exposing this city to huge financial risk and environmental damage. You are proposing locking us into a contract to burn, a contract that will commit us to find other sources of material to burn if we manage to dramatically improve our rates of recycling and waste reduction.

Could you tell us what type of waste this would be? Would it be commercial? Would it be hazardous waste? Would it come from across the region? From other regions? Or would you use simply biomass? What an inefficient and wasteful system you are proposing.

A contract that will continue to bring huge lorries thundering through the surrounding communities to feed the fire; a contract that will deny us from developing all the new technologies that will help us deal with our waste efficiently and effectively with the best facilities for the people of Leeds.

Lord Mayor, I have welcomed the improvement in the waste reduction targets that have come forward, that we have seen and discussed at Executive Board and I must say to Council that I have absolutely no problem at all with the Green Party's amendment asking for more to be done at all levels of Government, but I believe that we need to insist that this administration explains its lack of direction and what this reliance on market forces will mean in the future.

I would be happy, Lord Mayor, if the Green Party chose to add the second part of their amendment to ours and I am sure that our group could easily support that.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Come into my spider's web, David and then we will get you to lose your seat as well!

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: I have a feeling that the members opposite do not want to listen to the argument. If other local authorities can get alternative technologies approved in their business cases, then why can't we concentrate on going for those alternatives?

This Labour Group remains opposed to incineration. We are asking all of you in this Chamber to support us, whether to protect the communities that you represent or to protect the whole city from environmental damage of locking us for years into a one-site solution based on mass incineration. Come on, Councillor Smith, show some leadership, show some courage and, if you cannot, I can assure you that we are ready and willing to take it for you. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR LYONS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I get up month after month and ask the people over there what they are doing about an incinerator and I keep calling it incinerator because that is what it is. You put waste in and smoke comes out of the chimney - that is an incinerator. That is what they are going to do.

Why East Leeds again? We have got 100 sites that you have looked at or supposed to have looked at and come down with a short list of them. If you do not want to listen leave the Chamber. There are 100 sites that you have looked at. You have come down with a short list of four and they are all within yards of one another - they are all within walking distance of one another, anyway. Where are they? Cross Green, across that particular area, because your Tory masters have told you to put them there. That is why.

I have more to say yet - I have a lot more to say on them. Why has it become Council policy? Could you tell me and let me know the 100 sites that you have looked at so that I can see that you have been what I have always thought you have been out of this Chamber, a reasonable and fair chap, but in this Chamber he seems to stare over and you are doing what he tells you. Your Leader, Carter, if you did not know who it is. It is bad policy that you are coming out with. It is bad policy that you have looked at 100 sites. What consultation have you done? When you have decided on these four sites, you sent some letters out within a mile radius. You take a mile radius - it is not a mile radius, it is a half a mile radius because half a mile goes *that* way and half a mile comes *that* way, circumference, if you look round.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Somebody tell him what he is on about. You do not know your square from your hypotenuse!

COUNCILLOR LYONS: When you have done it will be all right because what we are doing - I never did. That is why I am here and you are there and you are not in command.

Let me tell you this, I want to know the Burmantofts and Richmond Hill Councillors have cow-towed to them. I was at a meeting where Councillor Brett said - and he said it openly, to be fair to him - "I will not vote for an incinerator."

COUNCILLOR BRETT: I am not voting for one, Mick.

COUNCILLOR LYONS: What he did not know - listen - it was being recorded and it is down in the Minutes, so that is what he said. Other people in this Chamber - Clive Fox - has welcomed it with open arms so long as it is not in his Ward. What he said - he shakes his head. Somebody was talking about liars and non-liars and telling the truth and everything else. All I know, he was asked the question and the

people in the area, "Would you welcome a site in your area?" and he said, "Certainly not, we would not welcome it. We welcome it in Richmond Hill but we will not welcome it in our patches."

So we go on. Why is the community where we are talking about - we are talking about health. Let me tell you that you keep telling me, and people keep telling me across there, that there is no health implications and I keep hearing doctors and professors and everybody else saying that there is. They are telling you and it is not only them saying it, they are out in the press saying it, out in the national press saying it, there is a health risk with an incinerator. That is what they are saying and I have got all the proof here with what they have said.

I will tell you something else, what they said about all nuclear plants - "You will have no problems here, you won't, we won't get any trouble here" until babies were getting born with two heads and God knows what and they had to shut things down. It is absolutely ridiculous and, as far as I can see, it is an attack again on a poor inner city area. You have chosen East Leeds and you have chosen it again because you will not dare put it anywhere else. If you put it anywhere else you will be outvoted. You carry on with your Leadership battle, do not bother about the people of Richmond Hill because we will look after them come May. Thank you very much. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: To move the first amendment can I call Councillor Ann Blackburn.

COUNCILLOR A BLACKBURN: Lord Mayor, first of all can I say that the Greens do not agree with building an incinerator anywhere in the city, be it in Councillor Lyons's Ward, my Ward, Morley - anywhere else. We do not agree with that.

If you have an incinerator we are talking about going into a contract for 25 to 30 years. We do not see where there is an incentive for the general public then to cut down waste, which is something that the Greens believe we have to do, because they will think, "They have got an incinerator there, it is OK, they can burn it."

Not only that, I do not have any grandchildren at the moment but in years to come I probably will do and I think what we have got to think here is how many of us that are Councillors here are going to be sat here in this Chamber in 25 to 30 years' time. *(Laughter)*

Let us be honest, not to be nasty or anything, but some of us probably are not going to be here, are we? Yet we are making this choice and it is something that our grandchildren will be lumbered with. I do not think that is right.

Going on from that, I will say that the Greens do agree with sort systems and the sort of system that they have in Doncaster where I visited and asked for some information from that, which I am still waiting for, but that is the sort of thing, the sort of schemes. There are other things there, the sort schemes, there are other things there that can be done to reduce waste.

We mentioned in our White Paper on packaging a month or two ago how, of course, a lot of waste could be reduced at source. This would be, of course, laws would need to come in from Government to do that but it is something that will have to come. We also want to see businesses cut down their waste as well and also for the general public to refuse extra packaging, like myself throwing back these white plastic bags. I was given about four I think it was on Saturday when I was shopping in the market and I would say on that that I do congratulate the ladies in Calderdale -

I do not know if you have heard of them or not - they call them the Bag Ladies because they have been in touch with the local shops in the town there and actually got them to stop providing these plastic bags and to have the choice of either bringing their own bag or buying a bag in the store and in the shop which is not made of plastic. I will just say I got *this* - it is another prop - in Scarborough. It is from a shoe shop, not plastic bags, I got this.

To reduce. We request the Council to urge the public to reduce waste by reusing articles that they already have, like taking any unwanted clothes, etc, to charity shops, but it does not stop there. If, for instance, a person has a worn out shirt, a blouse, this can be reused as dusters and buttons, of course, can be taken off and put in a button box. All this was something I was brought up with because, of course, in the war you did not have a lot of alternative. I am not wanting to cause a war or anything like that, but people then were actually taught what we are saying now to think about the waste and reuse but, of course, now we are in this consumer society which, of course, it is only too easy to throw things away when we no longer want them. Just bung it in the black bin and think no more about it, it does not matter.

As I said, reuse what we can reuse. Of course there are lots of things, if we think about it. I tear things up and tear blouses that come to the end of their life and use them as dusters. What I find now is on the TV we have adverts saying, "Buy these dusters, they are sprayed with a chemical, you can just use them once and throw them away", again giving out the totally wrong message.

Also repair. How many Councillors in this Chamber get their shoes repaired, I wonder? Nice to see, of course. Brilliant. I wish more of you would because, again, is it not all too easy to buy shoes cheaply that cannot be repaired again and just throw them away?

Again we say recycle. Recycle is something that we use a lot but, of course, recycle is, as we Greens see it, a last resort. Recycle is put stuff in your green bin but we think that the public should think before they do that. I know in my Ward they say, "Can I have another green bin? We are being green, we recycle." That should be as a last resort.

We believe that Government should play a major part by bringing in laws to reduce waste at source, as I said, but we also believe that this Council should promote, through advertising campaigns aimed at the general public but also work aimed at children done through schools, to refuse, reduce, reuse, repair, recycle - recycle, as I said, just as a last resort. Thank you. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR RUSSELL: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I will be very brief because I know there are a lot of people want to talk on this. As Greens it is obvious we are totally opposed to incineration. It is fundamentally wrong to burn our rubbish. It just sends out the wrong message. We have alternatives; we just need to have the courage to use them to reduce the volume of the rubbish that we collect.

This city, we could lead on this issue if we wanted to, if we had the courage to pick the solutions, the solutions that are sustainable and do not present a health issue to the people of our city, as my colleague over there said.

This must be combined, however, with working with industry and the public through education and legislation to get people to reduce the vast amount of packaging that seems to cover even the simplest products that we buy in the shops these days, so we must all work together to get the message out there to refuse,

reduce, reuse, repair and, as a last resort, absolute last resort, to recycle. I second this motion. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Can I call on Councillor Steve Smith, who has a second amendment?

COUNCILLOR S SMITH: Thank you, Lord Mayor. It is interesting that earlier in the day we were talking about education and the question was put down to one of my colleagues about education. It was on education in schools. I fear, having heard some of the arguments put forward by Councillor Blake that in fact it is adult education that is at fault.

I can quite understand some people who do not take a particular interest in this topic not having read the papers but, of course, Councillor Blake is a shadow member of the Executive Board and was there when the papers were put through the Board, so why she fails to understand them I do not know.

It is interesting, is it not, that Labour ask us to make our strategy clear. Actually I believe it is clear and I will come on to that, but first of all I will turn the question on its head and I will ask, what is your strategy?

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: They do not know, do they?

COUNCILLOR S SMITH: It is interesting, is it not, because sometimes - and I know it is not very often - we look to Government, do we not, for leadership? What is DEFRA policy? DEFRA policy is to maximise energy recovered from unavoidable residual waste. Who is the Secretary of State for DEFRA? It is Hilary Benn, the MP for Central Leeds. Have they been lobbying Hilary Benn? There is no answer to that one either.

There is an underlying principle and Councillor Blackburn talked about reduce and reuse and I wish everybody in our fair city was as committed to reducing, reusing and recycling as Councillor Blackburn is.

The big one, though, is recycling. We can talk about recycling as much as we like - and over there they have talked about it - but I sometimes like to look at the actuality. In the last five years of the Labour administration recycling in this city went from 10.47% to 14.54%, a rise of 1% per annum.

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: That is great.

COUNCILLOR S SMITH: That is the actuality. Well done. *(Applause)* In three-and-a-half years of this administration it has gone from 14.54%, it has just about doubled. In September, the best month on record that we have ever had, last month, 28.38%. *(Applause)* I ask you, whose record stands scrutiny?

Moving forward, 28% very good - not good enough, though. Our plan is to achieve in excess of 50%. Aspirationally we would like to make 70%. If everybody did as Councillor Blackburn did I am sure we could achieve 70%. Of course, in the real world not everybody would participate. If everybody participated, though, we think 70%. We have announced our plans, they were in the paper that Councillor Blake has seen. Separate food waste collections, garden waste collections and more materials at the kerbside.

What can we glean from what Labour have said? The last budget they stripped £350,000 from the Waste Strategy Budget and they were going to spend it on more composting – no food waste collection, just more composting. No extras at

the kerbside. What do you think would happen to the recycling rate in those circumstances? I do not know but I do not suspect it will get to 50%.

Even if we achieve 70%, however, there would still be a requirement to process a further 100,000 tonnes of waste.

There is a choice there. There is a choice that we continue doing what we are doing and we put that to landfill, which is environmentally a disaster, or we can look at a technological process. For me landfill is not an option. What can we glean from what Labour have said? I already told you in the last budget amendment they took out the money from the strategy. That means no strategy, nothing going forward to DEFRA this time, no education and awareness in our schools, no education and awareness out on the street. If there is none of that and there is no technological solution – landfill. I do not know but if they would like to tell us differently, then fine.

We are looking for a solution which is flexible enough to cope with the range of tonnages, so if we hit 50%, fine; if we hit 70%, it will cope with both. That is the idea that when we actually go to contract, that is what we shall be looking for. We also look for a solution which is not incinerator, incinerator, incinerator, as keeps being put about by others. In actual fact, a solution that has the health and wellbeing of people in Leeds at its heart, the health of wellbeing of the environment.

I have already spoken about their last thing but what have they come up with? They have come up with it again today. Why do we not be imaginative and look at what Manchester are doing? What are Manchester doing? They are building two incinerators. *(Laughter)*

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: That is where we are wrong – we should not build one, we should build two! *(Laughter)*

COUNCILLOR SMITH: Again, which plan stands scrutiny?

COUNCILLOR ATHA: Ours does, actually.

COUNCILLOR SMITH: If there is no plan at all I suppose you can scrutinise it, yes, Bernard. I suggest that labour let us know what their plans are. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: There is a young man on my right waving his arm who has been trying to attract my attention for hours, it seems, so Councillor Carter, could I call you this time!

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Young man! I love the Lord Mayor dearly!

Let us just come back a bit. I listened to Judith very, very carefully and the questions that were posed by Steve, she gave us no solutions whatsoever. We had a diatribe about all sorts of things you might do, you might not do. She talked about Manchester – I understand now they have got two incinerators in Manchester. She gave no solution whatsoever. All she wanted to do is delay.

In fact just as an aside, if you actually follow this through, if you ever want to alter one of our crematoria we would not be able to do it because we would not be able to build a crematorium under this proposal. It is barmy what you are saying.

The main thing about this is, at this moment in time we want money. We want money from Government. We are saying – and this is why I shouted across

that Richard could say he is not in favour of an incinerator because he is not voting for an incinerator. He may at some stage in the future vote against one.

COUNCILLOR LYONS: He is not voting against one, that is for sure.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Michael, I did not shout at you.

COUNCILLOR LYONS: Yes you did.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: When you get older you forget these things, Michael. Just going back a stage, you are delay, delay, delay. Let me just take you to a Public Accounts Select Committee. They produced a report which calls on the Government to take urgent action to ensure that taxpayers will not have to pay the £180m a year EU Landfill Taxes. It accuses ministers – your ministers – of reacting too slowly to the 1999 EU Directive on reducing landfill waste. It says there is now a significant risk that new rubbish incineration and (*inaudible*) plants will not be built on sites to meet any targets and yet the Labour Group opposite is again, again, again trying to delay this solution.

The solution is not here to build an incinerator. What we are saying is, you have got to get your Government to get the money for whatever situation they come up with. Whatever you come up with, you are going to have to come up with something.

However, I do not believe the Labour Party are in a situation that they have no policy. Mick Lyons has a policy along with the rest of them which is disguised as a “dare not tell the people of Leeds.” May I refer to May 2007, David Milliband put forward proposals for the Climate Change Bill that would allow independent local authorities to charge for household waste.

Less than a week ago Downing Street said, “Oh, no, we are not doing it” and then within one week – within one week – changed its mind and said, “Yes, we will do it on pilot schemes and then we will do it on a full scheme.”

That party over there have a plan. I will tell you what it is. They want to force people into more recycling and how they are going to force it is they are going to charge you for your bins, so when you go into Temple Newsam tonight, do not talk about the incinerator, Bill – you go and tell them that Mick Lyons and his pals want to charge you for your bins because that is exactly what they are proposing. That is what they are doing, oh yes.

I can assure you on this, in Burmantofts, we were talking in Burmantofts of exactly the same thing and across this city people will be aware that you and your Government want to charge for taking their bins away. Do not shake your head – it is you that is doing it, it is you that is pushing it because they know it is there.

Lord Mayor, today we are not deciding on an incinerator and I think that has got to be very clear. I would just read...

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Can you just repeat that, please? I lip read. Can you repeat it? No.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: ...the amendment put down by Councillor Smith, “welcomes the integrated waste strategy for Leeds and in particular its targets to reduce waste and increase recycling as far as possible.”

This is clear – and listen. This Council clarifies its preferred option is not energy from waste. We are saying it is not our preferred option. However, we will not get PFI money unless we go forward now and at this particular stage.

My Lord Mayor, I think Labour have got a lot of answering to do, far more than this side. This side has been open and let us not kid ourselves at all, that party is going to be the party for charging for your bins emptying and anyone who supports this today will be accused of the same thing. Thank you, my Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR BEVERLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I came here today prepared to speak in support of the Labour Party motion and I am glad to see that the Labour Party is backing the British National Party stance on this issue *(Laughter)* and that is that we do not want an incinerator either in Morley or anywhere else in the city.

I am actually going to support the Green Party motion because it is important that we acknowledge that the government does have a role to play in this and the government is, at the end of the day, responsible for the state we are in nationally as well.

The Green Party amendment does get to the heart of the issue in that basically we need to produce less waste; when we do produce waste we need to recycle more of it. That is the issue when we get it right down to its simplest form.

I have spoken before about this issue. I am not going to go into any more detail here tonight. Some councillors think it is fine, as has already been mentioned, to vote for an incinerator somewhere in Leeds, or at least not vote against an incinerator and then go back to their Wards and say to their constituents, "It is OK, I may have voted for it but I am not going to accept it being located in my Ward." I think that is completely unacceptable. I oppose it being built anywhere and I will be voting in support of the Green Party amendment. Thank you.

COUNCILLOR BRETT: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I want to start by clarifying that of the four sites, three are not in Cross Green, which shows how well Mick knows his former ward. Two are in Knostrop and one is in Skelton Grange, which are a considerable distance away from Cross Green.

Labour are trying to claim the moral high ground. Simplifying their argument, it is, we are wanting to build an incinerator, incinerators are bad, so we are bad. *(Applause from Labour Group)* None of the speakers so far have actually mentioned that we already have two incinerators in Leeds. Where are they? They are in the Aire Valley, they are in my Ward. In 1992 Councillor Lyons was on a planning committee that agreed to one of the incinerators being built.

COUNCILLOR LYONS: Lord Mayor, that is not true.

COUNCILLOR BRETT: £100,000 was given as a Section 106 grant.

COUNCILLOR LYONS: Lord Mayor, personal explanation. That is not true. I did not vote at that meeting.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lyons, you have not been misquoted so there is no reason for a personal explanation. He has not been misquoted.

COUNCILLOR LYONS: In any case, I did not vote.

THE LORD MAYOR: Fine, I understand that and I think Council do. Councillor Brett, continue.

COUNCILLOR BRETT: I will let others look at the record and see what happened in 1992. The long and the short of it is that in 1992 the planning procedures, when Labour were in control, gave permission for two incinerators. One burns what is called, in technical language, sludge – perhaps to you and me, poo. Not very nice. £100,000 was given in Section 106 money to local communities because it was perhaps recognised at the time that this was not very nice and that some payback needed to be given to local communities. Some, I understand, was spent in Hunslet, some was spent in Richmond Hill and £16,000 was put on one side to build a footbridge over the River Aire and that footbridge was never built.

Twelve years later, when we won in 2004, that £16,000 of unspent Section 106 money was found by my colleague Councillor Hollingsworth and we are now spending that money on environmental improvements in Cross Green.

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: Well done. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR BRETT: the point that we have reached now is that we do need to apply for £63m of moneys towards building some sort of residual waste plant. This is a rapidly changing scenario. It could be, in my view, a mechanical/biological treatment plant. That might be more adaptable, it might be something we can get planning permission more quickly for.

The climate is changing on this issue and changing very rapidly. Three years ago when I was first elected as a Councillor, nobody thought that we could have a ban on smoking in public places within three years and the change has been so rapid we now say that with a number of people – and certainly Joe Swinson MP in the Liberal Democrats has presented a bill to Parliament about reducing packaging in supermarkets. We now say the situation is changing so quickly that we need to delay exactly what sort of technology we use. We have doubled recycling. We are planning to double recycling again. We are the more recycling parties. They are not listening to it. Shall we all say it again to them? We are the more recycling parties.

To get to the moral high ground you need to look up. Many of the opposition councillors do not seem capable of doing that. Councillor Blake had the nerve to talk about they would provide leadership. Oppositions do not need to say what they would do but I tell you that the people of Leeds will deserve a party or parties that take hard choices. You will not deserve to run Leeds again until you tell the people of Leeds what you are going to do on this crucial issue. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. I do not know how clear we have to be to the opposition for them to finally sink into their heads that what we are proposing here is not a waste strategy that introduces energy from waste or incineration, which is a word you seem to understand better.

Let me just make it very clear to everybody else in this Council what voting for Labour's resolution would actually do. It would mean that by their own Government's regulations this authority could not bid for PFI credits and would miss out on about £63m, £4.7m a year. Why could we not bid? Because their ministers and their Government have told us we cannot rule out a particular technology and that includes incineration.

Furthermore, they have told us, we cannot bid for credit unless we have a site which we can guarantee we could put some form of treatment plant on if we got the credits. That is why we have to identify the old wholesale market at Cross Green because it is in our ownership. It is not our preferred site but the Government have told us we have to identify a specific site.

If you vote for their resolution you cannot bid for the credits for any form of technology. As Steve has absolutely rightly pointed out, it was at the last budget meeting of this Council when Keith Wakefield took out the money for enhancing the strategy, for trying to educate in schools younger people, the next generations how to recycle more and how important it was. He took all that money out. Where would we be with Councillor Wakefield's so-called Leadership?

I will tell you where we would be. We would be staring down the barrel of fines which could lead to up to £160 a year for Band D Council tax payers across this city because we were having to send waste to landfill. That is what their policy would lead to.

Les actually was only partly right when he reveals what he believes and I believe is really the policy. We know what the national policy is and we know how this lot, however much they huff and puff, slavishly do what their masters tell them. What they would do to fill that gap – because they would not be allowed to put £160 on Band D Council tax, what would they do and why have the Government actually said we will allow Local Authorities to tax waste? Because the Government know that Authorities, if they are led by people like them, will have no strategy. Their own rules will not let them put Council tax up by that much, so what will they do? They have only two things they can possibly do.

The first is to tax household waste on top of the Council tax and that is what they would do. They would tax household waste. The other thing that they would do is reduce the amount of bin collections and most Wards in this city would see the weekly black bin collection go overnight if they were back in control of this city.
(Applause)

COUNCILLOR BALE: Lord Mayor, I really think the motion on the Order Paper today is a very unintelligent one, if I may say so, and it is not much improved by the Green Party amendment.

I would hope we could all at least agree that on any environmental issue all of us are on a pretty steep learning curve; a process of re-education, an area of policy that in many ways has only recently entered our lives. The best definition I have ever heard of education is that education is a journey from cocksure ignorance to thoughtful uncertainty, and I invite colleagues opposite to take just a few steps along that road this evening.

Environmental issues – any environmental issue – is enormously complex. If you do not believe that, just try working out the most environmentally responsible way to dry your hands after you have washed them. To do a thorough analysis of that you would be into infection control, electricity generation, paper manufacturing and waste disposal, textile production and laundering. Environmental issues are complex and you are simplifying this huge environmental issue to a ridiculous degree this evening.

I normally have respect for the Green movement – but not tonight - because I think at its best the Green movement really is involved in an open-minded search for the best way forward for people and the planet. We have not seen that tonight. I thought we were going to get on to digging for victory and dried egg at one point, because what we heard was a lot of nostalgia and nostalgia is not the way forward. You have got to produce policies that are going to work in the real world, are going to work with human behaviour as it is rather than as Green politicians would wish it to be.

We all know the best way forward is first of all to minimise waste, then to recycle to the maximum extent, but at the end of the day we have a residue. The issue becomes what do you do with that residue, and there really are only three broad things you can do with it. You can bury it as a legacy to future generations – and this Government rightly is going to fine us if we do that and that is the crux of the financial issue. You can export it. Would you rather do that? Would you rather send it to China? Would you rather send it to some other part of the country? Or you can find a way of rendering that residue into an inert material and at the same time, if you can, extracting some useable energy from it and capturing the carbon and reducing the harmful emissions in the process of doing that.

It is that third broad option that we are talking about, not something crudely called incineration but that third broad option.

Meanwhile technological change, as Richard Brett said, is advancing the whole of the time. This is what is so mindless about this motion. You are rooted in the past of something that you think of incineration as burning rubbish at the bottom of your garden. Think how information technology has moved on in the last ten years and you will get some idea of how environmental technology will move on in the next ten years.

In the past environmental technology has not had the stimulus of markets. It has now got them because of tax regimes that are going to recoup social costs. It has not had the stimulus of fashion. It has now got that through Al Gore and his ilk and, as a result of that change in fashion and that move towards a market economy, it is attracting a business response. What we talk about as incineration now could be something very, very different ten years down the road.

We have got to be responsible about what is important for the future of Leeds. We have to take account of that technological change. We have got to keep options open whilst at the same time seizing opportunities when they present themselves – opportunities in this case for PFI credits – whilst at the same time not lumbering a future generation of people in Leeds not just with pollution but with a huge financial bill.

I really do urge you, however you thought you were going to vote when you came into this Chamber this evening, to recognise that a motion that says “We are against incineration”, even if it is leavened with a bit of Green Party nostalgia and idealism, simply will not wash. Please reject that motion and accept the amendment put forward by Councillor Steve Smith. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR W HYDE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I do not know why I feel this but *déjà vu*, I think is the term. We have heard it all before and we are getting a repeat of all the speakers going back into the early summer in particular. It seems to me it is irresponsible, it is unintentional misunderstanding on the part of the opposition and, as some of my colleagues have already said, they have got hold of the wrong end of the stick. Maybe we ought to be used to it by now but I do not think we probably ever will be.

This time round, Lord Mayor, there is an unusual difference and we have already heard from Councillor Carter that we are required by central Government under threat of severe financial penalties - and as we all know that means millions and millions of pounds if we fail – to considerably reduce the amount of waste that goes to landfill. This does not mean that we will replace landfill by incineration. It does mean that we need to work towards a long term goal of becoming a zero waste city. That means reducing, reusing, recycling and recovering value from all waste so that ultimately no waste at all is sent to landfill.

Members opposite are, I am sure, well aware of all this and they are also aware that the four sites that have been identified are for a waste treatment facility. Councillor Lyons can misunderstand as much as he likes and keep calling it an incinerator, but they are in fact potential sites for a waste treatment facility.

They also know that a decision on the technology that is to be used will not be made until 2010. As Councillor Bale has just said, with advances in waste treatment and recycling coming on stream all the time, it seems more than likely that incineration will become less and less likely to figure as a major part of that long-term solution.

Why, then, I wonder, Lord Mayor, do the members opposite pretend that they do not believe any of this? The only explanation I can think of is that they are doing something which neither you nor I, Lord Mayor, would ever dream of doing. They are seeking to gain a political advantage by distorting and misrepresenting the facts. I hate to have to suggest it but that seems to me to be what they are doing.

The facts are – and members opposite I am sure know this - that the Council wants to recycle as much waste as possible, that we will choose the best available technology and the best site on assessment against strict criteria and that a decision will be taken following public consultation as part of the tendering process in 2010.

As I have already said, members opposite know all of this. If they expect the electorate to have any faith in them, they really should withdraw this scurrilous White Paper now. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR ANDERSON: You will be pleased to know I am going to be brief because I just want to make one or two points. The first is that there is just about to be a Scrutiny enquiry into that, so we have already heard one member who has already pinned their colours to the mast. What use that member is going to be now, when we already know where that member is going to go. It will be interesting to see what Councillor Ogilvie, Councillor Coupar and Councillor Lewis say, because what is the point of looking at a Scrutiny enquiry if you have already made your mind up? We need to be careful with how we deal with what is being said tonight.

Coming back to why I am really standing up, I was invited to join the Leaders' Working Group that was set up and all the parties were asked to come along to it. All the parties have come along to it. I think I know what the Morley Borough Independents' view of life is. I know what the Greens' view of life is. I know what the Liberal Democrat view of life is. I think they certainly know what my view of life is as well. The one we have not heard from in any shape or form on any of the meetings whatsoever – and I think if I have maybe heard four or five words from the person concerned – is the Labour Group. We do not know. They do not participate. They do not want to participate in the discussions that we are having, they have no intentions because all they think they can do is, if they carp at the side for long enough, if you keep repeating an untruth, eventually people might start believing it.

If you want to tell us what your policy is, what is your policy?

COUNCILLOR LYONS: We do not want an incinerator.

COUNCILLOR ANDERSON: That is like saying "I do not want hanging." So what? I do not want hanging but that does not mean to say I have got a policy on law and order or anything. Mick, that just shows you how stupid your position is when you say, "I am against an incinerator." You are not for anything, you just know what you are against. You are not for anything. You did not expound any of the other

alternatives whatsoever. You did not say, if you come forward with MBT or autoclaving or anything else like that, that there are downsides. Where are the markets for the residue that comes out the far end? Where is all this produce going to be sold? A lot of them will lead at the end of the day to the residue having to be burned anyway, as per the Manchester option. That is where Manchester has gone down the route. They have gone down so far but then they are left with a residue that has to be burned at the end of the day, so you must keep your mind open to all the various alternatives.

I looked back to try to find out what was Labour Party policy at any time in the future. The furthest back I went was in 1995 when the Green Guru at the time was actually Councillor Lyons. He was on a group that had been set up and Councillor Walker was chairing it and I think Councillor Parker, if I remember, was on the same Panel as well. That was back in 1995. You are very proud of saying that you were in power till 2004, so that is almost 19 years. What policy did you come up with of dealing with waste in this city between 1995 and 2004? Has anybody seen it? Has anybody heard anything? No. I got on to Council in 1999. Did we debate anything in 1999 about waste? No. 2000? 2001? No, we never, ever debated it. It is only we are now having to pick up the cudgels because in 1999 your Government said this was coming along. We had to pick it up in 2004 and run with it. That is what we have had to try and do.

I will leave you with this thought. Go and have a look at the risk analysis of each of the alternatives. Go and have a look at the risk analysis of all the alternatives.

COUNCILLOR LYONS: Have it on your patch.

COUNCILLOR ANDERSON: Once you have seen that evaluate it out, then come back and say which is your preferred option after having looked at absolutely everything. If we give our minds away today and decide what we are trying to do, the government will say we are not just interested in playing and there is no government easier at taking money away from this city but, I think, to be quite frank, your government takes great pride in taking money away from this city because every time we try to do something they come along, put large obstacles in our way and then say, "Oh, you are not playing with that so we will take the money away from you."
(Applause)

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would like to speak in support of the Labour Group's White Paper opposing the construction of an incinerator anywhere in the city.

As tackling climate change and safeguarding our environment becomes ever more important, our waste strategy ultimately, as has been said, must be all about reducing the overall amount of waste produced alongside the reuse and recycling of as much of the remainder as possible.

We have spoken before and today we have heard from Councillor Lyons and others, and Councillor Blake, about our great concern that incineration risks encouraging exactly the opposite and that you end up having to feed 24/7 this great beast you would be creating in order to keep it viable with waste from other Local Authorities, commercial waste and even, potentially, biomass with the result that you potentially end up suppressing recycling demand.

Despite all the recent rhetoric – and we have heard it today, bluster and smokescreen – incineration is still at the core of the strategy with the PFI bid using incineration as its only benchmark. You seem unable to admit that the report you

commissioned two years ago that said that incineration was the only solution is now out of date. This does not have to be the case.

Instead of holding on to this blinkered view, why do you not admit that you have got it wrong and that alternative technologies have moved on and are now just as credible and could have been included in the PFI business case?

That is why other Councils are moving away from incineration. Why are they doing this? Because some of the other technologies are cheaper, have minimal environmental impact, can be scaled up and down much easier and can be constructed much quicker than an incinerator.

In making clear your waste strategy to the people of Leeds, we call on you to be much clearer how you are going to increase recycling in this city, especially to those communities cross Leeds, like Cottingley, which do not have recycling facilities and, according to officers, there is no money to introduce recycling to the 1300 properties here. Similarly, can you tell us why there has been no progress on recycling collection services for the city centre?

Lord Mayor, the administration's incineration policy sends the wrong message about the need to conserve resources and respect the environment. There are financially viable, environmentally sound alternatives and it is time that you took those alternatives seriously. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I will be pretty glad when the Leadership contest is over with, otherwise we are going to deaf if Councillor Brett continues to speak like this. I have to say that, Councillor Brett, you are ahead on noise but not on logic. *(Laughter)*

There is no doubt – I think it has been touched upon many times – what we hear today is really a political fix of smoke and mirrors. It is basically the administration trying to save their political necks at this May's election. There is no doubt about that.

You see, when Councillor Smith was not a candidate for the Leader, he was a lot more honest chap. Last December 12th he said in the YEP, "We have consulted massively" – I think it was 0.8% of the population – "and there is only one solution and that is an incinerator" and that was repeated actually at the Council the following day. The YEP does not get it wrong, David, and it did not get it wrong then.

Then we saw the budget proposals which actually talked explicitly about an incinerator and putting money in, as Andrew said, to get an incinerator through PFI bids. That was in your budget.

In March something happened to Steve Smith. He started to grow a forked tongue, along with some of his other colleagues because guess what was coming up in May? Another election. He started to say, "We are looking at all options. We are looking at everything. We are not committed to it." I will tell you one thing, on 10th May, if it is so open-minded and we are looking at it, why did the Greens resign from this administration and say explicitly it was down to the incinerator policy that he could not agree with? If it is an open mind, then why has he done it?

We are quite clear that it is an incinerator, but they persisted. This administration, first class stamp, sent a letter out to 10,000 people in East Leeds telling them on the one hand, on this hand, we might and we might not have an incinerator as a waste solution. 10,000 letters, a complete waste of money telling the

people of East Leeds absolutely nothing about their preferred option, which is an incinerator.

Then they carried on and I have got to quote you one of the candidates, Richard Brett. What did he say on 6th September? "We have not decided what sort of technology to use and we will not do so until 2010." Untrue. The preferred option is there.

Councillor James Monaghan – here is a guy who speaks his mind – "We intend to invite bids from a range of operators and then choose what is best for the city." By the way, at the end of his letter he says, "However, I am confident that our proposals represent the best deal available for our environment and people." He had already said at the end of the letter he had made his mind up.

What really gets you about the way this administration is treating the people of East Leeds in particular, is our famous sword of truth, Focus. Let me quote you from Mr Pryke. Mr Pryke – is he there? Listen how he is standing up for his community. "Cross Green market site is unacceptable. This important market must stay on this site" and what preferred option on the site is it?

COUNCILLOR: An incinerator.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Thank you. There we go. Pryke says again, "The favourite sites are in Knostrop or Skelton Grange some distance from Cross Green." That is a huge relief for the people of East Leeds to know that it is OK because it is in Skelton Grange.

The most ridiculous claim here has got to be more recycling. We have heard it today. Tell me anywhere in this country, anywhere in this world, where they have managed to recycle 70% maximum and have an incinerator alongside it? There is nowhere, it is a complete lie that they can do both. You either do one or you do the other. You cannot burn.

I will give you one more quote. The Liberals representing their Ward do not mind, all the four sites in there, have got a competition on the new East Leeds Road. Here we go. Some of the local residents have suggested to us Copperfields Way or St Hilda's Way. This is a competition to name the new East Leeds Road. Do you know what we should call it? The Incinerator Way because that is exactly what it is, with a lorry every two minutes, probably more when they add to it and they are completely misleading the people. Yes, we have alternatives. Yes, we have others. Other Authorities do it. If you cannot do it, why don't you resign and we will take over and we will do it properly. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR COUPAR: Thank you, Lord Mayor. First of all, Councillor Brett, I think you could do with a lesson in geography. Even your own leaflet suggests that the four sites are in the Cross Green area.

I would like to add my support to this White Paper and the comments already made by my colleagues. My constituents have made it very clear to me that they do not want an incinerator anywhere in the city, never mind on their doorstep. This administration has demonstrated to the people of Leeds how inept and inefficient it is at running this city by the way they have conducted the consultation on the waste strategy.

The letters that were sent out to residents in my Ward only added to their already growing confusion and worry. There is no wonder why, given the smoke and

mirrors policy used to hide the real facts. It is time to be clear on this strategy for the sake of the residents of Leeds.

The four identified sites are all in East Leeds. Why? I have lived in East Leeds most of my life. Why should we be the community to suffer at the hands of your proposals? Our communities will have to suffer the extra traffic, the increased noise and the possible health issues, not to mention the eyesore of an incinerator.

The Liberal Democrats in East Leeds should hang their heads in shame. They are letting down the very people who need them to stand out against this imposition. Councillor Lyons is right to call for public forums to be held as soon as possible in each Ward affected. The public deserve better. They deserve to be told the truth about the incinerator, especially because it could have such an impact on their communities.

I cannot understand why the coalition are so keen to see an incinerator in Leeds. It is surely time that all – if you would listen – members of Council take a serious look at this proposal and if you (*interruption*) – I will say it again. It is time that all members of Council take a serious look at this proposal and if you would not vote for an incinerator in your own community, then do not vote for one anywhere else. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Lord Mayor, I move that under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 22.1 that Procedure Rule 3.1C and D be suspended to allow this White Paper motion to be debated.

COUNCILLOR HAMILTON: Second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: To the vote. (*A vote was taken*) That is obviously carried. That will be the procedure then, Council. Can I warn you, Council, that the next speaker is making his maiden speech, so please give due respect. Could I call upon Councillor Arif Hussain.

COUNCILLOR A HUSSAIN: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. I would like to join my colleagues in demanding that public forums are arranged in the city so we can debate thoroughly and in depth the key issue regarding the proposed incinerator in East Leeds. A public forum is the least 100 residents in my Ward of Gipton and Harehills deserve given that many were left amazed when they were informed about the Council that they are living near one of the potential sites for this incinerator.

A letter to residents only added to the confusion and worry. It spoke of keeping residents thoroughly involved of developments and then in the next breath said that if the residents wanted further information, to look at a website or send an e-mail to the Council. Is that the standard of the consultation that the Council are providing these residents these days? Is that really good enough? Do you not realise that, for example that not everyone has access to a computer or the internet and what are you doing for the people who do not? Don't you care?

What we need is a public forum which will allow us to have a full and proper debate on this issue. The prospect of an incinerator in East Leeds is simply too big an issue to sweep under the carpet. I urge you, arrange these public forums as soon as possible. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I will be like Barry Anderson, I will be mercifully brief, I think you said, and then spoke for about ten minutes.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can I warn you that Councillor Anderson was only seven seconds short of his five minutes. *(Laughter)*

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: I totally fail to understand, we are very strong in saying what he did about the members of Scrutiny who are making a contribution today, because we are all party politicians. Nobody goes into a court as a member of Jury with an open mind. They all believe that – or should believe – that the person in front of them is innocent. They do not go thinking he might be, might not. They should believe they are innocent until proven guilty.

COUNCILLOR ATHA: Quite right. Obviously they do not believe that.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Obviously not. There is nobody outside of this Council Chamber, outside this side of the Council Chamber, who actually believes what you are saying. Nobody out there believes that this is some kind of open option and if you really pressed it it is not even Plan B or Plan C or Plan D you might be forced to have an incinerator but you are really expecting the Seventh Cavalry, the First Cavalry and everybody else to come galloping up and save you from having an incinerator and save you from having an incinerator in East Leeds.

There are Local Authorities who have actually managed to do quite an open consultation with the residents. I will say that they are not necessarily Labour Authorities. Newcastle has managed to do a ten option approach – offered ten options to its population of ways they could tackle this problem of a waste strategy in a very open discussion.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: You cannot even think of one!

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Leslie, behave yourself. Newcastle is an interesting case and you need to bear this in mind, because it used to have an incinerator and because it had an incinerator, its recycling went down to 3%. That is one of our fundamental concerns with everything you are saying about incinerators is about how they would drive you in a certain direction of actually attracting waste to burn. Newcastle has been very good and eventually had opted against an incinerator. Liberals and Labour both opposed an incinerator in Newcastle.

Also to quote you Liverpool, an Authority that has not been Labour for many, many years, pursued four options for applying for PFI credits – MBT, anaerobic digestion, energy from waste (incinerator) and autoclaving. We are all experts on autoclaving these days, aren't we? They submitted the four options to public consultation. Again, they had a neutral position, a lot of responses and they are now taking forward a £90 PFI bid to develop an MBT option. They are pursuing a non-incinerator option and the government has not forced them in a certain direction.

The government has granted those PFI credits. There is a real open approach there and I wish that we could see that here because here we have seen only a few months ago everybody on that side of the Chamber – and that is what Councillor Wakefield was referring to – you were all talking about incinerators and then suddenly you were not talking about incinerators any more, you were talking about it was kind of Mao Tse-Tung country, was it not, let a thousand flowers blossom, let a thousand ideologies contend.

You really think that we are stupid enough...

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Yes.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: ...to take that in and believe that suddenly you are open about where you are going. We know where you are going. That is why we put down this White Paper, that is why we are convinced that we know what you really think rather than what you are trying to put across today. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I think it was Councillor Bale extolling the values of education, so I am going to very quickly run through what I have already learned in this debate.

Councillor Bale and Councillor Anderson made a very good case for incineration. Councillor Les Carter confirmed it was going ahead, yet Councillor Brett said there is no such thing as incinerator coming. I am glad to see that those differing views are all on the same side.

They Bill Hyde chips in and says it does not matter because no decision will be made until 2010, not ruling out an incinerator; very convenient – is it 2008 you are next up for election, Bill?

We have an incinerator lobby here, we have a no-incinerator lobby and then we have the Les Carter “It is going ahead” and we have Bill Hyde, “We will not say until after I am up for re-election.” I am glad that this administration is showing some leadership on this point.

What I really want to talk about are the hidden costs of this waste strategy, which I do not think anybody has touched on in this debate. So far, even by this administration’s own reckoning, it would be 2013 before anything is up and running. By 2013 there will already be a cost to this Council of £25m for landfill and that has come about because the administration, in the wasted three-and-a-half years...

COUNCILLOR ANDERSON: You gave us the policy in the first place, if you remember.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: ... that it has had so far, has failed to move anything forward in the time that you have been in charge. You have failed to move anything forward so by the minimum of £25m-worth of landfill charges by 2013, which is the first date that you yourselves say you will have anything done and you have built up these costs to the city. I think it is quite right for us in the Labour Group to ask how will this cost be covered? Will it come from more cuts to social services? Will it come from more cuts to grants to community services? Will it come from selling off more land? Will it come from more cuts to homecare, more cuts to wardens? I think it is right to ask these questions.

This is because the reality is in the three-and-a-half years that this administration has been going round and round and round trying to create the perfect political fix to get you through the next election whilst all the time you have needed to get to the next election because you know there is a Labour Group here ready for power, in touch with the people of Leeds, increasing our votes, increasing our number of Councillors. You have been wanting a political fix and because of this, purely for the political expediency of keeping yourselves in power, you failed to face up to this problem and now you cannot even call it an incinerator – you have a strategy that has incineration at the heart of it but you cannot even call it an incinerator. You have a strategy that has a waste treatment plant. It is a big building, you are going to burn rubbish in it but you cannot even call it an incinerator. This is not some picture made up by the Labour Group. This is your own PFI policy. You might call it a reference policy, you might hide behind words, you might hide behind language like service development costs, but it is an incinerator.

The costs of your failure to act have been hidden. The costs of incineration have been hidden. The costs of your waste strategy have been hidden. It can only come from more cuts to front line services and everybody in Leeds will know it is because you have not acted in the three-and-a-half years. I think it is about time you faced up to this, told us what you are doing and got on with it and stop trying to just keep yourselves in power. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Lord Mayor, I am almost exhausted now, I have to say.

COUNCILLOR ATHA: Well sit down and take it easy!

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: I heard had so much indignation from that side of this Chamber today about this subject. They are talking about people deserve to be told the truth and you have denied people a debate on the waste issue. Contrast that against what I have heard from here. You are not the only party that is talking about an incinerator and not being in favour of it.

What you have actually got here – and I am including the BNP in this – we actually had more policy and debate from the Greens and the BNP than we have had out of about six speeches from your side. *(Applause)* I think you should be ashamed of yourselves, to quote Debra Coupar.

What I do not think you appreciate is that you are yourselves playing very high risks in doing this. You are using the language of indignation but it is actually being driven by cynicism. I will say, considering your response to last year's budget where you took the money out of education and put it in to composting, the reason why you took it out of education is because you do not really want a debate on this issue. What do you actually want is your line going through people's doors so that you can give them misinformation and scare them into thinking that what the future holds is something really terrible. What you should be doing is engaging them in a proper debate and that is something that you have not done this evening. You have not given us one single policy except that you do not to have an incinerator. Surprise, surprise – I think you have got a consensus here. I do not think any of us particularly want to have an incinerator.

COUNCILLOR J McKENNA: Oh yes you do.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: What we do want is the best sized solution for Leeds, the one that actually produces something which has the least waste not being recycled or reused or whatever.

It follows the mantra of the Green Party, it follows what you are meant to be going for. Please, give us something robust to work with so that we can actually have a discussion about it instead of you going out to people in Rothwell and giving them disinformation in the hope that it will bring you power, because that is all that James Lewis ever talks about – and I am pointing my finger at you now, James. All you ever talk about is, "When we are back in power we will show you." *(Laughter and applause)* I am sorry, but you do not get back in power by peddling lies. All you do actually is, you do not stop them voting for us because our vote went up in Rothwell when you went for Steve Smith last year. Our vote went up. What it does do is it disengages other voters. It means that they are less likely to believe what you say because they have no trust left in politicians. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR D BLACKBURN: I have got to say, some of the debate we have had today reminds me of what people told me of the discussion that happened 30 years ago in West Germany because that is what incineration is. That is the great

mistake the Germans made and when we went back to early consultations on this, when we talked with officers, that is one of the things that my group was saying all along.

The fact is, incineration is a failed technology. There are other methods of MBT that are far, far better and far better for the environment, but the other main problem with incineration is, what it does is it inhibits refuse, reduce, reuse, repair and recycle, the things that we have to do. We are making too much waste. We have to reduce that first. That is a precursor and if we are burning it, what we are doing is we are creating a market for that waste, which is wrong.

I have got to say, I am quite encouraged by Councillor Smith's amendment and what will say is, you have got my support to go for the money as long as the technology is right, but, as I say, we cannot support incineration at all. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Illingworth, I believe you wish to declare?

COUNCILLOR ILLINGWORTH: Yes, I wish to declare a personal interest, Chair, because the conversation has turned to composting and I am a director of LOGS, which is a community composting scheme in Kirkstall. We get Council money to compost. I have got a personal interest there, so I declare it.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Could I call Councillor Pryke?

COUNCILLOR PRYKE: I think today's contribution from the Labour Group has been a classic case of pick your lie, repeat it, repeat it, repeat it until people start to believe it. If you pick a lie with a bit of plausibility behind it, so much the better. It has served you well in previous elections and you are planning to use it again. We can read your leaflets before you have written them.

Like Councillor Golton's statement about Rothwell last time, you ran the incinerator story in Burmantofts and Richmond Hill Ward this year, and Richard Brett's majority went up. We put details on our leaflets about the Council's plans. If you did leaflets in our Wards, perhaps we would hear about your plans, but you do not do leaflets, do you, because you do not tell people what you are planning. It is a secret for you.

I am glad Richard Lewis made brief mention of Scrutiny because, like him, I was on Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny 2006/06, the Board chaired by Barry Anderson at the time, which had a working group into the then waste solution from the Council, and I remember on two separate occasions we were told by City Services officers that the government had fixed the system to force Authorities the size of Leeds into buying big technology. Five or six companies in Britain can supply that big technology and all but one of them are contributors to the Labour Party.

I cannot remember anyone in the Labour Group dissenting from the findings of the working group which led to the enquiry's report which accepted the then detail from our officers that we were being forced to buy this big technology. Energy from waste was certainly the front runner at the time, but it was not the only one and it definitely is not the one now because things have changed in two years, so either accept present or regress to the past.

A couple of other things. Councillor Hussain in his maiden speech asked for public forums on this. The forums in Burmantofts and Richmond Hill have debated or been able to debate, with full information and support from officers, the proposed waste solution seven times. We invite those officers to our meetings.

I attended the Harehills Forum the other week. Your Chairman had not invited any officers to talk about the waste solution. I will probably go to the Gipton Forum tomorrow, which I think is chaired by you. Have you got your invitations in already? You could do it. You could make the information available to your people but, so far, you have not. It is your fault.

Going back to 1992 and the glorious days when Labour had more than 80 Councillors and did not really have to worry about the opposition – 82? Congratulations. On 17th March Plans South allowed Yorkshire Water permission to build their sewage waste incinerator. That incinerator puts out an awful lot of dioxins. I think Councillor Congreve who was chairing the committee owes the people who live downwind from that incinerator an apology. They include the residents of Holton Moor, Garforth, Swillington, Kippax and Allerton Bywater. Your Government since 1997 has refused to reduce the limit permitted by the Environment Agency for emission of dioxins, so shame on you for that.

On 11th August Councillors Congreve and Lyons attended the Plans sub-committee then and that committee gave permission to the incinerator for nuclear waste. Councillor Procter was there as well and he was the only Councillor to vote against it. That was recorded. (*Applause*)

Your agency, the Environment Agency, prop. Hilary Benn, permits that incinerator to emit 100,000 times as much radiation as the incinerators in Germany. I would invite your Government to change that. I would invite you to apologise to the people of Leeds and I would invite you to drop your silly obsession over an incinerator because we are not in favour of it. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR WILSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. In a previous life – you are heckling me before I have started – I was a production engineer down at the copper works and I worked there for 40 years in the shadow of the previous incinerator, Skelton Grange. Thirty years ago we were requested to supply a large range of fittings to an EC test that was being conducted down at Barnsley and it was on clean burn and it was on cheap coal.

They developed a process of burning through a super-heated bed of sand. It is fairly old hat, but nevertheless it was successful and they discovered that the emissions, which I assume is what you are complaining about, the incinerator emitting toxins etc, actually burning through the fluidized bed reduced the emissions to something like one per cent or in that order. I have got a new word because it was not an incineration, it was evaporation, so now we have got evaporation as against incineration. It was highly successful.

The other EC countries that were involved with this test, notably the Low Countries – Germany and Scandinavia – all developed and took this process on and are still using this technology 30 years on. What we are talking about here, clean burn, is bloody old hat. They discovered that it did not only burn cheap coal, you could burn rubbish or whatever. It would take anything with the super-heated bed of sand.

It is just a few thoughts and, as I say, it was deemed to be a success and practically every country bar this one adopted it to some extent or other.

This business that you are always on about, Skelton Grange, if it is the chosen site – and, as I say, I worked near the site for 40 years – all I would say is that it would be a site that could take all the lorries off the road because it could be supplied by barge. You could have several depots dotted down the canal and you

could supply it by barge. It is also handy for a rail network so, as I say, if it was the site that was chosen, from an engineering point of view it would not be a bad one.

It is just a few thoughts. As I say, what we are talking about is old hat and it is evaporation, not incineration. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I have been listening with some interest to the comments from Labour members opposite. I would like to think there was a common thread that wove its way through the contributions that we have heard from them but there is not, save for the James Lewis thread which is, "We want to be in power no matter what it takes." That is what this issue is really all about, as far as the Labour Group is concerned.

It is pretty much about PFI sports centres. It is pretty much like Muslim burials. It is the same thread that runs through all of the issues, is it not – we will make a great big stir of it in the run-up to an election and we will try and pick up a few more seats.

The fact of the matter is, what you people have quite cleverly done so far in this debate is deflect away from the people who are to blame. The people who are clearly to blame for the predicament that we as an administration are in is your government, because the whole of the LATS concept is an interpretation of an EU directive dreamed up by your government. It is your government who have done it, not a wicked, nasty, horrible Tory Government led by Margaret Thatcher, not a Lib Dem administration, but it is a Labour Government who have dreamed up this landfill tax, not ourselves.

It is interesting, is it not, that there was a community charge which your lot christened Poll Tax. We need to start thinking of a better name than LATS. It is a tax. It is going to be a tax on every single household for disposal of their rubbish. That is what it is going to be and that is what we will start calling it as well.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: It is Labour's bin tax.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Judith, this White Paper is flawed completely because you talk about incineration. You cannot, believe me, vote for that because we incinerate as a city every single day of the year. We incinerate as a city. We need actually to address our incinerators. We need to do something about them because they within a certain amount of time their emissions will be at such a level that we have to do something about it. We incinerate at Lawnswood, at Cottingley and at Rawdon. We have incinerators. We burn bodies on a daily basis as a city. This catch-all resolution effectively says that you are against crematoria – you are against incinerators because that is how they are described within the legislation whether you like it or not, so it falls yet again.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: You wrote it, not us.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: It is telling, is it not, and colleagues here have touched on it, the two are not divorced as issues, are they, between the flurry of announcements in Parliament that actually you are not going to go forward any longer with this idea of taxing people on the amount of rubbish that they throw into their bin. That is not the case, actually, is it? It is not that you are not going ahead with it – you have just decided to shelve it for the minute. It is not going to be a priority and something that you are pushing through.

What is clear to us – what is very clear to us – is that is the mechanism by which we would have to pay for the future taxes that are to be levied upon us. That

and the removal of black bin collections is your central policy for dealing with waste in this city. I see Councillor Ogilvie shaking his head. No-one else has said what your solution is, as we have said time and time again. I hope Councillor Blake will enlighten us.

It is interesting, as Councillor Pryke has already mentioned, who is in favour of incineration in terms of elected members. Councillor Congreve is – I remember the debate well when he chaired Plans East. Councillor Lyons is – I remember the debate well when I sat on Plans East.

COUNCILLOR LYONS: I did not vote. You show me where the vote is.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: As usual I was allowed my brief comment, as it was in those days, against the proposal and then, “All in favour?” All the Labour hands, of course, went up. This was in the days, of course, when they had group meetings to establish their group policy on planning applications and they all got together. It used to be (a) or (b), did it not, where they all used to get together and, “Yes, we are in favour of an incinerator, boys, let us all go in there and put our hands up.” Yes, that is it.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Then someone comes and says we have decided to vote that way.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Absolutely and that is the truth of the matter. That is the truth of the matter. Without the information, without the debate, without the scientific information, without anything that we are going through, you decided to vote for incineration and this member voted against it. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: It was all a joke – I am not really going! *(Laughter)*

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: You have been recycled! *(Laughter)*

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: That is me, the plastic bag man. Here is a question. Who can tell me what *this* is? *(demonstrated)* It is Sooty without his clothes on, so it is obvious what *this* is *(demonstrated)* - it is Ramsbottom the worm without his clothes on!

Ramsbottom was telling us about how we failed to do anything about LATS since 2004. Here is a big question for you. When was the Council first made aware of LATS? Who can tell me? Can you lot tell me, or have you all got collective amnesia? How about you, Ramsbottom? Can you tell me when your administration was first told about LATS? No, they are all looking gormless, as usual. The answer, Ramsbottom and Co, was 1999. 1999.

COUNCILLOR LYONS: You are being insulting to a member.

COUNCILLOR HARRIS: I will tell you what, send me to Standards. I am quaking in my boots. 1999, so your lot first knew in 1999. We took over in 2004. That was five years in which you did nothing, absolutely nothing, so do not lecture us on the impending doom of what we are facing. At least we are trying to get to grips with it.

What are we trying to get to grips with? I remember the first debate all those months ago and I remember clearly what I said. We did say at that stage on the information available to us that incineration or energy from waste looked like the route we would have to go and I gave an assurance, as did Andrew and several

other senior members, that the whole thing was constantly under review and that if technology shifted, if circumstances shifted, we would shift with it and we would look.

What do you want? Do you want us to do what you did for 24 years, which was to cling on to a dogmatic position and refuse to shift irrespective of the evidence, or do what we have done, which is we are assessing a rapidly moving situation and trying to adjust accordingly?

If that is weak, if that is wrong, if that is a U-turn, fine – I am weak, I am wrong and I have done a U-turn. I prefer to do it that way than to just hang on, cling on to something because that is what you once said.

Perhaps our side is actually labouring under a misapprehension that we seem to think you do not have a policy. By virtue, actually, of what you said, it is possible that we can glean a certain policy. It must follow that if you do not want an energy from waste plant, you must want a plant of some description and so, Council, that plant has to go somewhere and the refuse that goes into that plant has got to be taken there somehow. Where are you going to put plant? We know that it is not going to be in East Leeds because the venerable Debra Coupar says not. Let us think of some nice open spaces where you could put it.

How about the Aire Valley at Kirkstall? That has got lots of nice open places for a refuse plant. What about Kippax? That has got lots of nice open places for the alternative refuse plant. It is going to have to go in one of those places and there are going to have to be HGVs to take your refuse to your plant, so that much we know. What a load of absolute drivel. You are running round in circles and you will not face that something has to be done.

In the end there will have to be a plant of some description. We have said categorically we are not choosing energy from waste as our preference. We are simply trying to secure £60m for this city so that we can build a solution and whilst Ramsbottom is so worried about 100,000 quid that has not been spent on flooding, my God the city would be very worried if you squandered £60m. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR CONGREVE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I have got to say, Councillor Procter views things through his usual rose tinted spectacles. He has got an outstanding memory if he can remember what went on at one particular planning meeting in 1972. (*sic*)

COUNCILLOR PROCTER: I have got it here. Do you want to read it?

COUNCILLOR CONGREVE: I am coming to that, John. You do not have to wave it at me. Lord Mayor, will you tell that member to be quite while I am speaking, please?

THE LORD MAYOR: Now, do not be naughty. Will you be quiet when he is speaking? I think the date, Councillor Congreve, was 1992.

COUNCILLOR CONGREVE: What you have got before you is the planning report. You have not got the verbatim of what went on at that meeting and you cannot have because there is no such thing as verbatims taken at Panel meetings.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: We have got it here.

COUNCILLOR CONGREVE: I am telling you, there was no verbatim taken.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: We will have it read out to you.

COUNCILLOR CONGREVE: What we were talking about in 1992 were two small scale industrial incinerators...

COUNCILLOR BRETT: 110,000 tonnes a year.

COUNCILLOR CONGREVE: Councillor Pryke, you were not even around. Small scale in terms of the incinerator that you lot are supporting. You are talking about huge incinerators taking domestic waste and other kinds of waste and to make it viable you are talking about importing waste from all over West Yorkshire.

COUNCILLOR BRETT: No we are not.

COUNCILLOR CONGREVE: You are not talking about waste on site. That is what you are proposing, so do not be preaching to us, Councillor Procter, about how well you remember this and that happened.

COUNCILLOR LATTY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I rise on this occasion merely to read a bit of information for the members here.

COUNCILLOR LYONS: You were not there to start with.

COUNCILLOR LATTY: I can read, Mick. I can read. What I am holding here is a Minute for the Plans Divisional Sub-Committee East chaired by Councillor Congreve and Councillors Clare, Crompton, Groves, Lyons, North, Pickard, Procter, Schofield and Taylor present. This was a proposed clinical waste incinerator at Knostrop Sewage Treatment Plant, Knowsthorpe Lane, Leeds 9. We have the application number but I will not bore you with that:

“The sub-committee considered an application by Yorkshire Regional Health Authority and Yorkshire Water plc for outline planning permission for a clinical waste incinerator at Knostrop Sewage Treatment Plant.

Result – that outline planning permission be granted subject to the conditions specified on the submitted schedule for planning applications.”

Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Blake, if you are still awake, it is you next.

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: Lord Mayor, thank you. I have to say you can always tell when they are getting into trouble, can't you? Some of them start shouting louder and louder and louder, some of them start getting personal and attacking people personally and haven't we had everything here today, this afternoon?

I would ask, what have we learned from their contributions. Not a right lot. We know that the Labour Group is opposed to incineration. We know that the Greens are opposed to incineration. We are not clear at all yet what the Morley Boroughs feel and we know that you are not going to put your hand up and oppose incineration in this city.

We have also learned that John Procter is against LATS, whilst we have also learned that John Bale is in favour of dealing with the waste situation that is facing us in this city. Can I just say to you, did I not predict exactly what Councillor Smith's line would be, that he is in complete denial. Do you know, Councillor Smith gets so few

papers on his portfolio to Exec Board I cannot believe that he is not aware that the outline business case has not yet gone to Executive Board. We are expecting it to go to the next meeting. We have not seen that outline business case.

You have put in your amendment...

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: What do you want to do?

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: ...that your preferred option is not energy from waste. OK, we will look forward to reading what is in that outline business case.

Do you know, the whole issue about debating the options in this city would not be taking place tonight if we had not continually raised our concerns, our objections, our concerns about location and all the people who are going to have to suffer from your policy. You lot have been in denial for three-and-a-half years. Steve Smith would not accept that there were any alternatives to incineration. I am delighted that the Greens have stuck to their principles, they have come away and I believe that actually they came up with some really positive ideas of how we can move this agenda forward.

I would like to say that as a result of John Bale's dismissive and quite rude attack on the Greens, we have decided that we will support the Greens' amendment to our White Paper. *(Applause)*

I will go back to what I said. There has been no proper consultation on this, no public debate. We are appalled by the delay that has been caused by you sticking your heads in the sand, but I can assure the people of Leeds, we are not afraid of a full debate. We have looked at the alternatives, we have argued them at Exec Board, we have argued them previously in here and we will take the debate out on to the streets of Leeds and involve our communities and tell them exactly what it is that you are proposing for this future city.

I will tell you this – I am going to finish on this, it has been a long day. When we are back in power we will do everything we can do to rescue this city from your lack of policy and your lack of action over the last three years. You have put the future of the city with waste reduction seriously at risk from your policy and we intend to make that better so that communities around our members will not have to suffer from the neglect that you have enforced upon them. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Somebody asked for a recorded vote. Is that seconded? Right. Chief Executive, a recorded vote, please, on the amendment in the name of Councillor Ann Blackburn.

*(A recorded vote was taken on the amendment
in the name of Councillor A Blackburn)*

THE LORD MAYOR: The figures are present 93; 'Yes' 44; 'Abstain' zero; 'No' 49, so that falls.

We need a vote on the further amendment in the name of Councillor Smith. Do you want a recorded vote? Right, recorded vote then, please.

*(A recorded vote was taken on the amendment in the name of Councillor
Smith)*

THE LORD MAYOR: The figures are, surprise, surprise, present 93 – that is a relief! – ‘Yes’, 49; ‘Abstain’ 1; ‘No’ 43, so that is CARRIED.

That becomes the substantive motion. Let us not spoil a set of three. Shall we have a recorded vote? No.

Can I then ask for a show of hands? Those in favour? Those against? I have done my sums quickly. That is CARRIED.

ITEM 11 – WHITE PAPER MOTION – GOVERNMENT TARGETS FOR NEW HOUSING

THE LORD MAYOR: Can I warn Council now, having run out of time, that all the White Papers will be taken through but not spoken on, so can I ask Councillor Andrew Carter to move his motion on White Paper – Government Targets for New Housing.

COUNCILLOR A CARTER: Lord Mayor, I wish to withdraw the White Paper in my name.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Is that acceptable to Council? AGREED

ITEM 12 – WHITE PAPER MOTION – THE ROYAL BRITISH LEGION “IT’S TIME TO HONOUR THE COVENANT” CAMPAIGN

THE LORD MAYOR: That moves us on to White Paper 12, Councillor Grayshon.

COUNCILLOR GRAYSHON: Thank you, Lord Mayor, I wish to move the White Paper.

COUNCILLOR LANCASTER: I second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: If we could move to the vote. All those in favour? That is CARRIED.

ITEM 13 – WHITE PAPER MOTION – HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION

THE LORD MAYOR: White Paper 13, Councillor Monaghan.

COUNCILLOR MONAGHAN: Thank you, Lord Mayor, I would like to move the White Paper.

COUNCILLOR ILLINGWORTH: I would like to second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: All those in favour? That is obviously CARRIED.

ITEM 14 – WHITE PAPER MOTION – LEEDS RHINOS AND CASTLEFORD TIGERS RUGBY LEAGUE TEAMS

THE LORD MAYOR: White Paper 14, Councillor Parker.

COUNCILLOR PARKER: I would like to move the paper, the appropriate wording, the second lot.

THE LORD MAYOR: I think you move the first, Keith, and then I seek consent of Council for you to change those words. Does Council give that consent? AGREED

Councillor Parker, I do accept you put your second set of words to Council. Councillor James Lewis?

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: Second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Therefore can I put that to the vote? All in favour? CARRIED.

Well done, Council. You behaved yourselves at the end. Wonderful. Can I thank all of you for your patience and your attendance and your contribution and a very safe journey home.

(The meeting closed at 7.40 p.m.)
