

LEEDS CITY COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

Held on

Wednesday, 8 May 2013

At

THE COUNCIL CHAMBER,
CIVIC HALL,
LEEDS

In the Chair:

THE LORD MAYOR
(COUNCILLOR A CASTLE)

VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

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

VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF LEEDS CITY COUNCIL
MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 8th MAY 2013

THE LORD MAYOR: Good afternoon everybody. Welcome to this afternoon's Council. May I remind everybody please to switch off all electronic devices that are likely to make annoying sounds. If I do hear any annoying sounds I will expect somebody to come to me with £5 in their hand towards the Lord Mayor's Charity.

I have a few announcements to make. First of all, it is with great sadness that I report the recent death of Honorary Alderman John Binks, MBE, on 27th March. I attended the funeral service on Friday 12th April, as did a number of Members and Members of the Morley Town Council. Honorary Alderman Binks was a long-serving politician, Freemason and Honorary Alderman of the city. Our thoughts are with his family. Will you please stand for a moment's silence?

(Silent tribute)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Secondly, Councillor Judith Chapman is on leave today and cannot attend today's meeting and she has asked me to say that, however, had the meeting gone ahead as scheduled, then she would have been in attendance.

Thirdly, I would like to welcome Councillor Debra Coupar to the meeting, the new Member of Council for the Crossgates and Whinmoor Ward. *(Applause)*

May I remind you about the Webcast this afternoon so please behave yourselves because your constituents will be watching you!

I have a late item to take in respect of the Annual Report of the Standards and Conduct Committee which will be dealt with at Item 7(a).

ITEM 1 – MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 27th FEBRUARY 2013

THE LORD MAYOR: We now move on to Item 1 on the Order Paper. Councillor James Lewis.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Graham Latty.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: Seconded, Lord Mayor.

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

ITEM 2 – DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 2, Declarations of Interest. Will Members please declare any Disclosable Pecuniary Interests.

COUNCILLOR LOWE: Can I declare an interest in the Healthwatch item?

ITEM 3 - COMMUNICATIONS

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 3, Communications. I understand that the Deputy Chief Executive has got a Communications Report.

DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE: Yes, Council should note that Stuart Andrew MP has written providing a response from Lord Freud, Minister for Welfare Reform, on the resolution relating to Child Poverty at the January meeting of Council. This response has been circulated to all Members of Council.

ITEM 4 - DEPUTATIONS

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Item 4, Deputations. Mr Gay again, please.

DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE: There are four Deputations. Firstly, Voluntary, Charity and Community Organisations regarding asylum support and the destitution of asylum seekers; the Wyke Beck Valley Community Forum regarding the post of Wyke Beck Valley Ranger and five local nature reserves in Wyke Beck Valley; West Park Centre Campaign Group regarding West Park Centre; and West Park Residents Association and other resident groups regarding the NGT Scheme.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor James Lewis.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: Move that the Deputations are received.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Graham Latty.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: I second, Lord Mayor.

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

DEPUTATION ONE – ASYLUM SUPPORT

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

MS G PHIRI: Thank you, Lord Mayor. My name is Grace Phiri and I am a Trustee of Leeds Asylum Seekers Support Networks. I am bringing this deputation to Leeds City Council today on behalf of ten charities in Leeds. Standing with me today is Peter from LASSN, Christine from PAFRAS, Elise from the Refugee Council and Rachel from Leeds Refugee Forum.

The welcoming and compassionate history of Leeds is known to all of us in this room. Some of you will have experienced this through your family histories. Others of you currently represent communities which, without doubt, have welcomed

refugees from different countries who have fled persecution. Communities have subsequently benefited from the contribution these refugees have made to the economic and cultural life of Leeds.

At the end of September 2012, 309 asylum seekers were accommodated and supported in Leeds, with a further 14 getting subsistence-only support. A single adult asylum seeker receives just over £5 a day to pay for food, clothing, toiletries and other essentials. Without a legal right to work or any other source of income, many asylum seekers struggle to survive on this while waiting for decisions on their applications, but they are lucky when they are compared to those who have had their claims refused and are left completely destitute.

Many destitute asylum seekers are forced to sleep rough, with no access to public funds or any right to work to support themselves. This leaves them extremely vulnerable to exploitation. This inhumane situation affects people who have been victims of torture, those with experiences of sexual violence or other trauma, as well as pregnant women.

It is difficult to estimate the exact number of destitute asylum seekers but only in the last year 261 new destitute asylum seekers have visited Positive Action for Refugees and Asylum Seekers, a charity based in Harehills.

Many destitute asylum seekers survive through generous support from the host community, faith groups, charities and compassionate individuals across Leeds. These organisations and individuals run drop-ins in churches, the overnight hosting of asylum seekers, food banks and winter hardship funds. In this way, this city has done a lot to counter the effects of an asylum policy which leaves those seeking protection in this country with either inadequate support to live on or no support at all.

We believe this practice has a devastating effect on the lives of individuals seeking sanctuary in this city, both in terms of their health and wellbeing but also in terms of their ability to pursue their asylum application and properly present their case for needing protection in the UK.

Leeds citizens from every postcode signed up to the City of Sanctuary pledge and we are standing in front of you today in a Chamber which only a few years ago voted to become a City of Sanctuary and to welcome those fleeing persecution and injustice.

We are asking the Leeds City Council Executive to look into the issue of asylum support and the destitution of asylum seekers and the impact it has on the lives of individuals across Leeds city, and to write to Home Secretary to outline its concerns.

We also urge Leeds City Council to support the recommendations from the recent cross party Parliamentary Report on Asylum Support for Children, of which the Bishop of Ripon and Leeds was a member, and also to endorse the aims of Still Human Still Here campaign, a national coalition with over 50 members including the Red Cross, OXFAM, Crisis, Mind, Citizens Advice Bureau and Amnesty International, and to make this clear in the letter to the Home Secretary.

We are proud that over many years we have been doing our bit to create a welcoming and just Leeds free of poverty and homelessness, and we hope Leeds City Council will continue to support us in this effort and follow through on its commitment to be a City of Sanctuary.

Thank you for your consideration and your support. Thank you, Lord Mayor.
(Applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor James Lewis.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: Thank you. I move that the Deputation be referred to the Executive Board for consideration.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Latty.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: I second that, Lord Mayor.

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

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

DEPUTATION TWO – WYKE BECK VALLEY COMMUNITY FORUM

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

DR B WATERS: Right, we have Anne Jerman from Rothwell, Marjorie Gartside from Leeds 8, we have Alan McHugh from Beckfields, from Holton Moor, and Pauline Wright from Killingbeck Fields. My name is Brian Waters.

My Lord Mayor and fellow Councillors, thank you for giving me the opportunity to address you today. My name is Brian Waters and I am Chair of the Wyke Beck Valley Community Forum. I wish to petition you on two closely related matters.

Firstly, we request that you continue to fund the post of Wyke Beck Valley Ranger after the current external funding ceases this September. Secondly, we request that you confirm the proposal before you to designate five Local Nature Reserves in the Valley. Our leaflet sets out where these are.

The Wyke Beck Valley Community Forum has its roots in campaigns by local tenants. It was established in 2005 and over the last eight years we have gained the support of Friends Groups and community groups all along the valley. Indeed, my introduction to the Community Forum was through one of the local Friends Groups. We endorse and support the City Council's Parks and Green Spaces Initiative.

Over the last eight years we have co-operated with many bodies, including the City Council in several of its facets. Our latest involvement will expectantly see a foot and cycleway over the Aire and canal by the end of this calendar year. We have both local cycle and footpath groups represented on our Forum. You may have seen reference to this project in last month's press and TV reports. Some of our efforts are also shown in the leaflet.

In 2010, to mark International Biodiversity Year, we were able to present the Lord Mayor with a Valley Ecological Survey, thus cementing the valley's role in the Yorkshire Biodiversity Action Plan. We are community representatives on the Valley Pride Access to Nature Partnership. This employs a Co-ordinator and a Ranger using funding from Natural England's 'Access to Nature' lottery grant. Besides building up grass roots enthusiasm in localities and schools, this programme will

produce this year detailed Valley Management Plans and a new Management Group. Together with Friends groups, these will continue the work we have started.

There are strong sustainable reasons why the post of Valley Ranger should be funded by the Council from this autumn and why complementary action of endorsing Local Nature Reserves in the Valley should go ahead. We are working with Parks and Countryside to further this aim.

In supporting the continued presence of a Valley Ranger and designating five new Local Nature Reserves, you are rewarding the community's voluntary efforts and benefiting all the citizens of Leeds.

Thank you for receiving us. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lewis.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I move that the matter be referred to the Executive Board for consideration.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Latty.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: I second that, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: All those in favour? (*A vote was taken*) Thank you very much. CARRIED.

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

DEPUTATION THREE – WEST PARK CENTRE CAMPAIGN GROUP

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

MS V JAQUISS: Good afternoon. I am from the West Park Centre Campaign. On my right is Mavis West; on my left are Douglas and Anne Gilliam. I am Victoria Jaquiss.

My Lord Mayor and fellow Councillors, even though you are not discussing it today, I would to thank you for giving me the opportunity to present the case for getting the West Park Centre up and running as soon as possible. I am only speaking here only on behalf of the charities and community groups.

I would like to make five points

On November 5th 2012, a hundred or so of us turned up as usual for work only to be called into an extraordinary meeting. Here, in the main hall we were that the centre's electrics had been condemned, and we were to pack enough equipment to last two months and then leave. The Council groups there were immediately given a previously mothballed room in Merrion House.

Then it we were asked to pack everything; pack away 20 years' worth of bags, filing cabinets, gamelan, resonance boards, cupboards-full of costumes, and we were given three days to do it in. Then when we did not do it in three days we were given three weeks.

We were 30-plus displaced organisations amounting to 2,000 or so regular users including, of course, all the Council services and then all the charities, who had bumped along in harmony with each other for decades, and now who hardly or never meet at all.

It is fair to say that we were taken aback the manner of the so-called “temporary closure”. One minute the electrics needed fixing and the next minute there was a consultation on the building’s entire future. Not only were we asked to leave with nowhere (or nowhere suitable) to go, but six months later we are still operating from our garages and spare rooms.

The next point is about the numbers and types of people affected. We feel that the numbers of users and how the centre was in demand has been underestimated. The last report talks about under use; not so. The place was buzzing from morning to late evening. What was lovely about the West Park Centre and what made it so special was the combinations of arts and sports, education and leisure, adults and children, disabled and able-bodied. Groups included the Travellers’ Education Service, children and adults with Special Additional Needs, the unions, self-help groups such as Gamblers Anonymous, and all day Sunday, every Sunday, the Church filled the Centre; many groups of vulnerable people and all surrounding the wonderful foyer for all the serendipitous meetings.

The next point I want to talk about is what a wonderful, practical building design it is. At the end of three spurs and in the middle there are four really good performance spaces - the former gyms, the rehearsal room, studio and the main hall. The main hall’s acoustics are good, in fact they have been recently improved. Many, many toilets, including disabled adapted. YAMSEN and ArtForms Music Service installed a multi-sensory classroom at one end of the centre and it was sad to see the result of ten years’ planning taken down in just one morning. Storage – there is exceptional and absolutely vital storage – there was PE equipment, the orchestra’s shared instruments, the opera’s costume cupboards and a car park, and you cannot underestimate a good car park. It would fit a 100 piece orchestra or a fleet of minibuses for the disabled, and with disabled access.

The fourth point I would like to make about West Park is its geography. It serves as a base for city-wide and regional work. It is a happy accident, but its geography near Leeds Ring Road is on best bus routes (1, 56, 96 and so on) and players and workers would come from as far away as Scarborough for the orchestras and from Sheffield for YAMSEN. The aspect to the West Park Centre has been significant too. It is an open aspect, surrounded by woodlands and playing fields and that gives you an extra feeling of security and it is also very convenient for a lovely parade of shops up there.

My last point is about West Park, the Accidental Inclusive Arts Centre. It did not start as a plan; it just grew. It was 25 years-plus in the making, groups developing links with each other. The Music Service and the music charities worked together and when we had a Christmas sing-along, the Northern Ballet sent two dancers to play for the kids, the orchestras shared their timpani, etc, etc.

The Council petition that we ran collected over 500 signatures in the two weeks that it was live. There are organisations (such as ourselves at YAMSEN) still unplaced or not satisfactorily placed. There are children and adults with special needs who are missing the hall and their regular rehearsals and there are orchestras missing the hall, the space, the storage - all the reasons that they chose West Park in the first place.

I am here today on behalf all these groups and on behalf of people who cannot speak for themselves. We need the £170,000 - or whatever it takes, really - spending on the electrics, and we need to get back into the building which, until this year, never suffered from the regular petty vandalism that is beginning to appear.

THE LORD MAYOR: Please will you make your final point, Ms Jaquiss, we have got to the end of the five minutes.

MS JAQUISS: In the first instance, we need to get back into West Park Centre and then we would be more than happy to plan for the future, whether it be as a CIC or staying within the Council. Thank you very much. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor James Lewis.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Latty.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: I second that, Lord Mayor.

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

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

DEPUTATION FOUR – WEST PARK RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

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

MR D KEMP: My Lord Mayor and fellow Councillors, my name is Doug Kemp from West Park. My colleagues are Martyn Thomas from Weetwood, Tony Green from North Hyde Park, Paula and Ian Liptrot from Belle Isle.

This deputation is speaking on behalf of the A660 Joint Council, which draws its membership from over twelve organisations representing residents, business groups, and individuals from South and North Leeds, all of whom share a common interest and grave misgivings over the proposed NGT trolleybus scheme.

Fundamentally it is felt that the Council is being drawn into spending money on a transport scheme which is conceptually wrong, conceptually flawed. The trolleybus is the wrong transport medium on the wrong route. Sadly, NGT owes most of its concept and planning to the original 1992 Supertram scheme. However, in the last 20 years much has changed: changes in thinking about the environment and transport strategies, in transport technology, not to mention the development needs and plans of Leeds itself.

Indeed NGT does not address planned regeneration schemes in the South and East of the city, nor does it address inner city traffic movements. In essence, the scheme is not fit for purpose and is not value for money.

Leeds has been starved of Government funding for its transport infrastructure, and yes, it would benefit from a modern transport network, but it has to be one which

is both appropriate and sensitive to the needs of the city, both now and in the future. Spending money on the wrong system is wrong.

For instance, why does NGT focus on the A660? It is the least important route in terms of traffic in and out of the city. It already has the highest bus frequency and the highest bus usage of all the radial routes whilst, if you look for South Leeds, NGT plans to take the trolleybus route through a pedestrian precinct, the grounds of a primary school and across Bell Isle Circus – one of the few bits of green area in South Leeds.

Does this sound like a scheme likely to attract overwhelming public support? No. No wonder increasing numbers of residents across the whole of Leeds think that NGT is madness.

What does NGT offer is a quality transport experience whereby the majority of passengers have to stand; luxury stops to enjoy while waiting for a less frequent service than currently available, having walked further because of fewer trolleybus stops (an ideal scenario for the disabled and elderly). It is likely to lead to the decimation of existing bus services, with the prospect of the total loss of some outer bus services. It will bring changes to the road architecture which disadvantage cyclists and pedestrians, and it will leave you with the same or worse congestion with traffic hold-ups leaving pollution levels unaffected from what they are now.

NGT does not even transfer significant numbers of car users on to the trolleybus; it merely moves bus users on to another type of bus.

Are you as Councillors certain this is the right system? Just look at the guided bus systems on the Scott Hall and York roads - ugly, outdated and less and less used.

There is a real danger that Leeds in 2020 could be saddled with an inflexible overhead cable-based single transport line, installed at great expense and incredibly expensive to extend into any meaningful network.

It does not have to be a trolleybus system. There are other options - options which are better, cheaper, more effective and future-proof.

NGT is a system that the people of Leeds do not want. They see it as being based on obsolete technology, a transport system which would be out of date before it begins to operate.

The Leeds Vision talks of “spending money wisely”, which is important, obviously, for Yorkshire and it is also important to recognise that although £173.5m of Government funding is being made available, the remainder, which is at least £76.5m, has to come from Local Authority sources.

These are significant amounts of money. Does it really make sense to blindly charge forward without taking stock of all the fundamental issues involved here? The feeling amongst people in South and North Leeds is that NGT does not offer the city of Leeds value for money. Thank you. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor James Lewis.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I move that the matter be referred to the Executive Board for consideration.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Latty.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: I second that, Lord Mayor.

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

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

ITEM 5 – REPORT ON LEEDS AWARD

THE LORD MAYOR: We now move on to Item 5 on the Green Paper, the Report on the Leeds Award. Councillor Wakefield.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor James Lewis.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: I second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Andrea McKenna.

COUNCILLOR A McKENNA: Lord Mayor, it is a great pleasure that I would like to support the nomination for the Leeds Rhinos for the Leeds Award. I first became involved with Leeds Rhinos during my time as Lady Mayoress when I attended an event in the Banqueting Hall and had the pleasure of meeting several of the players and Rob Oates, the Commercial Director. I was ashamed to admit to him that I had actually never attended a rugby game in my life. The following Friday I was invited by Gary Etherington to attend my first Super League match at Headingley Stadium. From that evening I became a huge fan. I have since had the pleasure of attending three Challenge Cup Finals at Wembley, none of which Leeds Rhinos have won so they have told me I am not allowed to go in future! *(laughter)*

The Rhinos have established themselves as the most successful Super League team in the country, ranking up six records Super League titles since the League was created. They are also three times World Champions, which has brought international sporting recognition to the city, putting Leeds firmly on the sporting map.

However, it is not just their sporting success which has propelled their status in the city. The role they play in the community is fantastic. I have been lucky enough to have met several of the players while on Mayoral duties and I cannot speak more highly of them. They do so much and have a highly visible role in the community. They visit schools, sports clubs and events across the city, meeting and inspiring hundreds of young children. They are really wonderful role models for young people and tremendous ambassadors for the city.

My friend and colleague Mary Harland has admitted a liking for Kevin Sinfield. I have to tell you, my liking is for the Wolfman, Jamie Jones-Buchanan, but please do not tell the husband!

The club also has an excellent academy system, providing rugby training for children all over the city and developing for the best of them the stars of the future. I have no doubt that the sporting success and their role of raising the profile of the rugby league in the city was a key part of Leeds being chosen as the host city for the

Rugby League World Cup next year, where several Leeds Rhinos players feature in the Great Britain team.

Leeds Rhinos are a great sporting name and are fantastic value to the city. We should all be tremendously proud of them and their achievements. It is only fitting, therefore, that we recognise them with such an achievement as the Leeds Award, and a perfect way to do it, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Wakefield, do you wish to comment?

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Lord Mayor, thank you. I have to admit to having a bit of a soft spot for Castleford (*laughter*) but my real loyalty lies with the Rhinos.

I always thought that women went to watch the sport but I constantly hear these lustful comments about the rugby league players, from Mary Harland in particular and Andrea.

Can I just say very briefly they are a truly great sporting team on the field and off the field and the work they have done in our city with the schools, going out to young people, inspiring young people, is something we should be truly proud of, and this award is the first of its kind in this city, we have never given it to a team and that is because the person who we should give it to, Kevin Sinfield (who Mary knows quite well!) actually preferred to put down all their success and all their work down to the team, so I think that it is a truly deserved team and I am really looking forward to being part of the presentation. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: All those in favour? (*A vote was taken*) I think that is just about unanimous. Thank you very much. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ITEM 6 – REPORT ON THE OFFICER DELEGATION SCHEME

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 6, Report on the Officer Delegate Scheme. Councillor Wakefield.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lewis.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: I second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Varley.

COUNCILLOR VARLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I must agree that we welcome the decision of the delegation of the Director of Public Health but I wish to comment on one aspect of the health protection area of the Council's statutory responsibilities.

The recent outbreak of measles in Wales has highlighted the seriousness of this disease. The reason for the outbreak has been attributed to the lack of uptake of the MMR – the measles, mumps and rubella – protection and its connection with autism, which has now been disproved.

We have now a large population in Leeds of students coming in the autumn term. We already have a large population of students. Unfortunately this group of young people are the ones who have not been protected in the past because of

these anomalies, and we have to be prepared for the possibility that the new students either have not been vaccinated fully or had no vaccination at all and they are, of course, entering our universities.

We need to be working with the universities in order to include this group in the already massive programme which needs to be undertaken to make sure that all the vulnerable groups are protected in our city. It is an absolutely dreadful disease and can cause great harm and often death in young people.

I feel this is a responsibility which has to take priority so that the Council can be proactive in this matter. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Wakefield.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Yes, Lord Mayor. I think those comments would probably be more appropriate on the Minutes, even though they are very welcome and very well made, because what we are talking about today under these Minutes are the responsibilities and functions of Public Health which are now back into its origin, so Local Government.

COUNCILLOR: About time as well.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Indeed it is, but if you remember Public Health did belong to Local Government in the 19th Century in particular. I was reminded the other day of a piece of our history in East Leeds when many Irish economic migrants who built our canals, our roads and our factories and homes, were caught up with the typhus disease. In actual fact it was the Local Authority under a Public Health function that actually brought clean water and sewerage to that part of Leeds and helped thousands of people who were dying very early of those kind of diseases.

It is a massive responsibility coming back, and I am pretty convinced, having gone for some particular time, and if you look at the 19th Century the role of Local Authorities in Public Health is very well made in places like Birmingham, Manchester, Liverpool as well as Leeds, but if you look at the functions now we really need it back in Local Authority because we do have the departments, the agencies, the partnerships and I believe the democratic role to actually try and address some of the comments that I will leave for later on under the Public Health Minute.

It is something that I am sure we will discuss later but I think we all agree that it is coming back home to its rightful role and we will do our best to make sure that we tackle the big issues of today, not only measles but, of course, obesity, smoking, alcohol problems and, of course, the big challenge which is health inequality.

As I say, I think all of us should welcome it coming back home to Local Government. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: All those in favour? (*A vote was taken*) Thank you very much. CARRIED.

ITEM 7 – APPOINTMENTS

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 7, Appointments. Councillor James Lewis.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Latty.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: I second that.

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

7(a) STANDARDS AND CONDUCT COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT

THE LORD MAYOR: 7(a), Standards and Conduct Committee Annual Report. Councillor Nash.

COUNCILLOR NASH: My Lord Mayor, Council colleagues. You will have received with your papers the Annual Report of the Standards and Conduct Committee and I am sure you have read every word of it. I am not going to bore you with repetition but I should like to draw to your attention a couple of things which may interest you.

Leeds was the first city to produce a Code of Conduct. I have seen other Councils' codes which were and probably still are a real dog's breakfast. Every Member of the Council has attended training sessions on our code and this has been a two-way process. The committee has listened to Members' comments throughout the year and has tweaked the code accordingly, therefore all of you have ownership of it.

As you know, the Committee has radically changed the method of dealing with complaints, with the Member concerned being given the opportunity to respond before any formal proceedings are taken – quite different from the old regime when a Damocles' Sword was hanging over all of us when at any time a Member, without their knowledge, could be reported to Standards Committee over trivial, spiteful and malicious complaints, causing much unnecessary worry.

No complaints (of which there have been few) have been referred to a formal hearing this year. In the past, hearings have cost this Council £100,000. This year the Standards Committee has returned its budget of £30,000 unused.

Finally, I should like to put on record the Committee's thanks to the Monitoring Officer and her staff for their support to the Committee in achieving a system which is fair to everyone. My Lord Mayor, I move the report. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Is Councillor Selby here to second? If not is there somebody else?

COUNCILLOR SELBY: Seconded.

THE LORD MAYOR: Oh, you are there! I could not see you for Councillor Ogilvie's big head! *(laughter)* Councillor Procter, please.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I hope that is not a case to be referred to the Standards Committee!

Lord Mayor, I stand to speak briefly on this particular item and really to thank Councillor Elizabeth Nash and her committee for, frankly, changing what was a discredited Standards procedure in this Council and many other Councils, and one which elected Members and also Parish Councillors, for that matter, had little confidence in at all. She, Councillor Nash, has swept that away and replaced it with

a process and a procedure which I think every Member of Council does now have confidence in.

In closing, Lord Mayor, I was reflecting, if we are to be judged who better to judge us than Councillor Nash. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Nash, you have the opportunity to respond if you would like to.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: Those words may come to haunt you.

COUNCILLOR NASH: I have nothing further to add, my Lord Mayor.

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

SUSPENSION OF COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES

THE LORD MAYOR: We now move on to the suspension of Council Procedure Rules. Councillor James Lewis, please.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am just giving Councillor Murray some running commentary on events!

Lord Mayor, I move in terms of the Notice and on this item I hope that Councillor Murray keeps up for the rest of the meeting!

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: Very cutting!

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Latty.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: I second that, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: All those in favour? (*A vote was taken*) Thank you very much. CARRIED.

Just to make clear so that Members understand what they have just voted for (*laughter*) all questions at this Council meeting will be answered in writing and there will be no discussion on this item of business.

SUSPENSION OF COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES

THE LORD MAYOR: We now move on to the top of page 7, again Suspension of Council Procedure Rules. Councillor Lewis.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Latty.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: I second that, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: All those in favour? (*A vote was taken*) Thank you very much. CARRIED.

ITEM 9 - MINUTES

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 9, the Minutes. Councillor Wakefield.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lewis.

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

- (a) **Executive Board**
(i) Leisure and Skills

THE LORD MAYOR: We now move on to the Executive Board Minutes, Leisure and Skills. Councillor Harington.

COUNCILLOR HARINGTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. This is Minute 207, page 61. As people know, statistics can be a bit misleading but here is one I think ought to keep our attention. The difference in life expectancy between more affluent parts of the city and less affluent is ten years. One of the reasons for this is that people in more affluent areas take more exercise, do more sport.

Although the Minute refers to “Inspiring a Generation, a Sporting Legacy for Leeds”, it is not just about sport, it is about health. If people are not taking enough exercise and their health is suffering, what can be done to inspire people so they do take enough exercise?

For some people it is very straightforward. They have always enjoyed playing rugby in freezing conditions or going for runs in the pouring rain, but not all of you are masochists like me, you are more sensible and so you probably like your sport to be less demanding or, at least, access to be as cheap, as easy, as welcoming as possible.

Next year many people watching the Tour de France will be inspired to be the next Sir Brad. They will go and buy the most expensive bike possible, deck themselves in Lycra and be off to the nearest Alp as soon as possible. That is fine, that is one part of the legacy but it is not the only part. Although obsessed with the Tour, for me the key thing is how many people we get on bikes, to make it seem clear to people that being on a bike is not about doing something special, having any special gear – certainly not Lycra, unless you have a passion for it. It is wearing whatever you like, whatever state of fitness you are, whatever shape you are, whether you are as svelte as Sir Brad or as rotund as Boris. It means wherever you live, especially, cycling should be for everybody; it should be a normal part of city life but, of course, that will only happen if people feel that it is safe to do so.

I am glad to say we have put in a bid from the City Cycling Ambition Fund which, with any luck, will be able to transform cycle lanes, transform junctions, make people feel that it is safe and comfortable and easy and welcoming to get about the city. I hope we will have bank bikes at the station where people can hire bikes to get about. I hope there will be more 20 mile an hour zones so children can be inspired to cycle or walk to school.

On 7th July this year there is a mass participation ride organised by Sky – not, fellow, Councillors, 200k across five Alpine passes, but just six kilometres in the city centre.

A city where hundreds of citizens cycle is clearly a city which is less polluted, more climate change friendly, more healthy and if in every part of the city people are cycling, then clearly the gap between the ten year expectancy will decrease.

Fellow Councillors, the cycling revolution is coming. The revolution is coming (*laughter*) and you Councillors, can lead this revolution and, as Karl Marx nearly said, “Councillors unite, you have only to lose your bicycle chains.” Thank you. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Maqsood.

COUNCILLOR MAQSOOD: Thank you. I cannot follow Councillor Harington’s speech – anyway, I will do my very best.

Lord Mayor, I also would like to speak on Minute 207 on page 61 regarding the sporting legacy for Leeds. The incredible success of the 2012 Olympics and Paralympic Games and the success of Yorkshire athletes is the perfect platform to create a sporting legacy in Leeds and to get more people leading active lifestyles which would lead to better health outcomes.

Living an active lifestyle is absolutely vital to health and wellbeing and it is really important that people take part in regular exercise, as well as maintaining a healthy diet to ensure they get and remain health. The transfer of Public Health from the Primary Care Trusts to Local Authorities is the perfect opportunity for the Council to really drive the Health agenda by introducing joined-up working between departments to ensure that Health and Leisure services are targeted at those who need them and those who struggle to access them.

The Leeds Let’s Get Active Pilot is a great example of some of the joined-up work that is going on in this respect. The scheme will be jointly delivered by the Public Health and Active Lifestyle departments within the Council. The scheme has also been matched-funded by Public Health, following a successful bid for funding from Sport England. Leeds Let’s Get Active is specifically aimed at identifying and removing barriers to participation in physical activity for the least active people in Leeds. One of the key barriers that the scheme aims to improve is the cost of being active. Leeds Let’s Get Active therefore aims to promote a lifestyle change where previously inactive people take up an opportunity to partake in exercise through free access to Council leisure centres. Leeds Let’s Get Active will be a city-wide offer but the offer will be greatest in areas where activity levels are lowest and health inequalities are highest.

There is a direct correlation between deprivation and sport participation, with populations living in more deprived inner-city areas having lower participation rates than those in more well-off suburbs of the city. Leeds Let’s Get Active will therefore attempt to address these issues in order to try and improve the health of people who need it the most. There is lots of evidence to suggest that regular exercise and healthy lifestyles have multiple, more broad-ranging benefits. For example, a similar sport pilot in Birmingham estimated that every £1 spent on contributing towards a healthy lifestyle equated to a £22 return---

THE LORD MAYOR: Please will you sum, up, Councillor Maqsood? We have got to the red light.

COUNCILLOR MAQSOOD: Leeds has an ambition to be the most active big city. The Leeds Let's Get Active Pilot is a really great way to tap into the success and enthusiasm of the Olympics, get more people into sport and keep people fit and active while establishing a lasting sporting legacy for Leeds. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Cleasby.

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I wish to speak on the same Minute and the same page. December 16th last year, Keith, Judith and Adam were gracious enough to come to Horsforth where we started our legacy. That was the re-naming of the old library, which is now the Brownlee-Stone Library. We are pleased in Horsforth to be able to not only honour our Olympians but our Paralympians.

The next stage of our legacy will be on August 17th where we will have a sports day with all the sports in Horsforth and the area represented, but principally a competition which is based on a triathlon, for our young people – that is the real part of the legacy.

I hope you will all want to come and I hope you will bring your youngsters who want to take part. They will receive a water bottle, because our plan is to get sponsorship for that, and we intend to showcase every event, not just for able bodied but for the disabled as well, and we are working with a company in York who will bring a roadshow which includes a range of ten different bicycles for our disabled youngsters to try out. We are hoping our legacy will complement what the city is doing and, Keith, you are more than welcome to come back. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Golton.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I was not intending to speak on this one but I was inspired by Councillor Harington and Councillor Maqsood, who made very great cases about the disparity in life expectancy and the value of exercise in terms of being able to equalise outcomes for people across the city.

What I will say is that sometimes, though, the policies that come out of different teams, even within the same departments, can sometimes have conclusions which actually grate against each other and although welcoming the £800,000 which is going to be invested in Leeds Get Active and getting people into those leisure centres, unfortunately I have been contacted by residents in my ward who feel that their open air leisure centres, which are the local parks, are in danger of having disinvestment in terms of their facilities, which will mean that there is disinvestment in their quality of life and their health expectancy. I am talking, of course, about our bowling greens across the city. £800,000 going into leisure centres at the same time as cutting £150,000 in our bowling greens, where we have some of our poorer pensioners – it is their way of keeping on top of their health, getting out, being active, talking to friends, getting their mental health kept on guard. One team is making a cut in that area which will affect people's health and expectancies and then a brand new initiative starts somewhere else and I think we need to get a balance between the two, so hopefully Councillor Ogilvie will give us an answer on that one. *(Applause)*

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

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Can I thank speakers on this Minute. The report was entitled "Inspiring a Generation, a Sporting Legacy for

Leeds” and there is a progress report following the Olympics last year, when I am sure we all agreed people across the city were inspired by the success of our Olympians and Paralympians. The challenge was how we could establish a legacy going forward – easy to say, much more difficult to deliver.

As Councillor Harington alluded to, there is a big health divide still in this city, depending on where you live and although we as a city have moved from 13th to third on the latest Sport England participation survey – that is people who do three sessions of 30 minutes a week – we clearly recognise there are still, however, far too many people who do not do any kind of physical activity in the city, the health cost of which is estimated to be about £10.1m a year, so clearly it is something we have got to do a lot more about.

What are we doing about it? The paper outlines a number of different initiatives, including securing some funding from Sport England to assist us to develop a new pitch strategy – how can we maintain and improve playing pitches in the city, particularly as a number of the pitch-based national governing bodies are keen to invest further in Leeds.

We are developing a City Sports Strategy that will highlight in particular the need to work much more closely with Public Health. In terms of school sport you will be aware the Government has recently announced, following its decision to scrap School Sport Partnerships when it took power, they have now announced some money which is going to go back into school sports. This will equate to about £9,000 per primary school, which is welcome. However, we have a real concern that each school will end up doing their own thing, so both Councillor Blake and myself, Children’s Services and Leisure, are doing a piece of joint work to see how we can get a much more joined-up approach so that we make sure every child in this city has access to good sport in schools.

We are also establishing a Legacy Fund for young people and also one of the other issues we discussed was rates relief for voluntary sports clubs in the city. Those sports clubs that offer a quality provision will be able to get up to 100% sport relief, which I know has really been welcomed by sports clubs across the city.

One of the issues that was raised in the paper was the opportunity to secure future large events, and Councillor Harington has actually touched on the Tour de France, which I will come to in a moment. Clearly this year we are looking forward to being a host city to the Rugby League World Cup, which will be taking place, two games, at Headingley, and I was very pleased that last week we were able to announce that we are going to be a host city for the Rugby Union World Cup in 2015, with two games taking place at Elland Road. That is the third biggest sporting event in the world, an estimated 4.2 billion people watch that so the spotlight will be on Leeds and I am sure we will be able to showcase the great things that go on in the city.

Councillor Cleasby, yes, it was a good event that we came to last year and I look forward to the event coming up. I am sure some of us will be there to attend that.

Moving on to the Tour de France that Councillor Harington spoke so eloquently about, clearly with having the Grand Depart coming to Leeds it is a real opportunity actually to make our city a much safer place to cycle. I am a much more cautious cyclist than Roger and other people here, Councillor Wakefield, Councillor Illingworth and others. The point is, and something that I have reiterated to Tom Riordan and I know Councillor Harington has as well, is that if you do not use the

opportunity of having the Tour de France to actually make our city a much safer and welcoming place to cycle, then we will have wasted that opportunity.

I was recently reading a report which showed how four cities – Barcelona, Seville, Dublin and Bordeaux - had gone from virtually no cycling to being cities where lots of cycling takes place over six years and what they have done is, they have invested in their cycling infrastructure and that is clearly something we are going to have to look at here.

Councillor Maqsood talked about the Leeds Let's Get Active Pilot. This is a joint piece of work with Councillor Mulherin and myself. I think this is a real opportunity to leave a positive legacy on the city. If we can reach people who currently do no physical activity by offering free access to leisure centres, gym and swim, and also by providing activities in our parks and community settings, we have a real opportunity, like Birmingham has, in reaching thousands of people and getting them doing physical activity. As I say, it is a real opportunity to leave a positive legacy on the city.

Councillor Golton's intervention at the last minute – I am sure Councillor Dobson will respond in the future; a bit rich coming from him.

THE LORD MAYOR: Please can you make your final point, Councillor Ogilvie.

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: I was just going to say, it is his Government that is imposing huge cuts on this city so we are having to look at...

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Why are they imposing them?

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: You are in denial, Stuart. We will come back to this issue, I am sure. *(Applause)*

(ii) Adult Social Care

THE LORD MAYOR: We are now moving on to Adult Social Care. Councillor Mulherin.

COUNCILLOR MULHERIN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I was expecting a few other people to speak before me. I would like to speak on Minute 208 on page 62 of the Minute Book in relation to Healthwatch Leeds.

On 1st April Healthwatch Leeds replaced the Local Involvement Network, previously known as Leeds Link, as the new local patient voice and Champion for Health and Social Care in the city. It is important that the Local Authority forms good working relationships with Healthwatch Leeds, for example through the Scrutiny Board and the Health and Wellbeing Board. To that end I am looking forward to meeting with the new Chair of Healthwatch before she joins the Health and Wellbeing Board later this month.

Healthwatch Leeds will also need to offer constructive criticism to social care. With demographic changes and Government budget cuts there has never been a more pressing need for strong public involvement in how social care goes forward. It is really important that Healthwatch is able to work with the Local Authority to help shape how social care services change and develop into the future. It is also important, given the huge changes and challenges facing the NHS that we are seeing under the Coalition Government, that there is someone who will speak up on behalf of patients to effectively put their point of view across. We only have to look at

what has happened with children's congenital heart services in our region to see that there is more than ever a need for patients to have their voices heard at a local, regional and national level when changes to health services are proposed.

I really do hope that Healthwatch Leeds will be able to give patients and service users that robust, strong, effective voice on health and social care issues in the city. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

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

COUNCILLOR YEADON: Thank you. I was expecting a few other people to speak as well, so slightly off guard.

Thank you, Councillor Mulherin. I think both myself and Councillor Mulherin feel very strongly that it is vital to have a robust voice for the public and patients and people who use our services, so we are hopeful that Healthwatch Leeds will be able to bring that forward in the future.

I think it is also fair for us to take this opportunity to thank the volunteers from Leeds Link as well who have spent a lot of their own time in attending meetings with myself, being representatives on Scrutiny as well as other Boards within the Council and further afield to be a strong voice. I know many of those will be transferring over to Healthwatch but I think it is only fair for us to put on Council record that we thank them for their time and energy that they have put into that body over the past few years.

The Adult Social Care and Health are going through some major changes at the moment and we know there will be a discussion later on today around consultation of the changes to services and how important it is for us to capture the thoughts and feelings of the public while we are looking at how we transform our services to meet the needs and demands of the future. It is through organisations like Healthwatch that will enable us to do that. They are there as a critical friend. They should be challenging, they should be robust, but they are also there to influence and to play a part in shaping our services within Adult Social Care and Health and Children's Services for the future.

Thank you. *(Applause)*

(iii) Health and Wellbeing

THE LORD MAYOR: We are now moving on to Health and Wellbeing. Councillor Lay.

COUNCILLOR LAY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would like to speak on Minute 209.

Like the Leader of Council earlier, I would like to welcome the recent return of Public Health to Local Authority responsibility, something that was removed from LAs after the reorganisation of Local Government in 1974.

Some of the great strides in public health took place when Councils last had this responsibility – sanitation, clean air and, of course, housing - the ability to build homes and to provide decent standards, something that this Council continues to pursue. It also had responsibility for reducing communicable disease – more on that in a moment. Again, as the Leader of Council knows there are many challenges for us to tackle – smoking, obesity, alcohol and health inequality - and once again it will

be the responsibility of Councils to reduce communicable diseases, which brings me to my point – one already made by Councillor Varley.

I would like to ask the Executive Member about the recent outbreak of measles across the country and our response as a city. Measles seems like an old relic of a disease. Adults over 50 may have a faint childhood memory of measles - in many cases, many of us were taken to measles parties - but we have almost totally forgotten the fact that measles is considered one of the most infectious diseases known to mankind. It has killed more children than any other disease in history. Before the introduction of vaccines measles killed hundreds of children in this country every year and left thousands more infected infants blind, deaf or developmentally disabled. Therefore, can the Exec Member give reassurance to our residents that the city is doing all it can to minimise the risk of an outbreak? Can she outline what plans the Council has to improve awareness, increase uptake of the jab and whether we have enough supplies of the vaccine and what emergency plans are in place should an outbreak occur? Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Buckley.

COUNCILLOR BUCKLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Can I refer you to page 62, also Minute 209, please.

Unlike Councillor Harington I have got no intention of quoting Karl Marx, you will be glad to hear. This is also, of course, on the transfer of Public Health from the former PCT to the City Council which we are told is going to be a good thing, and this specific question which I first raised in November of 2012 about the proposed Alwoodley Medical Centre based in Moor Allerton. If Members remember, my colleagues and I specifically raised this to avoid losing a PCT funding pot and to avoid the situation which we are actually, needless to say, in today. This whole situation has been going on for more than five years and it needs bringing to a conclusion.

Councillor Mulherin at the time was extremely supportive of our comments and was in full agreement with the arguments that we made at the time. Seven months have gone by, so it is now five years and seven months in this whole saga. I attended the final PCT Board meeting in order to ask them specifically about this and they said, quite out of the blue, "Oh, well, the business case for this was flawed." Why was it flawed? Because there was no money attached. Then the doctors consortium say to me the only people who could have attached the money are the PCT, so it is a completely circular argument. We are only talking about £300,000 and it just strikes me that maybe the redundancy money from the PCT was probably more than £300,000.

Now that this organisation has gone and we are back in the hands of the City Council, can the Executive Member help us? As she well knows and Members know, Moor Allerton is still a deprived area, it is a poor area and it still has no medical centre. As Members will shortly hear from my colleague, Councillor Harrand, in addition to all the medical necessities in that particular district, community cohesion is also an important factor at the moment.

Can I, given her previous strong support for this, ask her to undertake to facilitate a meeting this month involving all the parties and bring everyone together so that at long last we can get this matter sorted out and this much-needed centre built. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Khan.

COUNCILLOR KHAN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would like to speak on Minute 209, page 62, regarding the transfer of Health to Leeds City Council.

Responsibility for Public Health transferring into the hands of the Council will give us the opportunity to really shape policy and make a difference to people's lives. A big task lies ahead of us. There are many issues that simply must be addressed. Many of these issues are simply the result of the vast inequality that exists across the city in terms of health outcome. Nowhere is it illustrated more alarmingly than the ten year life expectancy gap between the best and the worst part of the city. To put this into perspective, a male living in Harewood on average can expect to live to 82 years old, while for a male in Hunslet the figure is 72 years old. The picture is similar for women, where a female living in Adel and Wharfedale can expect to live ten years older than a female in Hunslet.

This negative trend is reflected in many other areas across the city, with largely the inner city wards comparing unfavourably with outer suburb areas. This trend highlights a distinct link between poverty and poor health outcomes. Life expectancy numbers are reflected in many different illness and conditions that have damaging effects on people's lives. Cardiovascular disease, diabetes, cancer and dementia, for example, are all clear indicators of physical and mental wellbeing. There are significant differences with the spread of these conditions across the city, with inner city areas suffering high numbers of health problems in stark comparison to outer suburb areas. The same is also true with smoking rates, drugs and alcohol abuse which peak in inner city areas.

With Public Health now under Council control we can hopefully hope to turn a corner, support people to live healthier lifestyles and ensure that they have access to their health service no matter where they live.

The Leeds Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy has already been established, which outlines the Council's ambition to address these inequalities across the city as well as outlining other health priorities. The overarching priorities for this new approach to Public Health is to improve and protect the wellbeing of everyone in Leeds, but also to improve the health of the poorest the fastest.

This is a task that is going to require involvement of various departments within the Council and our partners, but now is the time to do it. I very much hope to see some significant change on the health landscape in the coming months and years which will reduce health inequality and give people equal access to health service, regardless of where they live, and better health outcomes for all. Thank you.
(Applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Harper.

COUNCILLOR J HARPER: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. Clearly I am going to speak on the same subject.

The transfer of Public Health from the Primary Care Trust to Leeds City Council gives us the opportunity to address an issue that is an extremely poor reflection on this city, and that is the twelve year health gap between the best off and worst parts of the city, and tackling this should be one of the city's highest priorities.

I represent Armley ward, that has a life expectancy that is twelve years less than Calverley and Farsley only four miles up the road, and I think that is just unacceptable – not for the people of Calverley and Farsley, of course – but we need to redress this situation. We need to do it and we need to do it properly by educating people and trying to ensure some healthy eating diet.

Diet is an important factor in maintaining a healthy lifestyle. People who eat healthily, eating foods with less fat, sugar and salt content, are less likely to suffer from chronic health conditions like heart disease and diabetes.

We need to encourage people to cook their meals at home using fresh and healthy ingredients. That is not always easy because shops selling fresh fruit and veg are often less accessible than hot food takeaways. Armley Town Street, for example, has lots of takeaways and very few shops selling fresh fruit and vegetables.

The transfer of Public Health will give the Council the opportunity to address this situation. A fantastic example of what is being done to encourage healthy cooking and healthy eating can be seen in the role of the Ministry of Food. What is the Ministry of Food? It is a food centre that offers cooking courses to teach those with little or limited cooking skills how to prepare tasty, healthy meals on a budget. It offers a standard eight week course (that is eight 90 minute sessions) and is commissioned by Public Health. It engages vulnerable adults, those at risk of ill health as a result of poor diet, and those who are less able or less motivated to prepare healthy food at home.

Its aims are to promote healthy eating messages, provide advice and assistance to users around budgeting and shopping, increase the uptake of fruit and vegetables, decrease the consumption of high fat, high sugar foods and takeaway meals, and decrease the intake of sale.

I am delighted that a new branch of the Ministry of Food has recently been launched at St Bartholomew's Community Kitchen in Armley. This will operate as a one year pilot programme and I very much hope that it will catch the imagination of local people and make a real difference to their lifestyles...

THE LORD MAYOR: Please will you make your final point, Councillor Harper.

COUNCILLOR J HARPER: ...and, more importantly, to their health and wellbeing. Thank you, my Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Mulherin to sum up.

COUNCILLOR MULHERIN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. First of all, can I thank Councillor Khan. Closing the gap between the best off and worst off areas by targeting those areas with the worst rates of ill health will take considerable time, but by working together with GPs, schools, health visitors, our social service teams and the Third Sector, we can improve health outcomes across the city and we are collectively determined to do that. The Health and Wellbeing Board will take its first steps later this month approving a Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy for the city which will support people to choose healthy lifestyles, work to ensure every child gets the best start in life, increase the number of people supported to live safely in their own home, and improve people's mental health and wellbeing.

As Councillor Khan noted in his speech, the overarching ambition will be to improve the health of the poorest the fastest because of what we know about the links between poor health and social and economic disadvantage.

Councillor Harper, thank you for your comments. The Ministry of Food is a great example of the work that is being undertaken through the Council's new Public Health role. Not only do participants on the Ministry of Food course learn to cook

healthy food from fresh ingredients, they also get advice on good nutrition and how to shop and source foods to eat well on a low budget.

I am delighted that we have been able to expand the programme this year from the hub at Kirkgate Market to the first of three spokes we plan to open in the city, that being at the Community Kitchen in Armley.

Councillor Buckley, I sympathise with the Alwoodley Councillors' concerns about the Alwoodley Medical Centre and its failure to progress before the PCT was abolished at the end of March. I understand that at the last PCT Board meeting, which I was not able to attend, it was announced that investment in Primary Care facilities had been affected by the Government reforms and that capital had been withdrawn. Any premises developments which did not have planning permission, land purchase and building commenced by the end of March were considered out of time and would have to be submitted to the new system, a process for which at that point had yet to be defined. Responsibility for primary care development has now moved to the West Yorkshire Area Team of NHS England. I would be happy to facilitate a meeting before the issue comes up for consideration at NHS England of all the interested parties to see if we can make progress.

The issue of the day, Councillor Varley, Councillor Lay – measles. The good news is that in Leeds there have been no outbreaks. There have only been seven cases in the city since January and we do have enough vaccine. Plans are being put in place, let by NHS England, our Director of Public Health, Dr Ian Cameron, is working with them to put in place a plan to immunise ten to 16-year olds who were not immunised first time round as infants by the MMR vaccine. GPs will be delivering the backlog jabs to those young people who need it. We are impressing upon NHS England and Public Health England the need to involve schools, colleges and our universities in the programme to promote uptake.

I think that is pretty much it, thank you. (*Applause*)

(iv) Resources and Corporate Functions

THE LORD MAYOR: We are now moving on to Resources and Corporate Functions. Councillor Harrand.

COUNCILLOR HARRAND: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Members might like to know that Councillor Sobel and I are using this Minute to comment on the demonstrations in Alwoodley last Saturday with all the appropriate authorities.

We wish to record our appreciation of the work that many organisations did on that day and in the week before it – that is Inspector Briggs and his colleagues at Stainbeck Police Station, East-North East Homes, Graham Brownlee and his church groups and within the City Council Youth Services, Area Management, Children's Services, Environmental Health (and particularly Environmental Health for having the place swept up in minutes, almost, after the thing finished, for which we give particular congratulations.)

You might like to know that the extremists who came that day were invited by a single resident. It is also worth noting at least 80% of the demonstrators on both sides were from outside Leeds.

It is possible to see this squalid little event as something that is behind us, but we must not fall into that temptation. When we strip away all the chanting and the banners, the hairstyles, the remarkable dress code and the juvenile website obscenities, there is a core of genuine concern about this. There is to be a Muslim

centre in a part of the city with no tradition of Muslim culture. That is inevitably going to be difficult and some Councillors across there may know that better than I do.

We must all accept our responsibilities to prevent, as far as we can, anything like last Saturday happening again. This includes City Councillors particularly for Alwoodley and Moor Town, officers of the Council and local people.

However, I think there is a special responsibility now on the leaders of the Islamic Mission. I have met them and they are intelligent and responsible men. That group now owns the premises. They might see themselves as having a duty to reach out from that building and talk and listen to the community. We had our warning last weekend; an island of a different culture in a sea of misunderstanding is going to take some time to be accepted. The process of building bridges which go in and out of the centre has to start now. Thank you very much. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Sobel.

COUNCILLOR SOBEL: I would like to echo the start of Councillor Harrand's speech. I would also like to thank the Police, particularly Andrew Briggs, East North-East Homes, Moor Town Methodist Church, Environmental Health and other Council departments who did excellent reassurance work up to the day and then, on the day, the police service itself.

I spent two-and-a-half hours at Moor Allerton on the Queens Hill Estate in my ward and on the Lingfield estate in Alwoodley ward and I think it would be worthwhile relaying my experience of the day to Members present.

I arrived at the Moor Allerton Centre in my car and I was greeted by around a hundred men – mainly men, there were some women – chanting obscenities as we drove past to go to Sainsbury's. When I was at Sainsbury's in the café to observe from that distance, I had many residents from Moor Town ward who were up there shopping complaining to me about the behaviour of the English Defence League at the Penny Fun pub on the Moor Allerton Centre car park.

Then I went on the Queens Hill estate and my residents there were justifiably horrified as well because many of these people had parked on the Queens Hills and were rude and obstructive to people on the estate.

I then joined the Unite Against Fascism gathering and spoke to them and I would like to actually thank Councillor Cohen and Councillor Buckley who gave a statement on the day and I will just read you some of that because I think it echoes my feelings as well as anybody's. Councillor Buckley and Councillor Cohen said:

“As your local Councillors we endorse the sentiments of Fabian Hamilton MP. Extremism of any type has no place in our modern multicultural society. Like Fabian we believe it is vital to show that our community is not prepared to be used in campaigns that create social division and disharmony. We too are proud that we do indeed live peacefully together sharing our different cultures and faiths. Any of those who try to divide us have no place here and we completely reject their vision of the world. Have a peaceful afternoon and we give you our best wishes for the fight against fascism, racism and intolerance.”

I thank Councillors Buckley and Cohen for their words on the day.

Then I saw the English Defence League march and the English Defence League were undertaking Nazi salutes and Zeig Heiling in the streets of Alwoodley. They were throwing offal and animal remains on the ground. They hurled a fake pig's head, a rubber pig's head, at the police. The police arrested four people on the day for drunk and disorderly behaviour. I am sure you can understand why.

I have a friend, Frank Pullen, who is in his 90s and he was at the Battle of Holbeck Moor on 27th September 1936 and his account of that day reminds me of my experiences last Saturday.

Lastly, I do want to echo what Councillor Harrand said about our need to work with UKIM. We have a UKIM Centre on the Carr Manors in Moor Town ward who work excellently...

THE LORD MAYOR: Please can you take a leaf out of Councillor Maqsood's book and finish your speech very quickly?

COUNCILLOR SOBEL: I will. We work with them very closely and I am sure that we will be able to do the same with them in the Lingfield estate. Thank you.
(Applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Akhtar.

COUNCILLOR AKHTAR: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. I am speaking on Minute 211, page 63, Local Welfare Scheme for Leeds.

As a ward Member for Hyde Park and Woodhouse, the provision of locally available support is very important to me and my local residents. Many of my residents are given little choice but to accept short-term, unstable work from employers. This means that they are often in a situation where they have periods of work followed by short-term claims for benefits. They have had to deal with long delays that many benefit claims can produce. In times like these it has been necessary for them to rely on crisis loans or other hardship support.

Another significant cause for hardship has been the suspension of benefits by the Department for Works and Pensions following decisions on someone's capability to work. These decisions are often reconsidered as soon as the medical evidence from the resident's own GP, social worker or any other health professional is assessed. With the Government replacing with the Localism Welfare Support, Council has been given control on how to assist people and I support localism and consider the scheme funding is only the same as the funding for the benefit it replaces in last financial year.

I am proud that in Leeds we will continue to offer direct assistance to people in emergency situations. Furthermore, I want to mention the ways that people can access help through the welfare scheme for vulnerable people. The nearest One Stop Centres in Hyde Park and Woodhouse are in City Centre, Armley and regional centre in Chapeltown. For residents with disability or other vulnerability these can all be difficult and costly places to reach.

I therefore welcome that our supported applications can be made with assistance from Advice Leeds Members, which includes the Burley Lodge Centre in my ward.

This organisation provides both debt and benefit advice. This means that the residents can receive specialist assistance whilst also making an application for the

welfare scheme. Provisions of services in this way will allow advisers to assist people in holistic ways and will claim to resolve any issues that slow down the benefit application.

My Lord Mayor, I also want to speak about the ability of Third Sector and voluntary organisations to be involved in the provisions of goods and services. In particular, it is exciting that...

THE LORD MAYOR: Please will you make your final point, Councillor Akhtar?

COUNCILLOR AKHTAR: ... projects are given to be used in order to provide basic goods for the residents and that all schemes of community care grants and crisis loans, people were paid in cash.

THE LORD MAYOR: This does not sound like the final point to me!

COUNCILLOR AKHTAR: On those bases I support the scheme, my Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Golton.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would like to draw attention to the Regional Economic Intelligence Unit. Lord Mayor, these are a team of professionals, they are data analysts who transferred to the Council payroll after the demise of Yorkshire Forward. The business case for doing so was based on the expectation that this professional bunch of people would be not only self-financing but they would also be a revenue earner for the Council and that other Authorities that we are in partnership with would be willing to pay for their services.

Lord Mayor, given that this team were taken on board at the same time as we were in conversations with many of our staff to talk to them about Early Leavers Initiative, we did ask at Executive Board that we did get regular reports to come back to us on how this team is performing in terms of its ability to wash its own face, I think is the term that gets used, financially.

Unfortunately, Lord Mayor, each year the projected income figure has been revised for this team and each year less work is requested from elsewhere, and increasingly the income for this team is based upon internal charges.

When we had our latest performance report we were told that this team had now actually made a loss for the first time, and I just thought that it might be pertinent that, given that we have just had an example earlier on about how it is all the Government's fault if Crown Green Bowling is getting cut – we cannot find any part of the Council which is isolated from that kind of conversation in terms of how it cuts its cloth to meet its need, and I think this is something that we need to be taking a look at. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Wakefield.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Can I thank you for your generosity on your last meeting, you have been very kind to all of us in extending our time and I hope I get the same treatment.

I am sorry that Councillor Bentley and most of the Liberals have dropped speaking, because you would have looked good on TV with that tie! I think we would have been entertained by your contribution, far more than your Leader.

Let me just go through some of the comments, because there was a very serious contribution made by Councillor Akhtar about the current pressures in crisis in our city under the Welfare Reform.

As we all know, we got a Local Welfare Scheme which is worth £2.8m. To update you on one scheme alone, what they call the Discretionary Housing Payment, the uptake in demand has gone up by 450%. I think that illustrates quite clearly that many people in our city are really struggling to actually cope with some of the welfare reforms. Already in the month of April we have had over 350 applications for this welfare. It is quite clear that cash on its own is not going to be enough for the demand that we have in the city for ordinary people to cope.

That is why I think the link with the partners that Councillor Akhtar was talking about, with organisations that recycle, the voluntary sector that recycle furniture so people can get furniture like cookers, freezers, beds and so on, is really important and so is, as we are beginning to find out, the proliferation of food banks because it is not money but it is food that people are desperate for, and the story I get across the city – and I am sure the story we all get across the city – is that they are literally under siege.

I think one of the things we have to do if we cannot give people money, that kind of support is valuable along with welfare support, employment support and, above all, credit union. One of the things that I really worry about is, of course, we have 41 legal loan sharks in our city. I am sure Robert appreciates how predatory they are. If people are getting into a very tight corner, then loan sharks are very easy. You can get a loan within ten minutes at 2,000%. We really have a massive task to make sure that we can give the advice, the support and so on to avoid people going to these loan sharks.

I do not know whether anybody followed Councillor Golton's – I will not call it a diatribe but I could not work out what the end conclusion was because we all agreed as parties that, given the importance of the region, given the importance that we now have to determine our own economic strategy within the city and region, we have to then also be responsible for the demography and housing needs, that Regional Economic Intelligence was something that we should have, given that there was no other agent in the city, if we are to plan for the future.

I think Councillor Golton has been minding his cabbages too long because one of the things that we kept saying to him, you do not understand the difference between external and internal. He has got an obsession. I have never known you have an obsession like this, Stuart, you really need to calm down about it. Let me give the rest of your colleagues who are here the benefit of the facts. Right.

The income generated so far, 52% has come from external; 26%, 22% from Leeds City Council and we are still trading. I am happy to share those with you.

Let me just say one thing about the EDL. I am delighted about the comments of the police, the public services and so on. I am delighted about the all-party approach to this because one of the things that we have done consistently in this city is actually we have all stood together in rejecting these fascist racists who come to our city deliberately to stir up racial hatred within our city and deliberately to destroy the heritage that we should feel proud of in terms of diversity of our city from all ethnicities and from all nations. I am pleased that the police and the parties – and thank you, Councillor Harrand, for your comments and Councillor Sobel – have actually stood together to reject these fascist racist thugs that deliberately stir it up. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

SUSPENSION OF COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Latty.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: I move in terms of the Motion, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lamb.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: Second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: All those in favour? (*A vote was taken*) Thank you very much. CARRIED.

Councillor John Procter.

(v) Development and the Economy

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I seek today to move a Reference Back in the terms of the Motion that has just been put in relation to an item that was heard at Executive Board in March vis-à-vis the future of Kirkgate Market.

I have to say, Lord Mayor, I am quite perplexed by how the Council now seems to be proceeding on this particular matter, especially as an all-party Scrutiny Board which I chaired last year came up with a common view and many of those thoughts, if not all of them, were accepted by the Leader of Council and, indeed, by the Executive Board.

It seems strange, Lord Mayor, that we have an all-party common declared goal to improve Kirkgate Market. We are told constantly that it is the jewel in the crown of the city and that we should all work together to support the traders and improve the market, and yet we do not seem to be able to get an all-party approach to its future and I think that is very sad, Lord Mayor.

Whatever happens with this Reference Back, what I hope is the result is that we do have an all-party approach to try and work constructively with the traders on the future of the market.

Lord Mayor, what we have proposed as a group is a 51% owned joint venture company, 51% owned by the traders, that is, 49% to be retained by the Council. We believe that that would ensure that the traders have the biggest possible incentive to see the market grow and improve.

We agree that it is a great idea to spend as much money as possible in refurbishing the market. £12.3m is talked of; if that ultimately is the figure, that is great. If, however, that is a figure that will be levered against potential rent increases and the like that will put the traders in a difficult position, maybe it is not so great.

Our concern and the traders' concern is that the money that will be spent will be spent in the wrong way. Certainly they have not been consulted about how moneys are proposed to be spent, pretty much like they were not consulted on the report that went to Executive Board. Lord Mayor, I see Councillor Lewis sighing and shaking his head. It actually said that in the Executive Board Report, Richard, that traders had not been consulted. That is what it said and it is your report that you took through Cabinet, I guess.

Lord Mayor, whatever the rights and wrongs are the people of Leeds, I believe, and certainly the traders, want this Council to sort ourselves out collectively to support them, the traders, the people who actually make the market and work collaboratively with them rather than simply doing things to them.

Lord Mayor, I hope colleagues will support this particular Reference Back and in closing I do say to the Leader of Council that he now has a chink of light that may enable him to resolve this matter with the appointment, I understand, of Councillor Gerry Harper as the new Labour Group Chief Whip to appoint a new Markets Champion – dare I say a conciliatory Markets Champion who will work on an all-party basis. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Latty.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: I second that, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Rafique.

COUNCILLOR RAFIQUE: Lord Mayor, it goes without saying I want to speak on Minute 194, page 52, regarding Kirkgate Market, which I think is the city's trading gem. The proposals recently approved by Executive Board for improvements to the market were discussed at the Sustainable Economy and Culture Scrutiny Board at the beginning of April. During discussions between Members it was clear that we all agreed that consultation is paramount to any decision making. Indeed, during debates on the market over the last two decades, the significance of effective communication has been clearly illustrated. This is why the proposals brought forward include definite trader representation on a new Management Board. The Council has recognised that it is vital to work closely with businesses in the market end to ensure that the voice of the traders is formally heard.

Lord Mayor, I believe that the consultation undertaken in the lead-up to the recently agreed proposals was of good standard. Officers and Members alike – and I have spoken to Members and officers personally – spent a great deal of time speaking directly to traders over many months and, indeed, provided several consultation events for business owners to go to.

However, the findings of my Scrutiny Board identified a need for more innovative thinking over the kind of consultation that takes place. We need to be even more creative than we already are as this will ensure that more people can have their say easily.

We should consider other means, particularly through new technologies available, of getting more groups and individuals involved. The importance of consultation cannot be under-estimated. The recent Scrutiny has shown that it is vital to involve as many people as possible when considering such key changes and decisions. In the case of the Kirkgate Market I believe wide-ranging consultation was carried out but I also think that there is still much we can do to consider different methods to ensure greater participation.

I am confident, Lord Mayor, that this will be done successfully. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Iqbal.

COUNCILLOR IQBAL: My Lord Mayor and fellow Councillors, I would like to speak with regard to Minute 194, page 52, regarding a report on the Market Strategy.

My Lord Mayor, I think everyone in this Chamber would agree that Kirkgate Market still remains a crown jewel of this city. The market is, to put it simply, iconic and quite rightly holds a very special place in the hearts of Loiners, not just here but right across the world. I am very proud to have the market in my ward.

Whilst its history and meaning to our city cannot be denied, we must also be honest and say that for far too long the market has stood still. You had six years, Councillor, Procter, and nothing was done, for various reasons, and that a new dynamic vision was needed to put it back where it deserves to be...

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: You call this dynamic?

COUNCILLOR IQBAL: ...right at the heart of the city's shopping experience. By investing over £12m directly into the market as part of the Council's proposed strategy, I really believe we will be on the right track to make this ambition a reality. Of course, it will be vital that we work with all key stakeholders on the strategy which clearly must include the traders, and quite rightly so, but I also think it is very important that whilst these discussions are undertaken, we do not allow ourselves to lose sight of what is on the table here, namely a significant multi-million pound investment in the market.

I would like to think that we would all agree that this is great news and something that has been needed for a long time. Thank you, Lord Mayor.
(Applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: May I ask Councillor Richard Lewis to sum up on the amendment, please.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Councillor Procter made reference to my colleague Gerry Harper in a very snide way...

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: It was not at all.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: ...which I think was completely unnecessary. I would actually say that of all the people in this Council Chamber, Gerry Harper has done most to communicate and consult with market traders. As he often says, his first job was in the market and he has been tireless in his efforts to talk to market traders and to get them to participate in the consultation that we have done.

We have had a large response to the recent consultation. It was disappointing in terms of the response from market traders. I think there were two reasons for that. One was the concerted effort by some activists within the market, people who spend all their time trying to frustrate the activities of this Council in terms of improving the market. Those people worked tirelessly and I have the emails to actually show that quite effectively, to frustrate our efforts to get people to take part and, Gerry, if he were here today, would confirm that for us.

We did have massive response from the public and if people do not want to take part in consultation, you cannot force them; that is up to them. The other reason that they may not take part in consultation is they just think we are never going to do anything, because if I were a market trader I would look back over probably the past 15 years and say, "Well, you have never really delivered on any big scheme, we do not think you are going to."

Well, we are, John. We are going to deliver this scheme. We are going to change the market. We are going to do what your Group totally failed to do in the years that it was in control.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: You are going to do what the traders do not want you to do, that is the point.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: The traders – you talked to one or two people, John, and they are people who have never wanted anything to happen other than that the market...

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: It is the representative body of the traders.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: ... should stay exactly as it is and that the rents should never go up. We are going to change the place. We are going to make it attractive to all the citizens of this city...

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Make it like the Corn Exchange.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: ...which is what it should be. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: I am now calling for a vote on the amendment in the name of Councillor Procter. *(A vote was taken)* The amendment is LOST.

Councillor Finnigan, please.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am coming to page 53, 195, New Generation Transport.

Certainly we heard a delegation earlier today that reflects most of our views. Phrases like “not fit for purpose” and “not value for money” and certainly “£76.5m” are phrases that we recognise and certainly we would support. We have had significant concerns about NGT in the same way that we had significant concerns about Supertram. Indeed, me and my good colleague Councillor Leadley did suggest years and years and years ago that Supertram was going nowhere and £40m later and not an inch of track was ever laid.

We believe that this is yet another white elephant. If you want to get public transport working better, then what you should do is re-regulate the buses. It was wrong in the 1980s to de-regulate the bus service. The Labour Party when it came into power should have re-regulated the buses. The only place where bus services work in a most efficient way is in London that has got a regulated bus service.

As my learned colleague Councillor Leadley commented, we would have spent the £19.2m on providing affordable housing, obviously on brownfield sites. We think that that would be a better use of this particular money. We believe that it would deal more satisfactorily with the demand that is actually out there and we honestly believe that in the years to come we will be sitting here with a Supertram 2 problem where we have spent lots of money and nothing whatsoever has changed. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Sue Bentley.

COUNCILLOR S BENTLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am speaking on Minute 195, page 53.

I want to make it perfectly clear that I support fully integrated, high quality transport for Leeds which should provide a reliable, faster, environmentally friendly, cost-effective service with cheaper fares. Other benefits should be a reduction in motorcars on our roads and hopefully an increase in the number of cyclists.

We as a Council need to understand that there has been a sea change in residents' attitudes since Leeds got confirmation of the investment for a new generation transport system. Residents are asking pertinent questions now, now that they see it may really impact on their communities and environments, changing the landscape for ever. This is seen as a threat by officials and is in danger of polarising the arguments and communities.

The two Park and Ride schemes are welcomed and should be built first so that any modal shift from cars to buses will help reduce congestion along the route. Is this a scheme fit for the 21st Century and using the most advanced technology to reduce running costs and emissions? Do we really need to have an invasive infrastructure when well regulated bus lanes may provide a more cost-effective way forward?

Interestingly, Geneva is ripping up its trolleybus system in favour of electric buses that are trickle charged at each bus stop and fully charged in three to seven minutes at the terminus. Look at London, using hydrogen fuel cell buses, which are ultra low in emissions, on one of its routes. Will cyclists be safe using the bus lanes alongside the three interconnected buses which have huge blind spots?

The system will be operational, we are told, in 2020, two years later than expected. The Government funding is finite, as is the Council's and Metro's. Who will meet the additional development costs during these two years?

I love Leeds, it is my adopted city, and I want it to be the best city, with futuristic transport but, sadly, I am not convinced by NGT. Two of our priorities are value for money and listening to residents. We need to heed both and not just for a system for the sake of using Government funds. That would be folly. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Anderson.

COUNCILLOR ANDERSON: Lord Mayor, I do not support NGT coming into the city because we are being fed things that are not true. For example, the time savings will not be as great in the north of the city as some officers are saying. It will damage the limited stop bus services in the north of the city. It is possible to use electric and hybrid vehicles to get exactly the same levels of performance, if only we would listen to what other people are saying instead of going into it blindly.

There will be increased congestion and increased fuel usage. If you are going to give priorities to NGT, that means some other part of the road system has to have its capacity reduced – simple mathematics. If you are giving one area an improvement, another area must decrease.

There is also grave concern about the sharing of bus lanes, road spaces and the cyclists as well. They are accidents waiting to happen. There is no experience in this country of getting this type of modal shift. Britain has never had a trolleybus system like is being proposed here and even Budapest, which is often quoted, is now turning against it.

The Council and Metro cannot make their minds up whether they are in favour of quality bus contracts or quality partnerships. That is vital before we can move this forward.

The reduction which we have had confirmed about service of the No 1 and the No 6 services are going to be significant, particularly because of the amount of housing development that is going to be going on in the north of the city. We need more transport, not less, which is what NGT would produce.

The business case is not based on sound information. The Holt Park leg – I do not know who thought that one up – it is unviable, as far as I am concerned, and the way that the team are proposing to take it round Holt Park by making it do a sharp right in front of a doctor's surgery, closing a car park at that point and then expect ill people to walk in front of NGT in order to get across to the other side, it is illogical, ill thought out and officers will not listen to what the views of local communities are.

At the end of the day, what is going to happen is going to end up being a waste of money because it is not going to give us the 21st Century public transport network that we need in this city that joins up with the other forms of transport, whether it be tram-trains, whether it be buses, whether it be improved pedestrian, cycling or whatever. There is no connectivity with this, no-one is thinking it through. We are rushing into this and I think we need to think again before we bring forward any further information on this because certainly the residents in the north of the city, based on the consultation that has been carried out by a number of us around here---

THE LORD MAYOR: Is this your final point, Councillor Anderson?

COUNCILLOR ANDERSON: Yes. Based on the consultation that has been carried out, they do not want it. Thank you very much. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Fox.

COUNCILLOR FOX: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. Member of Council, if someone were to come up to you and say, "Give me £250m and I will get you to work one minute eight seconds quicker than you can at the moment", I think you would very quickly show them the door and yet that is what NGT is all about, certainly as regards out part of the world coming out towards Holt Park.

Originally the journey into the centre of Leeds was forecast at 27 minutes 51 seconds and more recently that stretched out to 29 minutes and 52 seconds, whereas the timetabled bus service currently is 31 minutes, a saving of one minute and eight seconds, and we are told that there will be further revisions and you can be pretty certain which direction the revisions are going to go. In terms of somebody using the NGT as opposed to the buses, a saving of perhaps one minute.

We were told originally that the situation for motorists would improve, that their time into Leeds would be less. That was revised to, "Well, we think it will be about the same as at the moment" and we are told there are further revisions going on and you can guess again what the revisions are going to be.

It must be the case that it takes motorists longer to get into Leeds if there is NGT because NGT keeps coming off its dedicated track on to the road, back on the track, back on to the road each time it is given priority. Necessarily it must be so.

So why would we spend £250m to possibly achieve one minute and eight seconds; more likely actually to delay everyone overall? It really escapes me. I have

to say, what really strikes me as amazing is the fact that there are essentially six bullet points put forward by propagandists as to why this is a most wonderful scheme. The usual sort of thing, it is going to be better; no facts, no supporting evidence. The thing that really strikes me as astonishing is the claim, it keeps being repeated and repeated, that 4,000 permanent jobs will be created on the basis of someone saving one minute to travel into Leeds. If the people are going to travel one minute quicker into Leeds but they always start at 7.30, it will make no difference. If the people going into Leeds say "I get an extra minute in bed" that is, I suppose, a positive advantage, but basically the whole principle behind NGT is utterly absurd. It is ludicrous, nothing other than that and there is no way we should be spending this sort of money.

There is an opportunity now for the Council to back off. It surely must think very seriously about doing that, when it has got a 28% cut back in expenditure over a four year period. How on earth can we possibly carry on with this farce, spending £250m to save one minute and eight seconds or perhaps even make journey times longer?

My Lord Mayor, it is absurd, something should be done about it and done about it now. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Excellent timing, Councillor Fox! Excellent timing! Councillor Wadsworth, please.

COUNCILLOR WADSWORTH: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I also speak on Minute 195, page 53.

Richard, we need to have a rethink, don't we, because we have had a deputation to Council, we have had numerous Members speak about it. This scheme just does not stack up, does it? It does not stack up financially, it does not stack up environmentally, it does not stack up in any way at all.

It was based originally on the son of Supertram and Supertram was flawed to start off with and the city has changed dramatically since Supertram disappeared. It was based on students that would be the core user of this service, which we actually provided the funding for it to run. We are now told that the Park and Ride will be where it stacks up financially but our experience of Park and Ride in this city is that they do not work, but if this one does work it will probably not be big enough to accommodate the cars and then we will have parking in residential streets. Either way, that cannot work.

We get the Holt Park link which seems bizarre because there is all the problem with construction there and the right turn and the effects on the bus service, the No 1 and No 6, but we lose the link to St James's Hospital which, for my residents, was the only thing that they would have used it for. They might have gone to Boddington, got out of their car, got on to the NGT and been able to get straight to St James's Hospital which now they cannot do but under the new scheme will not be able to do.

We have just got a real white elephant here. I think, Richard, you need to be brave, you need to say, "Is this the right thing, have I got it right?" and have a rethink and if that means that you have to go back to Government and say it is a rethink and maybe a different situation applies or we do not want the money or whatever, you have to be brave and say that, otherwise we are going to end up with something that is new generation but a farce. Thanks, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor J L Carter.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Lord Mayor, for a public transport system to work, if it is going to work, it needs to improve transport for people and this does not do it. It actually worsens transport. If you live in Bramley you will find your bus services go down. You might say so what? You are trying to get people out of cars on to public transport by removing public transport for them. It will not work.

When we ask about the figures on the Park and Ride and the number of cars that can park there, even if it was full the number it takes off the road is virtually nothing. We argue this and ask the questions to people and they will not give us the right answer.

I find it amazing that people in cars are expected to go park their car and get on this thing. I live as near to the Park and Ride as anybody. If I go there, park my car and get on it, it is going to take me longer to come to town. I can stay in my car, stay comfortable, listen to my radio, come down to town and not just save a minute, save several minutes on getting down to town.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: You would go to bed in your car, Les!
(laughter)

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: You may think it is a laughing matter; I do not because you are going to spend £19.2m of our capital expenditure on this. It is not an investment. It is certainly not an investment because what I suspect will happen is, it will not be here where it is decided, it will be a public inquiry. You can see that building up, the opposition building up. It could well fail because it does not have the business use that it is supposed to have to prove the case is right. It does not have that at all and nobody is putting that into the case.

That £19.2m, somebody said more houses. By golly, I would like to see £19.2m put into housing. There are lots of things it could be put in.

We are trying to put a system in that Bradford had for years and Bradford has really done well out of it, did really well, didn't it? We see it flying along. Bradford took it out because it was a silly system. Why limit your transport vehicle to one particular line above you?

It has been said the different types of vehicles that you may have which you can put in which are improvements to the environment, enormous amounts you can do, but you can run them anywhere. This thing has got to have a line going across it, an ugly line going all the way through Headingley, all the way down to town. It has got to have this in. Why? It is absolutely barmy. The technology is there for a far better system, far cheaper. We could have LPG buses up and down that route. It would help the people in the city centre because they would have not the same amount of fumes and, indeed, the people will not start coming in their cars if they have a decent system out in places like Bramhope.

My Lord Mayor, it is a silly system. Richard, I did not know you were in charge of it but let me just make an offer to you.

THE LORD MAYOR: Please will you make this offer quickly

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: If you want this and it is so great, Richard, you can have it in Pudsey. Thank you.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: I would have it in Pudsey any day.

THE LORD MAYOR: We have reached the time of 3.40, so apologies to people who were wanting to speak on these Minutes because we are now moving on to the Scrutiny Board Minutes, at the top of page 11. Councillor Morgan.

(b) Scrutiny Boards

(i) Scrutiny Board (Resources and Council Services)

COUNCILLOR MORGAN: Thank you, Lord Mayor and fellow Councillors. I am speaking on Minute 86, page 69, the Scrutiny inquiry into Welfare Reform, looking in detail at the way this Council is responding to reforms coming from Central Government.

Although appearing to be well thought out and reasonable, especially with regard to making sure that all services and providers are prepared and supporting in helping resident subject to these welfare changes, I am concerned that the accumulation of benefit changes on the same households will have a huge impact.

Killingbeck and Seacroft has a significant number of Council and Housing Association properties. Nearly half, 5,000, live in social housing and an estimated 700 households have been affected by the bedroom tax. These same households in social housing have now to use a large amount of their income to pay their rent. This is taking more from their pockets and the local economy.

This is extremely difficult even if this was the only change happening, but remember other changes are being made, including reduced funding for Council Tax support. In my ward more than 1,800 households will be affected by this change, with people having to find an extra £11.82 rent and £2.45 for Council Tax every single week. This pushes the poorest further into financial hardship.

Evidence indicates 67% of households affected by these two changes are already in poverty, and 27% are families with children. This is causing a disproportionate effect on the poorest and, in my ward, where people need help most. The 1% benefit increase means more people trying to pay extra costs with less money than last year.

Back to my ward. 22% state that they have long-term health or disability problems, so upcoming changes to Disability Benefits are causing them more worry and concern. Whilst a robust system for assessing care and mobility is necessary, many are worried that the DWP's assessment for the Personal Independence Payments will repeat mistakes from Employment and Support Allowance criticised by the Public Accounts Committee as being unduly complacent.

This Council is making sure that all are helped, informed and given advice and Scrutiny is also looking at practical ways to help people through these multiple changes.

THE LORD MAYOR: Please can you make your final point, Councillor Morgan?

COUNCILLOR MORGAN: Some recommendations have already received a response and I look forward to the other recommendations being addressed.
(Applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Groves.

COUNCILLOR GROVES: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would like to speak on Minute 86, page 69. I would like to start by thanking the Resources Scrutiny Board for their work on welfare reform and their important recommendation to create a contingency budget of £200,000 for front line services. Leeds City Council has spent many months planning how we would deal with the raft of welfare reform changes. The Welfare Reform Strategy Board and the Welfare Reform Customer Services Board have succeeded in implementing and delivering new and redesigned services for citizens affected by the raft of changes.

Every single directorate and partners across the city have worked together to devise policies and procedures to respond to the Government requirements that seem to change on a weekly basis. The Board has planned with military precision everything from communication, administration, new contact teams, IT provision and staffing ratios. ALMOs carried out one-to-one personal visits to everyone affected and thousands of letters of notification. The teams also produced a valuable guide for elected Members and this was all on top of the day job.

We have had to calculate funding and try and forecast the effects from the reduced Government settlements. We have had to forecast where our teams should be deployed across the city and we have sometimes accurate information from the DWP. Training of front line service teams in localities, including partners and Third Sector organisations, was carried out to make sure that the people of Leeds would be able to access help across the city.

The work continues and the Universal Credit and the Local Government Framework will now follow. They will bring more pressure to our services yet, once again, there is no indication of resource from Central Government. Their policies totally lack the common sense approach that is needed in the real world. They appear to have no idea how this will work, whom it will affect and what the consequences of their policies will be.

For our teams the increase in workload in April was huge. Welfare Rights saw an increase of 131%; One Stop Centres from 35% to 149%; Contact Centre up 85%, Benefits and Revenue Change in Circumstances went from 5,000 last year to 8,449 this year. Local Welfare Scheme calls, we have had 1,896 to date.

So what are the consequences for our citizens in addition to what our team are dealing with on behalf of the Government? The consequences are disabled people suffering most waiting for tribunals, their money frozen because they have a genuine illness that is already debilitating; decisive and destructive measures that create unrest in our community, neighbour put against neighbour.

People who earn low incomes supplemented by tax credits...

THE LORD MAYOR: Please will you make your final point, Councillor Groves?

COUNCILLOR GROVES: I will. They are not scroungers, they are simply striving to do the best they can for their families. Tenants cannot afford to stay in their homes; this cannot be right. If you are made redundant you will be called a scrounger; that cannot be right. There is no recognition for people who work and get made redundant through no fault of their own because they are not a millionaire. The Government should...

THE LORD MAYOR: This sounds like another point to me.

COUNCILLOR GROVES: OK, just one more. The Government should be sanctioned for these ruthless and callous acts. Thank you. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Hardy.

COUNCILLOR HARDY: Lord Mayor and fellow Councillors, I am speaking on Minute 86, page 69, the Scrutiny Board Report into Welfare Reform. As a member of the Scrutiny Board I want to take this opportunity to explain the impact of welfare reform upon carers. Carers provide help for the sick and vulnerable, whether they are family members or friends. Many people provide very valuable care to people they know, whether it is a few hours a week or the equivalent of a full-time job which they do not get paid for. Over 9,500 people care for someone else in Leeds, meaning that 9.5% of the population are engaged in helping other people they know.

In Farnley and Wortley 2,315 people provide care, including more than 580 people caring for someone else for more than 50 hours a week. Care is often a 24 hour, seven days a week task with carers needing to be available at a moment's notice in order to assist and to prevent harm to disabled and vulnerable people. Care is not only a physical helping of someone but also can be watching over them to keep them safe, to prevent them from harming themselves or to provide reassurance and support in order to make the person feel secure.

Public authorities have had a strong responsibility to their carers. We have a responsibility to prevent them being in poverty or hardship. While the carer does the necessary work of looking after the sick, vulnerable and disabled people, Central Government has repeatedly told us they wanted to protect carers – some joke. To their credit they have increased Carer's Allowance and the care component of means tested benefits. However, they still increased the other components of benefits received by many full-time carers, such as personal allowances of income support by a massive 1%. This means that carers on the lowest income will still be affected by below inflation benefit increases introduced this year. Carers have also faced the brunt of the bedroom tax if they live in a home that has been assessed as too large for their needs. This significantly affects those who care for disabled partners, especially if their disabled partner requires their own bedroom to help them cope with their needs. What a disgrace.

The localisation of Council Tax Benefit has come with a 10% cut in funding. Thank goodness it was not more. Councillors are therefore being forced to decide who should bear the brunt of the reduction in Council Tax Support. The Government has produced a document entitled "Vulnerable People – Key Local Authority Duties" (if they had thought of that, they would not have had them cut but that is another matter) supposedly setting out the vulnerable groups the Government feels Local Authorities should consider.

THE LORD MAYOR: Please will you make your final point, Councillor Hardy.

COUNCILLOR HARDY: Through the Scrutiny Board inquiry we have been keen to make sure that...

THE LORD MAYOR: I hope this is not going to be a long final point, by the way!

COUNCILLOR HARDY: ...we support individuals in this city and I thank the Scrutiny Board for all its hard work this year. (*Applause*)

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

COUNCILLOR P GRAHAME: Thank you, Lord Mayor. This afternoon colleagues have highlighted very real worries about the impact of Government benefit changes on low income families and the Council. Given the scale and complexity of this issue and the comments today, I particularly want to expand on the work of my Board in this area.

We have spent a considerable amount of time looking at this issue. From a resources perspective it was vital we considered how benefit changes will impact upon Council collection rates and how that could affect our ability to fund services. I want to thank Councillors Morgan, Groves and Hardy who have today highlighted in detail some of the varied challenges facing the city as a result of the Government welfare changes. I can reassure the Chamber that all of the Scrutiny Board Members involved in that inquiry were first and foremost concerned about the low income families dealing with reforms first hand. We know how hard life is for many families at the moment and we recognise that these changes are an unwanted extra pressure on the family budget.

Councillor Morgan is right to draw attention to the many households in her ward that are affected by multiple benefit changes. This is a situation that Board Members know is replicated right across the city. Likewise, I welcome Councillor Hardy's comments about carers. As a Board Member he will appreciate the lengthy discussions we have had about protecting dedicated carers whose commitment to vulnerable people in Leeds can too often be overlooked. One of the key conclusions to emerge from the Board's discussions has been the need for effective support and advice to be put in place to help struggling households. The right financial advice needs to be targeted at the right people. For the Council I have no doubt that incorporating effective support into our Recovery Policy will also help protect our collection rates.

As Scrutiny Chair I want my Board's work to complement the activity that is already under way in other areas of the Council. I welcome, for example, the Local Council Tax Support Scheme that the Executive Board recently approved. However, despite these efforts to provide limited protection to households with our shrinking resources, there is no escaping the fact that around 28,000 people will face a Council Tax bill this year after paying nothing in 2012/13. While these households face bills of between £120 and £140, the Council could also find itself dealing with substantial costs to pursue recovery of as little as £2 a week.

The Board wrote to the Secretary of State, Iain Duncan-Smith, asking for a review of the current recovery process in order to reduce the hardships already felt by those finding it difficult to pay. Councillor Groves has very succinctly outlined the strain our services are anticipated to come under. In very basic terms, more rent arrears will mean more recovery action and for us that is likely to involve extra reminders, summonses, liability orders and requests for Attachment to Earnings or benefits. Extra resources have been put in place to help meet this demand but as a Board we want to monitor the situation closely.

The Board made 14 recommendations about welfare changes ranging from the ALMOs BITMO, continuing to ensure customer debt is as low as possible from this month, to the Council promoting neutral exchanges for tenants. The Board took the view that the arrears process should be reviewed to ensure customers are offered support when needed but also to enable the Council to make swift action where customers will not pay the rent.

The Board also argued that customers should have further opportunity to make contact with the Council to make payment to avoid the extra cost associated with court action.

We recommended that front line staff have greater flexibility and officers greater discretion when it comes to making payment arrangements and pursuing recovery of costs. We recommend in the strongest possible terms that staff dealing with these issues be well trained to ensure accurate, consistent advice and that the counsel should investigate redesignating properties where appropriate.

The scale of the challenge ahead of us should not be under-estimated. At the heart of all our recommendations is the belief that we must get communication with tenants right. As our resources diminish and it becomes harder to provide services, you cannot lose sight of just how important it is to respond effectively to the challenge of welfare change for the sake of the families affected as well as those relying upon our wider services. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

(ii) Scrutiny Board (Children and Families)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Urry.

COUNCILLOR URRY: I speak to Minute 110 on page 77 on Welfare Reform and Child Poverty.

Thirty years ago I was a front line benefits officer in Inner London. Within walking distance of the West End were many thousands of people struggling to survive on low income. It was and is self-evident that income is at the root of child poverty and should be the main factor in defining it.

As family incomes fall parents cannot take their children out, they cannot let them visit friends or go to parties because they cannot return the favour or afford presents, they cannot afford to buy them decent clothes and they cannot even afford to feed them properly. Family breakdowns increase under financial stress, potentially affecting the numbers of looked-after children.

The standard measure of poverty is where income falls below 60% of median, but this has lost meaning as the Coalition has forced median pay down, putting more families above the 60% level without any increase in income and allowing spurious claims of falling child poverty.

The Government launched a consultation on the new more Coalition friendly definition, moving the goalposts to massage a difficult issue. Professor John Bradshaw, who led the UK contribution to UNICEF's Child Wellbeing Report, described this Government consultation as reading as "plagiarised from a right-wing think tank."

Poverty affects housing, diet and achievement. Addressing it is a key priority. In 2011 the Institute for Fiscal Studies predicted 400,000 more children in poverty by 2015/16 mainly due to changes to the benefits and tax systems. How prescient, in a country now introducing food banks.

In Leeds more than 35,000 children now live in poverty – that is 22% or 23% - and get described in skivers' rhetoric, 59% of children in poverty are in households where at least one adult is working. The bedroom tax will affect over 8,000 as social housing tenants, more than 2,000 households with children.

There are four blocks to Leeds Child Poverty Strategy: financial support, setting up a Community Development Finance Institution to help low income families; Best Start in Life Early Start Teams increasing the number of children reaching a good level of development in Early Years Foundation stage; Employment and Adult

Skills and Apprenticeship Training Academy to improve availability and accessibility of apprenticeships; Housing and Neighbourhoods agreement between Housing and Children's Services to prevent evictions and subsequent entries into the social care system, and clarification that an unborn child has a Council bedroom requirement once proof of pregnancy is given.

We are seeking to improve Leeds free school meal take-up as around 5,000 are not currently taking their entitlement.

THE LORD MAYOR: Please will you make your final point, Councillor Urry.

COUNCILLOR URRY: Leeds is making a start in addressing child poverty; would that others were. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: It is now four o'clock and the winding up provisions apply, so I invite Councillor Campbell to seek leave of Council to introduce the Reference Back in the name of Councillor Golton, which is a third of the way down page 10.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Downes.

COUNCILLOR DOWNES: Second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: I am calling for a vote on the leave of Council for Council Golton to move his amendment without comment. *(A vote was taken)* That is CARRIED, thank you very much. Government Golton.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: I move in terms of the Notice.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Downes.

COUNCILLOR DOWNES: I second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Can I call on Councillor Wakefield to sum up, please?

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I notice how the TV cameras have disciplined everybody today. It has been a wonderful experience.

Firstly, can I start from where Councillor Harington started from, which was the Inspiring a Generation. I can give you the news that the Government has finally announced that it will financially support the Tour de France, the Grand Depart, from Leeds in 2014. It has taken some considerable time in order to get there...

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Just say thank you.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: ...but I will thank the all-party approach we have had locally and particularly in the region with the MPs who have lobbied very hard in order to get this financial support for the tour. I know he is not here today (we have got Alan Gay and that is why it has gone smoother!) but I would also put on record our tribute to Tom Riordan, who did an enormous amount of work behind the scenes to get us where we are.

I think Councillor Harington, other than his reference to Lycra, made some very important points about having big events like the Tour, like the Rugby League, like Test cricket and like Rugby Union all taking place in the next year because you

do inspire it. The remarkable statistic that came up to us is that Leeds now is the third highest city or place, Local Authority, for sporting participation, out of 245. I do believe these events inspire and create.

I think that if you are talking about the things that Councillor Harington talked about, and Councillor Maqsood talked about, you are also talking about how that leads to better health. I know that this one event, or these events, are not going to be on their own enough. We have to do far more with our schools in sport and it really is regrettable that although there has been a U-turn on sport in schools, there is clearly not enough because if we do not get those children participating in school and taking part, we will create a lifetime legacy of ill-health for those young people in the future.

I also think what we have done by encouraging our sporting clubs by giving them 100% business rate relief is really important. 52% of our volunteers out of the hundreds and thousands do it with sporting clubs in this city and that is a real tribute to the volunteer culture and I think we have to offer support, making sure they can financially manage that with their clubs in the future. That is so important for the comments made by Councillor Mulherin on Public Health. She said it herself and I said it earlier, no one department, Public Health, call it what you like, is going to do it. It is going to require the whole of the city, the whole of the Council to make the impact we want.

I will tell you what we have done today and we have done it time and time again and it is right to do it. We can explain the problem. We can explain the problem with Public Health. What we need to do now is start doing the action.

One of the agencies that we have talked about in a different way was the market. Somebody made reference to it today. The stuff they are doing in the market is encouraging young people to cook and to buy healthy food is just the thing that will make the difference in our city.

Let me say something, because I know there is another debate on the market later on so I will not repeat about some of the things we are going to say, but John has very skilfully used his words in Scrutiny. He has politically managed a situation on Scrutiny because the give-away was how a leaflet from the Friends of the Market quoted Councillor John Procter's Scrutiny and White Paper today. John, I believe in consensus, I believe in all-party because that is what I have done, but what you do very skilfully is try to whip up political opposition to one where there is none.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Me? No.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: I will tell you how you did it, and you are on camera.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: You are on camera, I am not.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: I will tell you how you did it. In the Executive Board Report, which I can remember, so can Councillor Richard Lewis, it said the market had not been consulted on the proposals. Absolutely true. It did not mean to say there had been no consultation.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: It did say that.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Frankly, if you had seen the outcome of that consultation, you would see we have listened. We are not knocking down a quarter of the market at all. In fact, we are investing £13.2m to improve it.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: £12.2.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: John, if you really mean all-party, get together with Richard, join us and try and make that an asset for the future.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: It has just gone up by a million, Richard. You had better find the extra million.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Today we saw something else, highly political. We saw the Conservative Party's competition to be the candidate for North-West on NGT. Les Carter, by the way, his mate Keith Hampson was the one that lobbied for the Supertram to go up into the route in North-West.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: He was a fool, the man, a fool.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: He has since repented.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Very convenient. Poor old Barry Anderson, who is dying to be the North-West candidate, and I hope you are, is now competing with Clive Fox and the others, so what you got today was as complete load of political nonsense and the Liberals, of course, are using this as a lifeboat for their election next year.

Let us get it absolutely straight. For 20 years this Council on an all-party basis has been lobbying Government because we were the only big city in Europe without a modern public transport system.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Trolleybuses are not modern.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: That is something that your Government, Les, has just signed up. Your Government's Treasury has said it is a good scheme, it is value for money and what is more you can have it, and there you are, all of your future candidates in North-West...

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: I am too old.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: ...are actually criticising your own Government for assessing the plans, passing the plans and doing it. How opportunist can you be. *(interruption)*

It is ridiculous because no-one has ever mentioned today in the debate about public transport, and we are talking about public health, how we needed to get rid of the rat-running, the pollution, the accidents, the congestion that all lie in North-West Leeds and has got worse – has got worse – and you have no solutions for the community having to put up with drivers taking different routes to get to the North-West. I think that is a really important issue when you talk about public transport.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: You wait till that public inquiry goes on.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Frankly, I listened very carefully, there is absolutely no vision. What you want to do is say let's have nothing in the city.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: You are not listening.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: If my colleagues could have spoken today – and I am sure they will in the future because I am convinced it will come back – what

we should have been saying is this is the start of a fully publicly integrated transport system, Councillor Bentley, that you talked about. This is only one component and if you look at the next ten years, we do have vision, we do have imagination and we do have the plans and resources to transform this city's transport system. I hope you can support it when it comes up.

Finally, the Scrutiny Board I think made some very important points about the pressures that are coming about to our contacts and the 134% increase in Burmantofts and Richmond Hill, but even in Wetherby, John, which is often seen (not by me but by some colleagues) as a rich, affluent place, they have gone up 80% in contact. Even in Otley, which is often viewed as a nice, sleepy place, Colin – how could it be with you there? – it is now seen as a place where actually it has gone up 90-odd per cent, so we know there are real pressures coming about in our city and I am not surprised.

Along with the statistics today we have seen also the comment that Councillor Urry made where there is 35,000 children in poverty, we have seen disability cut by £20,000 for 3.7m and so on and so on and so on.

Lord Mayor, I will try and finish in the time. I am pleased that we did something about the Council Tax, extending it to single parents with children under five. I am pleased we did it to carers. I am pleased we did it for disabled. I am pleased we have done something on Housing Benefit and redesignated houses. I am pleased we tried to do all the stuff we have in the Welfare system because, frankly, this administration will do everything it can to protect the most vulnerable in the city while it goes through probably the worst, unprecedented time people have ever experienced in this city as a result of the welfare cuts.

I move the Minutes, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: You have got the job already, Keith. You have got the job already.

THE LORD MAYOR: I am calling for a vote on the amendment in the name of Councillor Golton. *(A vote was taken)* The amendment is LOST.

I am calling for a vote on the motion to receive the Minutes. *(A vote was taken)* That is CARRIED.

ITEM 10 – BACK BENCH COMMUNITY CONCERNS

THE LORD MAYOR: We are now moving on to page 12, the Back Bench Community Concerns. Can I please remind Members that you have a combined speaking time of no more than six minutes, not six minutes each. Councillor Bruce, please.

COUNCILLOR BRUCE: I welcome the potential benefits that HS2 could bring, especially the 33,000 apprenticeships that the Labour Party proposes – one for every £10,000 spent. The benefits could be huge for Leeds if the scheme is done right. However, I am not filled with confidence at HS2 Ltd or the Government's performance on this so far.

The news that the proposed HS2 route would come through Woodlesford came as a bolt out of the blue for both residents and Councillors.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Is this part of the integrated transport, Keith?

COUNCILLOR BRUCE: Even though it will affect hundreds of constituents.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: HS2 no good but the trolleybus is.

COUNCILLOR BRUCE: Can you give me the courtesy of listening like I listened to you?

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: I might. Depends what you say.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: It is an audition for the Elmet seat.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: So we hear.

COUNCILLOR BRUCE: Some Woodlesford residents have been absolutely devastated to find out that their quiet, picturesque and beautiful canal side community will potentially be fundamentally changed with a 60 foot viaduct in Woodlesford to carry the high speed train.

The HS2 consultation has so far been a complete sham and HS2 Ltd and the Government have shown utter contempt for local people. As elected Councillors there has been no attempt by the Government or HS2 Ltd to contact us or residents directly, simply leaving us to find things out for ourselves and hindering our ability to do our job and help our constituents.

No letters were sent to my constituents in the path of HS2 but residents in Bridgewater Place in Leeds City Centre got their letters, although HS2 is going nowhere near them. The so-called consultation is an absolute shambles.

It just shows the incompetence and staggering contempt of the views and needs of local people and makes me question just how genuine the consultation process actually is.

Residents in the path of HS2 are left in limbo with their lives effectively put on hold, not knowing what they may or may not be entitled to. House prices have already plummeted and some may even not be saleable any more.

I would like to praise those residents who are working together and have formed an action group called SOWHAT. I think it is essential for all parties that represent Rothwell and Swillington to work together. There have been a series of public meetings on the issue which Councillors have attended but because of the vacuum that has been left by the lack of consultation, it has been hijacked by the Say No to HS2. That vacuum needs to be filled in a more positive way.

Of course, the Tory and Lib Dem Government has already demonstrated its incompetence in managing transport with the fiasco of the West Coast Rail Franchise, so Patrick McLoughlin needs to get a grip on his department.

Rothwell Council has finally got a response to our request from HS2 for a meeting and we recently met with the Chief Executive of HS2, Alison Munro, while she was in Leeds for the Buy Yorkshire Conference a couple of weeks ago. Whilst it was disappointing she did not give us any assurances on compensation and other issues that residents are concerned about, the main thing to come out of the meeting was that we got a promise that two senior representatives will be coming to Leeds to meet with the Councillors, the MP, the Leader of Council and the Chief Executive.

Just to sum up, these Leeds residents have been so badly let down by HS2 and by the Government and they need our help as a Council to try and make sure that they get some answers because they badly do need them. Thank you.
(*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Nagle.

COUNCILLOR NAGLE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Thank you, colleagues, for allowing me to speak on this issue.

HS2, as has been said, has the support of all the main parties and when finished we have no doubt it will be of great benefit to the country at large and to our community here in Leeds. I question, however, the manner in which this project is being planned and the manner in which it has been made public to those affected.

The families involved in Woodlesford found out the route was going past their houses in the media. They had had no contact from HS2. One of the many complaints they have made is that there has been no contact from HS2. These people are understandably very upset and very frightened and are now living in pretty much unsaleable homes. In some cases sales have fallen through.

My main concern about this whole project is this – what is going to happen to them over the next 20 years as this project comes to fruition? Are they supposed to put up with this? Most of these families will fall outside of any compensation scheme however it is drafted, and yet they are still blighted by it. No wonder they are frightened and angry about the scheme.

As Karen has told us, the only people who are actually talking to them are the Stop HS2 brigade, who are giving out biased information with their wonderful white elephant. HS2 has basically not spoken to anybody about anything ever, and that is a little bit depressing and frightening.

If HS2 keep to their original plan they are going to start building in 2027 and complete in 2033. This is a staggeringly long lead time for a project and I question why the details of the work from Birmingham to Leeds were released this early, but there you go. I would not have done that, but that is just me.

THE LORD MAYOR: Please will you make your final point, Councillor Nagle.

COUNCILLOR NAGLE: Can I just reiterate again, my main concern is for the families concerned. They are stuck in unsaleable homes and they are very frightened. Thank you. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Richard Lewis.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I can do very little other than agree with my two colleagues about the impact of this scheme on their residents. I have to say that as Executive Board Member I, along with Councillor Wakefield, had various discussions with HS2 but not about where the route would go. We had discussions about where the station would end up and I think I feel deeply frustrated that we were not consulted about the route of the HS2 and quite how it would impact coming from Wakefield into Leeds and then back out again.

We could have had a really good discussion, I think, on the basis of all the information and we could have been far more helpful, instead of which it was just, "You can talk to us about the station and that's it."

It does not take a huge leap of imagination to put yourself in the place of any residents who would have woken up one morning, looked and thought, "What a lovely day it is" – by the end of the day they were facing perhaps financial ruin, certainly a complete change in their lives because you are talking about a scheme that will have massive impact not on a huge number of residents, but on those residents who will be affected it will be absolutely devastating. They live in what I describe as a backwater, a nice part of the world but a very quiet part of the world and suddenly what have you got as your neighbour? You have got HS2.

I think all I can say is that we will be having future meetings with HS2 and the thing we will be trying to do is to engage with them on this whole issue of how it impacts over so many years, because we are talking about 20 years. If it were five years it is exactly the same discussion we had about the city centre. I hope to see HS2 come about but what if 17 years in we are talking about it not happening? It just does not bear thinking about.

We will engage with HS2 when they come up and talk to us about this key issue. It will not be unique to Leeds, we will have other communities across the country equally affected. We will do whatever we can to push for some kind of scheme that gives some kind of compensation to people, because I can see that houses will be unsaleable until people are aware of exactly what happens. That is all I can say. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ann Blackburn.

COUNCILLOR A BLACKBURN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I wish to speak on the subject of obstacles on pavements and forecourts. I remember some time ago a blind man contacted me stating that a post had suddenly appeared in the middle of the pavement. It was on a route he walked often and he felt confident that he knew where everything was on it. That was until the post appeared in the middle of what he regarded as the pavement.

When I took the matter up, I found the post had been placed at the back of the pavement by Highways. The land at the back of it was a shop forecourt but as both areas were tarmaced and there was nothing separating the two, pedestrians used it all as pavement. I did get the matter rectified but there are many such cases where posts, lamps, litter bins, telecommunication cabinets etc etc, are put in place without a thought being taken as to whether they will cause an obstruction to blind people, people in wheelchairs and people with pushchairs.

When telecommunication companies apply to put their equipment on Highways-owned pavements, this can cause a problem if there is a forecourt at the back of it which is tarmaced in line with the pavement and it is regarded and used as pavement by pedestrians. Surely, planning should suggest that the companies approach the owner of the forecourt for their equipment to be put on their land in such cases.

I ask Highways, Cleansing and Planning Departments to think before they approve anything fitted on pavements, walkways and forecourts and ask themselves this simple question – will putting it here cause an obstruction for people who are blind, who are in a wheelchair or are wheeling a pushchair? If the answer is "yes", please put it somewhere more sensible.

Also, there is a problem with some refuse collectors leaving wheelie bins in the middle of the pavement after they have been emptied and perhaps this is something Councillor Dobson could take up.

I now ask that you bear these things in mind so that we can make things more accessible for these pedestrians. Thank you. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Richard Lewis.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Can I thank Councillor Blackburn for bringing this issue up in Council. I think what you said has been common sense. I do not think anybody could disagree with what you say. I am sure my colleague Councillor Dobson was listening in terms of the impact on refuse collectors. I will happily take up the issue with officers to try and ensure that it does not happen in the future. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Wilkinson.

COUNCILLOR WILKINSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am greatly concerned at the threatened closure of Primrose Hill Nursing Home in Boston Spa. This was a purpose built facility about 40 years ago and is considered home to 33 elderly residents, many of whom are 90 years of age and over.

Social services contend that there is an over-provision of nursing home places in Leeds as a whole, but they have identified that there is an under-provision in the North-East of the city, which includes both Wetherby and Harewood wards. May I remind Members that it is only a few years ago that the Education Department identified an over-provision of school places and proceeded to close schools. Now there is an under-provision and we are in the process of having to build new schools or extending existing ones. Closing and selling off capital assets like our care homes is not good policy when the demographics are that the numbers of older people is booming. The Council taxpayer will end up having to build new care homes all over again.

In my view, public services provision should remain within the public sector where quality and accountability are the required standard. We owe our residents nothing less. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lamb.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would like to echo the comments of Councillor Wilkinson. We have grave concerns about the proposals to close Primrose Hill, which is a much loved and valued facility in our area that is used in a very wide catchment area of the city. It will be very easy for us to take the tack that the now Administration used to take in attacking Councillor Harrand for doing exactly what they are trying to do now but that would not get us anywhere at all, I do not think.

Lord Mayor, the majority of the residents in Primrose Hill Care Home are over 90 years of age – all but two of the current 28 residents are over 90 years old. Many have been there for quite some considerable time. I appreciate with the nature of care as things move forward and change people will want to stay in their own homes for longer, they will need this type of residential care for less time, but my concern is for the people that are there now and their families who are gravely concerned about the future of their relatives and the residents of this home.

I think it is a short-sighted decision and we have grave concerns that the consultation is deeply flawed for two reasons. One, the simple fact that the money was taken out of the Council's budget before the consultation was announced. That cannot be right. That has just given the impression to people that the decision has already been taken to close it and the consultation is meaningless. The second fact

is that the consultation has been announced as a proposal to close the care home, rather than a proposal to look at the options for the future.

What we know in our community is there is a real passion and determination to look after and care for this vital facility and if the department is willing to work with our community, we can find and explore all sorts of options and opportunities to protect this asset for the future.

We have offered, and I hope Councillor Yeadon will accept, that we would like to have a much more detailed public consultation event in our ward on an OVA style to really enable the community to get involved in understanding the issues and to put forward some serious proposals for how we can protect Primrose Hill in the future.

The residents that are there now need this facility now. There will be many people in the future that need this kind of provision in our community, we believe, and our community is passionate about this facility, and we believe that there is the opportunity to save it and protect it. The staff that are there provide wonderful care to the residents that are there now. They deserve our support, the residents deserve our support and, Lord Mayor, I really, really hope that on this issue the Administration will change their minds and work with our community to find a way to keep Primrose Hill open. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Yeadon.

COUNCILLOR YEADON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I think it is sensible and only right to start off by saying I completely and we all completely understand that this is a subject which causes stress and anxiety and has to be dealt with as sensitively as possible, and that is something that we have committed to and we intend to see the consultation go through in that manner.

I just want to reiterate the point that this is a genuine consultation, and I think this has been my mantra for months now. Please judge us on what we have done previously and the first round of consultations that we did regarding our Residential Care Home Strategy really demonstrated that it was proper consultation. At the beginning of that consultation people said, "This is a done deal, you have already made your minds up" but we learned so much through the consultation, we gained a lot from what communities had to tell us, that we changed the proposals and what was agreed at Executive Board was very different to the proposals that had been consulted on previously. That is exactly the way that we intend for this consultation to take place. We want to hear what people have to say.

We are committed to taking part in a workshop-style consultation event, and I know we have had lots of meetings and I expect we will have lots more meetings in the future. I have committed to meeting, in the next couple of weeks, with the Save Primrose Hill Group and will continue to speak with people and have offered every single person who has contacted me personally the opportunity to meet and listen to what they say.

We have got a huge challenge ahead of us. You only have to see what was in the press and on the telly today – Sandie in her role as President of ADASS spoke very eloquently on the radio and on the TV around the challenges we have got in social care and the fact that we have to find some way of meeting the increasing and changing demand for older people with the tight financial circumstances that we currently have. It is a massive challenge but I absolutely accept that the best way of doing that is through negotiation, consultation and working with all ward Members of political parties to try and find a solution for their communities, so I am committed to that.

Councillor Wilkinson, public services to remain in the public sector – a man after my own heart, on the wrong side of the Chamber.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: You are on the wrong side of the Chamber, Lucinda, you should be over here.

COUNCILLOR YEADON: I don't think had a change of heart recently. I think we are all absolutely committed to public services and if we were in a different time with a different financial situation, we would be having a different debate and wouldn't it be great if the Local Authority could itself build residential homes and older people's housing for the future? We do not have the funding to do that and I think we would be living in a virtual world if we pretended that we did. What we have to do is work within our means, work with partners that we can work with and find solutions for the future as effectively and creatively as possible, and I hope we can have some of those discussions in Wetherby and in the other areas to find those solutions together. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lay.

COUNCILLOR LAY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would just like to take a few minutes to talk about the Otley Business Improvement District Initiative, also known as the BID, and why Otley needs one.

There are now well over 200 Business Improvement Districts in the UK, now well established, but as yet we do not have one here in Leeds. I want Otley to be the first.

Of course, we all know Otley has a lot to be proud of – its history, its character and its people. It has a number of undoubted assets as a community but there is also a growing realisation that additional investment is needed to help Otley to move forward successfully into the future.

Otley must adapt to the increasing changes in the way people live, work and spend. Online retailing, out of town retail parks and difficult economic times are just three of the key factors affecting small market towns like Otley.

Today, the choice for Otley's town centre businesses is stark. It is either a reactive and piecemeal approach reliant on a handful of individual businesses who rely on investments which are almost entirely dependent on the availability of increasingly scarce public resources, or it could be about taking a proactive and cohesive approach involving the whole business community, where collaboration brings with it the benefits of shared experience and common objectives, and a pot of money to do with as they, the business community, sees fit.

This is where a Business Improvement District helps, as it is an opportunity to self manage and self fund. The Council does not administer the BID pot of money. The Otley BID Ltd team does. It would be a company limited by guarantee and the directors would be drawn from the business community. It is an opportunity to develop private and public relationships and a collective effort and drive towards sharing a vision and, perhaps most importantly, it gives businesses a strong local voice without the role of local politics and politicians having an undue influence – something I find rather appealing.

It also allows innovation, such as in Preston they spent some of their BID money on supporting the police and reducing crime by 10% in the town centre; or in Kingston, London, which was the first UK BID area, where they have a free

cardboard recycling scheme for businesses that has recycled over 250 tons of business-generated cardboard; or our near neighbours in Skipton who have offered free business training and workshops on diverse subjects such as the psychology of the customer, training on fire and first aid as well as business mentoring, to name a few. Indeed, since Preston obtained their BID status they have been able to demonstrate an increasing footfall in their town centre of 232,000.

How will it work? Put simply, the 500 or so businesses are asked to vote on whether they wish to levy a one per cent charge on their rateable value for the next five years. A new vote then takes place every five years thereafter and if a critical mass of businesses – and I do not wish to bore anybody here with the details of that – then a Business Improvement District will be created. A successful “Yes” vote will lead to a start date of April 2014. The levy money is then collected on behalf of the BID team by Leeds City Council and then returned, in its entirety, to the BID team.

I know the Otley BID team. Knowing them as I do I know they are passionate about Otley because they are members of Otley Town Partnership and the Chamber of Trade. These guys know what they are doing.

This team also has the full support of Otley Town Council. Indeed, OTC has already agreed to back the BID and vote “Yes” in the official ballot. This small band of men and women have worked tirelessly over the last two years and have now reached the point where they need the help and support of Leeds City Council. They have researched the issues, they have spoken to the businesses. They know that, for example, a business with a rateable value of £18,000 will pay an extra £3.46 per week into the BID pot. They have worked out it will raise £70,000 per annum and, over the five years, more than a third of a million pounds.

Having spoken to their businesses, they know what some of their early goals are. They want cleaner streets and better lighting, improved tourism and marketing budgets, more festivals, fairs, street activities to draw customers and visitors into the town and perhaps, yes, even boats back on the River Wharfe. The point is, the business community decides how to spend the levy and the big plan will reflect those ideas.

On behalf of the Otley BID team, the business community and the ward Members, I am asking Council to support the BID because, as a Council, I believe we have some responsibilities to ensure it happens. As a partner I want the Council to use its vote to vote “Yes” in the ballot. As a partner I want the Council to offer up a few thousand pounds to pay for the cost of the independent ballot. I am also expecting the ward Members, although I have not spoken to them about it yet, and Otley Town Council to stump up some of the costs of the ballot as well, so it would very much be a shared partnership.

Finally, an Otley Business Improvement District will make a real contribution to our local economy and contribute a great deal towards achieving our shared vision for Otley. I am very proud of Otley---

THE LORD MAYOR: You did say that was your final point and the red light is on.

COUNCILLOR LAY: One paragraph. I am very proud of Otley’s attempt to be the city’s first BID area and I am aware of three other potential Leeds BID areas. This is the chance for the Council to support and encourage not just the development of the Otley BID but all the BIDS across our great city. Thank you. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Richard Lewis.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I must say I got a bit worried when Sandy was saying, "I will talk to my colleagues afterwards" because I thought shouldn't you talk to your colleagues first? That is all about collaboration and consultation that we are part of.

BIDs are part of the financial landscape that we are all looking at now. Some officers went down recently to London's West End and had, I think, a full and frank exchange with the people there about the advantages and disadvantages of the scheme that they have. Clearly there are potential advantages but it does depend very much on precisely what the scheme is, because we do not know yet, and I am sure you will understand, Sandy, that we cannot just endorse something without actually knowing what is in the package.

I can see that in somewhere like Otley where you have got the Town Partnership, where you have got a lot of networks already in existence, that it is a kind of logical progression from those to go forward with something that does guarantee you an income.

One thing that does concern me, and certainly when I talk to officers about the whole concept they were not quite sure how the voting mechanism worked and there were different views expressed as to quite how that would work in terms of rateable value and quite how that pans out. I suppose the other bit is that businesses actually support it, because there is always a tendency – and my colleague Jim McKenna was just pointing out to me that in Armley a similar proposal was floated and only one business at an early stage did support it, so it is very much about businesses getting on board this idea.

If you look at the overall picture, it is not a huge expense to them if they are prepared to have that bigger vision. I think that is about you persuading them and the Town Partnership and other people in Otley persuading them of the value of it.

COUNCILLOR LAY: There is already over 100 business backing the BID. I had six minutes. I can answer those questions.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: You got more than I got so let me finish. I think it has got huge potential. Let us see what happens, let us see what the BID actually consists of. I think we have to be honest that what works in Otley will not necessarily work everywhere else. I expect to see a BID come forward for the City Centre and again that will be very interesting, but there are so many shopping centres and shopping areas in Leeds, some of which are under real pressure, where this just is not the solution. It is one of the answers that we will have and I look forward to seeing the full proposal to come forward from Otley. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dawson.

COUNCILLOR DAWSON: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. I want to tell you today why Leeds City Council and the communities in Leeds should be supporting a scheme called Heroes Welcome. You may not have come across it, but remember it because it is an important initiative. It encourages businesses and communities to support the British Armed Forces by way of giving their personnel a warm welcome, a service upgrade or sometimes a small discount.

I would like Leeds to be a city that gives a warm welcome to members of the Armed Forces and to sign up to the Heroes Welcome Scheme. A number of Authorities up and down the country have already signed up to this scheme. The scheme started in 2008 in Scarborough when a few local businesses grouped

together - now over 500 strong and growing - to offer Service personnel special acknowledgement and some discounts.

In 2010 the Government asked the communities to show their positive support for those serving in the British Armed Forces by signing up to the Armed Forces Covenant.

I believe that taking ownership of the Heroes Welcome Scheme goes some way to fulfilling that fine aspiration. In 2012 the Royal British Legion's Community Covenant Guide to Good Practice recommends the Heroes Welcome Scheme as one in which a community can show its open support to those serving in the Armed Forces.

Local Authorities up and down the country have signed up to Heroes Welcome already. These include Town Councils such as Mirfield, Malton, Pickering, Whitby, larger Local Authorities such as Hull City Council, City of York, Doncaster Council (that is the same Doncaster Council that now has an Executive Mayor from the Labour Party), even the Green run Council in Brighton supported the Heroes Welcome Scheme.

One Council, though, has refused to support the Heroes Welcome – it is Morley Town Council. It is true. At the January meeting of Morley Town Council the Labour Group put forward a straightforward resolution that the Town Council should consider joining the Heroes Welcome Scheme to show its support for personnel in the British Armed Forces in a similar manner to other Local Authorities in Yorkshire. I believe this was a non-party political issue but to my amazement the ruling MBIs refused to support this resolution. To be clear, the entire MBI Group refused to support Heroes Welcome.

You may ask why MBI Councillors in Morley refused to support an organisation that provides help to servicemen and women from our Armed Forces. Remember, Morley was dubbed the most patriotic town in the UK. I repeat, it is the most patriotic town in the UK.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: A result of us, of course, nothing that the Labour Party has done.

COUNCILLOR DAWSON: Are the MBI against our Armed Forces? No, they provide a lot of support. Have they supported the Armed Forces on other occasions? Yes, of course they have. The answer to this puzzle is that the MBIs put political advantage and the interests of their party first and foremost, even ahead of supporting the Armed Forces of the United Kingdom.

The reason they did not support the Heroes Welcome Scheme was the proposals from the Labour Party.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dawson, I think this is a little bit unfair because the Members of the MBI do not have the opportunity to answer back.

COUNCILLOR DAWSON: The merits of the scheme, the organisation involved do not matter. What matters is they cannot be seen to support something that the Labour Party proposes. It is the worst kind of yah-boo politics. (*hear, hear*)

Hopefully this Council will agree with my sentiments for supporting Heroes Welcome. I would like to see a show of united, unambiguous support for what is clearly a caring, helpful and supportive scheme for our Armed Forces. Thank you. (*Applause*)

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: Absolutely outrage. Absolute outrage.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Gruen.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: My Lord Mayor, I have rarely been as shocked as I am now having just heard what Councillor Dawson has reported to us. Didn't we all from all sides pass a Covenant for the Armed Forces? Didn't the Leader speak out at various times? Didn't people from across the Chamber say we needed to do more about housing, we need to make things easier for those people who have given sacrifices on our behalf in the Armed Forces?

I almost thought when I first read this in preparation for today, this cannot be true.

COUNCILLOR ELLIOTT: It is not. It is not.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: It is total fabrication. Well done for recognising it.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: The Morley Boroughs would not be doing this, would they? The Morley Boroughs would not be doing this, and so I had to look at the Morley Borough Town Council Minutes.

COUNCILLOR: They have Minutes?

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: They have Minutes, they have grown-up politics there. It says here:

"To consider a motion proposed by Councillor N Dawson. Morley Town Council to consider joining the Heroes Welcome Scheme to show its support for personnel in the British Armed Forces in similar manner to other Local Authorities in Yorkshire. The motion was proposed and seconded.

Councillor Elliott proposed an amendment. This was read out but it was determined the proposal was not constitutional so it was not allowed."

They are ahead of us. Some amendments are declared unconstitutional, which is unheard of in this Authority.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: It is a better one, Peter. A better amendment.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: Therefore, the original motion proposed by Councillor Dawson was voted upon and not carried. The Morley Boroughs voted against the motion.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: It was not good enough, Peter. We expected better.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: Come on, let's not play politics about this. It really is outrageous, colleagues. The Armed Forces are far too important to be used in this way.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: Like he has used it. It is too important, yes.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: I thought Councillor Dawson's report to us was very persuasive, frankly.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: In Cherwell it would be, Peter.

COUNCILLOR ANDERSON: You do not care about this.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: Lord Mayor, I am not used to being heckled.
(laughter)

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Only by your own Group.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: Only by my own Group, yes! Really, I have to say, we did talk to the British Armed Forces and they are very warmly receptive of the work being done by Leeds and they congratulate us about the Covenant across all Council services. They believe that our approach should be built on, and is a national exemplar.

Thank you for drawing it to our attention. Can we reaffirm our Council's commitment to the Covenant and simply note that others have not done so.
(Applause)

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Lord Mayor, could I ask if the Constitution could be suspended to allow the Morley Independents to reply to a situation which this Council – I am asking what it is. They can do it or vote against it. I am asking it be suspended to give the Morley Independents, which are not my Party, who have been attacked viciously by two Members of the Labour Party (*interruption*) without the opportunity of a reply. I move that, my Lord Mayor, and I hope that Council will give them the opportunity.

THE LORD MAYOR: Is anybody prepared to second that? That is duly seconded.

COUNCILLOR CAMPBELL: My Lord Mayor, I rose to second that because I believe the agreement we had with Whips (*interruption*) - I think, Lord Mayor, it is interesting that Councillor Coupar is back and now thinks she is chairing the meeting.

THE LORD MAYOR: We have a proposer, we have a seconder. All those in favour of letting the MBIs speak. (*A vote was taken*) LOST.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: What a disgrace. Repressing debate.

THE LORD MAYOR: Before we break for tea...

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: What a shower of charlatans.

THE LORD MAYOR: ...can I just say on the Order Paper it says that the Roll of Honour will be unveiled and then people will speak. I was concerned about people coming back late from tea, coming through that door as we were unveiling the Roll of Honour, so Members will speak and then we will be unveiling the Roll of Honour.

Could I have you back at quarter-past five, please.

(Short adjournment)

ROLL OF HONOUR – COUNCILLOR SUZI ARMITAGE

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Wakefield.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Firstly, can I say what a privilege it is to be able to welcome Suzi Armitage's husband, Terry, to this very special occasion - I think he is sitting somewhere around – for the unveiling of the former Councillor Suzi Armitage's name on the Roll of Honour.

I think many of us who attended the funeral will realise how popular Suzi was with Members, officers and the community. I was very much reminded last week during the election when many people came to the door to express their sorrow about losing somebody who they dearly loved and had great admiration for.

I think in many ways there are too many things that Suzi did here to spend the next five or ten minutes on. One of the things I can recall is her making absolutely outstanding contributions to committees like Adult Social Care, to CB&R, to the Fire Authority, to Under Eights and, of course, we should not forget that she was also the iron lady of Licensing towards the end. *(laughter)*

We all know that whatever she did she did with character; she was straight talking. As Terry has just reminded me, she called a spade a shovel. I think she did it also with great determination and humour. Humour to Suzi was important. I think it allowed her, helped her, fight her illness for many years because she was a great denier of illnesses and she was a great denier of her illness towards the end, but she used to use humour to get over it.

I told a few jokes at the church, which I had to clean up for the audience in the church and I will keep them clean now. She had great stories which Terry has warned me are not all true but they did get better as the night went along. One of the stories I can remember last year, even, when she was asked about her life, what would you like to come back as if you die, she said, "I would love to come back as a pigeon because I could return all the favours" - she did not use that word! – "that people dropped on me." I have spent some time looking up at the sky quite recently. *(laughter)*

I think the best tribute that we can give Suzi is that, actually, she was the authentic voice of the people of East Leeds. As I said, she spoke their language, she understood their concerns, she actually articulated them brilliantly here and she did an enormous amount of work in the ward, particularly with the elderly and with the youth. I think there is no finer tribute to say that Suzi was a great champion of her community and of her ward.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Les Carter.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: My Lord Mayor, on behalf of the Conservative Members of this Council I would like to first of all support every word that Councillor Wakefield has said.

Her stories were fantastic. I remember once having to make a speech and I didn't have a clue – it was supposed to be a light hearted one with a few jokes. I told Suzi and she brought me some letters, which I am not going to repeat here because they were awful, which were from constituents who were asking for certain repairs to be done to the house and the way they were written, they were fantastic. I used them at a Conservative dinner and they all loved it, so I owe her thanks for that.

Suzi was known as a hard working Councillor, always there to provide help to those who needed it. She had a reputation as an outstanding ward Councillor. Whilst a strong and loyal supporter to her own Party, she also was able to deal with Members of all other Parties in this Council Chamber because she believed that was for the good of this city. She had friends across every Party in this Chamber – every Party in this Chamber.

I remember when she fought to stop the closure of the dining facilities. Do you all remember?

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Yes I do, I have got the bruises!

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: May I just say much to the dismay of all the Party Leaders, who were always surprised at the support she received around this Council. She really did know how to put out the noses of the Leaders. She fought this closure not to provide goodies for Members – that was the last thing that was in her mind, she would never allow that to take place. She fought this closure because she understood the need for Members of all Parties to come together and meet in a place where they could put party politics to one side and talk about events for the good of this city, and that is why she fought it.

She had a wonderful personality. Even during her illness she was always good fun. Amazing, I could not believe how much fun she was. She was highly respected by all Members of this Council. Indeed, my Lord Mayor, she will be remembered by all Members of this Council as an outstanding Councillor and a kind and good person. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Downes.

COUNCILLOR DOWNES: Thank you, Lord Mayor. On behalf of the Liberal Democrat Party I would like to offer my support as well for this award and echo the comments that have gone before me. It is always hard speaking third so I thought I will not prepare too much because most of it will have been said.

I remember Suzi, though, from her work on the Licensing Committee on which I have served for many years and she was certainly a formidable lady, and very forthright in her views and she stood up for what she believed in. She certainly, when it came to facing taxi drivers etc who may not have agreed with the way that she was laying down some of the rules, she stood up to them in a very determined way. The Licensing Panel had one or two challenges from certainly members of the public and she always defended not only the rest of her Panel but also officers who sometimes came in for fire. I think that is a tribute to her that she was prepared to defend those that were around her.

I was also on a sub-committee in Licensing, there are six sub-committees from the 18, and she always chaired our sub-committee. I remember towards the end she would come in, she would come in on her motorised scooter and she would always make light of it – she was never ill. Even when she was losing her voice towards the end, she still insisted on coming in and chairing Licensing Committee meetings, such was her dedication to the cause. It was really impressive to work alongside somebody who was dedicated and committed.

When you talk about some stories, Keith, you are right, she told us quite a number of them. Perhaps I will not repeat them if they are not all true but she certainly told of events within her ward and certainly within some of the pubs within her ward, and certainly some of the people she threw out of the pubs, etc. (*laughter*) She was a lady who really knew what she was about.

It was a great sadness that she passed and the Council is a poorer Chamber without her. With that I would like to say farewell, Suzi. I was not able to get to the funeral because I was away at the time so that is my chance to say so.

One last thing I always remember, every Christmas without fail we all got a Christmas card from her as Chair of the Licensing Committee and it was a wonderful touch, a very personal gesture and a very personal person. Thank you. *(Applause)*

COUNCILLOR GETTINGS: Lord Mayor, I first met Suzi when I joined the Licensing Committee and even though I am a person who originates from Councillor Wakefield's ward of Methley, I had quite a culture shock on first meeting her. To say she was a real character would be an understatement. To say that she would not mince words also is an understatement - her bluntness, colourful personality, occasionally colourful language and a no-nonsense Chairman.

I soon realised and appreciated her immense knowledge about Licensing and her immense commitment to that committee. She had a warm personality when you got to know her and her ability to communicate with ordinary people was one of her strengths. Her concerns and supports of women's issues was also something she championed.

Her observations following visits to a Licensing premises or nightclubs or other late night city economy were sometimes humorous but there was always a sting in the tail. She always had a no-nonsense serious response to those issues. She certainly left the Committee members in no doubt that her views were based on what she saw and what she heard from working people. The Council is certainly a better place having known her and her contribution to Leeds City Council Licensing matters were absolutely outstanding.

For me personally she was a warm and supportive colleague and she is certainly sadly missed by the Licensing Committee and is truly worthy of the honour that this city now bestows on her. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ann Blackburn.

COUNCILLOR A BLACKBURN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I was a Member of the Social Care Scrutiny Board in 2003 when Suzi chaired it. She was a strict Chair but firm and fair. We would often chat in the Members dining room/lounge. She once told me that her elderly mother wanted to see her married before she died. As Suzi had lived with her partner Terry for many years, she did not see the point but went along with it to please her mother. Needless to say, Suzi did not have a church wedding, she got married here in the Civic Hall.

David and I liked Suzi. She spoke her mind and called a spade a spade. If she thought something was wrong, she would fight tooth and nail to have it put right. Many will remember her fighting the cause of the small Neighbourhood Networks in her patch so they were not taken over by Irish Health and Homes.

Suzi was a fighter. She fought cancer; I hoped she would win. I told her she could win but unfortunately this was a fight she lost. I will miss her. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, colleagues, for what you have said. Between you, you have painted a very clear picture of the Suzi that I knew and greatly respected. Could I ask you, please, to stand while the Roll of Honour is unveiled.

(Unveiling of the Roll of Honour)

(Photographs taken) (Applause)

SUSPENSION OF COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES

THE LORD MAYOR: For members of the public we are at the bottom of page 13 of the green Order Paper. Councillor James Lewis, please.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Graham Latty.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: I second that, Lord Mayor.

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

EMERGENCY MOTION

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Illingworth.

COUNCILLOR ILLINGWORTH: Thank you, Lord Mayor. This Emergency Debate runs to a very tight timetable and each speaker only has three minutes to make their point. I am going to concentrate on earlier events, leaving the episode last month with Sir Roger Boyle and Sir Bruce Keogh for others to deal with. Although recent events are very important, this seems the most efficient use of the speaking time.

It is difficult to get across to the public the sheer deviousness of the Safe and Sustainable Review. After 34 years in politics I have seen nothing to match it. Sometimes I wonder if the whole of Government is contaminated by deceit and trickery in the style of Yes Minister comedies. Does this have any connection with the mess that we are in?

The whole of our database of documents is available to Leeds Councillors and Group Officers on our computer network. We have just added a couple of new items which I mention today. These were already in the database but tucked away inside other documents and a bit difficult to find. These details are typical of events over the last five years, so it is instructive to look at what took place.

Appendix Y is part of the decision-making business case. This large bundle was released to the public after the final decisions were taken by the JCPCT on 4th July 2012. Up to that point very few of the Safe and Sustainable reports had been published and most of the business was transacted behind closed doors. The Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee – the JHOSC – repeatedly tried to get more information since 2011 but access was unlawfully refused.

The key statement is in the third paragraph:

“Projected activity levels for each centre in the various potential options are shown in appendix AG.”

In 2012 there was no appendix AG, nor did the Safe and Sustainable documentation give any indication where it might be found. We tracked it down to the pre-consultation business case in 2011, finally published on 13th May, towards the end of the consultation process, long after the other documents were available.

Appendix AG uses a different numbering system to the other consultation documents. The main document used A, B, C, D. In this appendix it is 2, 14A, 6 and 8. It sounds like lottery numbers, doesn't it? (*laughter*) The ultimately successful option was 14A and if you study the table in appendix AG you can see that at 14A Southampton and Bristol both failed to achieve the absolute minimum of 400 procedures per year and Newcastle only made it by physically compelling people from Yorkshire and Humberside to go there against their will. In other words, the ultimately successful scheme failed to deliver on the central target for the entire exercise.

Option 8 (otherwise known as D) was the only one to include Leeds. Although it was rejected, it easily met the target on all counts.

Curiously, by the time these figures came back to the second public meeting of the JCPCT over a year later, the previous estimates had mysteriously changed. The favoured centres now apparently had sufficient patients but another strange thing had happened. Table 4.2 in the Health Impact Assessment purports to show the movement of patients between hospitals – suddenly it did not add up. It had previously been correct, or at least believable, but now patients appear from nowhere and every single line is wrong. Despite repeated requests, Safe and Sustainable is completely unable to explain these discrepancies and has refused to enter into a debate.

How did all this happen? It might have some connection with the almost total exclusion of medics and politicians from Yorkshire and the Humber from the decision-making process and the considerable over-representation of the numerous secret advisory groups. It might also reflect the fact that four members of Professor Kennedy's Independent Expert Panel proved to have close connections with the hospitals that they were supposed to be assessing. Despite repeated requests, Safe and Sustainable refused to publish full details of their individual scores.

Conscious of the need for speed I am going to break off at this point but there is more to this particular tale that I will share with you at a later date. We should, however, remember that the recently published mortality statistics provide no statistical support for closing any of the existing centres and that all the desirable changes in duty rosters and surgeon training are capable of being achieved in other ways. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Latty.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Lord Mayor, when I sat down to try to find something to say in this motion I started assembling facts, and then I thought, well, John Illingworth has assembled all the facts and I am sure he is going to present them to everybody and, let's face it, we have all seen how much information he has put at our disposal. I thought no, let's not bother about the facts too much; let's think about people. It is really about people is what we are talking about – mothers, fathers, tiny babies, surgeons, doctors, nurses and it is about Leeds, the Leeds that we all love and the hospital that we all love.

This scandal puts a smear on Leeds's reputation. It hurts all of us but, more importantly, it brings worry and heartache to parents and it impugns the reputations of those dedicated people who have made our children's heart unit what it is.

I do not say “was” because most people still value that unit and what it has done for so many little lives. Indeed, surgeons and nurses came from hospitals in London to this unit and found that all the procedures were very good and that some were exemplary.

The Independent Reconfiguration Panel Report – and that is a mouthful – into the Safe and Sustainable Review and the processes that they used is the biggest that has ever been produced by that Panel. It is now languishing on the Secretary of State’s desk. Until he knows that the High Court ruling is not going to be overturned he cannot publish it, or it would be unwise to publish it, so our unit and the doctors, nurses, surgeons, continue to work with a cloud over them. It is totally unfair and totally unjust.

If you just go back to the review for a moment, why was there nobody from Yorkshire and Humber on the Review Team? Why was credence given to the North American data that was used as a comparator when in actual fact it was based on small units, completely different from anything over here? Why were factual and arithmetical errors in the Health Impact Assessment and Decision Making Business Case left unchallenged? There are so many questions and so few answers.

There is no way that we can address the debate without mentioning Sir Roger Boyle and Sir Bruce Keogh. Roger Boyle has been totally partisan in his words and deeds, which can only be taken as intended to undermine Leeds’s position. Sir Bruce Keogh was really a victim in that he could not do other than order a closure – he was damned if he did; he was damned if he didn’t.

Going back to the beginning, all these errors, misjudgements and perhaps untruths are nothing when compared with what the real victims of this scandal have to bear. I think that today our real message is to those people – quite simply, we have not forgotten about you and we will do all we can to set things right.

Lord Mayor, I support and second this motion and I add the Conservative Group’s voice to the call for a fresh and public appraisal. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Mulherin.

COUNCILLOR MULHERIN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would like to support the White Paper tabled by Councillor Illingworth. The Safe and Sustainable Review of children’s heart surgery has been a lesson in how not to conduct a review of any vital public service. There has been a complete lack of transparency and accountability. When I was chairing the Regional Scrutiny Board and before when Councillor Dobson was chairing that Committee, the Chair of the Decision Making Joint Committee of Primary Care Trusts repeatedly ignored requests to attend the JHOSC and answer Yorkshire and Humber Members’ questions. Documents essential to our consideration of the impact of this review were deliberately withheld. The final Health Impact Assessment was finally published after all consultation was ended. The Price Waterhouse Cooper’s Report into travel and access was likewise published after we had been obliged to submit our initial report, and the Kennedy scores, which formed the basis of the Quality Assessment of the ten units operating on children with congenital heart conditions, were withheld throughout.

The only meeting of the Decision Making Panel that was held in public was the final meeting on 4th July last year, when well-rehearsed arguments were made to justify their preferred option, which proposed the closure of Leeds, Leicester and Brompton children’s heart surgery units.

It became clear at that meeting and in documentation that Councillor Illingworth and others have successfully brought to light through Freedom of Information Act requests, legal letters and use of a full range of Scrutiny regulations, that the Yorkshire and Humber Regional Scrutiny Board's initial report had effectively been ignored, as had the 600,000 name petition submitted by people from across our region in support of retaining the Leeds unit. That petition was counted as just one submission in the formal consultation, whereas thousands of text responses elsewhere were counted as separate replies.

The reasoned arguments for retaining the Leeds unit with its genuine co-location, excellent networks, continuity of care for adults who are treated by the same expert team in Leeds, and second to none transport connections across the region to ease transfer of patients and access for their families are well known in this Chamber. The review failed to consider the impact on adults and the consultation to take place on their services is effectively predetermined by the outcome of the children's decision.

In autumn 2011 I made the first referral of this issue to the then Secretary of State, Andrew Lansley. Sadly, he did not come down in our favour at the time, preferring to give the JCPCT the benefit of the doubt. Recent events will, I hope, ensure that his successor, Jeremy Hunt, takes more interest in this issue and looks properly into what is taking place and why the closure of the Leeds unit, which is safe and sustainable, would be the wrong decision for the whole of our region.

There have also been two judicial reviews of this process brought by Brompton and successfully by Leeds. It begs the question at what cost has this flawed process been defended by the NHS? How much has been spent on legal action to defend the incompetence and arrogance evidenced in the way that the Safe and Sustainable Review has been conducted? If it had been held in public, held to account throughout, we might have reached a better outcome...

THE LORD MAYOR: Please will you wind up, Councillor Mulherin?

COUNCILLOR MULHERIN: ... for children and families who depend on it and at considerably less public expense. Lessons need to be learned from this process to prevent the same mistakes being made again. A Select Committee Inquiry might help this to be done and in the meantime implementation of the Safe and Sustainable Review will stop. Due process is not complete, the review does not stand up to public scrutiny and the public have a right to ensure that such significant decisions about their services are being made for their benefits, not for the benefit of vested interests. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Ann Blackburn.

COUNCILLOR A BLACKBURN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Let's be honest, the Safe and Sustainable Review was nothing but a sham. We all know that if you closed Leeds and people with a seriously ill child had to travel to Newcastle, that that could be fatal for the child. It is ridiculous.

There should be a children's congenital heart service in both Leeds and Newcastle, to be perfectly fair to both cities. There should be that; nothing less.

I hope everyone will support this White Paper and help John Illingworth to continue the fine work he has been doing. Thank you. *(hear, hear) (Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Golton.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Lord Mayor, I am finding it very hard to follow Ann Blackburn today. *(laughter)* She is on a stormer; succinct and to the point. I will try and follow it but I do not think I will manage it.

This saga of the children's heart unit has been an example of the NHS at its best and at its very worst. At its very best, if the NHS was a religion then the people of Yorkshire have certainly started a crusade because they would not allow this decision to be taken by mandarins in Whitehall and affect what we as a regional community would have commissioned for ourselves, because it fits our needs and it creates a standard of service which our parents require and our children have benefited from.

Of course, at the same time it also shows the worst of the NHS, which is the fact that within it there are some very unaccountable elites which are certainly not used to the vigour and rigour of public accountability and, as they say, cometh the hour, cometh the man and, Councillor Illingworth, I will never delete an email from you ever again! *(laughter)* *(Applause)*

He has taken that standard and he has been able to lead those who are more senior than him politically and take the argument forward and say to these people, "You cannot make decisions like this which affect real people and communities without expecting them to put up a real fight" and I do not think that fight is yet finished.

All I will say is, I am just amazed how little shamed-faced they are, those that are taking the decisions in the centre because you would have thought that the amount of misinformation that has been made about our children's hospital and the mistakes that have been made by people who are supposed to be senior and responsible in their decisions would have meant that they would have stepped back by now. I think the message that this White Paper will say to them is I think it is wise that you should and just leave us alone and get on with providing proper services for our children. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Varley.

COUNCILLOR VARLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Little to say, most of it has been said, but I must begin by commending the work of first of all Councillor Mulherin when she had this responsibility and the continued and extreme diligence that Councillor Illingworth has taken on this point.

The bullet points in the motion are obviously the core of the misgivings and the mismanagement and the lack of public involvement and the lack of transparency. It is just unfortunate that these decisions had not been picked up on earlier.

The heavy-handedness of the NHS England on the very day that they became responsible for the new regime in this country, marching into our heart unit and closing it on flawed data, which obviously the outcome was to distress parents and patients.

In the motion the final call to the NHS England, it is hoped that it is heeded and I would also like to add, if the outcome is not favourable to us in Leeds, it is not only Leeds that is affected, it is the whole of north central England which is affected and not only the children's heart congenital unit but it has a knock-on effect because we will lose the expertise of a greatly important type of surgery in our city and that will also have an effect on the area surrounding us.

My colleagues and I at the Morley Borough Independents wholeheartedly support this motion that is being brought forward. Thank you, Lord Mayor.
(Applause)

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

COUNCILLOR ILLINGWORTH: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Thank you for the kind words from colleagues. Councillor Latty stressed the effects on people; Councillor Mulherin stressed the secrecy, the way they ignored evidence, the ignoring of adults, transport issues, JR; Ann Blackburn said the review was a sham; Stuart Golton contrasted the excellent service in Leeds with the behaviour unaccountable; Councillor Varley mentioned the heavy-handed behaviour of NHS England.

It is rather a rush to get all the points in and I hope I shall manage it, but to summarise, there has been no consideration of adults, no regard for intercurrent disease, inadequate consideration of neonates, insufficient regard of co-location, little planning for the Children's Cardiology Centres, inadequate consideration for families and their travelling costs.

There is no significant difference in mortality in the UK centres. Decision Making Business Case on page 212 is not evidence of what is claimed. The Health Impact Assessment table 4.2 does not add up correctly and the activity predictions show that favoured centres will fail to meet their targets.

You must remember that spending by the National Team was four times greater in the North East than it was in Yorkshire and the Humber – four times greater than in our area – and that we were excluded from all the advisory groups. All the advisory groups met in secret; 14 out of 16 JCPCT meetings were held in secret; there were secret email discussions instead of public debate; there was refusal to disclose the Kennedy scores; there was a slow and selective release of papers on their website. The National Commission Services Panel met in secret and decided while it was inquorate. It never visited the centres it assessed. Constant bending of the rules to produce desired outcomes and a massive overlap between the members of these various secret advisory groups. No respect for the Scrutiny regulations or for the public bodies, the Admission to Meetings Act, which is Statute law.

There was a failure to declare an obvious personal interest, both in the secret advisory groups and in the Independent Expert Panel – what a joke that name is. There was a lack of evidence supporting some of the proposed changes. The American and European research referred to very tiny surgical units, much smaller than the smallest unit in the UK, and we know from the latest statistics that the large UK units perform on average slightly worse than the smaller units and therefore there is no case for change.

It is impossible to repair the Safe and Sustainable review. It was such a mess, so fundamentally undermined by secrecy, undeclared interests and personal ambition, that nobody can have confidence in it. If change is needed – and that has yet to be demonstrated – then the only way forward is a completely fresh start.

Lord Mayor, such a review must be based on reliable evidence and be conducted entirely in public so there is an opportunity to challenge and rectify mistakes. We need advice from the National Centre for Health and Clinical Excellence and we need fair representation from all parts of the country and all sections of the community. We must consider adults as well as children and the needs of the entire family, as well as meeting the needs of the affected child.

Lord Mayor, I move the resolution. Thank you. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: May I call for a vote on the Emergency Motion in the name of Councillor Illingworth, please. (*A vote was taken*) That is CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Thank you very much.

ITEM 11 – WHITE PAPER MOTION – KIRKGATE MARKET

THE LORD MAYOR: We are now moving on to item 11, the White Paper motion on Kirkgate Market. Councillor Cohen.

COUNCILLOR COHEN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I have been asked a number of times today why we are bringing today's White Paper on Kirkgate Market. Why are we seeking to re-look at a decision made at Executive Board, particularly one that was examined again at Scrutiny? Members of Council, the reason is simple. There are times when, as a full Council, for the good of the city as a whole it is necessary for us to say wait, we need to look again to get this right.

Our White Paper today is not about political point scoring. It is about recognising that at the heart of these proposals are fundamental problems and if we let them go ahead in their current form, we are going to be doing a terrible injustice to those whose livelihoods and businesses rely on the market, and ultimately we are going to be doing real damage to this city.

Several times today in the Reference Back the market was referred to as the jewel in the crown. What we should be trying to do is polish that jewel and do it in the right way.

There are a number of really serious issues with the proposals as they currently stand. One of them has been touched on, that of lack of consultation. Almost every trader I have spoken to – and I have spoken to a significant number of traders – tells me the same thing – “We were not really listened to, we were not properly asked for our views and we were absolutely given the distinct impression that nobody was really interested in what we had to say and that our views would not count for anything.”

It is a fact that the driving force of the success of this market is that group of dynamic small businesses that make it, the traders. The notion that any change should or could be brought forward without their views and thoughts being front and centre has to be a nonsense.

I have no doubt we are going to be told again – we have been told once already – that we tried to get input from traders, we went from stall to stall, we wrote to them but they would not engage. With respect, the failure to get traders to engage has to be a failure of the consultation process. Council officers, perhaps even some Councillors, may well have tried but the failure to get engagement is their failure and their failure alone. Let us not try and blame a group who, frankly, feel disenfranchised.

One of the bigger issues, even more serious, though, is that these proposals will require a significant number of traders to move stalls. How many? That is a closely guarded secret. This report suggests that some of those businesses – again, no clear number put forward – the right way forward is to terminate those leases and give them a new lease in a new unit in another part of the market. These are not like-for-like leases because these new leases will not contain within them a right to

assign, a right to pass on that business to a future family member or sell it so that they can realise some of the investment and hard work.

That sounds to me more like the actions of a Victorian era landlord, Members of Council, but it is not; it is what this Council is proposing as part of these market proposals. It is immoral.

I know it will go absolutely against the grain of Members opposite not to support the Executive in this matter. At Scrutiny Board one of your Members did feel that this matter was so serious that they felt unable to support the Executive however. They felt we did need to take a short pause, which is all we are saying – a short pause – to get some of these fundamental details correct.

THE LORD MAYOR: Please could you make your final point, Councillor Cohen.

COUNCILLOR COHEN: Absolutely. All I will say, Members of Council, is I urge you, please support this White Paper. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lamb.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: I formally second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Richard Lewis to move an amendment.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I think a number of you may have received an email from the Friends of Kirkgate Market calling on other people to lobby today's meeting. I have to say, if our proposals were so awful, where is that lobby? Where are those hundreds of people? John, shake your head – where are they? I have to say we have, how many, 400 businesses in the market, 2,000 people employed.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: They are running their businesses.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Yes, businesses that do not work at six o'clock at night, as you should know.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: How little you know.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: That shows how little you know about these businesses and how they run. Waste of space.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Quiet yourself down, lad. Wind your neck in a bit, will you, and let me finish.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: Say something interesting.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Yes, very nice. I have not had a single email from a constituent on what we are doing about the market.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Because you have got your own market in Pudsey, haven't you?

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: For God's sake, are we going to have a debate? Can I have some injury time please, Lord Mayor? Yes, we have a small market in Pudsey, as you should remember, John, because you did once stand as

Parliamentary candidate for the Conservative Party but it was not one of your finest hours, as I remember.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: You've got a Conservative MP now, haven't you?

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: The problem with the mark, I think, has been summed up by that lack of attendance.

You tend to play up this whole issue about bad relationships and I will just quote you something that Barry Anderson said three years ago when we debated this. He said:

"Personal attacks on officers of this Council by traders or by anybody purporting to stand up for traders are not acceptable."

Why did he say that? I will tell you why he said it, because our staff at the market have a hell of a time with a small number of traders whose behaviour is absolutely outrageous. I say that as somebody who has worked in public-facing jobs and having read the logs, I certainly would not have put up with the behaviour that some of our officers have to take. It is slightly irresponsible of you to endorse that kind of behaviour and that kind of attitude.

I have talked to representatives from the National Market Traders Federation, tried to engage with them. Gerry has tried it on far more occasions than I have. What you find is they are not really interested in the bigger picture of what is happening with the market. They just want to talk about micromanagement and it is very, very difficult to talk to people on those terms.

I would love us to do a proper consultation and get people to take part, but if people are not willing you cannot force it on them. That's life. I think probably they have more important things to do. As Councillor Lamb says, it is about getting on with running the businesses and that is what this is about because most market traders do not want to run the market. They want their own businesses to succeed in a market that is a good environment and we have a huge opportunity now with John Lewis, with everything that is going on down there, with BurgerGate as another nudge to people going back to proper grass roots shopping, for the market to succeed.

We have a wonderful opportunity, we have a massive potential investment coming from this Council and all we get from the party opposite is, "Oh, you should talk about deeds of assignment." This was a report on strategy, not on detail. Councillor Cohen, you have not been around this place for very long but reports that come to Exec Board do not go into all the detail about issues like that until the appropriate time and when that time comes, we will talk about them and then that is the time to make your objections heard, but all you are doing is actually scaremongering.

We have some great proposals for this market, we intend to go ahead with them and we will make the market even more of a success without the help of the group opposite. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Taylor.

COUNCILLOR E TAYLOR: Second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Leadley.

COUNCILLOR LEADLEY: My Lord Mayor, Kirkgate Market has been in steady decline for about 30 years, regardless of who has been in political control of the City Council. Lack of trust between management and traders and often lack of effective management have been persistent and underlying themes.

I am sure that the current market management team tries its best and is well intentioned but there does seem to be a tremendous gulf between management and traders which has not been helped by occasional excursions into expensive, generally unsuccessful and sometimes rather trivial legal actions as shown by the current and unnecessary dispute over the power of assignment of leases by long-established traders.

We must have a Market Management Board which is not merely advisory. It must have the power to manage and be at some distance from the City Council and its Executive Board, rather like the Board which manages the Grand Theatre and the City Varieties. There should be Councillors on the Board but above all there must be traders with full voting rights.

Investment in the market is welcome and it is overdue. What Council needs to look at most urgently is not the huge appeal of Kirkgate Market for the residents of Leeds, which the motion and the amendment claim, but the clear evaporation of much of that appeal in recent decades, as shown by the vacant stalls, the lack of any need to push to the front to grab the best bargains and the absence of any danger of being crushed or trampled by thronging crowds.

There is a historic and sentimental loyalty to Kirkgate Market rather like that which sustained the Post Office, Royal Mail, Marks & Spencer and Woolworths during periods of decline but those loyalties can be worn too thin. Woolworths eventually went under and of late the Post Office and Royal Mail never seem to justify their national treasure status, despite having tremendous reserves of public good will. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Procter.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Yes, thank you, Lord Mayor. First of all I would like to support every word that Councillor Cohen has said in his reasoned argument.

I have said time and time and time again both in the Scrutiny Board that I chaired and also at the call-in that nobody but nobody in this Council can say with complete confidence that they dealt with the market in the best way, and I say that on behalf of our Group when we were in administration albeit only three years ago.

Yes, it is challenging and testing when you have got a bunch of vociferous people who are trying to defend their livelihoods and those of their families. You talk endlessly about employment opportunities – just think how many people are employed in the market, think how many businesses have gone out of business and have closed. My Scrutiny Board spent two years coming up with a series of recommendations which every member of that Scrutiny Board agreed with – every single member – and what does it amount to? I thought we were getting somewhere and in the discussions that I have had in the run-up to those papers going to Executive Board, discussions with the Leader of Council and others, I had got a very firm indication, as had the traders themselves, that the current administration would look favourably on a joint venture company – would look favourably on a joint venture company.

Before anybody says “Oh not, that is not the case”, I have got the emails. I have got the emails from officers, I have got the emails from politicians saying that

that would indeed be a position that would be considered and, indeed, the traders, the National Market Federation traders who met – and I might say the National Market Federation, it is a bit like a union and so you elect the officers, don't you, to represent you in the union, pretty much like the market traders elect the NMTF. If you are saying that actually you are not prepared as a Council and as an Executive to respect and recognise the NMTF, that is quite a departure, isn't it? I think that is not the right way at all.

We believe that there has been support previously for the approach that we are outlining and we certainly hope that there will be again.

Just to correct and make very clear from the appendix that was put round at the Executive Board - did consultation take place and who was involved and all the rest of it - yes, some consultation was undergone, but let us be clear about this, an officer report. Traders and Members with a direct interest in the future of the Kirkgate Market have not been involved in this appraisal – have not been involved in this appraisal. It is a sad state of affairs when the majority of the traders, politicians across all parties – all parties – and the public at large have a clear, clear view and yet that is put aside for what? I suspect put aside for political dogma and that is not a good idea at all, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dobson.

COUNCILLOR DOBSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. As you have probably gathered, I am not Gerry Harper. Interestingly, I am really disappointed that Gerry is not here today because I can say he has put two years of tremendous hard work into this. He will be gutted he is not here to speak on this paper; along with Richard and the officers I think he has done a tremendous job of work.

That said, I do have a degree of empathy, I suppose, with a what of what Dan has said today and some of the key aspects of his paper around management engagement, yes, I can see that as being an issue, but what I would say is from the quite horrendous situation of two, three years ago, that is a much improved picture by the new management team who are working tremendously hard to address that and in terms of healing rifts, which I think goes hand in hand. The market of a few years ago – and it is not a political point, I think somebody else made the point, it might have been Tom – for 30 years the market has been not only in decline, it has been a 'never the twain shall meet'. The interface between the Council and the traders was non-existent or aggressive and unacceptable at best and I do not think we did ourselves any credit in that either, and I think that has been addressed.

Interestingly, three years ago now I went to Holy Trinity Church for the inaugural meeting of Friends of Kirkgate Market and there were three key themes that came out of that: the management had to improve and start listening – I suggest that is happening; listen to traders – I suggest that is happening; and thirdly, it was talk of investment, and it was not £12.3m. They wanted the roof on the 76 fixing and would have called that a draw.

I think what the strategy does is addresses those initial concerns of Friends of Kirkgate Market and the traders and considerably more besides.

We talked a lot about the past, as we always do in market debates, but let us talk a little bit about the future. This year, March/April, over Easter, 7% up in the market. I was in on Saturday last and for the first time in a long time the place was buzzing. 7% up on last year. You could say that is the Trinity bounce. I say this, I hope so. I hope so because think about it, if you can get 7% on the back of Trinity, 15 million potential footfall per annum for John Lewis and if we do not make this leap

of faith now, back the market through this strategy, I think future generations and current generations of traders will look at us and say, "This was the opportunity for you to do something substantial in Kirkgate Market and you blew it." We cannot afford to do that.

I think Richard is right, there is room to move and to look at the various aspects around the assignment of lease, all sorts of things that were not covered in the Executive Board paper but are open to negotiation and that key word, "talking" to the traders, and I think we can achieve that.

I have not really prepared anything today so if it is a bit of a stream of consciousness, just bear with me. One of the things that really does worry me is this term of "gentrification." Give over. Traders want to make money. We should be assisting them. The proposals we are looking at, the capital investment we are looking at, the linkage to John Lewis will achieve that and make the market sustainable for the next 200 years so I am asking Members of this Council to support Councillor Lewis's amendment. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ann Blackburn.

COUNCILLOR A BLACKBURN: Yes, Thank you, Lord Mayor. I have been involved with the Working Group to do with the markets and I do actually use the market as well, so I have talked to traders that have come to that Working Group but also traders when I have gone in the market. I know that something has got to happen with the market because you only have to go in there and see at the moment that half the stalls are empty and I do believe that John Lewis coming there will invigorate the market – at least I hope so. I believe it will and from what some of the traders that I have spoken to said, they believe it will as well and they want to cash in on that.

The only thing that does concern me is the matter of traders not being able to assign their leases. I do think that they should be able to. If you have had a market stall for many years you should be able to pass it on to a member of your family if you wish to do so. Even though we know with the proposals that some people will have to move and be offered stalls elsewhere with the market, I believe that that assignment should go with it and I think it is unfair not to.

Whilst I think we have got to go forward to regenerate the market, and I like the idea that was mentioned at the last Group meeting that we had with traders etc down at the Town Hall quite a few weeks ago now about having a management structure like the Grand Theatre and the traders would have seats on the Board and most of the traders thought that was a good idea and a way forward.

I totally believe that is the right thing we should be doing but I do believe we should look at the assignment of leases. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Davey.

COUNCILLOR DAVEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. As my good friend and ward colleague earlier mentioned in the afternoon, we are very proud as ward Members to have Kirkgate Market in our ward. It is an historic and central part of this great city of ours. Those of you who are keen buffs of history will recall, of course, that the city's first Aldermen and Councillors were actually market traders, so the history of the market goes right the way back to Day One.

It is not that long ago that coaches from across the country used to drop people off for day trips to Leeds Market, so it has been quite sad to see over the

years how the market has deteriorated. I really welcome the news of the £12.3m investment and, as the paper says, it is anticipated that it will see footfall increase between 10 million and 15 million, which I am sure everyone in this Chamber will say is most welcome.

You will recall when the Victoria Quarter opened with Harvey Nicks and the bounce effect that that had on the city – as soon as you mention Leeds now to anyone in London they immediately say, “Oh, Harvey Nicks” and that is the reason that they come to Leeds and the associated economic benefits that that brings.

I think that something similar could be achieved with the market if we implement a carefully thought out strategy. You will be aware of the work that Mary Portas is doing and particularly about the various cities in the UK with failing retail markets. I think there will be many Councils throughout the country and many market traders will be looking at Leeds quite enviously when they hear that a landlord is investing that amount of money in a property, and they will be wishing “Why can’t our Council do something similar?”

I am very happy to support the amendment. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Golton.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. The market has always been a very hot potato and I have always admired anybody who takes on the mantle of Market Champion because it was a little bit like being given the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland in any pre-Major Government.

I think it could be very easy to play politics with the markets but I think it would be the irresponsible thing to do. The markets have had a difficult time for quite a few years and I have seen the change from when I was a boy and used to go in there with my granddad, because we lived at Saxon Gardens flats and we went in virtually every other day, and I shop there now, and it has changed a lot. The reason why it has changed is because we have changed. Our traders have changed and nothing can remain in aspic.

I went along to one of these arty events that they had and it was some theatrical production in the market hall and they had all these actors playing out people from times past and it is very easy to get nostalgic, but some of the things that they were mentioning were things like rickets and picking up the potatoes and things that others did not want to sell or did not want to buy. We have come a long way since then.

The market, though, has a window of opportunity right now. We have the investment that we are going to have in the Harewood Quarter, we have John Lewis down the road, and we have an asset – you called it a jewel, it is an asset that really needs some care and attention. I think what has happened over the past two or three years under Sue Burgess has actually demonstrated that we do not have to have a dysfunctional relationship between what is portrayed as underdog traders and a corrupt landlord. Actually, I have seen evidence through being involved in that process of consultation and involved in how we have discussed how the market might be improved or not, and some of the ideas have been dismissed – what has come out of that is the fact that I think we do have a responsible leadership in place that can take the traders along with them, and I think we need to offer that trust at this stage because of that window of opportunity where we can make the most of one of our greatest assets in the city centre.

I have been given assurances that individual leaseholders will be addressed individually and they will have their leases individually negotiated. Now I have got to trust people on that because I was under the impression that it also included what you were talking about in terms of that value to the leaseholders. I think we have got to hold our nerve and trust those people who are in charge of taking our market forward over the next couple of years, so I will be supporting the Labour amendment. *(Applause)*

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

COUNCILLOR COHEN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. That was a fine example from, I may say, Councillor Lewis there of smoke and mirrors. On the one hand, look at the pretty picture we are painting but do not look at the dark underbelly of these proposals because there absolutely is a dark underbelly to these proposals. You had the clear opportunity today to state clearly and unequivocally that the right of traders to assign their leases will be built into any future proposals and you resolutely failed to take that opportunity. I am delighted that we are recorded today because it is there for all to see and will be for time immemorial.

As suspected, we were told that efforts were made to consult. I call to mind the old adage if three friends tell you you are drunk, you are drunk. The traders say there was not consultation, the Friends of Kirkgate Market say there was no consultation and it seems abundantly clear to those sitting over here that there was not proper consultation. I am going to apply that rule. It is all very well you saying it, Stuart, but, as I say, the rule of three says I do not think so.

Fact, that because of these proposals there has been a total breakdown between management and traders. Interestingly yesterday Friends of Kirkgate Market went into the market, did a straw poll of 96 traders – that is 25% - that is actually more than you guys managed to get involved in the consultation, I might add. Of those 76 – that is 80% - made it clear they had no confidence in the management of the market. That does not sound to me like an improving situation. Clearly we need to resolve this before we move forward.

Fact, that when these new leases are granted, there will be a vastly inferior lease to that which they currently have. It appears that there will not be a right to assign that lease. It has to be one of the bizzarest, most immoral proposals to come out of this Council for some many years.

Of course we understand and appreciate the level of investment but surely to goodness the investment has to be right. Spending £12.3m of public money on a whimsey and on an ill thought out project cannot be to the good of the city.

I realise it is a huge ask for Members opposite to ignore your Whips. I realise how fond you are of them. Nonetheless, I ask you to do the right thing and take a brief pause. Let us not in haste pass something today that is going to result in an immoral, unjust proposal going forward.

I ask you, therefore, not to support the amendment and to support the unamended motion. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: I am calling for a vote on the amendment.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: Can we have a recorded vote, Lord Mayor, please?

THE LORD MAYOR: Have I a seconded? Recorded vote.

(A recorded vote was held on the amendment in the name of Councillor R Lewis)

THE LORD MAYOR: There are 88 Members present in the Council Chamber, 74 in favour, 14 against and no abstentions, so the amendment in the name of Councillor Lewis has been CARRIED. Therefore it becomes the substantive motion.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: Recorded vote, my Lord Mayor.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: Seconded.

(A recorded vote was held on the substantive motion)

THE LORD MAYOR: There are 88 Members present in the Council Chamber, 73 have voted "Yes", 15 have voted "No", there are no abstentions so the substantive motion has been CARRIED.

ITEM 12 – WHITE PAPER MOTION - SKILLS

THE LORD MAYOR: We will now move on to White Paper number 12, Skills. Councillor Ogilvie.

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. We woke up last month on 1st April to some dramatic and alarming headlines, welfare changes hitting some of the poorest people in the country pitted against boom time for the richest. April 1st, of course, is April Fool's Day but there is nothing funny about the welfare changes of this Government.

Welcome to Cameron and Clegg's Britain – food banks opening up all over the country, pay day loans proliferating on the High Street as Councillor Wakefield mentioned earlier.

Wouldn't it be good if Government built policy using evidence and facts, not stigmatisation? What will look good on the front page of the Daily Mail, George Osborne style, is not a good way of developing policy that will actually work, so how about we start basing it on fact, not fiction? Like the fact that just over half the welfare bill goes on pensioner benefits, with the next largest amount to people in low wage work. A minority of the welfare bill is spent on out of work benefits.

I want to give a real life example of someone in Leeds who may be harmed by the welfare changes of this Government. Jacob is a 27-year old living in Leeds, born with spina bifida. He works as a data support officer and ward clerk in the renal dialysis unit. Key to him being able to work has been his eligibility for DLA and the higher rate mobility component which qualifies Jacob to purchase a car on the Motability Scheme.

As you know, DLA has now been replaced by this Government with a Personal Independence Payment and with that a whole new set of assessment criteria which have been uniformly criticised by disability bodies around the country. For Jacob there is a very real danger that he will lose his motability vehicle, which would mean he could no longer get to work and would therefore have to give up his job, which would be an utter catastrophe and an absolute scandal.

Lord Mayor, the point of this White Paper is that we are arguing that we are much better placed at devising programmes that will actually help to get people to

work than the policies devised by this Government such as the Work Programme, which has been an unmitigated disaster. Contrast that with what we are actually doing here, whether it is through our network of Job Shops, we have supported over 3,000 people into work over the last year; whether it is through our Community Learning Trust chaired by Councillor Mitchell, which is providing adult learning in community settings - we have supported over 7,000 adults to re-engage with learning and gain new skills, helping them on their journey as we move them closer to the jobs market; or whether it is our work on apprenticeships – over 7,000 new apprenticeship starts in the city or the 900 new apprentices we have taken on as a Council over the last few years.

I am going to give this Government a little bit of credit for City Deal. Governments do not generally like ceding power and this Government has done the City Deal, so I give them credit for that. We have used City Deal here in Leeds to establish our Apprenticeship Training Agency and we are also using it to help get 1,100 16 and 17 year olds currently classed as NEET back on to the straight and narrow via the Devolved Youth Contract.

I want just to give you a very quick example of another person who has benefited from the Devolved Youth Contract. John is a young 16-year old classed as NEET who found himself homeless after falling out with his father. He is working with the West Leeds charity BARCA and John was provided with a keyworker, who will work with him for up to twelve months. The keyworker has helped get him on to a course with the College of Building, has helped to find him housing and helped get him Income Support.

THE LORD MAYOR: Please will you wind up, Councillor Ogilvie.

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: The point I wanted to make is that we as a Local Authority are much better placed at the role of developing employment and welfare schemes and we are calling on the Government to devolve much more power in this area down, and I move this White Paper. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Mitchell.

COUNCILLOR MITCHELL: I second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Golton to move an amendment.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: That was quick! Lord Mayor, I think this is an unfortunate White Paper. I got into the last debate talking about how you should not unnecessarily do things politically. The wording of this paper is facile, basically. You are talking about all these marvellous opportunities that you are providing but the Government is such a badly performing body on this field. Let me remind you about the 900 apprenticeships that you are supposed to have had started in the Authority. The Authority is not employing new people, therefore it does not have the apprenticeship opportunities for new people. All your apprenticeships are basically your present staff who have qualified for an NVQ apprenticeship, so you are not actually providing new opportunities for people.

In terms of the other success that you are talking about, you talk about the ATA, the Apprenticeship Training Academy. The Apprenticeship Training Academy is a body which has been set up by being in conjunction with Government. The reason why we were able to get that City Deal which allowed you to set up the ATA is because of the leadership of Councillor Wakefield. He set up the Commission for Local Government, he talked about civic entrepreneurship, he talked about getting more out of partnership and, like an adult, went to the Government and said, "We

want a strong adult relationship with you, we want a partnership, we want to show you what we can achieve and then through doing so we can then give you the trust that you can devolve more down to us because we are a proven deliverer of such things.”

To put a White Paper Motion forward which basically says, “Do you know what, Government, you are useless at everything that you do”, even though they produced 500,000 apprenticeship start ups which were real apprentices, young people who were actually entering the jobs market, which compares to just 280,000 in the last year of the Labour Government, so do not talk to them about delivery because at the moment we cannot demonstrate it. If you are really serious about demonstrating delivery so that they will devolve even more down to you – because I support this welfare stuff coming down to Leeds City Council because we know where it fits best within our own communities, we know where the need is, we have the knowledge, but you do not get that by “dissing” the people who you want to have the devolution from and not delivering yourselves. If we do not get our act together and start actually talking to some of those small and medium sized enterprises that there are in this city, we will not get that backing that we need to make the Apprenticeship Training Academy a success, because we will not have the places to put those young people.

That is why we put in our amendment those Business Engagement Officers that we would have in each of our communities and it is through doing practical things like that that you will get the delivery which will get you the trust, which gets you devolution, not through rhetoric, not through piss poor – I am not sure if I am allowed to say that! (*interruption*) not through heart-rending, you hope, examples of individual people who are finding it tough. You help people who are finding it tough by giving them an absolute resolution to their problem, not by rhetoric in the Council Chamber. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Campbell

COUNCILLOR CAMPBELL: I second that, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lamb to move a further amendment, please.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I will try and temper my language in light of the TV cameras.

To listen to Councillor Ogilvie you would think that before 2010 we lived in some kind of social Utopia where everybody had a job, everyone had the skills they needed, there was no unemployment in the country but let us have a reminder, since we are going to start attacking Governments, of what things were like before 2010. Let us remind ourselves what things were like during the boom years when the economy was thriving under the last Labour Government when there were never less, in the decade leading up to 2008, then five million people unemployed in this country. That is true. When they left Government in 2010 they were just sort of a million young people unemployed in 2010 when they left office. That was after a decade of growth and they have the tenacity to come here and attack this Government about skills and jobs. Why are there so many young people today who do not have the skills they need to get the jobs that there are? Let us not forget, there have been a million private sector jobs created since 2010.

The big challenge for employers – and we have seen from Councillor Lewis how little people on that side understand about people trying to run businesses – he thinks, as he said, that business starts when the door opens in the morning and it finishes when it closes at night. Those people who run businesses...

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: I did not say that at all.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: You said exactly that, Councillor Lewis, you said exactly that.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: It will be on camera if you want to check.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: People who actually run businesses know the hours and graft that they have to put in and the key, the absolute key to getting jobs for people in this city and in this country is to work more closely with the private sector and in particular with small and medium sized enterprises.

If every single small business in this country were able to create one job, there would be no unemployment in this country – one job for every small business. I can tell you as someone that has been desperately trying to fill a full-time vacancy now for eight weeks, and in eight weeks I have had twelve applicants – two from Slovenia, one from Estonia, one from South Africa and a host from all around the country but I cannot get anybody to fill the job that is suitable. It is full-time, it is well paid, it is a permanent position and part of the problem is that the young people in particular who have applied do not have the soft skills. I will give you the details at the end, if you know people then please, please let me know. I am sure there are a few people on that side that could do with a job but do they have the suitable skills and that is what this is all about.

There are two things instead of the usual problem over there, what Councillor Ogilvie does is blame somebody else for all the problems, try and start doing things here. There are two things we need to do. We need to make sure that people in this city have the skills they need to take the jobs that they are. A lot of it is soft social skills. The big challenge is getting people who can turn up on time, getting people who will come to work day after day and are ready to do the hard work that needs to be done out there. There are businesses that are waiting to offer jobs and opportunities.

We have seen in the State of the City meetings how lamentable we are at engaging with business. We think talking to the CBI who represent 7% of all businesses in the city constitutes engagement with business. It does not. We need a real and serious engagement with businesses in this city. They are the ones that can tell you the skills that they need to fill the positions they have to help them grow and create more jobs in the future.

Lord Mayor, this administration needs to stop blaming the Government, get its act together and start doing something in this city to work with businesses, to create opportunities for people who need them. I move the amendment, Lord Mayor.
(Applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Latty.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: Seconded.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Finnigan.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am a little disappointed with this White Paper. I am a great believer in political knockabout and this afternoon we have seen Councillor Dawson's contribution, which has been entertaining – inaccurate but entertaining – and sometimes that is a good thing, but I think we let the unemployed down at the point where we have this sort of political knockabout.

My colleagues on the right will point to *you* on the left and argue your mismanagement of the economy has led us to this particular position and youth unemployment was increasing up to 2010, and that is accurate. A certain accuracy with what they said.

You will say it is all the fault of this nasty Coalition Government and they have done this and they have done that and there is a certain accuracy that some of the decisions that they have taken have been poor ones that have not helped and assisted. We can have another political knockabout and we can play the blame game but that does not really help and assist in terms of providing the skills that the unemployed need to try and get into work and reduce unemployment.

In terms of welfare reform there is no argument at all that everybody agrees that welfare reform is necessary. The Labour Government commenced its own welfare reform in 2008, the ESA reforms, the bedroom tax was introduced by yourselves in 2008 in the private sector. That is accurate. Some of the new reforms that the Coalition have come up with, the bedroom tax, Council Tax reduction, are entirely bonkers and ought to be scrapped. They clearly are not going to work in any shape, way or form.

Having all of this political knockabout and trying to blame people is not going to help and assist. What we do need is a localised approach where we decide what we can do along with local employers, small, medium and large, and we discuss with them how we can best provide those skills that are absolutely necessary. We need to get youth unemployment down but it is inevitable that while ever we play this political knockabout, the people we fundamentally let down are the unemployed.

What we do need is a unified approach that looks at providing the skills that are required locally and getting those unemployed people into work. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ann Blackburn.

COUNCILLOR A BLACKBURN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I think what Councillor Finnigan has said I wholeheartedly agree with, so I am not going to repeat it. We do owe not just the young people but all the people who are out of work some form of employment. We should, if they need training, be able to provide that but we need the jobs and there is not the jobs out there. I appreciate what Councillor Lamb said that there is sometimes jobs there that people cannot do, there is quite a lot of jobs out there that people have to have high qualifications for and if you have not got them, well, let's be honest, there are plenty of people out there who have. There is a lot more people looking for jobs than there is jobs and that is the problem, is it not?

What happens then is that some people end up being employed by agencies and that is a bit of a farce. I know that full well because my son is unemployed at the moment but he is not claiming because he works for an agency. I will tell you something now, that agency does not guarantee you five days a week, it can do as it wants with you. He can get a few weeks in five days, some two days, some one day. How on earth can a person live like that? Yes, we need to be doing better to get people into jobs. We need to be talking to employers to find out what they want and what training they want, but we have got to do something better than what we are doing now. We owe it to not just the young people but everybody out there that is looking for a job and it is all right Government Ministers saying people that are not working are scroungers – a small minority maybe are but the majority of them want jobs and we need to make sure we can get them in jobs. Thank you. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Groves.

COUNCILLOR GROVES: Thank you. We have to meet a number of crucial challenges if we are to achieve our ambitions and deliver a strong and sustainable economy for Leeds. We must help the 25,000 unemployed citizens capitalise on new and emerging opportunities for our city. We must also work hard to help those 66,000 on income related benefits.

We know that the economic climate in this country is challenging. However, our city is attracting investors. Regeneration and economy development is fantastic but if we do not take those people with us when we regenerate our city and equip them with the skills that they need to get their jobs, what does it mean?

I am confident that with the help of our Economic Department we will be able to help to prepare our young people with the skills they need for new and emerging opportunities, such as the Leeds Science Park. We must remain focused and ambitious for those unemployed people who feel isolated and anxious on a daily basis. As leaders we must desperately need to put our hearts and soul into helping them. There is no one size fits all on this agenda. However, the 396 people unemployed in Alwoodley and the 1,500 unemployed in Middleton all need the same level of support and service.

We started work over a year ago with a Jobs and Skills Board in Middleton Park. We looked at the services in our locality. It was clear that the resource was on the ground but we had a lot of silo working and there is still some of that to some extent and it was producing a diluted approach with no measurable outcomes.

South Leeds has 4,200 businesses employing 66,000 people, so why do we have one of the highest unemployment rates in the city? The answer is that industry has simply disappeared and our people were not ready for the new sectors that arrived. They did not have the skills to get that employment.

We must change if we are to make a difference. We must change how we commission, how we train and we connect to people in South Leeds. We have already started this and you cannot do it on your own. As elected Members we have worked with businesses, we have worked with Third Sector organisations and the partnerships are beginning to make a difference. We have delivered training with Leeds City College, we have evolved The Point based at the White Rose Centre offering a broad spectrum of opportunities including retail skills, customer services, security work. We have delivered four market place events in Leeds schools and One Stop Centres, we are opening a new Job Shop at the St John's Centre and we have just got a partner to deliver training for us.

We are holding a Welfare to Work event on Thursday in the heart of the Middleton estate where local employers with jobs...

THE LORD MAYOR: Please will you sum up, Councillor Groves?

COUNCILLOR GROVES: ... will be recruiting. Yes, I will. I believe that locally commissioned services are the way forward but we should also look at the strategic work we do. Do the millions of pounds of procurement deliver real jobs for our people and does the million pounds of commissioning deliver jobs to narrow the gap? We must do this---

THE LORD MAYOR: One final sentence!

COUNCILLOR GROVES: Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Robinson.

COUNCILLOR ROBINSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I was actually finding that very interesting, what was being said there, what was going on locally, but I find the White Paper put forward by Councillor Ogilvie a little confusing, because on the one hand he is praising the ATA and on the other hand he is criticising the Government.

I think we all have to recognise that Governments have to make difficult decisions on the economy, whether it is the Conservatives in the 1980s, whether it was the Labour Government in the 2000s or whether it is this Coalition Government now. No Government is any different and retraining and reskilling to make our economy competition is essential to this country's economic future. With globalisation, people and skills are moving all the time, quicker than ever. Businesses will move to different and more competitive environments if we do not keep up as a city and that is why I was finding it so interesting what Councillor Groves was saying about regeneration going on.

It includes investing in skills, and it includes investing in skills from businesses and from this Council and from this Government, and the Government is trying to do some of that, I believe. We as a Council, I worry sometimes, are speaking in a vacuum on business and actually the private sector is not listening to us.

I was finding it very interesting recently reading Lord Adonis's report on the North East of England where he was saying about the regional development there and that more needs to be devolved to those regional agencies. It is very interesting, he came out with one quote that I will paraphrase ever so slightly, that he would like to see – and what I would like to see in Leeds is as many apprentices as we have students in this city. I think it is essential that we do not just focus on high level jobs, we need to focus throughout our economy.

Welfare spending keeps on coming up in this debate and welfare spending is getting unsustainable as a country. We have seen it go up from 1997 from £55.7b to 2010 when it was up to £110.9b. It has doubled. This country cannot keep operating on the basis that we can have the cake and the ha'penny, that actually spending can keep going up and taxes can stay at exactly the same level.

I do have to say – I am going to make a slightly political point – the Party opposite has not come up with any substantial proposals on welfare nationally at the moment. When you put Liam Byrne (the man who said there is not any money left) in charge of coming up with those proposals, it is a pretty dire start. If I had any recommendation for Ed Miliband it is change him, for a start. Maybe that is a little bit of regeneration for the Labour Party to start on.

I have heard about Cameron there but this Government has created one million jobs in the private sector and it is a pretty good start, if you ask me.

Councillor Ogilvie has talked about building policy. We cannot build policy by throwing money at it, which is what we did in the past. We need to build policy far more cleverly, we need to invest in people, we need to invest in skills. This Government should be praised for devolving powers that it has done at the moment but the administration and we in Leeds need to do far more to engage with business and actually to set those skills for the people who we claim to represent. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor McNiven.

COUNCILLOR McNIVEN: Lord Mayor, in the year to September 2012 41,000 young people in Leeds aged 16 to 24 were unemployed. This is up 2,500 on the same period in the previous year. Leeds has a 10% unemployment rate; the national rate is 8.1%.

Analysis of National Unemployment Statistics for 2012 reveals that long term unemployment has more than doubled since 2008, up to 172%. Women have seen particularly sharp increases. What has been done by the Coalition to address this?

The Future Jobs Fund, introduced by the previous Labour Government, was summarily terminated after less than a year with a claim that it was expensive and unsuccessful. On the contrary, analysis of the programme by DWP in November 2012 concluded that for a cost per head of £3,100 to the Exchequer, each participant was £4,000 better off, individual employers gained £6,850 and society benefited by a massive £7,750 per participant. The gross cost was £720m but recouped roughly 50p for each pound spent on the programme.

Flexible New Deal, devised by Sir David Freud and acclaimed by specialists in the field of employment, planned to run concurrently with the Future Jobs Fund, was never given the green light by the Coalition. Instead, the Work Programme was introduced, a kind of New Deal light without the many quality assurances which would have ensured that jobs were non-exploitative and were sustainable.

Evaluation of the work programme has been conducted for DWP by the Centre for Economic and Social Inclusion. The initial report of this longitudinal study, which covers the period from late 2011 to summer 2012, makes depressing reading. To date, despite referrals to the programme increasing from £2.5m to £3.3 as unemployment increased, only 3.6% of participants had moved into work. At a cost of between £1b and £1.3b per year, is this value for money?

Being out of work for more than a year has a significant impact on people's confidence. Government needs to focus on creative initiatives to help these long term unemployed to maximise their chances of gaining and keeping jobs. I believe that this can only be achieved by the devolution of responsibility for the alleviation of worklessness to Local Authorities. We have a proven track record as exemplified by the way we as a city have embraced the apprenticeship agenda, the creation of the Apprenticeship Training Agency and our success in creating 7,204 new apprenticeships in the last academic year.

Our actions to mitigate the worse excesses of the welfare changes have resulted in a huge bank of intelligence being created in Leeds.

THE LORD MAYOR: Please will you make your final point, Councillor McNiven.

COUNCILLOR McNIVEN: We know the individuals who need to be helped into employment in our respective ward – a one size fits all employment approach throughout the country does not work. Entrust us with the welfare and deployment budgets and we will succeed where at present there is only failure. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: In order to keep within the 30 minute time limit for this White Paper motion, we now need to move to Councillor Ogilvie to sum up, so apologies to speakers who had indicated they wanted to speak.

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I will be brief. Can I thank all the speakers for their contributions – some have been more illuminating than

others. Councillor Groves I think spoke very well. A number of Members commented on what Councillor Groves was talking about in her role as the Inner South Employment Champion. I think she is actually doing some really good work at bringing together partners round the table in the Inner South to actually tackle the endemic problems that we have got in terms of employment in the city and it is a model that I think we are keen to share in other parts of the city.

We are actually working with Councillor Gruen on how we can devolve more power in the employment and skills field down to Area Committees, because I know all Members are keen to play their leadership role in this area. This takes me on to Councillor Golton's point about business engagement. We recognise that this is something that we have got to do much better and as part of the work looking at devolving down to Area Committees, we are looking at how we can use intermediaries to help do this. For example, in the South we are looking at working with Morley Chamber of Commerce; in the West working with the Ahead Partnership to work with business engagement. Just out of interest, the Employment and Skills Service has worked with 250 businesses during the last year, including 113 SMEs.

Mention was made of the ATA which started trading at the end of January. The ATA has engaged with over 180 businesses so far, which I actually think is quite good since January. Eleven apprentices have been placed in business, workplaces for a further 22 with 78 more progressing.

Councillor Lamb, I think some of your statistics and figures were somewhat dubious – I would be interested to know where you got those from.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: I will send them to you.

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: I have to say, we are not going to take lectures from parties opposite that were responsible for some of the highest levels of youth unemployment since the 1980s. We recognise that there is a lot more that needs to be done as a city but we are certainly not going to take lectures from the Conservative Party.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: I think you should.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: You might learn something.

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: The fact is that a piece of research, for example, by Sheffield Hallam University shows that when the welfare reforms have come into full effect they will take almost £19b out of the economy, and that cannot be good at all. Lord Mayor, we recognise that...

COUNCILLOR LAMB: That is a spurious figure.

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: ...we want more responsibility over employment and skills and that is what our White Paper is about and I hope Members feel able to support it. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: I am calling for a vote on the first amendment in the name of Councillor Golton. *(A vote was taken)* That motion is LOST.

I am calling for a vote on the second amendment in the name of Councillor Lamb. *(A vote was taken)* That amendment is also LOST.

I am calling for a vote on the motion. *(A vote was taken)* That is CARRIED. Thank you very much.

ITEM 13 – WHITE PAPER MOTION –
DEPUTY POLICE COMMISSIONER

THE LORD MAYOR: We are moving on to Item 13, the White Paper Motion on the Deputy Police Commissioner. Councillor Golton.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Thanks, Lord Mayor. It has got nothing to do with the cameras that I have been up so often!

I have been going on about not getting too political about some subjects but I have to say this really is an own goal and it is not strictly a party political issue.

The Police Commissioners were brought in, I am not sure about you, Les, because I know you do not toe the party line always but I certainly know this Party was not in favour of Police Commissioners and I know that Councillor Wakefield definitely was not in favour of Police Commissioners and we certainly got a statement from the public when only 13.3% of them turned out to bother to vote for them.

Unfortunately, of course, it was supposed to bring greater accountability to the role and through standing as a candidate I am afraid you are open to the full public glare of accountability. That means that the decisions of the Police Commissioner are subject to public appraisal.

It just beggars belief that this chap who, as soon as he gets selected and gets elected, the first thing that he commissions as a Police Commissioner is a deputy that he told no-one about in his manifesto, a deputy that he restricts to just one Party, so he is not interested in thinking, "Do you know what, I know what my priorities are I am going to find somebody who is going to stand by me and support me." No, his first thought is, "Who from my Party can I help into a high paying position?" As soon as he has done it, and I will not mention all those connected within Labour Party regionally in terms...

COUNCILLOR J McKENNA: Whose legislation is this, Stuart?

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: ...in terms of who she is married to, but when he has done that he goes and does it a third time and appoints a Labour Councillor to be Director of Communications or Policy or something.

It would be comedic if it was not actually very, very serious. The fact that we only have 13.3% of people voting in the Commissioner elections is because they were disengaged. They said, "Do you know what, this is a decision on high and we are not going to participate." When these kind of decisions get taken by a politician – because that is what this Police Commissioner is, they are a politician – they do not just think, "Oh, the Labour Party, what a terrible corrupt bunch they are in their cronyism." No, they put us in with it, put the Tories in with it, they put the Liberals in, they put every politician in and it is that kind of open disdain for the public and their taxpayers' money which allows the likes of UKIP to slip into our midst.

We have already seen off some of the right-wing miscreants on this Council and I do not think it is responsible for those people who get elected to high office to behave in this manner and create an environment where it is even easier for those kind of politicians to make their mark in this city. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Leadley.

COUNCILLOR LEADLEY: My Lord Mayor, I wish to second Councillor Golton's motion. Both the motion and the amendment have their good points. They come to similar conclusions, though from different starting points. It may be that not many will have ploughed on to the end of the Minute Book published for our 12th September meeting last year. Those who did will have been rewarded by an account on those remote pages of fascinating events at the Annual Meeting of the West Yorkshire Pension Fund Joint Advisory Group. How was it that such an obscure organisation elected a Chairman, changed its Governance Compliance Statement (in effect its constitution), had its new Chairman resign and elected another new Chairman all in the space of a few minutes? Might it have been to create a job for the former Leader of Bradford City Council who had lost his seat earlier in the year?

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: Surely not. Surely not. Shocking.

COUNCILLOR LEADLEY: A few months ago who would have thought that a job as well paid as Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner would have been advertised with a qualification that only paid-up members of one political party need apply?

What is the purpose of Mr Burns-Williamson's strategy? Does he mean to create a socialist police force (*laughter*) to provide sheltered employment for some superannuated members of the KGB (*laughter*), the Stasi or the Securitate? Those police forces were not as efficient as all that. There was a meeting of the Albanian Politburo in the 1970s which developed into a furious row which ended when its members all drew revolvers and shot each other. (*laughter*) None of them had been frisked on the way in. It is said that only Comrade Chairman Enver Hoxha showed the eagle-eyed foresight of a true leader of the proletariat. He was the only one wearing a bullet proof vest! (*laughter*)

I understand that he (that is Burns-Williamson rather than Hoxha) has now appointed a research assistant, also on a Labour only contract. These recent events do seem to have been a throwback, perhaps not to things which used to happen behind the Iron Curtain but certainly to a time when political bosses in England handed out public sector jobs to their political cronies and associates.

Certainly the very idea of having elected Police and Crime Commissioners was positively daft, but there is no excuse for profiting from a farce when it is at public expense. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Gruen to move an amendment.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: Lord Mayor, I am the straight man today, clearly, when there is political knockabout and I know I am in what is called Fergie time, so I will be quick.

The real issue today is what have the last two speakers got in common?

COUNCILLOR: They are not in power.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: They are not in power and neither of their parties have got a single Police Commissioner in the whole of the country. I know, it is very sad, it is very sad.

The issue for us really is the whole legislation leading up to this is totally flawed. Nobody in this Chamber ever wanted a Police and Crime Commissioner and, indeed, if you ask someone to sabotage an election, what would you say to them? What would you have to do? The first thing you do is you hold an election in

November when it is dark nights. You would hold it with a seven, eight months out of date election register. You would tell nothing to anybody, you would not advertise it or publicise it. You would say to candidates, “You are forbidden to publicise yourself and send anything out, we will not pay for it.”

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: What has that got to do with it?

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: Then you would make it so complicated and meaningless that nobody actually turns out and you refuse to say beforehand what the threshold would be when these people would actually have any credibility.

All of that process by the Coalition Government – that is my amendment, if you would care to read it.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: I have read it, Peter.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: I am talking to Councillor Hamilton, who looks stupendously incredulous. That is his normal look, that is his look on a good day!

I think you should actually blame your Government for introducing a nonsense of legislation and then allowing people in the legislation to do what they want.

The Conservative PCC in Humberside appointed his crony ward colleague and said, “Hey, mate, you can be my deputy” and this guy then refused to resign as a Councillor, took both salaries until they forced him out.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Why didn't you learn from that mistake?

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: In West Mercia there is an Independent and he has been appointed on a £50,000 a year salary and he was a campaign manager of this particular person. In Essex, £50k, £60k, no experience, nothing. In Kent they appointed a Youth Commissioner and we all know about what happened to her within a matter of days. Few can be paid £15,000. The Conservative in Northamptonshire has got four Assistant PCCs – four – every one of them on 65,000 quid.

Come on, this is a national issue. It is a national issue because of your wretched legislation that nobody wanted and you foisted upon the people of this country. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Charlwood.

COUNCILLOR CHARLWOOD: I will formally second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ann Blackburn.

COUNCILLOR A BLACKBURN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am fed up of getting up and down today! This is something that I have got to speak on.

The thing is that as you may or may not know, the Green Party did not put anybody up for the Police and Crime Commissioner role. The reason why not is, we did not believe in doing so, so we did not even have a name on the ballot paper. In fact, a couple of people rang up and asked us why not and we did explain why that was because we said do we really need a Police and Crime Commissioner? We do not believe we did in the Green Party, and according to people across parties when we discussed it before, none of us believed we needed one yet, of course, when it comes down to it people do put in for it when it is there, I suppose. It is a decent

salary after all, isn't it, I suppose, really? I would also say so why do we need a Deputy Commissioner? Again, I do not think we do.

Certainly from the ballot box, which has been mentioned before, the majority of people and also people who I spoke to up and down – not just in my ward, around the place – also do not see the point. They said, “We did OK before, why do we need one now?”

I believe that, OK, we have got them now whether we like it or not. We have got them so surely, now we have got one, they should be taking notice and think, “Well, not a lot of people voted for me really so come on, I have got to give them a bit of confidence in me, I am doing the right thing.”

To me they should not be having a Deputy Commissioner, whether it be Labour Party or whoever it is. They should not be having one. That money should be put back into policing. We need more front line policing, I think we all agree we need more front line policing. I know in my ward and I am sure others there are always problems out there. We need more policing – why not spend it on that? As far as I am concerned they should have spent all the lot on that and not bothered with any Commissioners at all. *(Applause)*

We will be supporting this motion and I hope the rest of you do as well. Thank you. *(Applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor J L Carter.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I have a lot to follow today, haven't I? Councillor Leadley is extremely amusing but not relevant to this debate. Peter just made a lot of smoke because he did not want to actually get down to the nub of the issue.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: Les, that is unfair.

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: The nub of the issue is quite clear, very clear, Peter, should the people who we support pay 56,000 quid a year for a Labour adviser? That is the question, that is the point and I do not believe they should.

I am a bit disappointed because I was a great supporter of Mark. I did not actually vote for him but I was not far from it, I will tell you. I was delighted when he got the job having been his deputy for five years, I thought he will be OK, he will be his own man and he will go forward.

COUNCILLOR DOWNES: You were his deputy?

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Yes. I did not take £56,000 a year!

COUNCILLOR TAGGART: Are you a secret member of the Labour Party, Les?

COUNCILLOR J L CARTER: Yes, that is right. The point is, when I was his deputy Mark was his own man but what did he do? The person he has appointed, she is a political adviser, we know that, there is no disguising that, and she is a very good political adviser – a Labour political adviser, we know all that, but what she is not is a deputy because if Mark Burns-Williamson goes ill or goes missing for a period of time, she takes over his role, all the responsibilities he has got, and one of those responsibilities is to hold the Chief Constable to account for the benefit of the people of West Yorkshire.

When we interviewed her and asked her about this particular point, she admitted she had not got the skills to do that. She had not got the skills to do it, she admitted it. No ifs, no buts, the girl was honest, she is an intelligent person, she was honest but she has not got the skills for the job.

Then he has gone on and started to appoint an adviser at another £40,000-odd a year. This man is from Newcastle. He was an Executive Labour Board Member up in Newcastle. He has now come down, suddenly he has got this job. It is all on the internet, he has got the job, so we are now paying nearly £100,000 a year for political appointments, in my opinion.

I do not care what you say Peter, you can do and think what you want, I think that would have been far better spent on the police. It would have given us more officers and that should be where it is spent. When Mark Burns-Williamson cries out about the Government cuts, he cannot do that when he is prepared to pay £100,000 a year for political advisers which he does not need. Thank you, Lord Mayor.
(Applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lowe.

COUNCILLOR LOWE: I am speaking in support of Councillor Gruen's amendment.

As you all know, there has been no-one who has spoken more vociferously against this appointment than me and yet I am able to support this amendment because quite frankly I think this whole matter has got boring. I have talked about this issue for six months and so has the Police and Crime Panel. We need now to move on and do what we were chosen to do by this Council and that is to hold the PCC to account for policing in West Yorkshire. The people of West Yorkshire are interested in one thing and one thing only – crime, reduction of crime, safer communities, safer homes. They do not want us to keep wasting time, energy and resources talking about something that is past.

The reason why Mark has made this appointment is because the legislation allowed him to do so and in fact the legislation encouraged him to do so because the only course that he can make that is not politically restricted is the Deputy post. It quite clearly says it in the legislation (which I have got a copy of here, if anyone is interested) so not only did Therese May and then the Police Minister say this is a political post that we expect you to make, that is exactly what Mark has done. If you have got a complaint to make about this, make it to the right people. As I told you on the Police and Crime Panel, that is Theresa May because she is the one at fault here.

I want us now to move forward with Mark and the Police and Crime Panel to do the job that we have been chosen to do, hold him to account for policing and not the rest. We have had the debate, move on because I am bored and I am sure the people of West Yorkshire are equally bored. Get over it, move on. (Applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Golton to sum up.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Do you know what, Alison, we have not had the argument. You might have had it, all your lot on that bench might have had it and you might have all gone "Oh my God, what an embarrassment", but do you know what, we have not had the opportunity to do it and we had the opportunity delayed because, if you remember, this meeting was supposed to happen a few weeks ago,

so if this argument has dragged on it is not because we did not want to have it sooner.

COUNCILLOR TAGGART: She died of natural causes, we did not kill her.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: As for you saying it is boring now, move on and, what was it, “the legislation allowed him to do so”, do you know what, I thought that the Commissioner was paid £100,000 to think. I thought a Police Commissioner was about pride and order and about being a moral arbiter, because the decisions he has taken have set him back and his own reputation. He has already said he had a fantastic reputation while he was doing his old job. The has got a new job, the money has gone to his head and, do you know what, he has actually sullied it not just for him and for your party but for us as well and that is why we are having that debate today, because we have not had an opportunity to debate it. We do not find it boring, we find it disgusting. (*Applause*)

Peter Gruen. I am really glad that Councillor Lowe can find it in herself to support your amendment, but the amendment does nothing to actually address the question that we have got here which basically is about standards in public office. Basically to turn round and say, “Do you know what, it is in the legislation and if it is in the legislation he is allowed to do it.” Just because you are allowed to does not mean to say you have to. You have given loads of examples of other people that have done the same thing – these have appointed a deputy, and these have appointed a deputy, and this one has appointed two or three. Do you know what, as I said again, those are examples of how not to do it and each area gets its own Commissioner because they are supposed to have their own mind and they are supposed to make decisions according to their area.

We have heard a lot about police cuts. I have had it in Labour leaflets put out by Councillor Bruce in my area *ad infinitum*. She is very good at getting her message across – I hope you are going to promote her some day. Do you know what, she talks about 20% police cuts all the time. £100,000 we have here, £100,000 that could go in front line policing. Ann Blackburn hit it on the head. It is front line policing that people want and that is what they commissioned him to do, the few that voted for him, so why does he not start delivering it? (*Applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: I am calling for a vote on the amendment in the name of Councillor Gruen. (*A vote was taken*) The amendment is CARRIED and now becomes the substantive motion.

All those in favour of the substantive motion? (*A vote was taken*) That is CARRIED.

That brings us to the end of this today’s meeting. Thank you for your attendance and a safe journey home.

(The meeting closed at 7.24pm)